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Abstract

This project demonstrates how Horace uses rhetoric in his poetics in order to advocate for moderation. The first chapter focuses on the rhetorical strategies of the *Satires*, in which Horace uses a poetic *persona* with an ambiguous social status and that acts as a bad *exemplum* of the morals he advocates for. The chapter also explores Horace’s use of a motif where something that appears quantifiably larger is, in fact, either of equal or lesser worth, which also appeals to issues of class. The second chapter turns to Horace’s use of rhetoric in the *Odes*. In the *Odes*, Horace focuses his attention on the quickness of time and impending death to discourage his audience from expecting too much of the future or engaging in activities that are inappropriate for their age. Horace offers this message to several different addressees throughout the *Odes*, which further broadens the scope and universality of his powerful message.
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INTRODUCTION

Rhetoric and Poetics

Rhetoric, according to Aristotle, is a discourse whose function is “to see the available means of persuasion” (*On Rhetoric* 1355a). Aristotle also describes three species of persuasion: *ethos*, or character of the speaker, *logos*, which relates to the argument itself, and *pathos*, where the hearers are led to feel a specific emotion. Late in the Roman Republican period Cicero describes the function of rhetoric as follows: *docere debitum est, delectare honorarium, permovere necessarium*, “to teach is an obligation, to please is complimentary, to move is necessary” (*De Optimo Genere Oratorum* 1.4). With these ancient definitions in mind, I consider rhetoric in Horace to be the persuasive strategies he uses to teach, please, or move; in other words, the ways in which Horace aims to change the way in which his audience thinks about the issues he addresses. In particular, Horace accomplishes the goal of *docere* (teach) because his poetry is didactic in nature. Since teaching is a goal, it ought to move (*permovere*) the reader to change their behavior and live their life in the way that Horace suggests. Horace also aims to *delectare* (please), as he points out in his *Ars Poetica.* In order to reach his rhetorical goals, he must also focus on the three species (*ethos, pathos* and *logos*) that Aristotle lays out in *On Rhetoric* 1356a. Rhetorical situation, or the context in which a rhetorical act takes place, is important to consider in any rhetorical analysis. Aristotle describes the importance of context in rhetoric: “so opportunities (*kairoi*) and ages in life and places and times and powers

---

1 Translation by Kennedy 1991.
2 *On Rhetoric* 1356a.
3 Latin text from Hubbell 1949.
4 See Toohey 1996 for overview on didactic poetry, which he defines as poetry that “aims to instruct” (2).
5 *Ars Poetica* 333-335: *aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae / aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere vitae. / quidquid praecipies…* “whether poets wish to benefit or please, or to speak at once both the delights and proper things for life, whatever you will advise …”

make things great; for if a person [acts] beyond his power and beyond his age and beyond such
things and if [the actions are done] in such a way or place or at such a time, he will have
greatness of fine and good and just things and their opposites.” 6 Horace is especially concerned
with timing in his work and how certain things are appropriate at certain times, as will be
discussed below. In the Ars Poetica, he says: ordinis haec virtus erit et venus, aut ego fallor, / ut
iam nunc dicat iam nunc debentia dici “this virtue and charm of arrangement, or I am wrong,
will be that one say here and now things which ought to be said here and now” (42-43). 7 Horace
considers timing and the context of his work in order to make his arguments stronger.

When considering the role of rhetoric and persuasion in poetry, it is also necessary to
consider definitions of poetics. Aristotle defines poetics as something that is mimetic, or that
imitates or represents something in life; however, not everything written in verse might be
considered mimetic. 8 For instance, Aristotle lists Empedocles as an example of someone who
writes in verse but is not mimetic because he is describing science and not imitating or
describing something in life. 9 This nuanced distinction is significant because, as I aim to show,
Horace is being both mimetic, and therefore poetic, and also instructive, and therefore rhetorical,
in his works. Horace himself seems to follow a similar model to Aristotle in his own exploration
of poetry since he also considers poetry in terms of mimesis: ex noto fictum carmen sequar, “I
will pursue verse formed from something known” (Ars Poetica 240). Despite the fact that
Horace admits that his poetry is mimetic, Horace still engages in rhetoric in his works.

6 On Rhetoric 1365a. See also Carey 1994: “the precise effects sought depend on the situation of the speaker” (29).
Carey also offers a detailed discussion on Aristotle’s species of rhetoric as means of persuasion.
7 Latin text from Rudd 1989. Translation is my own.
8 On Poetics 1447a.
9 On Poetics 1447b.
The issue concerning whether rhetoric and poetics are compatible is controversial and has between rhetoric and poetics is William Howell’s 1968 essay, “Aristotle and Horace on Rhetoric and Poetics,” in which he ultimately argues that the two discourses are incompatible based on Aristotle’s definition of poetics discussed above. Nevertheless, he does acknowledge that the different discourses may have an influence on one another: an orator may turn to an anecdote in order to further his argument but, ultimately, the mimetically influenced anecdote is still under the control of a non-mimetic aim, which is to offer support to what the orator is recommending.10 While I disagree with Howell’s overall statement concerning the incompatibility of rhetoric and poetics, his discussion of how the different types of discourse overlap, as described above, is helpful because he delineates how a poet or orator may use techniques from each other to further their own goals. This overlap is important because my project investigates how Horace implements rhetoric in his poetry. However, where Howell suggests that Horace’s work would only be poetic and concerned with aesthetics, I demonstrate that his work is both poetry and rhetoric because his goals concern both aesthetics and persuasion.

Where Howell argues for the distinct paths of rhetoric and poets, other scholars have gone into great depth about the rich and intertwined history of rhetoric and poetics. For instance, Walker addresses the complicated history between the two forms of discourse and how they overlap throughout their respective development and are, therefore, not mutually exclusive, as Howell suggests. Medievalist Charles Sears Baldwin suggests that “poetry and rhetoric were fundamentally different, even incompatible things, which the ancients had perversely persisted in confusing.”11 Walker, in his book *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity*, refutes this claim.12

---

10 Howell 1968: 333.
11 Baldwin 1924.
Matthew Fox suggests that “the terms ‘rhetoric’ and ‘literature’ do not have constant, historically unchanging terms of reference; and the differences between our own application of these terms today and the equivalent Roman categorizations are as enormous as the differences between the two worlds to which they are applied,” suggesting that these terms were more ambiguous for the Romans than for a modern audience. In a more recent study, Irene Peirano-Garrison argues that “rhetorical theory is interesting not as a system of classification that poets follow or depart from but rather as a powerful cultural lens through which poetry is viewed, read and sometimes disowned as a rhetorically constructed genre,” which suggests that rhetoric as a “cultural lens” may have unconsciously influenced poetry, even if ancients themselves distinguished the two genres, especially in the post-Augustan period. Overall, rhetoric and poetics seem to evolve together and the boundaries of each are not well defined both in a modern context and an ancient one. Regardless of the perceived finitude or lack thereof of the categories of rhetoric and poetics, rhetoric would have been inherently present in any text that aimed at affecting its audience. The inclusion of rhetoric may not be intentional, but is still present, especially in a society, such as ancient Rome, in which rhetoric was an integral part of the education system. The difficulty that scholars have had in establishing boundaries for the two genres shows that the two discourses may have leaked into one another despite what authors may have thought themselves.

Furthermore, an author’s use of rhetoric and/or poetics affects its aural quality and effects the listener’s ear. Rhetoric is generally associated with oratory and speech-giving, and certain aural aspects of a text affect how the text is received. Since a rhetorician is concerned with how their words are received in order that they may produce the desired affect with their audience, sound plays a major role in the crafting of a speech. Poetry also has a performative quality,

---

whether it is heard at a performance or simply being read and is also something that one would listen to with the meter playing a large role in the aural quality of the piece. As a result, I suggest that regardless of whether scholars define rhetoric and poetics as distinct, both share an affinity in their need to appeal to a listener. Isocrates, an Athenian rhetorician, suggested that “even poetry mediocre in thought could beguile hearers by effects of harmony and symmetry in themselves,” which suggests that sound was a crucial component for persuasion.\(^{15}\) The sophists also studied the aesthetics of sound, especially in the work of Gorgias.\(^{16}\) Overall, both poets and rhetoricians are influenced by how words sound and they manipulate the aural aspects of their work in order to help them achieve their overall purpose.\(^{17}\) Alliteration serves as an example for an aural aspect of both poetry and rhetoric. In the speech *In Catilinam I*, Cicero repeats an *s* sound in order to make Catiline seem suspiciously snake-like.\(^{18}\) Horace also uses alliteration rhetorically in *Odes* 1.4.13, where Horace imitates the sound of Death knocking on the door by repeating the sound *p*, which I examine in more detail in Chapter 2.\(^{19}\)

**Rhetoric and Horace**

While I have previously discussed the relationship between rhetoric and literature in general, it is also worth noting how rhetoric may have been used as a tool for reading Horace for scholars in the last century. A crucial source for Horace’s use of rhetoric is his own *Ars Poetica*, published about twelve to fifteen years after the *Satires* and the first three books of *Odes* in c. 19

---

\(^{16}\) Wilkinson 1963: 10. See also Consigny 1992 for a discussion on Gorgias’ poetic style.
\(^{17}\) Coleman-Norton 1948 offers a discussion on how orators would have compared their art to music, which, again, emphasizes the importance of sound in oratory (19).
\(^{18}\) *Non solum insidiantem somno maritorum,* “not only plotting against the sleep of spouses” (*In Catilinam I*: 26).
\(^{19}\) *Odes* 1.4.13, *Pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas*... “Pale Death knocks on the huts of the poor with an impartial foot.”
BC. Horace himself says *non satis est pulchra esse poemata; dulcia sunto, / et quocumque volent animum auditoris agunto*, “it is not enough that poems be pretty; let them be sweet, and may they drive the mind of the hearer wherever they (the poets) want” (*Ars Poet.* 99-100). Here, Horace directly says that poetry may have an effect on the minds of men, which is also the goal of rhetoric. If a poet is able to lead the mind to where they, the poets themselves, want, they must be aiming to persuade the listener. Any analysis that examines rhetoric should consider a work’s rhetorical situation, which would include the audience and context of the work. The *ethos* or character of the speaker is also a significant aspect of rhetoric, and therefore should also be considered in a rhetorical analysis. Horace acknowledges this himself: *ordinis haec virtus erit et venus, aut ego fallor, / ut iam nunc dicat iam nunc debentia dici*, “this virtue and charm will be of this order, or I am deceived, that he may say here and now things that should be said here and now” (*Ars Poet.* 42-43). Horace notes that there is an appropriate time to say certain things as expressed with the temporal adverbs *iam nunc*, an idea that is also relevant in rhetoric where *kairos* or ‘timing’ should be taken into consideration by someone composing a speech act.20

Regarding rhetorical situations, Ellen Oliensis has been especially influential in offering ways to read Horace. She focuses on Horace’s poetic “situations” and the relationship between the speaker and addressees of Horace’s poetry; she also uses the term “overreader” for whom the addressee “sometimes functions as a conduit… it is the kind of relation, whereby one person stands in for or in front of another.”21 An addressee of Horace’s poetry may sometimes function “as a conduit for another conversation with an overreader,” or someone other than the explicit addressee.22 The overreaders that Oliensis describes are usually specific people, such as

---
Maecenas or even Horace himself and are different from *persona* in that they are not a mask for the speaker of the poem, but rather a party to whom the poem is being implicitly addressed.\(^{23}\) While Oliensis describes specific people as overreaders, Francis Cairns suggests an even broader intended audience in his examination of *Odes* 1.20.\(^{24}\) It is obvious that Horace’s audience goes beyond the poet’s addressee, but the acknowledgement of an audience outside of the poem’s specific address is significant, since there are separate rhetorical situations both within the poetry itself and in the later reception of the poems. Kathleen McCarthy, in an analysis of Catullus 6, shows how there are two poetic situations in a given poem: one is the context within the poem, in which characters, specifically the speaker and addressees, interact, and the other is the context in which the author historically wrote the poem.\(^{25}\) The analysis of Catullus 6 is also applicable to Horace’s work where there is one interaction happening within the poem itself that is simultaneous with an interaction happening outside of the poem between the author and reader.

**Rhetoric and Satire**

Just as scholars have questions about rhetoric’s relationship to poetry in general, there has also been significant debate concerning rhetoric’s relationship to satire more specifically. Dan Hooley suggests that satirists would not have consciously used rhetoric, while Catherine Keane suggests that satire is full of several genres including law and teaching, with the latter especially involving rhetoric.\(^{26}\) Michèle Lowrie also discusses the connection between satiric and legal language, especially in *Satires* 2.1, where Horace intentionally has Trebatius imitate a legal style.

\(^{24}\) Cairns 1992 points out that in *Odes* 1.20 Horace makes several references within the poem directed at his contemporary audience (85). Therefore, although the ode is addressed to Maecenas, Horace’s work is directed at a larger audience.
\(^{25}\) McCarthy 2019: 3.
in order to draw a connection between satire and law.\textsuperscript{27} The \textit{Satires} of Horace are ostensibly didactic; the narrator is often moralizing and warns his audience against a variety of different vices. In this way, the satirist is fulfilling the role of a rhetorician because he is aiming to teach his audience about the correct way to live. Frances Muecke also discusses law and rhetoric in her chapter on \textit{Satires} 2.1, noting that the rhetoric in this satire centers around Horace’s \textit{recusatio} and \textit{priamel}.\textsuperscript{28} She offers a counterpoint to Leeman who suggests that, in \textit{Satires} 2.1, Trebatius helps Horace formulate the \textit{status} (the point on which a case is turned in rhetoric) of his poetry and of the cases that are made against him.\textsuperscript{29} Both analyses argue that Horace is consciously using rhetorical theory in his work.

A significant aspect of satire that claims its roots in rhetoric is the satiric \textit{persona}, discussed in more detail below. Deer and Deer describe \textit{persona} as “a character created to serve the author’s dramatic purpose.”\textsuperscript{30} Since the satirist has a purpose to serve, he must inherently be serving his purpose using rhetoric. Unlike traditional oratory, the \textit{persona} may not necessarily be someone that the author intends for his audience to trust. However, Deer and Deer also point out when discussing Heller’s \textit{Catch 22} and Genet’s \textit{The Balcony} that “both writers show us corruption and dehumanization by inviting us to play the destructive games their characters are playing while making us observe how destructive they actually are.”\textsuperscript{31} Kirk Freudenberg discusses \textit{persona} in ancient satire more specifically as a mask that the satirist wore that likely did not represent the writer himself, and he points out that \textit{persona} is also a common term in rhetoric for assuming a certain character.\textsuperscript{32} I hope to show in my discussion on his \textit{persona}, that

\begin{footnotes}
\item Lowrie 2005: 408-409.
\item Muecke 1995: 215.
\item Leeman 1982.
\item Deer and Deer 1977: 712.
\item Deer and Deer 1977: 715.
\item Freudenberg 1993: 4.
\end{footnotes}
Horace uses the same strategy in his *Satires*. His *persona* says one thing, but through the language of the verses, Horace shows us something else. The result is that Horace argues for his point by using his *persona* as an example of negative behavior.

Rhetoric also lends itself well as a tool for writing satire because it is didactic and instructive in nature. Cicero describes the function of the ideal orator as follows: *Optimus est enim orator qui dicendo animos audientium et docet et delectat et permovet*, “for the best orator is he who by speaking teaches and delights and moves the minds of those listening” (*De Optimo Genere Oratorum* 1.3).33 Like the orator, a satirist teaches (*docere*) his audience how to live, and his teaching arouses humor which pleases (*delectare*), and he hopes to move (*permovere*) his audience into heeding his words; therefore, the aim of the satirist is the same as that of the rhetorician. In his study of persuasion in satire, Charles Witke writes: “Insofar as the poet of satire seeks to persuade his audience to change, he is a rhetorician. It is useful to contrast the functions of rhetoric and poetry in reference to satire, because satire is… both persuasion and art.”34 Horace is rhetorical in his *Satires* in that he teaches (*docere*) his audience certain moral lessons, especially in regard to moderation, in a way that is pleasing (*delectare*) in order to move (*permovere*) his readers to adopt the moderation that he promotes. In the *Satires*, as I detail in Chapter 1, Horace advocates for moderation as a life practice by way of an inconsistent poetic *persona* and by use of other rhetorical strategies such as *exempla*, repetition, and the juxtaposition of opposites.

Notably, Horace also uses rhetoric for a greater social and political purpose. He wields it as a tool to keep the elite in power in his promotion of a simple and more moderate way of life. 35

---

33 Latin text from Hubbell 1949. Translation is my own.
34 Witke 1970: 15.
35 Connolly 2007. In *The State of Speech*, Joy Connolly, looking primarily at Cicero, argues that rhetoric can be a political practice in Rome and that it is embedded deeply in society. In particular, Connolly looks at rhetoric as a
Nevertheless, he keeps his own social status ambivalent throughout the *Satires*. The effect of this ambivalence along with the other rhetorical strategies that Horace uses—his inconsistent *persona*, *exempla*, repetition, juxtaposition of opposites—is that the parameters that define different social classes become meaningless, because the rich can have their needs met with the same amount of resources that can accommodate the poor. Likewise, there is no reason for the lower classes to complain about their plight since they have sufficient resources and are living life with either equal or higher quality to the rich.

**Rhetoric and Lyric**

Like the *Satires*, Horace’s *Odes* (Books 1-3, 23 BC; Book 4, 13 BC) are didactic in nature and, therefore, Horace continues to fulfill the *docere* goal of an orator. In the *Odes*, Horace promotes specific ideals and ways of life in the manner of an orator or philosopher. In his book, *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse*, Gregson Davis has shown that Horace uses rhetoric in order to persuade his readers toward a specific view of the world. Davis suggests that the poet must compose a “lyric argument” and “the composer of the *Odes* is primarily engaged… in conveying ideas and philosophical insights in a manner that is rhetorically persuasive.”

Daniel Marković makes a similar claim for the contemporary poet Lucretius, who also espouses an Epicurean way of living through poetry. Horace’s lyric poetry also gives ample opportunity for creating aural effects. L.P. Wilkinson describes the *Odes* as “remarkably smooth-flowing,” which is in line with Cicero’s recommendations that words be way to maintain the *status quo* and keep the elite in power, while appeasing the masses by forming a national Roman community.

36 Davis 1991: 2.

37 Marković 2008: “Epicurean concern with the problems of ethics and with the question of how one should live one’s life makes rhetoric indisputably relevant for an analysis of Epicurean discourse” (10).
smooth and evenly flowing. His work in lyric is especially of interest in terms of Horace’s use of meter, since he makes use of so many different schemes. These schemes, as I show in my second chapter, change how the poem is heard and interpreted.

Pindar, the epinician poet of fifth-century Greece, also influenced the Odes of Horace. Like Horace, Pindar seems to take stances in his poetry in which he engages in rhetoric. One way in which he does this is through the genre of epinikion itself that falls under the epideictic category of rhetoric laid out by Aristotle, which is rhetoric intended to praise or blame. The references to Pindar and his Epinician style of poetry implies that Horace was working with a poet who would have been writing in a style that is adjacent to Aristotle’s epideictic rhetoric.

Although the explicit point of Pindar’s odes is to praise victors of various games, Pindar makes other, less explicit points. In this case, he is engaging in deliberative rhetoric, which Aristotle defines as προτροπὴ τοῦ δὲ ἀποτροπῆ, “hortatory or dissuasive” (Rhet. 1.3.3). Pindar also makes use of deliberative rhetoric since he makes claims that he wants his audience to agree with.

Leslie Kurke suggests a possible argument for Isthmian 2 in her book, The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy, in which she asserts that Pindar is making an argument about money that pertains to society overall, and not only to the subjects being praised in the poem. At a certain point, Kurke directly refers to the poem’s “argument,” which she suggests is that money, when used properly, can be a useful tool to help one make progress for

---

39 Thomas 2011 calls the first part Odes 4.1, “a long Pindaric sentence, marked by a peculiar parenthesis and praeteritio” (131). In Odes 1.1, we can also see the Pindaric reference early on where there is a reference to currículo pulverem Olympicum, “Olympic dust on the course” (lines 3-4).
40 Rhetoric 1.3.3. See also Race Style and Rhetoric in Pindar’s Odes for an in-depth analysis of the rhetorical function of Pindar’s style in the Odes.
41 The works of Pindar and Aristotle’s coining Epideictic rhetoric are asynchronous. Carey 2007 points out, in reference to Aristotle’s categories (epideictic, deliberative and judicial) that “both the division and the labels are derived from existing trends in oratorical practice. Fourth century rhetoric codified but did not create the categories” (236). It is fair to apply Aristotle’s Rhetoric to those who came before him because he was observing a norm that had already been in practice.
42 Rhetoric 1.3.3.
themselves in the world. Kurke suggests that Pindar praises Thrasyboulos and Xenocrates for using their money wisely in *Isthmian* 2, and one of the ways in which they use money wisely is by commissioning a poem from Pindar. The idea that Pindar is creating an argument in poetry suggests that he must be using rhetoric to do so. He is trying to convince his audience of something by using deliberative rhetoric. At the end of the ode, he says: μὴ ἄρετάν ποτε σιγάτω πατρῶν, / μηδὲ τοῦσδ᾽ ἐμνους ἐπεί τοι/ οὐκ ἐλινύσοντας αὐτοὺς ἐργασάμαν., “let him not ever be silent about his father’s excellence nor these hymns, which I did not compose to be at rest” (*Isth*. 2.44-46). At this instance as well, Pindar seems to showcase song and poetry as a source of honor. Pindar’s argument is that song and poetry are beneficial aspects of society and that it is an honor for someone to have a song written about them. Overall, Pindar is able to make an argument about the proper way to use money and how one should act in that facet of society.

Likewise, Horace, who references Pindar frequently in the *Odes*, makes arguments in his own poetry. Like Pindar, Horace argues for how one should act and live in society. Like Horace as well, Pindar addresses his poem to one person, Thrasyboulos, but his argument is meant to reach to his entire readership.

**Chapter Summary**

In this thesis, I examine how Horace uses rhetoric in the *Satires* and the *Odes* in order to advocate for a moderate way of life. Horace employs various poetic devices, including the manipulation of meters and repeating motifs, to advance his calls for moderation. Part of Horace’s rhetorical strategy requires the construction of his character as a poet in the two works and how he interacts with different characters within them. The effect is that the world and

---

43 Kurke 2013: 213.
characters within the verses create a rhetorical effect that influences how Horace’s readers receive the message of moderation. Therefore, the fictional world within Horace’s work also constitutes a rhetorical strategy.

The first chapter, “Inconsistency as a Rhetorical Strategy in Horace’s Satires,” examines how Horace employs several rhetorical strategies, such as the use of exempla, repetition, and the juxtaposition of opposites, to advocate for moderation, especially with regard to wealth. In this chapter, I show how Horace uses a persona that is inconsistent with the social class and morals he espouses to support his message. I go on to trace Horace’s exploration of the motif where something that appears quantifiably larger is, in fact, either of equal or lesser worth. The repeated motif appeals to issues of wealth and social mobility to show that belonging to the upper class is not necessarily better than belonging to the lower class, and conversely, belonging to the lower class is not necessarily worse than belonging to the upper class. Finally, I discuss how this motif draws upon existing Epicurean ideas, and therefore helps to bolster his rhetorical means of arguing for moderation.

My second chapter, “Mortality and Praise as Rhetoric in Horace’s Odes,” turns to Horace’s arsenal of rhetoric in the Odes. In his later work, Horace advocates for moderation in a style that continues to be didactic. In the Odes, however, Horace focuses his attention on the quickness of time and impending death to discourage his audience from expecting too much of the future or engaging in activities that are inappropriate for their age. Mortality helps Horace advocate for moderation because death is an experience that is shared by all of humanity regardless of social status; no matter how rich someone is, they all suffer the same fate: death. Horace offers this message to several different addressees throughout the Odes, which further broadens the scope and universality of his powerful message.
In both works, Horace uses rhetoric to teach his audience to pursue a moderate way of life. The means by which he does this is through crafting *persona* in his works, which are characterized in order to advance his rhetorical aims. He also uses the sound of the poetry in itself, especially by manipulating the meter and using alliteration and repetition. Horace’s sound effects align with the content of the poem, which has the rhetorical effect of emphasizing Horace’s argument. Horace seamlessly uses both rhetoric and poetics in order to teach, please and move his readers.

45 For an example of Horace’s content aligning with sound effects, see the knocks of Death in *Odes* 1.4.13, which is discussed in detail in Chapter 2.
CHAPTER ONE
Inconsistency as a Rhetorical Strategy in Horace’s Satires

Introduction

Due to its didactic nature, rhetoric lends itself well as a tool for writing satire. Cicero describes the function of the ideal orator as: *Optimus est enim orator qui dicendo animos audientium et docet et delectat et permovet*, “for the best orator is he who by speaking teaches and delights and moves the minds of those listening” (*De Optimo Genere Oratorum* 1.3). Like the orator, a satirist teaches (*docere*) his audience how to live, and his teaching arouses humor which pleases (*delectare*), and he hopes to move (*permovere*) his audience into heeding his words; therefore, the aim of the satirist is the same as that of the rhetorician. In his study of persuasion in satire, Witke writes: “Insofar as the poet of satire seeks to persuade his audience to change, he is a rhetorician. It is useful to contrast the functions of rhetoric and poetry in reference to satire, because satire is…both persuasion and art.” Horace is rhetorical in his *Satires* in that he teaches (*docere*) his audience certain moral lessons, especially in regard to moderation, in a way that is pleasing (*delectare*) in order to move (*permovere*) his readers to adopt the moderation that he promotes. To Horace (65-8 BC), the Roman satirist and lyricist of the Late Roman Republican era, moderation is a value attributed to one who lives correctly, a value which manifests itself through several different themes and motifs. In the *Satires*, Horace advocates for moderation as a life practice by way of an inconsistent poetic persona and by use of other rhetorical strategies such as *exempla*, repetition, and the juxtaposition of opposites.

---

46 Latin text from Hubbell 1949. Translation is my own.
47 Witke 1970: 15.
An analysis of the relationship between rhetoric and poetry highlights how Horace uses rhetoric within his poetry. Aristotle defines poetics as something that is mimetic, or that imitates or represents something in life; not everything written in verse would be considered mimetic.\textsuperscript{48} For instance, Aristotle lists Empedocles as an example of someone who writes in verse, but is not mimetic because he is describing science and not imitating or describing something in life.\textsuperscript{49} This is interesting because, as I aim to show, Horace is being both mimetic (poetic) and instructive and, therefore, rhetorical in his works. This is further complicated because Horace himself seems to follow a similar model to Aristotle in his own exploration of poetry since he seems to also consider poetry in terms of mimesis: \textit{ex noto fictum carmen sequar}, “I will pursue verse formed from something known” (\textit{Ars Poetica} 240).\textsuperscript{50}

The issue concerning whether rhetoric and poetics are compatible is controversial and has been discussed in scholarship for decades. Howell in “Aristotle and Horace on Rhetoric and Poetics” discusses the connection between rhetoric and poetics in which he ultimately argues that the two discourses are incompatible for ancient people based on Aristotle’s definition of poetics cited above. He does acknowledge that the different discourses may have an influence on one another: an orator may turn to an anecdote in order to further his argument but, ultimately, the mimetically influenced anecdote is still under the control of a non-mimetic aim, which is to offer support to what the orator is recommending.\textsuperscript{51} While I disagree with Howell’s overall statement concerning the incompatibility of rhetoric and poetics, his discussion on how the different types of discourse overlap, as described above, is helpful because of his discussion on how a poet or orator may use techniques from one another for their own goals. This is important because I will

\textsuperscript{48} \textit{On Poetics} 1447a.  
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{On Poetics} 1447b.  
\textsuperscript{50} Latin text from Rudd 1989. Translation is my own.  
\textsuperscript{51} Howell 1968: 333.
argue how Horace makes use of rhetoric in his *Satires*. However, where Howell suggests that Horace’s work would be only poetic and concerned with aesthetics, I demonstrate that his work is both poetry and rhetoric because his goals concern both aesthetics and persuasion.

Other scholars have gone into depth about the intertwined history of rhetoric and poetics. For instance, Walker, a more recent scholar, goes into more detail concerning the more complicated history between the two forms of discourse and how they overlap throughout their respective development and are therefore not mutually exclusive, as Howell suggests. Walker, in his book *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity*, refutes the claim made by the medievalist scholar Charles Sears Baldwin that “poetry and rhetoric were fundamentally different, even incompatible things, which the ancients had perversely persisted in confusing.”52 Fox suggests that “the terms ‘rhetoric’ and ‘literature’ do not have constant, historically unchanging terms of reference; and the differences between our own application of these terms today and the equivalent Roman categorizations are as enormous as the differences between the two worlds to which they are applied,” suggesting that these terms were more ambiguous for the Romans than for a modern audience.53 In a more recent study, Peirano-Garrison argues that “rhetorical theory is interesting not as a system of classification that poets follow or depart from but rather as a powerful cultural lens through which poetry is viewed, read and sometimes disowned as a rhetorically constructed genre,” which suggests that rhetoric as a “cultural lens” may have unconsciously influenced poetry, even if ancients themselves distinguished the two genres, especially in the post-Augustan period.54 Overall, rhetoric and poetics seem to evolve together and the boundaries of each are not well defined both in a modern context and an ancient one. Regardless of the perceived finitude or

53 Fox 2007: 369.
lack thereof of the categories of rhetoric and poetics, rhetoric would have been inherently present in any text that aimed at affecting its audience. The inclusion of rhetoric may not be intentional, but is still present, especially in a society, such as Rome, in which rhetoric was an integral part of the education system. The difficulty that scholars have had in establishing boundaries for the two genres shows that the two discourses may have leaked into one another despite what authors may have thought themselves.

Just as scholars have questions about rhetoric’s relationship to poetry in general, there has also been significant debate concerning rhetoric’s relationship to satire more specifically. Hooley suggests that satirists would not have consciously used rhetoric, while Keane suggests that satire is full of several genres including law and teaching, with the latter especially involving rhetoric.\textsuperscript{55} Lowrie also discusses the connection between satiric and legal language, especially in \textit{Satires} 2.1, where Horace intentionally has Trebatius imitate a legal style in order to draw a connection between satire and law.\textsuperscript{56} The \textit{Satires} of Horace are ostensibly didactic; the narrator is often moralizing and warns his audience against a variety of different vices. In this way, the satirist is fulfilling the role of a rhetorician because he is aiming to teach his audience about the correct way to live. Muecke also discusses law and rhetoric in her chapter on \textit{Satires} 2.1 that the rhetoric in this satire centers around Horace’s \textit{recusatio} and \textit{priamel}.\textsuperscript{57} She is specifically arguing against Leeman who suggests that, in \textit{Satires} 2.1, Trebatius helps Horace formulate the \textit{status} (the point on which a case is turned in rhetoric) of his poetry and of the cases that are made against him.\textsuperscript{58} Both analyses argue that Horace is consciously using rhetorical theory in his work. A specific aspect of satire that influences rhetoric is the satiric persona, discussed in more

\textsuperscript{56} Lowrie 2005: 408-409.  
\textsuperscript{57} Muecke 1995: 215.  
\textsuperscript{58} Leeman 1982.
detail below. Deer and Deer describe *persona* as “a character created to serve the author’s dramatic purpose.”\(^\text{59}\) Since the satirist has a purpose to serve, he must inherently be serving his purpose using rhetoric. Unlike traditional oratory, the persona may not necessarily be someone that the author intends for his audience to trust. However, as Deer and Deer also point out when discussing Heller’s *Catch 22* and Genet’s *The Balcony* that “both writers show us corruption and dehumanization by inviting us to play the destructive games their characters are playing while making us observe how destructive they actually are.”\(^\text{60}\) I hope to show in my discussion on his *persona*, that Horace uses the same strategy in his *Satires*. His *persona* says one thing, but through the language of the verses, Horace shows us something else. The result is that Horace argues for his point by using his *persona* as an example of negative behavior.

The speaker’s advice in both books of *Satires* (Book 1, c. 35 BC; Book 2, 30 BC) offers broader social implications as well. In the second book, Horace introduces a variety of speakers who take up the task of the moralizer of Book 1. A consistent motif throughout the collection that this chapter explores is the deceptiveness of surface appearances: things appear one way on the outside, but, in reality, are their opposite. This sentiment or motif, in fact, is considered a generic mainstay of Roman satire that stretches as far back to its founder Lucilius (180-103 BC) through his successor, the satirist Juvenal (c. 55 CE - c. 127), who would devote a full satire to the pitfalls of surface appearances.\(^\text{61}\) In Horace we see this motif manifested in innumerable and unique ways. One observes the convergence of social classes wherein Horace presents objects that are associated with a higher socio-economic class (such as the peacock in *Sat. 2.2*) as being of equal or higher value to a more modest item (the chicken in *Sat. 2.2*). Horace also expresses

\(^{59}\) Deer and Deer 1977: 712.  
\(^{60}\) Deer and Deer 1977: 715.  
\(^{61}\) Juvenal, *Satire* 2.
disparity in terms of quantity. In *Satires* 1.1, Horace compares the results of drinking from a huge river to sipping from a jug, where both drinkers get the same amount of water, but one who chooses to drink from a river gets swept away by its raging current (1.1.57-59). The river here symbolizes class because the greedier person, who represents the person who hoards wealth, is the one who suffers bad consequences. This motif exemplifies Horace’s calls for moderation because people who seemingly are better off ultimately have a lesser or equal amount of resources than those who are less wealthy. Therefore, to seek more than a reasonable amount of wealth or status is fruitless.

Notably, Horace uses rhetoric, a tool that is used to keep the elite in power, in order to advocate for a simple and more moderate way of life. He also keeps his own social status ambivalent throughout the *Satires*. The effect of this ambivalence along with the other rhetorical strategies that Horace uses—his inconsistent persona, *exempla*, repetition, juxtaposition of opposites—is that the parameters that define different social classes become meaningless because the rich can have their needs met with the same amount of resources as the poor. Likewise, there is no reason for the lower classes to complain about their plight since they have sufficient resources and are living life with either equal or higher quality to the rich.

---

62 By criticizing excess so early in his works with an image associated with Callimachus, Horace also praises precise Callimachean style. However, as Scodel 1987 notes, Horace does not blindly follow either Callimachus or Lucilius.

63 Connolly 2007. In *The State of Speech*, Connolly, looking primarily at Cicero, argues that rhetoric can be a political practice in Rome and that it is embedded deeply in society. In particular, Connolly looks at rhetoric as a way to maintain the *status quo* and keep the elite in power, while appeasing the masses by forming a national Roman community.
Persona and *Ethos* established through Maecenas and Horace Sr.

The term *persona* has loaded meaning and has led to much debate in scholarship on Roman satire in particular. Horace’s use of *persona(e)* reveals much about how he employs some major facets of his rhetoric. *Persona* typically refers to a mask worn by an actor, and it describes the character that the satirist puts forth as the speaker which tends to be a fictional character with shades of the actual poet. Osman Umurhan describes *persona* theory as a way to gauge an author’s perspective through his assumption of different “masks” or perspectives on any given issue, social or political. Kirk Freudenburg also points out that *persona* is a common term in rhetoric for “every Roman schoolboy was expected to master the practice of characterization for the sake of projecting a positive, trustworthy image (*ethos*) of himself as a speaker.” So, Horace aims to give off the appearance of establishing his speaker as trustworthy. However, as Freudenburg ultimately argues, Horace’s speaker appears to be shaped both by the comic stock character of the *doctor ineptus* and the Hellenistic cynic moralizer. The speaker also should not be taken seriously and appears more as someone to be ridiculed rather than someone to be trusted; the satirist’s claims make sense on their own but taken together they are overstated and may prove contradictory. The speaker’s lack of reliability will ultimately make him into an *exemplum*, who teaches the readers what not to do through his inconsistency.

---

64 Anderson’s seminal chapter “The Roman Socrates: Horace and his Satires” (1963: 13-49) features one of the initial scholarly breakthroughs in the application of *persona* theory and the study of Roman satire. Iddeng 2000 offers an extensive discussion of the strengths and pitfalls of *persona* theory when applied to Roman satire.

65 *OLD persona 1*: A mask, esp. as worn by actors.

66 See Braund 1997 for an in-depth discussion of *persona* as a mask.

67 Umurhan 2011: 222.


69 Freudenburg 1993: 8. See also Keane (2006) 19-24, for her discussion on how Horace acts as a dramatic subject within his satires in addition to his use of other stock characters. Duff 1936 also discusses the connection between comedy and satire in that they both share a similar social outlook dependent on realistic observation (6).

It is in Horace’s first published work, the *Satires*, that he establishes his poetic *persona*. While this *persona* may not have a strong or serious *ethos*,$^71$ Horace’s creation of a fictional *persona* is a rhetorical tactic which helps him further his points concerning moderation because he becomes an example of the things that he is arguing against, namely immoderation and inconsistency. While the *persona* Horace has created is a fictional character in his *Satires*, *ethos* refers to the how the audience perceives the character in terms of his credibility and morality.$^72$ Horace’s *persona* has a weaker *ethos* because of its inconsistency and through his adoption of the traits of the cynic moralizer and *doctor ineptus*, described above. These characters are typically not people that one should attempt to imitate. Freudenburg describes the *doctor ineptus* as “the moralizer who, as a Cynic, rustic, or buffoon, take himself far more seriously than his abilities will allow.” $^73$ Although the *persona* of the speaker himself is inconsistent and not too be taken seriously, Horace does establish credibility through his association with others, specifically his patron, Maecenas, and his father, rather than through his own merits.

Horace’s address to Maecenas appears almost immediately in the first line of the first satire, and by beginning his work in this way, Horace immediately associates himself with a person of prestige. He elevates his status before his reader in the following manner: *Qui fīt*,

---

$^71$ Quintilian on the Roman equivalent of *ethos*: *Duae sunt species…alteram ἥθος, cuius nomine, ut ego guidem sentio, caret sermo Romanus: mores appellantur, atque inde pars quoque illa philosophiae ἥθικη moralis est dicta. Sed ipsam rei naturam spectanti mihi non tam mores significari videntur quam morum quaedam proprietas…, “There are two species….one *ethos*, whose name, as I indeed understand, Roman speech lacks: *mores* are named, and likewise from there that ‘ethical’ part of philosophy is called moral. But to me observing the very nature of the thing, *mores* does not seem to be meant so much as a certain quality of *mores*” (*Inst.* 6.2.8-9). Latin text is from Russell 2002. Translation is my own.

$^72$ Quintilian defines *ethos* mores specifically: *Ἡθος, quod intellegimus quodque a dicentibus desideramus, id erit quod ante omnia bonitate commendabitur, non solum mite ac placidum, sed plerumque blandum et humanum et audientibus amabile atque iucundum… quo mores dicentis ex oration perluceant et quodam modo agnoscantur, “The *ethos*, which I understand, and which I desire from speakers, it will be that which before all will be committed to goodness not only mild and peaceful, but generally pleasant and refined, and pleasing and agreeable to the listeners… in which the *mores* of the speaker may shine forth from the speech and be recognized in a certain way” (*Inst.* 6.2.13).

$^73$ Freudenburg 1993: 34.
Maecenas, ut nemo, quam sibi sortem/ seu ratio dederit seu fors obiecerit, illa/ contentus vivat,

“How come, Maecenas, no one lives content with the lot which reason either gave or chance threw at them?” (Sat. 1.1.1-3). As Oliensis points out, Horace’s entrance into high society may be problematic because he makes fun of those who, dissatisfied with their lots in life, desperately climb the social ladder. As a result, the address to Maecenas could be read as hypocritical and, therefore, might negatively affect his character. Why should readers take the speaker seriously when he does not even heed his own advice?

A solution to this potential hypocrisy lies in Horace’s characterization of Maecenas and his relationship with him. In Satires 1.6, Horace addresses Maecenas and discusses how he came into his circle, which was through the merits of his poetry rather than the status of his father. Horace continues on to praise his father again and he describes how his father had him educated at Rome. He ends the satire being relieved that he is able to walk the streets in peace without being nagged by people who need something from him; he is able to do so because of his lack of ambition. In Satires 1.6 he says regarding the start of his friendship with Maecenas: quod placui tibi, qui turpi secernis honestum/ non patre praeclaro, sed vita et pectore puro, “because I was pleasing to you, who distinguish an honest man from a disgraceful one, not by an eminent father, but by their life and pure heart” (Serm. 1.6.63-4). At this point, Horace creates ambiguity between social classes because although his father is not praeclarus, he does turn Horace into the sort of man with whom Maecenas would want to associate and, therefore, even though parentage is not a factor in Maecenas’ judgement of a

75 Latin text from Gowers 2012. All translations are my own.
worthy friend, it is ultimately because of his father that Horace falls into Maecenas’ circle. Therefore, his father ultimately turns out to be praeclarus without having a senatorial background.

Horace portrays his father as another major influence on his character and rhetorical education. The father figure discussed here is an invented character of Horace’s, and the portrayal may or may not be accurate to Horace’s father in life. Horace introduces the character of his father in Satires 1.4, his first programmatic poem, in which he begins by discussing his poetic predecessors and his place within them, claiming not to count himself among established poets. Not coincidentally, it is in this satire where Horace begins to define his role as a satirist. One way he does this is through describing the education that his father gave him, which contains examples of incorrect behavior:

\[
\begin{align*}
\textit{insuevit pater optimus hoc me,} \\
\textit{ut fugerem exemplis vitiorum quaeque notando,} \\
\textit{cum me hortaretur, parce frugaliter atque} \\
\textit{viverem uti contentus eo quod mi ipse parasset}
\end{align*}
\]

a most excellent father made me accustomed in this (speaking freely or jokingly), by pointing out examples of vices, so that I may flee from them, when he encouraged that I live sparingly and frugally in order that I live content with that which he had prepared for me.

(Sat. 1.4.105-8)

First, by bringing up his father in a satire that focuses on poetic predecessors, Horace includes the figure of his father among this group. Horace is using the invented father as a role model for his own satire; as his father provides \textit{exempla} of what not to do, so does Horace in other satires. The father figure particularly encourages moderation here, which is clear in the final lines of the passage: \textit{cum me hortaretur, parce frugaliter atque/ viverem uti contentus eo quod mi ipse parasset}, “when he encouraged that I live sparingly and frugally, in order that I live content with

---

\footnote{Oliensis 1998: 33.}
that which he had prepared for me” (v. 107-108). Therefore, the father encourages Horace not to seek too much beyond what he had provided. Not only does Horace emulate the character of his father, but he also the father’s didactic strategies. Like the persona of the Satires’ speaker, the father also has traits of a comic stock character: the stern father. The fact that the father is also a comic character suggests that, although the persona character seems to take the father seriously in the context of the poem, Horace likely does not intend for the audience to admire the father figure as the persona does.

The way that Horace’s father teaches is through exemplis vitiorum, or examples of what one shouldn’t do. Horace gives an example of one of his father’s examples:

\[
\text{nonne vides Albi ut male filius utque}
\text{Baius inops? Magnum documentum, ne partiam rem}
\text{perdere quis velit,}
\]

Do you not see how badly the son of Albus is down and poor Baius? A great example, that one should not want to waste his inheritance.

(Serm. 1.4.109-111)

Here, Horace’s father uses the son of Albus and Baius as a documentum of what one should not do. The point he makes here specifically concerns moderation because he warns against spending too much money in a careless way and encourages his son to be frugal instead. Horace explains his father’s method of teaching in the fourth satire, after he has already spent Satires 1-3 teaching through similar means: Horace has already set a precedent for using exempla in order to get his own didactic message across. Yona has also shown that Horace uses similar vocabulary when the

---

77 See, for example, in Terence’s works: Demea of Adelphoe, Demea of Eunuchus, Simo of Andria, Chremes of Heautontimorumenos. For a more in-depth discussion on fathers in Roman comedy see Anderson 1995.

78 Gowers 2012: “Albius (‘Man A’) was condemned for his love of bronze at [line] 28,” with Baius following him both in order of verse and alphabetically, Horace makes his father’s moral teachings an equivalent to a child’s ABCs (177).
father says whether something is moral or immoral. In addition to making use of his father’s character’s vocabulary, I would add that he also makes use of the character’s rhetorical strategy of using exempla in order to teach others their moral principles. The style of the exempla of the father also are emulated by Horace in earlier satires. As Rudd notes, “The figures who come under attack (one cannot call them characters in the full sense) are etched with a few quick strokes—just enough to provide a neat illustration; then they vanish in the wake of the argument.” Here Rudd is describing Horace’s style of exempla as short-lived. While Rudd is describing Horace’s use of exempla here, I would argue his description is also accurate for the exempla provided by Horace’s father. In the passage above, Horace’s father does not add much in way of description to Albius and Baius, and simply uses them in view of his teaching objective, which is simply that Horace should not follow these two as examples. After he has made his point, the exempla of Albius and Baius are no longer necessary. Overall, both Horace and his father use exempla that are brief in nature, which is evidence of Horace’s following in his father’s rhetorical footsteps, even as closely as following in a precise satiric style.

Horace describes his father with the superlative optimus, “the best” or “greatest”, which although his father is a freedman and low-born, grants him a certain eminence. This is the same word Horace uses to describe three other very important men: Maecenas (Maecenas optimus 1.5.27), Vergil (optimus olim/ Vergilius 1.6.54-55) and Octavian (Octavius optimus) 1.10.82.

---

79 Yona 2015: 236. Yona focuses on the role of Epicureanism in Horace’s critique of society by looking at Horace’s use of sensation and Epicurean language, and he finally describes Horace’s father’s advice as communicated using parrhesia or frankness, in accordance with Epicurean tradition. For more on the influence of Epicureanism on Horace, see “Epicureanism as a Rhetorical Strategy” below.

80 Rudd 1966: 15.

81 Instances in which Horace emphasizes his humble birth include: Ut me libertino patre natum, “as me, born from a freedman father” (1.6.6) and nunc ad me redeo libertino patre natum, / quem rodunt omnes libertino patre natum “now I return to myself born from a freedman father, whom everyone gnaws at, having been born from a freedman father” (1.6.45-46). The latter example is especially poignant due to the repetition of libertino patre natum which creates noticeable redundancy and shows that Horace really wants his readers to know about his humble birth.
The repetition of optimus at different points in the Satires suggests that Horace considers his father comparable to this crowd of men that are of extremely high status. In doing so, Horace blurs some of the lines of social status. The use of optimus is earned by Horace’s father’s character and values rather than from his status at birth. Horace learns to emulate his father’s character in his relationship with Maecenas, who, as noted above, prioritizes character and virtue over wealth and lineage when deciding who to include in his circle. As a result of the lofty characterization of Horace’s father, his advice gains prestige, and, as a result, Horace’s advice also gains prestige because he learned what he knows from a man who is optimus. Horace’s father, as noted above, is also described as non patre praeclaro (Sat. 1.6.64), which contradicts the adjective optimus. As discussed in more detail below, Horace avoids defining his social status, and, since his father’s status is a reflection of his own, he also makes his father’s status appear ambiguous. While Horace does seem to lean more on his father’s status as a freedman, he also raises him to a higher status by describing him using the same adjective, praeclarus, as Maecenas, Vergil and Octavian. Furthermore, as discussed above, Horace’s own social status is heightened by the lessons his father taught him because of how these lessons positively affected his character, which, in turn, made Horace appealing to Maecenas.

Another major influence on Horace’s work is his patron Maecenas; both figures serve as father figure to Horace, but they come from two different classes, which is important because these two men who appear to be of different qualities externally are placed on the same level as one another by Horace. Horace uses both Maecenas and his father to elevate his own ethos as someone who is qualified to teach morality. In addition, Horace elevates his father by including him among men who are optimi and by staying true to his father and his teachings even after

82 Schlegel 2000: 108-117 discusses Horace’s father and Maecenas as two father figures; she suggests that the men are paired in order to mark their similarities, but also emphasize the differences in their social statuses.
being inducted into Maecenas’ circle. Holding allegiance to his father does not diminish Maecenas’ status nor does it affect their friendship. In fact, as I have argued above, it is because of Horace’s father and Horace’s admiration of his father and his teachings that Horace had the character traits which would impress Maecenas. By including his father in this group of optimi homines, and by making his low-born father the source for his social gains, Horace elevates his father to a higher social status than he was born into, which is a way that Horace begins to blur the lines of his father’s social status, and in turn, his own. This blurring of lines is significant because it harkens back to Horace’s value of moderation; if being rich and being poor become indistinguishable, then there is no point in striving towards being rich. Catherine Schlegel describes Horace’s relationships to his biological father and his patron Maecenas in terms of class:

Horace can make himself ‘belong’ to all levels, to the low as a writer of satire (a low genre) and as the son of a freedman, to the high as a Callimachean poet (“far, far from the mob,” 18) and friend to Maecenas. Horace’s father, having risen from the status of a slave to rear his son among the sons of senators (77), is thus the origin of his son’s social allegiances, to both the high and the low.83

She also argues that Horace ultimately holds allegiance to his biological father, as well as the rank of his biological father, rather than to Maecenas.84

In order to further his argument against amassing wealth, Horace keeps his social status somewhat ambiguous. It has been argued that Horace was of equestrian status even before he was introduced to Maecenas, and that both he and his father enjoyed a considerable amount of wealth.85 Armstrong argues that Horace states explicitly that he is of equestrian status in both

83 Schlegel 2000: 114.
85 Taylor 1925 and Armstrong 1986. Both argue that Horace was of equestrian status and held considerable wealth in real life.
Satires 2.7 and 1.6. While Armstrong and Taylor make a convincing case for Horace being in the equestrian class, Horace is less straight-forward about his class than Armstrong suggests. Overall, he seems to emphasize more the fact that his father used to be a slave and that he comes from humble origins and he seems to downplay the wealth that he may have. At some points, it seems as though Horace belongs to a higher echelon in Roman society and at other points, he seems to portray himself as less well-off. The result is that it is unclear what class Horace’s poetic persona hails from even if Horace was equestrian. There are a couple reasons he might choose to be non-committal. One reason is that it may serve his rhetorical purpose to appear to be of different social classes at different times because both classes have traits that boost the speaker’s ethos. When he appears poor, he seems more humble and wise in a folksy way, while, when he seems to be better off, he seems refined and sophisticated. Another purpose that Horace keeps the social status of his persona ambiguous is that it is another way of showing that greed is pointless.

Another important satire in which the speaker creates an inconsistent character is Satires 1.3. Horace’s inconsistency here is another rhetorical tactic with which he argues for moderation. In this satire, Horace exemplifies the faults, which he claims plague both others and himself. In the passage below, Horace describes a fault that he might have, which is that he is perhaps a bit too open and talkative during quiet times, and he says that if someone should fault him too harshly it would be unfair, or unmoderated, since it is aequum (1.3.70), or fair, to take both faults and virtues into consideration.

\[
\text{simplicior quis et est, qualem me saepe libenter obtulerim tibi, Maecenas, ut forte legentem aut tacitum impellat quovis sermone molestus: 'communi sensu plane caret' inquimus, eheu,}
\]

86 Armstrong 1986. See also Freudenburg 2021: 76, 275-6.
87 Anderson 1974: 59.
And he who is simpler, such as I often willingly presented myself to you, Maecenas, so that perhaps he being a bother assails someone reading or quiet in some conversation: we say, ‘clearly he lacks common sense,’ alas, how casually we establish a hostile law against ourselves! For no one is born without faults: he is best, who is pressed by the least, a sweet friend, as is fair, weighs by good qualities with my faults, he inclines toward the good things being greater, if only there are more good qualities for me, if he wants to be loved: by this law he will be placed on the same scale,

(1.3.64-73)

While he acknowledges his faults, he also exemplifies them. In the *ut* clause, there is an elision between *tacitum* (66) and *impellat* (66), and, if they were not on separate lines there would also be one between *legentem* (65) and *aut* (66). While apologizing for the fault of interrupting, he interrupts himself in his meter, and therefore performs the fault that he is criticizing himself for.

Another notable aspect of the passage is his use of *optimus* (1.3.69); as has been discussed above, Horace uses this term for both Maecenas and Horace’s father to prove that Horace considers his father to be on the same level as Maecenas despite their outward differences. The use of *optimus* here suggests something additional, namely that Maecenas and Horace’s father are examples of those who are pressed by the smallest vices (*minimus urgetur*, 1.3.70). So, Horace puts Maecenas and his father above himself in virtue because when comparing his faults to theirs’, Horace’s faults are not the superlative *minimus*, but they are rather just *minora* (*Serm*. 1.3.20). In other words, Horace describes his father and Maecneas as *optimi*, a term that Horace uses sparingly (only above and in the cases described before where he refers
to his father, Maecenas, Vergil and Octavian). This suggests that the use of *optimus* here refers specifically to these men and, therefore, the *optimi* are the ones with *minimis vitiis*. Furthermore, since *urgetur* is passive, Horace’s father and Maecenas are even farther removed from their faults because they are pressed by faults passively instead of actively committing them. The speaker, therefore, describes himself as more fault-ridden than his mentors, despite the fact that even his faults are quite small. This is part of Horace’s rhetorical strategy: the speaker says he has lesser (*minora*) faults, since everyone has them, but he uses Maecenas and Horace’s father, who have *minimis vitiis* to boost his ethos. However, as will be discussed below, although the speaker says he has less faults, he shows indirectly that he has several and that he is blind to them.

Despite the claim that he has less severe faults, Horace goes on to break a lot of his own rules in *Satires* 1.3. For example, although he discusses Tigellius’ fault of inconsistency, Horace also showcases some inconsistency within his own style:

> *Nil aequale homini fuit illi: saepe velut qui currebat fugiens hostem, persaepe velut qui Iunonis sacra ferret; habebat saepe ducentos saepe decem servos; modo reges atque tetrarchas omnia magna loquens, modo ‘sit mihi mensa tripes et concha salis puri et toga, quae defendere frigus quamvis crassa queat.’*

nothing was steady for that man: often he was just as he who ran fleeing the enemy, and very often he was just as he who bore the sacred rites of Juno; he often used to have two hundred, often ten slaves; at one time speaking about kings and tetrarchs and all great things, at another time ‘may there be for me a three-legged table and a shell of pure salt and a toga, which may be able to ward off the cold although it is course.’

(*Serm.* 1.3.9-15)
In this passage, Horace condemns Tigellius the singer for his lack of consistency concerning his satisfaction with different lots; at one point, Tigellius needs the grand things of a rich man, but, at other times, he is fine with humble items and does not need much money. However, there are some inconsistencies within the passage itself, which suggests that the speaker does not necessarily follow his own advice. For instance, there is repetition in lines 9 and 10 (persaepe velut qui) and the adverb saepe is also present in the following two clauses in lines 11 and 12. The repetition is important here because it sets up an expected pattern that Horace will break in the following lines. Up to this point the speaker is consistent in his use of the adverb saepe, but breaks that consistency when he switches from using saepe (9-13) in his examples of the singer’s behavior to modo…modo (13-14). The repetition of saepe has a similar meaning to the correlative modo…modo. Both phrases imply that Tigellius is fickle and behaves at different extremes at different times. If the speaker were trying to exemplify the consistency that Tigellius lacks, he might continue to use saepe throughout the line or the modo…modo construction throughout the passage. The modo…modo is also in the preceding lines: modo summa/voce, modo hac, resonat quae chordis quattuor ima, “at one time with the highest voice, at another time with this the lowest which resounds from the four chords” (Serm. 1.3.7-8). Overall, Horace’s alternation of these phrases displays a little bit of irregularity, which is what he accuses Tigellius of.

In conclusion, I have argued how Horace crafts his persona in the Satires as someone who ought to be mocked. Since the persona is laughable, he serves as an exemplum of what one should not do. Horace’s persona claims two figures as major influences: Maecenas and the father figure. Horace says that Maecenas did not bring him into his circle because of his lineage, but his father is the reason that he was able to join the circle. Horace makes the social status of his father
ambiguous in order to make his own status ambiguous. This ambiguity becomes rhetorically convenient for him. In terms of the invented father figure, Horace is influenced by him in regard to their common use of *exempla* and other stylistic features. Horace refers to both Maecenas and the father as *optimus*, which is a way that Horace blends the lines between different social statuses. By referring to both men as *optimi*, Horace elevates the status of his father. Horace also uses the term *optimus* again in 1.3 to refer to those who have the least faults. By using the word *optimi*, which he also uses with his father and Maecenas, Horace puts these two men into the category of those who have few faults. Horace contrasts himself against men who are *optimi* because he has more faults than them, even if those faults are still few. Within the same satire, Horace, while criticizing the faults of others, displays his own faults within the style itself. He criticizes Tigellius’ inconsistencies but is inconsistent himself in his technique.

**Discrepancies between Appearance and Reality**

In the previous section, I discussed some inconsistencies in Horace’s style, as well as some discrepancies between the satirist’s style and content. A motif of inconsistency that is abundant throughout the *Satires* is that there are several instances throughout where what appears on the outside is inconsistent with the true nature of a character or object. The motif is an example of juxtaposition of opposites, which I listed as a rhetorical strategy earlier in the paper. An example of someone appearing to be of a higher social status externally without actually living up to that expectation occurs in *Sat*. 1.10, when Horace criticizes those who approve of mixing Latin and Greek. Horace metaphorically rolls his eyes at those who are impressed with Greek letters: ‘*at magnum fecit, quod verbis Gracea Latinis miscuit.*’ *O seri studiorum!* *Quine putetis difficile et mirum, Rhodio quod Pitholeonti contigit?* “*But he did a great thing, since he
mixed Greek words with Latin ones.’ O slow learner! You who think that it is difficult and marvelous, what happened upon Rhodian Pitholeon” (20-23). Here, Horace is conversing with some other person whose identity is not clear and may be assumed to be the opinion of some bystander or of the general public, either of whom could be invoked to bring up a counterargument to Horace’s. If someone brings up a counterargument, they are assuming that this is an argument that the average observer would come up with, so it seems that the interlocutor’s perspective is supposed to represent a general view that is commonly held. Therefore, Horace is implying that the average person would consider having knowledge of Greek to be something prestigious, while Horace does not find it that impressive. The result is that while some poetry may appear prestigious and upper class by throwing around some Greek, Greek words do not make poetry good, and you are a fool if you are impressed by these poems.

It is worth noting too that Catullus’ name is mentioned in the line immediately preceding the ones quoted: Catullum (Sat. 1.10.19). The mention of Catullus’ name calls to mind carm. 84, in which Catullus also deals with the use of Greek language in a way that is supposed to convey a sense of elevated diction. In c. 84: Chommoda dicebat, si quando commoda vellet/ dicere, et insideas Arrius hinsidias,/ et tum mirifice sperabat se esse locutum,/ cum quantum peterat dixerat hinsidias. “He used to say ‘hopportunities’ whenever he wanted to say ‘opportunities,’ and Arrius used to say ambushes as hambushes, and then he was hoping that he had spoken wonderfully, when, as much as he had sought, he had said ‘ambushes.’” (1-4). In this poem, Arrius attempts to imitate a Greek accent by adding rough breathings to the beginnings of words, by saying hinsidias instead of insidias, and by aspirating the ‘c’ of commoda in order to make it

---

88 Gruen 1991: The aristocracy had long been associated with attraction to Greek language and culture, even adopting Greek cognomens (227).
89 Latin text from Garrison 2012. Translation is my own.
sound like a Greek *chi*. Like the interlocutor of *Satires* 1.10, Arrius thinks that he sounds better and smarter when he combines the Greek language with the Latin language, but he ultimately ends up failing in this. It seems that both Arrius and the poets of that Horace is referring to in 1.10 are trying to make themselves look like they are more educated or more important than they actually are, and they ultimately make fools of themselves. Susan Shapiro notes that aspirated syllables “became a sign of status and sophistication, while the lack of such aspiration signaled a low-class origin.” 90 Shapiro’s observation confirms that Arrius and Horace’s targets are both trying to appear to be upper class on the outside, but ultimately fail.

Even the specific poet that Horace mentions, Pitholeon, seems to have stumbled upon the technique by accident (*contigit*, Sat. 1.10.23), which suggests that his use of these Greek words did not have any significance to his quality as a poet. In these cases, those who use the Greek language to sound more sophisticated, attempt to make themselves appear one way, but the actual quality of the person remains the same, if not worse considering that they look foolish in the process of attempting to make themselves look better. This applies to class as well because, by trying to sound like they know more Greek, they are also trying to imply that they were educated in Greek, which is something that someone of aristocratic status would have. 91

Often, the inaccurate appearances pertain to quantity or size not making a difference in something’s quality. At one point, Horace criticizes his predecessor Lucilius, considered the inventor of the genre of satire, for being too loquacious; while Lucilius’ verses appear to be great because of their length, they leave much to be desired:

\[
\text{Nam fuit hoc vitiosus: in hora saepe ducentos} \\
\text{Ut magnum, versus dictabat stans pede in uno;}
\]

90 Shapiro 2011: 33. She also notes here that while aspiration had dropped out of popular usage for Italian peasants, /w/ was still used by the educated elite in the early Republic. 91 Palmer 1961: Plautus has Greek words predominantly in the speech of slaves or others of low social status (83). Throughout his book Boyce also notes how freedmen incorrectly use Greek in literature (1991).
Cum flueret lutuletus, erat quod tollere velles;  
Garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem,  
Scribendi recte: nam ut multum, nil moror. Ecce  
Crispinus minimo me provocat: ‘accipe, si vis,  
Accipe iam tabulas; detur nobis locus, hora,  
Custodies; videamus uter plus scribere possit.’  
Di bene fecerunt, inopis me quodque pusilli  
Finxerunt animi, raro et perpauca loquentis:

“For he was faulty in this: often in an hour, as if it were a big deal,  
he would recite two-hundred verses standing on one foot;  
while he flowed muddily, there was that which you would want to remove;  
talkative and sluggish to bear the toil of writing,  
of writing well; for as much as he writes, I could not care less. Behold,  
Crispinus bets me his right arm: ‘take up, if you want,  
take up now the tablets; let a place be given, a time,  
judges; let us see which is able to write more.’  
Thank the gods that they fixed me with a poor and insignificant mind,  
Rarely speaking even a few words:”

(1.4.9-18)

The poems of Lucilius here seem like they are a big deal, ut magnum (line 10), because they are long and because he writes them quickly. However, upon closer inspection, they are unimpressive, slow and painful for the speaker to listen to. The speaker suggests that the poem could be improved if it was shorter seeing as “there was that which you might want to remove” (1.4.11). Horace specifically uses Callimachean references here to criticize Lucilius’ poetry, especially referencing instances where Callimachus speaks about his own brevitas.92 Here, the speaker of the poem seems to directly address the readers with the second-person verb velles. While the specific identities of both audience and speaker are somewhat insignificant, Horace establishes an agreement with the undefined subject of velles, namely that Horace and ‘you’ are on the side of moderation and few words, and these other people flow muddily. It is worth noting that the verb is singular, which suggests a more intimate one-on-one conversation with his audience, which furthers their separation from the talkative others.

---

92 See specifically Aitia 3-6 and Hymn to Apollo 106-109.
In *The State of Speech*, Joy Connolly notes that rhetoric seems to create a “collective sense of belonging for citizens” within their state and political climate.⁹³ Although Connolly is referring to a larger scale community and sense of belonging, I would argue that this, too, is applicable to Horace, but as one who seems to create a more intimate community with himself and the audience of his poetry in these lines. As a result, the length or amount of poetry that Lucilius produces does not hold weight for the speaker, and the audience is meant to agree, since the quality is not adequate.⁹⁴ The value that is placed on the quantity of verses is reinforced by Crispinus’ request for a competition, in which Horace and Crispinus would be competing in the amount of verses they are able to produce quickly rather than the quality of their poetry. This suggests that from the perspective outside of the community Horace has established between the speaker and audience, having a lot of verses seems like a great thing.

In the final lines of the passage (17-18), the speaker seemingly self-deprecatingly thanks the gods for his small wit. However, the fact that the speaker is grateful for his insignificant mind (*pusilli animi*) is ironic because it shows that one does not really need to say a lot in order to produce poetry and Horace seems to imply that it is actually one with a more significant *animi* who is able to write more compact poetry. Harrison describes Horace’s overall style as “fundamentally influenced by the Callimachean aesthetics of brevity, elegance and polish.” ⁹⁵ This style in itself exemplifies the moderation that Horace argues for, and he brings the Callimachean aesthetics to the forefront in this section by describing Lucilius as flowing muddily in his verses. One may argue that the speaker is not really referring to poetry in this line, but

---

⁹⁴ Euripides’ character in Aristophanes’ *Frogs* makes a similar accusation against Aeschylus: ἡξοντ’ ἄχαλινον, ἀκραίτις, ἀπόλυσον στόμα, ἀπεριλάλητον, κομποφακελορήμονα, ‘having an unbridled, powerless and open mouth, not to be out-talked, great bombastic speaker” (vv. 838-839). Greek text from Henderson 2002. Translation is my own.
⁹⁵ Harrison 2007: 262.
since they are speaking within the limits of verse, it seems fair to apply their
_inopis...pusilli...animi_ to poetry, and that producing more words is more of an outward show
than an act of poetic achievement. It is worth noting also that the mind that the speaker is
thankful for is described as _inopis_, which specifically suggests a lack of wealth or means. So, the
speaker seems to also be thankful for something that may associate him with a lower class,
which indicates that other speakers that could be described as _inops_ may, despite having little,
lead a higher quality life overall. In general, the style that Horace advocates for here is also
inconsistent with what the stuffed genre of satire usually entails.\(^96\)

In 2.1, the opening programmatic poem of the second book of _Satires_, Horace uses _inops_
again. This time, Horace associates _inops_ with outside appearances when the speaker says: _seu me tranquil\_a senectus/ exspectat seu mors atris circumvolat alis./ dives, inops, Romae, seu fors ita iusserit, exsul./ quisquis erit vitae scribam color_, “whether peaceful old age waits for me or if
death flies around on dark wings, rich, poor, at Rome or, if chance should order thus, an exile,
whatever will be the color of my life, I will write” (57-60). In this case, there are several
different external issues at play in addition to class, such as how close the speaker is to death
(_seu me tranquilla senectus expectat seu mors atris circumvolat alis_) or his location and status as
a Roman (_Romae seu fors ita iusserit, exul_). If _tranquilla senectus_ (“peaceful old age”) is waiting
for Horace, he has a long life ahead, but if _mors atris circumvolat alis_ (“death flies around on
dark wings”), the threat of death is more immediate. However, the external circumstances do not
matter, and ultimately, no matter what is happening on the outside, the speaker says that he will
continue to write. The term _color_ especially marks that all of these things are external and they

\(^{96}\) Gowers 1993, in particular, describes satires as a ‘stuffed,’ genre or mixed dish (110). However, she also notes
that Horace breaks the rules of usual satire: “He is neat, not messy, subtle, not crude, and reticent, not outspoken” (126).
only matter in terms of how life looks to an outsider, but on the inside, the speaker’s life remains the same despite any outside circumstances.\textsuperscript{97}

The motif of two things of seemingly different values amounting to the same experience can be seen most frequently in \textit{Satires} 1.1 and 2.2. These satires seem to be linked through shared themes and images; in addition to both satires containing the aforementioned motif, both satires have Epicurean speakers, which is discussed in more detail below, and they both have a positive \textit{exemplum} of someone preparing for a harsh future during abundant times. For instance, the theme of being prepared for whatever fate has in store is shared in both satires in a similar way, which is a theme that has Epicurean undertones.\textsuperscript{98} Overall, the shared imagery between these two satires in the instance of being prepared for the future is especially striking due to the similarities in diction examined below. The image of the ant and the farmer both preparing for an unknown future link these satires, which also both contain ample examples of the motif of inaccurate appearances. In 1.1, Horace compares those who save for retirement to an ant: \textit{sicut/parvula –nam exemplo est—magni formica laboris/ ore trahit quodcumque potest atque addit acervo/quem struit haud ignara ac non incauta futuri} “just as a tiny ant of great labor, for example, drags in its mouth whatever it is able to and adds it to the heap which it has built, hardly unaware and not incautious of the future” (32-35). The passage in 1.1 also pertains to the theme of the outside as opposed to the inside when Horace describes the ant as \textit{parvula} and the ant’s toil as \textit{magni}. The two adjectives are also juxtaposed opposites. Even though the ant appears small on the outside, it achieves something great. The ant also proves to be worth more

\textsuperscript{97} \textit{OLD color} 1: Color, as a property of physical objects, also, a particular color, \textit{OLD 6}: An outward appearance, semblance. There is not a definition here referring to the quality of one’s life, so it seems that \textit{color} is specifically referring to how Horace’s life appears on the outside here.

\textsuperscript{98} Yona 2018: 27 states that one characteristic that may define “Epicurean economics,” includes “forethought on the part of the sage in the sense that, being mindful of the future, he will make provisions for the purpose of acquiring goods.”
than its outward appearance because it is able to be *haud ignara ac non incauta* “hardly unaware and not incautious” (1.1.35), terms which personify the ant and give it cognitive abilities beyond that which one would normally ascribe to an insect. Both of these terms also are litotes, with the negatives *haud* and *non* modifying *ignara* and *incauta*. As a result, even though it is an understatement it has a bigger impact; one could also translate the phrase as “very aware and very cautious.” So, the language itself that is describing the ant is reflective of the ant’s qualities. The ant is also understated, but has a large impact and thinks about things in a bigger way than it appears on the outside.99

The image of the ant of *Satires* 1.1 has striking similarities to the image of a man preparing for difficult times ahead in *Satires* 2.2; these similarities link the two satires together. The image of the ant reflects another passage in 2.2, because it also describes someone preparing for a difficult future during easy times. The speaker of *Satires* 2.2 is a farmer of Apulia, who espouses his homespun philosophy.100 Ofellus asks: *uterne/ ad casus dubios fidet sibi certius? Hic qui/ pluribus assuerit mentem corpusque superbum,/ an qui contentu parvo metuensque futuri/ in pace, ut sapiens, aptarit idonea bello? “Which will trust himself more confidently in dubious circumstances? This one, who has made his mind and arrogant body accustomed to more things, or he who content with little, and fearful of the future prepares things that are fitting for war during a time of peace, as a wise man?” (107-111).101 Although the latter passage does not explicitly contain the theme of appearances not being what they seem, both describe an entity preparing for harsher times ahead during times of general well-being. The ant is preparing food

---

99 Although these satires are ten years removed from one another, the observations still stand. Sharland 2010 notes that not only are there conversations with individual satires, but also between satires and even between the two books of the *Satires* (5-7).

100 Freudenburg translates Ofellus’ name as “Mr. Morsel” and specifically plays on *ofella* “pork cutlet” (2021: 86). Leigh also points out that pork is considered a morally wholesome rustic fare (2015: 46-7).

101 Latin text from Freudenburg 2021. Translations are my own.
for winter during a less-harsh spring, and the man in 2.2 is preparing for war in peacetime. The terms *non incauta futuri* (1.1.35) and *metuensque futuri* (2.2.110) are grammatically very similar with both containing *futuri* as an objective genitive of a terms that mean ‘fear.’ Both passages also contain similar wording when describing the ant and man, with the ant being described as *parvula* and the man being described as *contentus parvo*, which also suggests a direct link between the two passages.

In sum, I have shown how Horace uses the motif of surface appearances not reflecting what something consists of on the inside. Consistently, something that appears large on the outside is likely as useful as something that comes in a more modest quantity. One example Horace uses are quantities of verses (1.4.9-18). Outside appearances may also have to do with class, for instance, the use of the Greek language is associated with the upper class, but Horace criticizes it, saying that Greek does not make poetry effective. The motif of the outside being greater than the inside is especially prominent in *Satires* 1.1 and 2.2, which mirror one another with several shared images, especially the ant in 1.1 and the man in 2.2 both preparing for a less peaceful time in the future. In the following section, I will discuss other images within *Satires* 1.1 and 2.2 that display the motif of the outside not agreeing with the inside, namely with regard to foodstuffs and consumption.

**Outer Appearances of Food**

Food serves as another facet of Horace’s rhetorical arsenal. Foodstuffs enable Horace to show that two things associated with different classes can have the same value. Gowers’ (1993) *The Loaded Table* provides a strong examination of how literature can illuminate Roman attitudes toward different types of foods and discusses how “writing against luxurious food…can
be explained a the most immediate and universally intelligible image of Rome’s expansion”
where heaps of food on the table reflect heaps of spoils and gluttony is “an image of the Romans’
uncontrolled appetite for power.”102 In Horace, she argues, food is about satisfaction rather than
excess and it can act as a metaphor for knowing one’s “literary, political, moral” limits.103 I look
at food in Horace’s Satires as a major example of what I have discussed above in terms of things
appearing to be greater on the outside than they turn out to be in reality. Often, Horace compares
two different foods with two different associations that are made by society, such as different
types of fish or poultry. One example occurs in 2.4 where Catius says that Picenis cedunt pomis Tiburtia suco: nam facie praestant “apples from the Tibur yield to those from Picenum in flavor:
for they stand out in appearance” (70-71). The apples from Picenum look nicer on the outside,
but their flavor is not up to the standards of the apples from the Tibur.

In 2.2, Ofellus, says, after comparing a peacock’s and hen’s outward appearances: carne
tamen quamvis distat nil, hanc magis illa/ imparibus formis deceptum te petere! “even so, there
is no difference in the meat, you seek this one (the peacock) more than that one (the chicken)
deceived by their different forms” (2.2.29-30). Here, the peacock has associations with being
part of the meals of wealthier people and it appears to look more exotic with its colorful feathers,
but that does not make a difference because, as Ofellus points out, num vesceris ista, quam
laudas, pluma? “you do not eat that plumage which you praise, do you?” (2.2.27-28). Without
the feathers, there is nothing distinguishing the peacock from the chicken. So, although in this
instance it is less about the size of the supply, the principle stands – as established in Satires 1.1
with the example of the river (54-59) – something may come from a source that seems more
refined or more plentiful, but, nevertheless, no one is getting anything more out of it or anything

---

103 Gowers 1993: 126.
of higher quality and therefore greed is a waste of time. Overall, the motif of the deceitful nature of appearances is a tool that Horace uses throughout the Satires to promote moderation especially in terms of class. Even if someone appears wealthy on the outside, that may not actually mean that they are a higher quality person, and, as a result, there is no point in aiming to accumulate wealth nor consuming food items that reflect similar qualities.

Horace also discusses quantities of food to make the point that appearances do not matter. In 1.1.54-59:

\[ 'at suave est ex magno tollere acervo.' \]
\[ dum ex parvo nobis tantundem haurire relinquas, cur tua plus laudes cumeris granaria nostris ut tibi si sit opus liquidi non amplius urna vel cyatho et dicas 'magno de flumine mallem quam ex hoc fonticulo tantundem sumere.' \]

“‘But it is sweet to take from a great heap.’
As long as you allow for us to drain just as much from a small pile, why do you praise your granaries more than our grain-bins? As if you did not have a need of liquid greater than the urn or jug and you said, ‘I would prefer to take just as much from a great river than from this little fountain’

(1.1.54-59)

Here, the speaker says to the person who would rather take from a bigger supply that it ultimately does not make a difference what the size of the supply is because each person takes the same amount (tantundem) even if it is from a different sized supply. In the second half, with the jug and river, Horace warns against being greedy because ultimately one gets the same amount (tantundem or at least non amplius) of water no matter the size of the supply; in fact, the person who takes from the magno flumine may get swept away (1.1.58).\(^{104}\) Horace emphasizes the contrast between different containers magno…acervo (54) as opposed to parvo (55), and then magno (58) is contrasted with the diminutive fonticulo (59). The emphasis of the different

\(^{104}\) See also Callimachus Hymn to Apollo 109-112 for the image of a ποταμόιο μέγας ρόος ‘great flow of a river’ and ὀλίγη λιβάς ‘small stream.’
container sizes is accompanied by the repetition of *tantundem* or “the same amount” in lines 55 and 59. Ultimately, the emphasis here is that despite the vastly different sizes of the granaries and drinking sources, everyone needs the same amount of food and water and it having a bigger supply is meaningless.

So far, I have discussed how specific foods can have different class connotations as well as different quantities, but still have the same quality. The event or setting of a meal can have the same effect; a city dinner may seem more refined to an outsider, but it is not necessarily better than a rustic dinner. An especially memorable section of the *Satires* is when Horace’s guest, Cervius, tells the tale of the country mouse and the city mouse. It is not difficult to see that the city mouse is meant to be associated with wealth while the country mouse is meant to appear poorer, which means that again we are dealing with social class. The country mouse’s home is described as follows:

*Olim*

```latex
rusticus urbanum murem mus paupere fertur
accepisse cavo, veterem vetus hospes amicum,
asper et attentus quaesitis, ut tamen artum
solueret hospitii animum. Quid multa? Neque ille
sepositi ciceris nec longae invidit avenae,
aridum et ore ferens acinum semesaque lardi
frestra dedit, cupiens varia fastidia cena
vincere tangentis male singula dente superbo,
cum pater ipse domus palea porrectus in horna
essest ador loliumque. Dapis meliora relinquens.
```

---

105 Fraenkel calls *Satires* 2.6 the “most accomplished of all Horatian satires,” and, in particular, “The tale of the two mice with which the satire concludes is one of the best-known and most-admired pieces of Roman poetry” (1966: 142-143). Holzberg 1992 describes the usefulness of the fable, “Und diese Fassung wurde einerseits immer wieder wegen ihrer ausgefeilten narrative Technik als Musterbeispiel für die Bearbeitung eines Fabelstoffes gepriesen, andererseits ist ihre Intention m.E. deutlich erkennbar, so daß sie für die Analyse von Form und Gehalt der rekonstruierten Phaedrus-Fabel eine denkbar solide Vergleichsbasis liefert;” “And this version [of the land/city mouse fable] was on the one hand repeatedly because of its polished narrative technique a perfect example for the treatment of the fabric of the fable, on the other hand, its intention, in my assessment, is distinctly clear, so that it provides an extremely solid basis of comparison for the analysis of the form and content of the reconstructed Phaedrus-Fabel” (233). I include Holzberg’s assessment of *Satires* 2.6’s fable because it shows that Horace’s version of the fable of the two mice is used as a primary example of this fable.
“Once
a country mouse is said to have received
a city mouse in his poor burrow, an old host receiving an old friend,
unrefined and intent on his savings, nevertheless he loosened
his strict spirit with hospitality. What more? Nor did he
envy the chick-pea that had been put aside nor the long oats
and carrying in his mouth a dried fruit and half-eaten bits of lard,
he gave it in vain, hoping with the varied dinner,
to overcome the disdain of the one barely touching (the food) with his haughty tooth;
while the father of the house himself stretched out on this year’s straw
ate emmer and darnel. Leaving the better parts of the meal”
(Serm. 2.6.79-89)

Here, Cervius introduces the tale of two mice from opposite lifestyles. The country mouse’s
home is described in a humble way. He has savings (*quaesitis, sepositi*; savings, that which is
placed aside), but overall, his home is described as *paupere cavo* (poor burrow), with *paupere*
specifically having class connotations. The unimpressed city mouse soon invites the country
mouse to his own abode and the country mouse is very easily convinced: *haec ubi dicta/
agrestem pepulere, domo levis exsilit; inde/ ambo propositum peragunt iter, urbis aventes/
moenia nocturni subrepere,* “when these words struck the country mouse, lightly he leapt from
his house; from there both made the proposed journey, eager to creep under the walls of the city
by night” (Serm. 2.6.97-100). It is clear that the country mouse went willingly from the
description of him leaping from his home and the fact that both mice were *aventes,* or eager, as
they went excitedly towards the city. The sound of the lines is also rushed; the ends of lines 97
and 98 end in vowels while the following words of the next lines (98 and 99) begin with vowels,
which creates an odd effect of the words not eliding, when it feels like it should. The effect is
that the lines run together and mirror the haste with which the country mouse follows the city
mouse into his richer home. The eagerness of the country mouse suggests that he was not
entirely content outside of the city and longed for more wealth, thus succumbing to greed.
When the country mouse visits the city mouse’s house, their roles reverse, and the
country mouse appears to be richer as the city mouse serves him. Even though the city mouse’s
home appears more opulent, the meal itself will also take a negative turn. Like the house of the
country mouse, the abode of the city mouse is also described in detail:

\begin{align*}
\text{cum ponit uterque} \\
\text{in locuplete domo vestigia, rubro ubi coco} \\
\text{tincta super lectos canderet vestis eburnos} \\
\text{multaque de magna superessent fercula cena,} \\
\text{quae procul exstructis inerant hesterna canistris.} \\
\text{ergo ubi purpurea porrectuum in veste locavit} \\
\text{agrestem, veluti succintus cursitat hospes} \\
\text{continuatque dapes nec non verniliter ipsis} \\
\text{fungitur officiis, praelambens omne quod affert,} \\
\end{align*}

“When they each place their
footsteps in an opulent house, where a covering tinged
with red dye shone upon ivory couches
and many dishes were left over from a great dinner
from yesterday, which were in piled up baskets.
So, when he (the city mouse) had set up the country mouse
stretched out on the purple covering,
just as a waiter in a short jacked he runs about,
he keeps the feast coming, not unlike a slave he
performed the very tasks, licking everything beforehand which he brings out,”
\begin{flushright}
(Serm. 2.6.101-109)
\end{flushright}

There are several parallels between the imagery of the country mouse’s house and the city
mouse’s.\textsuperscript{106} However, while the country mouse dines at the city mouse’s home, he is the one
being served and therefore appears to be the upper-class guest while the city mouse, who is
supposed to be wealthier, is reduced in status acting as the slave. In this way, this story combines
the city and country, and therefore the two extremes of social status associated with them, as
Horace does throughout the \textit{Satires}. The country mouse almost seems to come out on top here,

\textsuperscript{106} West (1974) illustrates some parallels in comparing the descriptions of the two homes: one mouse lives in
\textit{paupere...cavo}, the other \textit{in locuplete domo}. The participle \textit{porrectus} is present the descriptions of both houses, and
both times it modifies the country mouse; at his own house, he is stretched out on \textit{palea...in horna} and at the city
mouse’s home, he is stretched out on \textit{purpurea...in veste} (72).
but he soon finds the consequences of his greed when the Molossian hounds interrupt the feast, and he retreats back to his original life.

Overall, it would seem that the difference between living in the country and living in the city is a matter of class with those living in the country seeming poorer and with those making their living in the city being wealthier. Overall, Horace seems to celebrate living in the country because it is simpler, and he hails it as an aspect of frugal living. In this way, Horace aligns himself with a humble way of life, as he does throughout Book 1 when he repeatedly brings up his humble parentage. However, it is worth noting that his style of country living is not the same as that of the country mouse here, or Ofellus, both of whom are poorer. Horace received his villa from his wealthy patron and he would never have received the Sabine villa without spending some time in the city and elevating his social status. West points out that Horace can be represented in both mice, which furthers the ambiguity of Horace’s social position. The result is that Horace is again being ambivalent about his social status. In addition to this, Horace associates living in the city with being wealthy, and living in the country with living modestly, but then he dismantles this by being a wealthy person living in the country. He makes these opposites meaningless, and therefore again shows that even if one appears to be less wealthy because they live in the country, that does not necessarily mean that they actually are.

**Epicureanism as a Rhetorical Strategy**

Above, I examined how some of the shared imagery between *Satires* 1.1 and 2.2 furthers Horace’s argument for moderation, from the discussion of parentage and social class to poetic genre and food. Even if something seems grander or larger on the outside, it may not matter for
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107 West 1974: 78.
the end result of how useful that thing is, and thus, there is no point in things being too extravagant. Many of the shared images between *Satires* 1.1 and 2.2 may also be associated with images in Lucretius’ *De Rerum Natura* and the substances that make up the universe. The speakers of these poems have been argued to be associated with Epicureanism. The aspects of Epicureanism that are of particular interest here include the idea that, one, things are able to be infinitely divided into smaller parts and, two, that pain at one time can turn into pleasure. Overall, while Horace did not strictly adhere to any philosophical program, it is likely that Horace was sympathetic to the school of Epicureanism, and he certainly would have been familiar with the work of Epicurean poets such as Lucretius and Philodemus.\textsuperscript{108} However, rather than simply advocating for Epicureanism, I believe that Horace is using Epicureanism as a rhetorical strategy in order that he can argue in a way that is similar to that of a philosopher, who would also advocate for a way of life.

The speakers of *Satires* 1.1 and 2.2 are different in terms of class, but they share common values. Having two speakers of different economic backgrounds share similar ideals of the correct way to live, strengthens the shared message of moderation because it becomes a universal and is shown to hold true regardless of economic classes. The speaker of 1.1 seems to be either Horace himself or some other poet that is similar to Horace, which is evident from the address to Maecenas in the first line. However, it is worth noting that the *persona* of the speaker of 1.1 has been up for debate: Turpin describes the speaker of the first three satires “to put it bluntly, a jerk”\textsuperscript{108}

\textsuperscript{108} Giesecke 2000: 95. Giesecke also notes parallels between the poetry of Horace and Lucretius, in particular in terms of both verbal and contextual correspondences that are most noticeable when the poets describe the origins or developments of human civilization. Yona 2018 also says that the fact that Horace was familiar with Philodemus’ work is “indisputable” (17).
and “an incompetent Epicurean.” Armstrong disagrees with Turpin’s harsh judgement of the speakers, but agrees that the speaker is devoted to Epicureanism.

On the other hand, 2.2 is mostly narrated by the character Ofellus who is more rustic in character. Bond describes Ofellus as a rustic character who may seem naïve and unintelligent to Horace’s more refined audience. Yona, however, suggests that “the character of Ofellus bears close resemblance to Horace’s father, who was also a bumpkin sage raised on a ‘starveling farm’,” which is the interpretation I am more inclined to agree with because he shares similar values with the speaker of Satires 1.1. The mutuality of the two speakers’ sentiments suggests that these values are something that Horace actually wants to persuade his audience to hold. It would not make sense for Ofellus to be present simply to be mocked and not taken seriously if Horace agrees with Ofellus’ message. When these two speakers from different classes make the same arguments, we see another example of these two classes coming together into something that makes them equal. This also mirrors the idea of two sources being different on the outside, but ultimately ending up producing the same result. The goals of the two narrators are the same, which lends a universality to Horace’s claim against greed, which seems to be an argument that Horace genuinely believes in because it arises in several satires.

Through the mirrored images in Satires 1.1 and 2.2, Horace makes two speakers from different classes equal and, therefore, gives strength to his argument against greed because people from several spheres of the Roman world condemn it. Since it seems that Horace is making arguments that he genuinely believes in his satires, it makes sense that Horace’s
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111 Bond 1980: 118.
112 Yona 2017: 614.
113 See also, Fraenkel 1966: Horace “in agreement with views held by Augustus, regarded avaritia as one of the most serious menaces to a healthy Roman society” (96). Satires that specifically mention avaritia include 1.4 (26) and 1.6 (68).
speakers, even if they seem outside of the norm in some way and some scholars have considered them to be parodic\textsuperscript{114}, are not entirely there to be mocked and that readers are meant to take their messages somewhat seriously. There is evidence as well that Horace, while he likely did not consider himself a full-blown ‘Epicurean,’ was sympathetic to Epicurean ideas.\textsuperscript{115}

Furthermore, both Ofellus and the speaker of 1.1 have Epicurean ideas. As noted above, Armstrong and Turpin both take the speaker of 1.1 to be a follower of Epicureanism, and several also note Ofellus’ connections to Epicureanism.\textsuperscript{116} Like Horace, the Epicurean poet Lucretius in \textit{De Rerum Natura} is interested in what things and matter consist of. Similar to Horace he frames his scientific discussion in terms of surface appearances:

\begin{verbatim}
  Praeterea nisi erit minimum, parvissima quaeque corpora constabunt ex partibus infinitis, quippe ubi dimidia partis pars semper habebit dimidiam partem nec res praefiniet ulla. ergo rerum inter summam minimamque quid escit? nil erit ut distet; nam quamvis funditus omnis summa sit infinita, tamen, parvissima quae sunt, ex infinitis constabunt partibus aeque.\textsuperscript{117}
\end{verbatim}

“Meanwhile, unless it will be the smallest, each of the smallest bodies will consist of infinite parts, indeed, when the part of a half part will always of have a half part nor will anything be fixed. Therefore, what will there be between the highest and smallest of things? There will nothing that stands apart, for although the whole sum is entirely infinite, nevertheless, the things which are smallest will equally consist of equal parts”

\begin{verbatim}(1.615-622)\end{verbatim}

Here, Lucretius states even if things appear to be extremely different in size, everything is equal because its material consists of infinite parts. This idea ties well into the examples discussed

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{114} See, for instance, Bond 1999: 8. Bond speaks the narrator of 2.4 (Catius) in this particular instance and suggests that Horace is parodying a philosophical lecture. Freundenburg also argues that the speaker of the diatribe satires is also parodying a cynic moralizing philosopher, specifically Bion (1993:21-33).
  \item \textsuperscript{115} Giesecke 2000: 95. Giesecke argues that in \textit{Satires} 1.5, Horace associates himself with Vergil and Varius Rufus who both have associations with Epicureanism, and that through this friendship, “it is difficult to imagine that they did not in some way influence his personal philosophy.”
  \item \textsuperscript{116} See, for example, Rudd 1966: 251 and Yona 2017.
  \item \textsuperscript{117} Latin Text from Rouse 1924. Translation is my own.
\end{itemize}
above regarding size, such as the amount of muddy poetry Lucilius writes. Lucilius produced a
large quantity of verses, but despite the quantity, his poetry lacks good quality and he ultimately
ends up sounding lutuletus, ‘muddy’ (Sat. 1.4.11) and garrulus atque piger, ‘talkative and
sluggish’ (Sat. 1.4.12). Lucilius’ muddy poetry and Lucretius’ work share some common
sentiments. When Lucilius asks ergo rerum inter summam minimam quid escit?, ‘what is the
difference between the highest and smallest of things?,” he is suggesting that the size of
something does not matter because it can always be broken down (DRN 1.619). Lucilius should
have broken down his poetry and, Horace suggests, erat quod tollere velles; ‘there was that
which you would want to remove” (Sat. 1.4.11).

In the above passage, Lucretius describes divisions into infinite parts, which Horace
expresses through descriptions of portions of mullet in Satires 2.2. Ofellus asks: laudas, insane,
trilibrem/ mullum, in singula pulmenta necesse est “do you praise, insane one, the three-pound
mullet, which it is necessary that you diminish into single portions?” (33-34). In this example,
there is a large fish, which, since most people probably cannot eat a three-pound mullet, ends up
getting cut into smaller, bite-size pieces, which ultimately makes its size irrelevant. This passage
also very closely follows the image of the peacock and the chicken in the same satire, both of
which contain incredulous rhetorical questions containing the same verb, laudas.118 The
proximity and shared diction of the passages link them; Horace is discussing the example of the
chicken and the peacock in order to discuss class, and the example of the three-pound fish to
discuss Epicureanism, so both points of discussion are intertwined with each another.

Both passages also share the idea of appearances not mattering as much as quality; the
peacock and mullet appear great, but the peacock is no better than the less flashy chicken and the

118 Num vesceris ista, quam laudas, pluma?, “you don’t eat the feathers which you praise do you?” (Sat. 2.2.27-28).
mullet can always be broken down to make its size irrelevant. This relates directly to the Lucretius passage because it describes something being great, or *rerum inter summam* “among the highest of things” and it being able to be broken down infinitely (*De Rerum Natura* 1.1.619). So, no matter what size something is on the outside, even if it is *summa*, everything ends up ultimately equating to the same thing because everything is always made up of something smaller all the way down to the *minima*, which are indivisible. Ultimately, all things are made up of the *minima*, so no matter how great (*summa*) something appears on the outside, it is still made up of the smallest parts (*minima*). Similarly, the mullet is also diminished *in singula pulmenta*, ‘into single portions’ (*Sat.* 2.2.34). Here, the full *trilibrem mullum*, ‘three-pound mullet’ of Horace reflects the *summam* of Lucretius, while the *singula pulmenta* reflect the *minima*.

Lucretius also explores the notion of surface appearances as inaccurate reflections of inner substance or character. For example, *servitium contra paupertas divitiaequne, / libertas bellum concordia, cetera quorum/ adventu manet incolmis natura abituque/ haec soliti sumus, ut par est, eventa vocare. “slavery, on the other hand, poverty and riches, freedom, war, harmony, and the rest with whose arrival and exit nature remains unharmed, and these things, as is proper, we are accustomed to call ‘events’* (*De Rerum Natura* 1.455-458). This section of *De Rerum Natura* goes well with the section quoted above (*Sat.* 2.1.57-60) because it describes a person’s outside circumstances changing, but within he is unchanged, he will always be a writer. All of the experiences that Lucretius lists as *eventa* in the passage above, are outside circumstances, and many of them directly relate to a social class, such as *servitium, paupertas* and *divitiaeq*. However, despite these *eventa*, both when they arrive (*adventu*) or leave (*abitu*), *manet incolmis natura*, “nature remains unharmed.” The suggestion here is that despite
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119 Long and Sedley 1987: 36 suggest that the section concerning *minima* may be appended to a section about atoms.
someone’s social status, which can come and go, their internal *natura* does not change. In the *Satires*, Horace shows several people of different social classes having similar *naturae* to one another, such as the two narrators of 1.1 and 2.2. Horace’s social status also changes throughout the course of the *Satires*. He meets Maecenas in *Sat.* 1.6 and thereafter his status continues to elevate as the *Satires* progresses.\(^1\)

Another aspect of Epicureanism Horace draws on is the idea that something that is painful at one time turns out to produce pleasure later. Therefore, something that initially appears painful actually turns out to be beneficial. The idea is documented by the ancient biographer Diogenes Laertes in his account of the life of Epicurus:

> Καὶ ἐπεὶ πρῶτον ἄγαθὸν τοῦτο καὶ σύμφωνον, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ οὐ πάσαν ἡδονὴν αἴροιμεθα, ἄλλ᾽ ἔστιν δε πολλὰς ἡδονὰς ὑπερβαίνομεν, ὅταν πλεῖον ἡμῖν τὸ δυσχερὲς ἔκ τούτων ἔπειτα καὶ πολλὰς ἄλγηδόνας ἡδονὰς κρείττους νομίζομεν, ἐπειδὰν μεῖζον ἡμῖν ἡδονὴ παρακολουθή πολῶν χρόνον ὑπομείνασι τὰς ἄλγηδόνας.\(^2\)

And since this is the first and innate good, through this we do not choose every pleasure, but as it is so that we step past many pleasures whenever a greater difficulty follows from them; and we think that many pains are better than pleasures, since a greater pleasure follows us closely after we have endured the pains for a long time.

(Diogenes Laertius, *Life of Eminent Philosophers* 10. 129)

According to this passage, things may not necessarily be as they appear. Although something may seem pleasurable in the moment, it may ultimately turn out to be painful, which is an unperceived aspect of the thing that originally appeared pleasurable. This is also true for something that appears painful at the outset, which ultimately turns out to be better. Horace uses this Epicurean idea in terms of social class when he describes things that are initially painful, which ultimately turn out to be beneficial. One thing that may appear to be painful is having a

---

\(^1\) Especially useful in tracking Horace’s rise on the social ladder is Oliensis’ comparison between *Sat.* 1.6 and *Sat.* 2.6. In both satires, Horace attempts to take a walk through the city, but in the first book, Horace is able to take a leisurely stroll, while in the second he is rushed about due to his increased fame and association with Maecenas. Also, in *Sat.* 1.6, Horace eats dinner alone, while in 2.6 he is surrounded by guests (1998: 42-51).

\(^2\) Greek text from Hicks 1925. Translation is my own.
need for wealth. However, when Horace is poorer in his poetry, he has more leisure time and ultimately ends up having more pleasure as a result.\textsuperscript{122} Horace also, as discussed above, praises his freedman father, who may appear on the outside to have painful circumstances, but he actually possesses great wisdom. We can also see this in the discussion above of the ant and the wise man who both prepare for harsh circumstances during peaceful times.\textsuperscript{123} It is difficult and painful to make preparations for harsh times ahead during peace, which is suggested through the fear that both examples experience. As noted above, the ant is \textit{non incauta} (1.1.35), and the wise man is \textit{metuens} (2.2.110). However, both serve themselves well for a less fearful future, thus ensuring future security and pleasure from a painful experience.

It seems that Horace uses several facets of Epicureanism that align with his agenda concerning moderation. This is useful because using Epicureanism allows Horace to use rhetoric in a way like that of a philosopher who would also advocate for a way of life. Epicureanism seems especially to serve Horace’s purpose because of its appeal to moderation, particularly when it comes to social status. First, even if something appears to be great or prosperous on the outside, it is still made up of the same indivisible parts. Secondly, if something initially appears painful, such as being less wealthy, it will ultimately end up providing greater pleasure. As a result, we can see how these outside circumstances or outside appearances transcend class throughout the satires in a way that agrees with much of Epicurean thought.

\textbf{Conclusion}

In this chapter, I have examined how Horace employs several rhetorical strategies in his \textit{Satires} to advocate for moderation, which has the effect of making the pursuit of wealth seem

\textsuperscript{122} Oliensis 1998: 42-51. See note 40.
\textsuperscript{123} \textit{parvula: Sat.} 1.1.32-35, \textit{sapiens: Sat.} 2.2.107-111.
futile. He crafts a persona that sometimes seems wealthy, specifically through his association with Maecenas and potential equestrian status, and, at other times, he appears to come from a lower class with his freedman father and with excitement about country living. He uses the *ethos* of both these *optimi viri* to strengthen the *persona* of the speaker. However, despite the attempt at establishing *ethos*, the speaker undermines himself by not following his own advice, especially in *Satires* 1.3, where he condemns Tigellius for his inconsistency, but then proceeds to be inconsistent himself. He uses other speakers, such as Ofellus and his father, to put forth ideas that agree with people of upper classes, and Horace combines the classes in that way as well. Finally, he uses motifs that feature something fancier or larger turning out to be worth the same or less than something mundane in order to also show that something being associated with the upper-class does not necessarily make it better, and in that way distinctions between social classes are moot. The motif is especially prominent in *Satires* 1.1 and 2.2, which I argue are closely linked to one another. It is also prominent in Epicureanism, which has been closely associated with the speakers of both of these poems. Horace’s use of Epicureanism allows him to use the school in order to advocate for a way of life, and therefore it is a rhetorical strategy. Throughout the *Satires* Horace connects ideas by repeating specific Latin words or phrases, such as *optimus* connecting Horace’s father to other great men of the time, including Maecenas. Horace also achieves his rhetorical goals by juxtaposing opposite ideas, this can refer to quantity (*see magno* and *parvo* lines 54-55) or it can refer to general connotations of class, for instance the peacock, which is associated with the upper class, is juxtaposed with the chicken, associated with more rustic meals. The rhetorical strategies that Horace uses throughout the *Satires* helps him further his point in favor of moderation by showing that greed is a pointless vice. In the following chapter, I will examine the rhetorical strategies that Horace uses in the *Odes*. Like the
Satires, the Odes are didactic, and Horace again advocates for moderation. A significant strategy that Horace uses in the Odes is his insistence on the quickness of time. The ways he achieves this is by focusing on impending. Horace also manipulates the meter in the Odes to sound either quicker or more sluggish, which represents the passing of time. Horace emphasizes the limits of time in order to dissuade his audience from expecting too much of the future or engaging in activities that are inappropriate for their age, and he encourages them to be moderate with their expectations of life.
Mortality and Praise as Rhetoric in Horace’s Odes

Introduction

Like the Satires, Horace’s Odes (Books 1-3, 23 BC; Book 4, 13 BC) are didactic in nature and, therefore, Horace continues to fulfill the docere goal of an orator. In the previous chapter, I discussed Horace’s rhetorical strategies in the Satires, with which Horace argues for moderation. In the Odes, Horace promotes specific ideals and ways of life in the manner of an orator or philosopher. Davis suggests that the poet must compose a “lyric argument and “the composer of the Odes is primarily engaged… in conveying ideas and philosophical insights in a manner that is rhetorically persuasive.” Marković makes a similar claim for the contemporary poet Lucretius, who also espouses an Epicurean way of living through poetry. We see Horace, himself, stating his purpose of recommending a specific way of life in Odes 2.10: Rectius vives, Licini, neque altum / semper urgendo neque, dum procellas / cautus horrescis, nimium premendo / Litus iniquum; “You will live more correctly, Licinius, by not always pushing the deep, nor, while cautious you shudder at storms, by pressing the hostile shore too much” (1-4). Here, Horace directly and deliberately advises Licinius on how he may live his life in the most correct way, which requires some persuasion on Horace’s part. In his later work, the Ars Poetica, Horace writes: aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae / aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere vitae. / quidquid praecipies… “whether poets wish to benefit or please, or to speak at once both the delights and proper things for life, whatever you will advise…” (Ars 333-335). Here, Horace
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124 Davis 1991: 2.
125 Marković 2008: “Epicurean concern with the problems of ethics and with the question of how one should live one’s life makes rhetoric indisputably relevant for an analysis of Epicurean discourse” (10).
126 Latin text from Garrison 1991. All translations are my own.
shows that teaching about life is a goal of his work as a poet. Therefore, it makes sense to look at how Horace may be acting as a teacher in any of his works.

In this chapter, I analyze the specific rhetorical strategies that Horace implements to persuade his audience towards a moderate way of life. I look at some of the ways that Horace manipulates his poetics with devices such as alliteration, enjambment, and the manipulation of the meter to further his points. This is significant because these effects also alter the sound of the poetry, which is also an important aspect of rhetoric that assists in the delivery of the sentiment; Isocrates, an Athenian rhetorician, suggested that “even poetry mediocre in thought could beguile hearers by effects of harmony and symmetry in themselves,” which suggests that sound was a crucial component for persuasion. Both poets and rhetoricians are sensitive to how words sound and they manipulate the aural aspects of their language in order to help them achieve their overall purpose. Horace uses his poetics and the aural qualities of poetry in order to have a meaningful effect on his readers and further his rhetorical goals.

First, to best understand how Horace aims to teach or deliver his message, I explore the dynamics between the speaker of the poetry and the addressee, and how that relates to the poet and his actual audience. Horace establishes some basic rules of rhetorical engagement that may be broken down into the following steps. First, he conveys his argument by addressing his poems to specific people; the relationship he builds between the speaker and addressee in his poetry, as well as the relationship with the poet and his wider readership, help to establish a small community to whom Horace directs his argument. Then, I apply the ideas around speakers and addressees to my analysis of the carpe diem odes (for instance, Odes 1.4 and 1.11). In that section, I focus on odes that center mortality and aging and suggest that Horace uses mortality as
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127 Isocrates, Evagoras 10.
a means for advocating for moderation. He uses his poetics and imagery that is dark and foreboding to make mortality more vivid and menacing to his audience. The idea of mortality also plays into Epicureanism, which, as I have shown in the previous chapter, is an influence for Horace, and is something that Horace uses as a rhetorical strategy to bolster his argument against immoderate behavior.

The final part of the chapter looks at how the case that Horace makes for moderation also aligns with the values of Rome under Augustus, which will become especially salient in my analysis of *Odes* 4.129 As a result, Horace’s concentration on moderation shows his support for Augustus, while also suggesting that the higher echelon of Roman society ought to practice moderation in their day-to-day life. I suggest that the first ode of Book 4, since it uses themes that are similar to those that are abundant in the first three books—namely moderation, mortality and *tempestivitas*—links the fourth book to the previous three books of odes. Horace ultimately uses these themes to promote Augustus.

**Relationship Between the Speaker and Addressees**

While the speaker of the *Satires* invites mockery because of his inconsistencies, the speaker of the *Odes* appears much less ridiculous.130 This is likely a reflection of Horace’s experience as a poet. It is here, according to Oliensis, that Horace establishes his *auctoritas* as a poet, mirroring Octavian’s establishment of *auctoritas* as he becomes Augustus.131 While the speaker of the *Satires* would give advice only to break it, the speaker of the *Odes*, seems to
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129 These ideals or virtues may have included *fortitudo, labor, vigilantia, diligentia, cura industria, and prudentia* (Galinsky 1996: 83). While none of these translate directly to ‘moderation,’ moderation is an aspect of several of these virtues.

130 Oliensis 1998 describes the speaker as an “imperial poet,” having qualities such as “boldfacedness” and “self-effacement” (102).

adhere to the similar advice he gives. Oliensis describes the poetic power of Horace in the *Odes* as coming from “not conquest but restraint.”¹³² Since restraint and moderation is typically what Horace teaches in the *Odes*, it seems that the speaker is appropriately reserved.

Typically, each of the *Odes* has a specific person to whom they are addressed in the vocative. Horace establishes complex and intimate relationships between the speaker and addressees of his poems. As briefly discussed in the previous chapter, in *The State of Speech*, Connolly describes how rhetoric creates a “collective sense of belonging for citizens” within their society and political situation.¹³³ I suggest that Horace uses addressees and second-person verbs and pronouns to create an intimate relationship between the speaker and addressee in the poems. While the addressee is significant in the poem in terms of who they are and to what social class they belong, ultimately Horace is speaking to the reader as well, who may also benefit and feel they belong within the bubble that Horace creates. McCarthy, when describing Catullus 6, observes: “Catullus’s poem yokes together the world of the characters and the world of the reader by means of the first-person speaker, who is positioned as both a character in the story world and the author of the text we are reading.”¹³⁴ The description also applies to Horace, who uses addressees, who may or may not be fictional depending on the particular ode, to connect the readers to the world within the poem.¹³⁵

Addressees in the *Odes* may vary in social status in relation to the speaker, and the speaker shares similar ideas throughout different poems toward a variety of different addressees.

---

¹³⁴ McCarthy 2019: 3.
¹³⁵ Citroni 1983 has said that Horace’s odes are meaningful first for the named addressees, secondly to others in the social circle of Horace’s addressees and the poet, and lastly to the general reader (76). However, some of the addressees of the *Odes* are clearly not people who are members of Horace’s audience, and therefore the poem would have little meaning for them; for instance, *Odes* 1.14 is addressed to a ship, while other *Odes* are addressed to gods. Therefore, I would say that the primary audience for the *Odes* is the reverse of Citroni’s: The *Odes* are aimed primarily at the general readers, secondarily for his social circle, and lastly for the expressed addressee of the poem.
In different chapters of his dissertation, Daniel Barber examines various types of addressees including women and gods; his analyses are significant because women and gods will have a different social status from the speaker, while an addressee who, for example, is a male citizen, may be treated more as an equal. The status of Horace’s addressees in relation to the speaker affects how the speaker talks to them and the overall roles that each character fills within the rhetorical situation of a poem. Oliensis describes the dynamics between the speaker and addressee: “In Horace’s carefully constructed poetic ‘situations,’ this addressee sometimes functions as a conduit for another conversation with an overreader,” or someone outside of the explicitly addressed recipient of a particular work.

Oliensis and Barber also offer some useful strategies for reading social class that are applicable to my reading of Horace and how he exercises different levels of authority over different addressees. In terms of this authority, Oliensis claims:

When he is addressing an unproblematically subordinated ‘other’ such as a slave, Horace regularly cedes some of his authority, making a display—for the reader’s if not the addressee’s benefit (the servile addressee is not positioned as a reader of Horatian poetry) —of his gracious affability. And when he is addressing an undeniably superior ‘other,’ most notably Augustus, he always takes care to safeguard his own authority, even if that means indulging in a certain calculated ungraciousness.

This interpretation suggests that Horace tries to make himself and his addressees somewhat equal no matter who the addressee is, but despite this, the societal expectations of the differing statuses between a speaker and addressee still have an effect on the rhetoric of a poem. For instance, in a poem where the addressee is female, there are almost always sexual undertones. This phenomenon by itself with the sexual roles expected in Roman society suggests that the male

---

136 Barber 2010.
139 Barber 2010: 127.
speaker would have authority over the female addressee, and also suggests that the speaker makes his arguments in the context of the erotic, and not in the context of more serious subjects.

Overall, the relationship that Horace establishes between the different parties of a particular work is significant to this study because it affects the poetry’s rhetorical situation, as the examples below aim to show. While, as Barber points out, the social class of the addressee may affect Horace’s attitude, I suggest that addressees from different classes often get the same lessons from Horace. The implication is that Horace’s message is applicable across all social classes, and he, therefore, blurs the lines in a way that is similar to what he has done in the Satires, as I examined in Chapter 1. In Odes 1.4, for instance, one’s social class does not grant them exemption from death. I will explore more specific dynamics between speaker and addressee in the examples that follow.

Mortality, Aging and Carpe Diem

In Odes 1.4 and 1.11, moderation is connected to the speaker’s warning against cultivating long hopes due to the limited amount of time allotted to each person’s life. Thus, although the speaker’s main warning in these poems is a view towards being aware of one’s mortality and making the most out of the time one has, the speaker is also promoting moderation, since it would be immoderate and an impractical use of allotted time to cultivate goals that are too long for the small span of life. Another way that Horace warns his readers of their limited life span is through the idea that as a person gets older certain activities, especially those regarding love, become inappropriate. As a result, Horace argues that it is immoderate and indulgent to engage in these activities after reaching a certain age. The warning against engaging in love at an
age where it is too late also plays into the warnings concerning mortality, because Horace shows in this way as well the limits of one’s life.

In *Odes* 1.4, Horace warns his addressee, Sestius, against expecting too much in life. Horace begins the ode by describing the dissolution of winter and the beginning of spring. By using some of his trademark poetic devices, Horace shows that there is always a right time to act in a certain way, and, later in the poem, he warns that mortality prevents humans from lingering for too long in an activity that would be appropriate for someone of a younger age:

*Solvitur acris hiems grata vice veris et Favoni,*
*trahuntque siccas machinae carinas,*
*ac neque *iam* stabulis gaudet pecus aut arator igni,*
*nec prata canis albicant pruinis.*

*iam* Cytherea choros duci *Venus imminente luna,*
*iunctaeque Nymphis Gratiae decentes* alterno terram quatiunt pede, *dum gravis Cyclopum Vulcanus ardens visit officinas.*

*Nunc* decet aut viridi nitidum caput impedire myrto
*aut flore, terrae quem ferunt solutae;*
*nunc* et in umbrosis Fauno *de cet immolare lucis,*
*seu poscat agna sive malit haedo.*

*Pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas*
*regnumque turris. O beate Sesti,*
vitae summa brevis spem nos vetat incohare longam.

*iam* te premet nox *fabulaeque Manes*
et domus exilis Plutonia; *quo simul mearis,*
*nec regna vini sortiere talis,*
*nec tenerum Lycidan mirabere, quo calet iuventus*
*nunc omnis et mox virgines tepbunt.*

Harsh winter is melted with the welcome change of spring and of Favonus,
And machines drag the dry keels,
And no longer does the cattle rejoice in the stables or the farmer at his hearth,
Nor are the meadows white with white hoar frost.
Now Cytherean Venus leads dances, with the moon threatening overhead,
And comely Graces joined with Nymphs
Shake the ground with an alternate foot, when burning Vulcan
inspects the mighty workshops of the Cyclopes.
Now it is fitting to encircle a shining head either with green myrtle
or with a flower, which the melted earth bears;
and now also it is fitting for Faunus to sprinkle meal in the shadowy groves,
whether he would seek to sacrifice a lamb or prefer to sacrifice a kid.
Pale Death knocks on the huts of the poor and the towers of the rich with an
impartial foot. O happy Sestius,
The greatest span of life forbids us to begin a long hope.

Soon night will press you and the storied Shades
And the bleak house of Plutonia; where, as soon as you go,
Neither will you obtain by lot kingships of wine with dice,
Nor will you marvel at soft Lycidas, because of whom all the youth
now are hot and soon virgins will grow warm.

The poem begins with the imagery of the beginning of spring (grata vice veris et Favoni) and the
activities (lines 2-12) that take place during that time of the year. The meter of the poem is Third
Archilochian, or alternating lines of dactyls and iambs imitating the transition from winter to
spring.\(^{140}\) Just as the seasons change from spring to winter and then back again, the lines of the
poem change from dactyls to iambs. The tone shifts suddenly at line 13 when we are reminded
that spring, along with all the seasons, is temporary, and that we will all die no matter the
position we hold in life. Horace uses the selected meter as a rhetorical tool to sway his audience
because it reflects in the ear of the listener both the temporary nature of the seasons and the
temporary nature of the life of a person. Helena Dettmer’s examination of the structure of the
Odes also shows that there is a cyclical pattern throughout the entire Odes 1-3, with certain odes
later on directly mirroring earlier odes in a deliberate pattern.\(^ {141}\) Dettmer’s observation about the
structure of the first three books of Odes, along with the actual content of so many odes being
focused on cyclical aspects of nature and the temporariness of seasons and human life, shows the
importance of cycles throughout the odes. One major way that Horace uses cycles is to represent
the change in seasons and the implications of that temporal framework.

line that combines dactylic trimeter and iambic dimeter.

\(^{141}\) Dettmer 1983: 120-135.
Another way that Horace emphasizes the temporariness of spring through his poetics is through repetition of certain time adverbs. *Iam* is repeated in lines 3, 5, and 16, and *nunc* in lines 9, 11, and 20. These time adverbs often appear in close succession to one another, and, in lines 5, 9, and 11, they are emphasized at the start of the lines with the use of anaphora. I argue that Horace’s frequent use of temporal adverbs creates the rhetorical effect of urgency, which promotes the point that time is fleeting. The time adverbs remind the readers that spring is necessary. Words that refer to ‘now,’ remind us that there is a time that is not ‘now,’ namely, the impending future. These time adverbs also aid in Horace’s suggestion that there are specific times that it is appropriate to do certain things, which is also implied by *dece*‘it is fitting,’ being modified by the two uses of *nunc* in lines 9 and 11. My interpretation that the time adverbs add urgency to the poem differs from the readings of Corbeill and Davis, who both take a more optimistic stance on the poem, in that the cyclical aspects shown in the meter and the nature of seasons shows that humanity succeeds through its successive generations.\(^{142}\) While seasons may be cyclical, humans are not. Once our youth is over, it does not return, whereas spring will always return. There are also aspects of the poem that give it a more sinister and urgent feeling, which would also be emphatic to the reader. For instance, *imminente luna*, in line 5, with *imminente* literally meaning ‘hanging overhead,’ could also have the connotation of being ‘threatening,’ as if night or death is always hanging overhead even in pleasant times. The *imminente luna* likely foreshadows, or ‘hangs overhead,’ line 13, when Death appears.\(^{143}\)

A major shift in the tone of the poem occurs at line 13 with the entrance of Death. Before this point, Horace creates the image of spring dissolving an icy winter and provides images that


\(^{143}\) Uden 2020 gives a helpful examination of how later gothic authors use classical authors in order to further their own goals of creating a foreboding atmosphere. The foreboding imagery in Horace would easily aid a gothic writer looking for chilling inspiration.
are appropriate for springtime. The final image we see in line 12 is of a young animal being sacrificed, which may provide a transition into death. We again see some foreboding imagery at line 11 with the adjective *umbrosis* describing the shaded grove in which this sacrifice is taking place. The image here may provide a transition into the rest of the poem, where Horace addresses mortality. Although the foreboding imagery may provide some transition, the shift in line 13, starting with the personified *Pallida Mors*, is still jarring. Present in these lines is the alliteration of the labial consonant *p* which could be interpreted as a “barrage of kicks” as Death knocks on the doors of mortals.\(^\text{144}\) I would add that the sound of knocking is aided by the scansion of line 13, which contains several long syllables in a row. Horace draws attention to the meter here with *pede*, which is itself a Roman metrical term; by drawing attention to the meter Horace wishes his audience to notice the slowing rhythm.\(^\text{145}\) This slowed rhythm resembles the rolling knock. By imitating the knocking of Death in this way, the suggestion is that he is here right now, and it furthers the sense of urgency created by the repetitions of *iam* and *nunc* elsewhere in the poem.

Death’s spondaic knocks in line 13 recreate the rhythmic beating of the heart, which is itself a function of life. The effect of the heartbeat imitation is twofold. When someone feels their heart beating intensely, it is often due to anxiety or fear, so the imitation of the heartbeat may arouse such in the reader. As I have shown above, Horace does offer some foreboding words before the arrival of Death, so it seems that he is trying to produce some anxiety for his readers. Another important aspect of the heartbeat is that it connects a person to the present. When someone takes a deep breath, breathing being another signal of life, it is meant to reconnect them to the present. It seems likely that the heartbeat could have a similar function, which accentuates the effect that Death is here at that moment. Other ways that Horace

\(^\text{144}\) Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 68.

\(^\text{145}\) *Pede* may also refer to the Roman custom of knocking on doors with one’s foot (Garrison 1991: 209).
perpetuates urgency in this stanza is through his use of enjambment between lines 13-14 (pauperum tabernas / regnumque turris). Here, the knocks of Death spill onto the next line. It is as if Death is coming so quickly that the verses cannot keep up with it. Overall, the effect of urgency created by Horace’s use of poetic devices aids his overall argument concerning time because it emphasizes the passing of time and brings the passing of time into the awareness of his audience. This speaks to the larger theme of moderation, namely that the limits of time create boundaries within which humans must moderate their hopes.

As noted above, the relationship that Horace establishes between the speakers and addressees of his poems is also a key rhetorical strategy. In 1.4, Horace introduces the addressee, Sestius (line 14), who is known for his wealth.146 Anderson suggests that since Sestius is an acquaintance of Horace, he is able to give him casual life advice in this particular poem.147 This is especially significant when considering the Pallida Mors stanza in which Horace specifically describes death knocking on pauperum tabernas regnumque turris, “huts of the poor and towers of the rich” (lines 13-14). Horace shows that Death comes to everyone regardless of what social class they belong to, which is an idea consistent with the Horatian theme that material objects are of the same value regardless their perceived value.148 Following the address, Horace uses nos in line 15, which could refer to Sestius and the speaker, but also includes all humans, since we are all susceptible to death, and therefore the message that the brevity of life prevents humans from cultivating long hopes is relevant to everyone and does not seem to be exclusively meant for the addressee of the poem. Anderson suggests a slightly more refined audience: “Sestius the affluent

146 Sestius was appointed by Augustus as consul suffectus in 23 BCE despite his siding loyally with Brutus in the past (Will 1982: 240). This could be an indication of Augustus’ political intelligence, which has the effect of showing off Augustus’ moderation in that he does not only give honors to those who have always agreed with him politically.
147 Anderson 1992: 118. For more on addresses between friends see Williams 2012: 71, 159.
148 See Chapter 1 for a discussion of moderation in Horace’s earlier satires.
consul stands for all those who in middle age and relatively comfortable circumstances need to remember how close Death is.” Regardless of whether the Sestius stands in for the whole human race or just those for whom Death may be of concern due to their age, the address to Sestius is not meant only for Sestius.

Odes 1.11, the famous carpe diem ode, is another where Horace warns his audience against spem longam, or ‘long hope’ (line 7). In Odes 1.11, Horace addresses Leuconoē, but as in Odes 1.4, the actual audience that Horace is trying to convince is anyone who happens to be reading. The message of the poem then applies to the entire human race:

Tu ne quaesieris, scire nefas, quem mihi, quem tibi finem di dederint, Leuconoe, nec Babylonios temptaris numeros. Ut melius, quidquid erit, pati, seu pluris hiemies seu tribuit Iuppiter ultimam, quae nunc oppositis debilitat pumicibus mare Tyrrenenum: sapias, vina liques, et spatio brevi spem longam reseces. Dum loquimur, fugerit invida aetas: carpe diem, quam minimum credula postero.

You should not ask, it is wrong to know, what end the gods give to me and what end they give to you, Leuconoē, nor should you experiment with Babylonian numbers. As it is better to endure whatever will be, whether Jupiter has granted many winters or if this is the last, which now weakens the Tyrrhenian Sea with opposing rocks: may you be wise, may you strain the wine, and because of life’s brief span, may you cut back on long hopes. As we speak, envious time flees: pluck the day, trusting as little as possible in the next one.

Here, the vocative address is to Leuconoē, whom Horace accuses of being too obsessed with trying to figure out their futures, both her own and the speaker’s (quem mihi, quem tibi/finem).

His overall argument, similar to 1.4, is that the amount of time humans are allotted for life is

---

150 For general scholarship on Odes 1.11: Konet 1974-1975 suggests that Horace took Semonides as an original source for the poem. See Marsilio 2010 for etymology of Leuconoē’s name and for the amatory theme in the poem. See also Schwindt 2016.
limited, and one should not hope for too much, but enjoy the moment as it happens. Throughout
the poem, he uses second-person jussive subjunctives (*quaesieris, temptaris, sapias, liques,
reseces*), which function as rather polite commands, making it seem as if Horace is giving
Leuconoë advice. The last second-person verb, however, is a simple imperative, which makes
the command *carpe diem* stand out and emphasizes it as Horace’s main point of the ode. Once
again, a first-person plural element, *loquimur* in line 7, is introduced in this poem. As with *Odes*
1.4, the overall message is applicable not only to the addressee of the poem, but to the entire
human race because it involves death, which is universal. Another notable element of this ode is
the image of the sea wearing down rocks, which could symbolize life being worn away. Horace
uses the metaphor of the sea crashing into the opposing rocks to provide a natural *exemplum* to
further his point that life is temporary, and everybody’s remaining time is constantly being
diminished.

Horace also advances his argument about the brevity of life and expresses the urgency of
the situation through the meter of *Odes* 1.11. The meter of the poem is Fifth Asclepiadean which
consists of a spondee followed by three choriamb and ending with an iamb.151 Jenny Strauss
Clay suggests that the choriamb of this poem mirror the rapidity of time, with slower moments
at the beginnings of the lines, where the choriamb are preceded by a spondee, which indicate
there may be “brief moments that we may be able to snatch” because the meter slows down.152 I
agree with Clay that the choriamb create the effect of time moving swiftly, but I think that the
spondees at the beginning of each line help Horace emphasize his argument beyond just
moments to snatch. The spondaic moments align with moments where Horace is giving

151 A choriamb consists of a long syllable, two shorts, and another long (—∪∪— ) (Garrison 1991: 381).
152 “The rapid choriamb of time’s inexorable passing have as their counterpoint the staccato phrases that interrupt
its flow and signal those brief moments that we may be able to snatch” (Clay 2015: 114).
Leuconoë a prohibition. Therefore, the spondees emphasize the advice-giving aspect of the poem. Note, for instance, the first line in which the words *tu ne* are both scanned long. The *ne* emphasizes that Horace is about to give advice, because it signals a negative command, and the audience anticipates what that command will be. Line 2 begins with *finem*, which relates to the prohibition above, since it is the direct object of *quaesieris*. These few words sum up Horace’s overall message of the poem, and the fact that they are scanned as spondees in a sea of choriambics brings them to the reader’s attention because they require a slowing down in the meter. The spondees in particular emphasize the fact that Horace is giving instructions.

Mortality continues to be a major theme throughout the *Odes*, and Horace continues to deploy it rhetorically. *Odes* 1.25 is not usually considered a ‘*carpe diem*’ poem, but some of the ideas that it puts forth are similar because the poem promotes engaging in certain, love-related behaviors at a time in one’s life when it is appropriate to do so. Since love becomes less appropriate as one ages, mortality also becomes a theme in this poem, since the passing of life is reflected in aging. In this poem, the speaker addresses Lydia, a woman who is getting woken up less often by boys in the night because she is getting older. Soon the boys will prefer younger women to the soon-to-be-shriveled Lydia. Again, Horace illustrates the urgency of time passing using temporal adverbs; the poem begins emphatically with *parcius*, “less often,” being the first word, and temporal adverbs are also prominent in line 6: *minus et minus iam*; “already less and less.” Ronnie Ancona also notes these repeated time adverbs, including *parcius* at the poem’s start, and her reading is focused on the consequences of Lydia’s age for her love life. These consequences are what Horace warns Lydia about in the poem, as the poem progresses with a colder tone (*Odes* 1.25):

---

153 “Name suggests luxury and voluptuousness” (Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 110).
Parcius iunctas quatiunt fenestras
Iactibus crebris iuvenes protervi,
Nec tibi somnos adimunt, amatque
Ianua limen,

Quae prius multum facilis movebat Cardines. Audis minus et minus iam:
“Me tuo longas pereunte noctes
Lydia, dormis?”

Invicem moechos anus arrogantis flebis in solo levis angiportu,
Thracio bacchante magis sub inter-
lunia vento,
cum tibi flagrans amor et libido,
quaes solet matres furiare equorum,
saeviet circa iecur ulcerosum,
non sine questu,

laeta quod pubes hedera virenti
gaudeat pulla magis atque myrto,
aridas frondes hiemis sodali
dedicet Euro.

“Less often the bold young men
Shake your joined windows with frequent throws,
Nor do they snatch away your sleeps and the door
Loves the threshold,

Which before used to move its hinges much more
Easily. You now hear it less and less;
“Lydia, are you sleeping while I, being yours, pass
Long nights?”

In turn, as an old lady feeble in a
lonely alley you will weep for
haughty adulterers, while the Thracian wind rages
more beneath a moonless sky,

when love and lust burning for you,
which is accustomed to drive crazy the mothers of horses,
Will rage around your ulcerated liver,
not without complaint,
because happy youths rejoice more
in green ivy than in dusky myrtle,
and they give the dry leaves to Euros,
the ally of winter.

The Thracian wind and moonless night (9-10) bring a dark, cold tone to the poem, along with the reminder of winter, and therefore also death, at the end (19). There are also several words that describe madness at this point: bacchante (11), furiare (14) and saeviet (15). All of these words are likely meant to dissuade anyone from following Lydia’s path. The overall argument of the poem is that time is fleeting and that soon men will no longer knock on her door for nocturnal trysts and will seek younger women who are more appropriate for their age. As a result, Horace is accusing the Lydia of being immoderate because she is engaging in indulgent activities that are no longer suitable for her age. At one time in her life, such activities would not be immoderate, but she has come to a time in her life where it is no longer appropriate to seek out love, according to Horace. The speaker of the poem is likely a lover of Lydia who has been rejected, which, like Odes 1.11, implies that the speaker is personally invested in the message of the poem.155 Horace ends the poem by insulting Lydia, but these insults are not aimed at the outward audience. At this point, like several characters in the Satires, Lydia likely serves as an exemplum of how one should not act as Horace advances his previous points concerning mortality and moderation. The insults also aid Horace in his rhetorical aims because he creates a common point of ridicule for him and his audience, which helps strengthen the bond and sense of rapport between author and audience.156

156 See Corbeill 1996 for role of humorous invective in the forming of a community between speaker and audience; invective not only gains goodwill of audience (captatio benevolentiae), but also helps to establish common values of the audience and speaker because the subjects of the speaker’s mockery are things that are outside of the norm of those values (5-6).
Horace’s advocacy for moderation by using mortality also has social implications, which are similar to what I have described in the previous chapter concerning the Satires. Early in the Odes, Horace establishes Death as a universal visitor to both the rich and the poor (Odes 1.4.13-14). This description is unquestionably true from a human perspective. Horace’s vivid description of Death’s knock in Odes 1.4 reverberates throughout the rest of the odes and other instances where Horace brings up mortality, which happens often throughout the Odes. In Odes 2.3, for instance, there is once more the split between rich and poor and again Horace makes the point that death comes to the rich and poor alike:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{divesne prisco natus ab Inacho} \\
\text{nil interest an pauper et infima} \\
\text{de gente sub divo moreris:} \\
\text{victima nil miserantis Orci.}
\end{align*}
\]

Whether born rich from ancient Inachus  
Or poor and low, it makes no difference  
Concerning the race under the sky you linger:  
A victim of Orcus pitying nothing.  
\[(Odes 2.3.21-24)\]

Again, there is the grouping of rich (dives) and poor (pauper), and regardless of which category one falls into, they are still a victim of Orcus.

From the examples I have examined above, we can also see a variety of addressees. The variety in addressees also aids Horace’s argument concerning moderation in view of Death’s certitude. Two are women (Leuconoë in 1.11 and Lydia in 1.25) and one is a wealthy citizen (Sestius in 1.4). While Horace may use different approaches between Sestius, a friend, and the two women, both of whom are potential lovers, his overall warning is the same, which shows that it is applicable across the socio-economic spectrum.
Epicureanism in the *Odes*

In the previous chapter on the *Satires*, I discussed how Horace uses Epicureanism to bolster his rhetorical agenda. Horace relies on Epicureanism in a similar way in his *Odes*. While Horace makes significant use of the atomist aspects of Epicureanism in the *Satires*, in the *Odes* he taps into Epicurean attitudes towards death to discuss moderation. In his *De Rerum Natura*, Horace’s near contemporary Lucretius warns:

```
Denique avarities et honorum caea cupido,
Quae miseris hominum cogunt transcendere fines
Iuris et interdum socios scelerum atque ministros
Noctes atque dies nitit praestante labore
Ad summas emergere opes, haec vulnra vitae,
Non minimam partem mortis formidine aluntur.
Turpis enim ferme contemptus et acris egestas
Semota ab dulce vita stabilique videtur
Et quasi iam leti portas cunctarier ante;
Unde homines dum se falsa terrore coacti
Effugisse volunt longe longeque remosse,
Sanguine civili rem conflant divitiasque
Conduplicant avidi…
```

Finally, *greed* and the blind *desire* of offices, Which *compel* wretched men to transcend the boundaries Of the law and occasionally they compel allies and ministers of crime Night and day to strive with outstanding labor To rise to the highest wealth, these wounds of life Are nourished in no small part by fear of death. For, in general ugly contempt and bitter poverty seem to be removed from sweet and steady life, And seem as though they now linger in front of the gates of death; From where men compelled by false terrors want to flee To remove themselves far, far away, they kindle wealth with civil blood and They, greedy, duplicate their riches…

(DRN 3.59-71)

Moderation is encouraged here through the warning that *avarities* (greed) and *cupid* (desire) force men (*cogunt*) to act inappropriately. *Avarities* is naturally associated with lack of

---

157 Latin text from Rouse and Smith 1975. Translation is my own.
moderation. It is clear that Lucretius is especially concerned with lack of moderation in terms of wealth through his use of the phrases *ad summas...opes* (63), *rem...divitasque* (70). What drives and nourishes the lack of moderation, according to Lucretius, is *mortis formidine* (fear of death, 64). Lucretius says that *acris egestas* (bitter poverty, 65), the opposite of wealth, appears to be associated with death to those whom he is criticizing because it *leti portas cunctarier ante* (lingers in front of the gates of death, 67). While Epicurean doctrine says that fear of death is pointless, Lucretius here actually warns that it is harmful and leads to greedy behavior.  

Horace also makes use of the fear of death, as in the examples discussed above. Like Lucretius, Horace also connects the fear of death to wealth, but he does not warn that fear of death will cause excessive greediness, but rather, that excessive greediness is pointless because death comes for everybody regardless of their lot in life. The interconnectedness that Horace shows between the fear of death and desire for wealth reflects the connection that Lucretius shows, which is that the fear of death as a cause for greed. Lucretius goes on to describe how nature would upbraid an old man lamenting his coming death:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{omnia perfunctus vitai praemia marces;} \\
sed quia semper aves quod abest, praesentia tennis, \\
inperfecta tibi elapsast ingrataque vita, \\
et nec opinanti mors ad caput adstitit ante \\
quam satur ac plenus possis discedere rerum.
\end{align*}
\]

After accomplishing all prizes of life, you wither;
But because you always long for what is absent, you despise things that are present,
Life has slipped away from you incomplete and unpleasant,
And to you not considering it, death approached your head before you are able to depart satisfied and full of things.

*(DRN 3.956-960)*

---

158 Rider 2014 explores Epicurus’ view on death nicely saying that Epicurus argued that since people do not experience sensation after they die, they can experience no pain and therefore fear of death is useless. He also explores arguments against this view, since death also leads to pain because a deceased person misses out on the joys of life. See also Lucretius *DRN* 3.861-869.
Like Horace in the *carpe diem* poems, Lucretius warns here against wasting one’s life looking for things that are missing, which is an idea that looks forward to the *spem longam* in Horace’s *Odes* 1.4 and 1.11. *Aves* (line 957) is related to the noun above *avarities* (*DRN* 3.59), and *rerum* (line 960) may also refer to wealth, which again suggests a connection between fear of death and a desire for wealth. Like Horace in *Odes* 1.4, Lucretius uses his poetics to describe Death being present in the moment. He says that life *elapsast*, “has slipped away” (line 958). The perfect tense makes it clear that it is something that has already happened and happens as one complete, swift motion; the prodelision also adds to the urgency of life’s flight because it makes the line run faster. The *nec opinanti* in the following line (959) suggests that one may not even be thinking about death even though life has already slipped away. *Opinanti* modifies *tibi* (958) in the previous line, with *tibi* being very far removed from the participle. The effect of the hyperbaton suggests that life escapes the one in question (*tibi*) before he even thinks or realizes it (*opinanti*). Overall, Horace draws on Lucretian connections between death and wealth to further his own argument. Lucretius and Horace both implicate the fear of death with worries about amassing wealth in life, and they both warn their audiences about the quickness of death while using their poetics to accentuate death’s sudden arrival.

**Book 4**

Horace published his final book of *Odes* in 13 BC, a full decade after the original three books. Many scholars have argued that the book represents overt propaganda, and this has given rise to the debate as to whether Horace was compelled to write the book. This, in turn, creates concern for the level of self-expression Horace was able to exercise in his work.\(^{159}\) Others

\(^{159}\) For instance, on the propaganda aspect, see Benario 1960. See also Thomas 2011, who suggests as well that *Odes* 4 must be read in the context of the commissioned *Carmen Saeculare*, and while noting that scholarship has
demonstrate a significant preference toward the first three books and claim that the final book is not as well-written.\textsuperscript{160} Scott defends the fourth book saying that the poems are put together more thoughtfully than past scholars have given Horace credit for, and that self-expression cannot be entirely compromised in it. Even if the fourth book of \textit{Odes} is not necessarily pure propaganda, it is important to keep in mind that the book has a heavy emphasis on Augustan rule. Even when Augustus is not explicitly invoked in an ode, it is useful to keep him in mind when reading any of Book 4’s odes.\textsuperscript{161}

Horace’s opening to Book 4 of \textit{Odes} has troubled a lot of scholars since it doesn’t seem to correlate with the rest of the book, and because it features themes, in particular moderation, mortality and \textit{tempestivitas}, that correspond more with Horace’s previous odes than with the book it introduces. I suggest that, in fact, \textit{Odes} 4.1 functions as a link from Horace’s first three books to this new and final book of odes.

As I have argued, moderation is a prevalent theme throughout Horace’s \textit{Odes} 1-3, but carries through significantly into 4.1. Horace seems to consider moderation a virtue throughout \textit{Odes} 1-3, as he condemns those who lack restraint, and praises those, including himself, who appreciate simple things and are free from luxury. For example, in Book 2, he says, \textit{auream quisquis mediocritatem / diligit, tutus caret obsolete / sordibus tecti, caret invidenda / sobrius aula} “Whoever will esteem the golden middle, he, safe, is free from the filth of a worn-out roof, and sober, he lacks a palace despised” (2.10.5-8). In this instance, Horace associates comfort with moderation, and he insinuates that those who are too luxurious will be victims of envy.

\textsuperscript{160} Generally eased on Book 4, is happy to use the word “propaganda” in his work (10-11). Fraenkel 1966 also notes the writing of the \textit{Carmen Saeculare} as a reason why Horace decided to return to lyric (400, 410).

\textsuperscript{161} For instance, Bowra 1928. Fraenkel 1966 writes that the fourth book “far less rapid” than the poetry of Horace’s younger days (410).

\textsuperscript{161} Mitchell 2010 goes as far as to suggest that Augustus may be the speaker of some odes, specifically \textit{Odes} 4.1.
Thus, Horace highlights moderation as a virtue and the lack of moderation immoral. One may also note that *auream* agrees with *mediocritam*, which indicates that Horace finds a metaphorical wealth in moderation, and that real wealth is unnecessary.

In my discussion of *Odes* 1.25 above, I explain how Horace argues that there are certain times in life when it is appropriate for certain types of love. Horace continues to build on the idea of someone being too old for love in his opening to the fourth book of *Odes*. At *Odes* 4.1.1-7, Horace entreats Venus:

\[
\text{Intermissa, Venus, diu} \\
rursus bella moves? Parce, precor precor. \\
Non sum qualis eram bonae \\
sub regno Cinarae. Desine, dulcium
\]

* mater saeva Cupidinum, 
* circa lustra decem flectere mollibus 
* iam durum imperiis; 

Do you again stir wars, Venus, 
that have been interrupted for a long time? Spare me, I beg, I beg. 
I am not of the sort that I was under the rule 
of good Cinara. Cease, fierce 

mother of sweet Cupids, 

\[ \text{to try to bend a man nearing his tenth lustrum,} \]
\[ \text{now obdurate against your soft commands.} \]

Here, moderation is used in terms of erotic love, which is implied through the address to *Venus*...*mater saeva Cupidinum*, as well as *mollibus...imperiis*. Love is an indulgence the speaker has had his fair share of, and he shows restraint from the passions of his past. He has made it clear that while he has enjoyed plenty of Venus’ gifts, he is done with them now, and must restrain himself from being too greedy in love. The reason that erotic love would be unrestrained at this point is due to the speaker’s age; since the speaker is *circa lustra decem*, or nearing fifty years of age, erotic love is no longer appropriate. Since the reasoning behind Horace’s moderation here has to do with age, there is still an undercurrent of mortality because he is too old for certain types of love, and now his brief span is even briefer. In the next stanza,
Horace calls Venus *saeva*, which shows that desire is a strong temptation for him. Nevertheless, he is *mollibus / iam durum imperiis* “now resistant to your soft commands” (4.1.6-7). Since the theme of moderation is so frequent in Horace’s previous works, by reintroducing it in 4.1, Horace reminds his audience of the values he has established for himself, while also introducing moderation as a theme in his new work. Both *Odes* 1.25 and 4.1 share the theme of someone who is too old for love. However, in *Odes* 1.25 the speaker is warning Lydia against taking a lover at an old age, since she has been wondering where they have gone. However, in *Odes* 4.1 the speaker himself is the person who is too old for love (and poetry), but he is able to show self-restraint that Lydia does not.

The book also clearly has a strong focus on explicitly supporting Augustus, as in the next ode, Horace addresses Augustus *o Sol / pulcher, o laudandei* “O beautiful sun, O one who should be praised!” (4.2.46-47). Horace claims that moderation is a virtue that should be associated with Augustus through the values he promotes as a ruler. In the concluding ode of Book 4, Horace records some of Augustus’ accomplishments, among which he lists that Augustus *evaganti frena licentiate / iniecit* “he cast reins upon unrestrained liberty,” which suggests that Augustus, while he may not himself necessarily be moderate, promotes moderation under his rule (4.15.10-11).

The theme of *tempestivitas*, “the right time,” ties into the idea of moderation, in that one should only indulge in what they want if the time is right for it. While the word is not used explicitly in the poem, the theme is still present. Horace uses the adjective *tempestiva* at *Odes* 1.23.12 describing the addressee, Chloe, who is at an appropriate age to begin to engage in love. This is another important aspect of the *Odes* as a whole and may also be implicated in the idea of

---

162 These values may have included *fortitudo, labor, vigilantia, diligentia, cura industria, and prudentia* (Galinsky 1996: 83).
there being a correct time for love and, therefore, the word is used in an erotic context. In 4.1 Horace again suggests *tempestivitas* by saying that he is in the wrong stage of life for romance. In the ode, Horace evokes Venus, and asks her to focus on a young man, Paulus Maximus, instead of himself; in doing so, the poet seems to shun love, because it is inappropriate for a man his age. Horace explicitly refers to the right time for love when he asks Venus: *si torrere iecur quaeris idoneum*, “if you seek an appropriate liver to scorch” (4.1.12). Although the time for love has passed for Horace, since he is already in his tenth *lustrum* (line 6), it is the right time for love for Paulus Maximus, because he is still young. It is appropriate, therefore, for him to indulge in the pleasures that Horace alluded to in his earlier work.

Horace deliberately sets up *Odes* 4.1 in a way that excludes himself to establish that there is a right time for everything, and thus he still follows the ideals he did when he wrote the first three books of *Odes*. In earlier odes, Horace uses *tempestivitas* in a similar way in describing the stage of life someone should be in for erotic encounters, such as in *Odes* 1.25 discussed above. Horace’s inclusion of *tempestivitas* in 4.1 closely mimics the way he uses it in previous books, in that he focuses on what is right for someone during a certain stage of their life, and thus he reminds his readers of his values, and makes it clear that, although some time has passed, he still adheres to the same ideals he did when he wrote the first three books.

The mirrored uses of *tempestivitas* helps Horace bridge his previous books of odes with his new one. Furthermore, since *tempestivitas* is especially notable in 4.1, the ode can be taken as an overarching introduction to the book as a whole. So, *tempestivitas* could also be applied to Augustan rule, which indicates that Horace uses this previously established theme to suggest that the time is right for Augustus within the scheme of history. *Tempestivitas* is also used throughout the *Odes* in a causal way. One event is dependent on the occurrence of another event, and these
two events have to have a specific temporal relationship to one another for the dependent event to occur appropriately. If the independent event does not occur, then, if the dependent event occurs anyway, it does so inappropriately. For instance, the famous Cleopatra ode begins:

\[ \textit{Nunc est bibendum, nunc pede libero} \\
\textit{pulsanda tellus; nunc Saliaribus} \\
\textit{ornare pulvinar deorum} \\
\textit{tempus erat dapibus, sodales.} \]

\[ \textit{antehac nefas depromere Caecubum} \\
\textit{cellis avitis, \textit{dum} Capitolio} \\
\textit{regina dementis ruinas,} \\
\textit{funus et imperio parabat} \]

\[ \textit{Now} \textit{there must be drinking, now the ground} \\
\textit{must be beaten with a free foot, now was the time, friends,} \\
to decorate the couch of the god \\
with Saliariban banquets. \]

Before this, it was not right to fetch the Caecuban from the ancestral cellar, \textit{while} the raging queen was preparing destruction and death for the empire (1.37.1-8)

Here, the bringing out of wine is temporally dependent on two events which suggests that it is \textit{tempestivus} after those two events have taken place. It would not have been appropriate \textit{dum} “while” the queen, Cleopatra, was scheming against the empire, whereas it is appropriate \textit{nunc} “now” that there are celebrations. This causal use of \textit{tempestivitas} is common throughout the \textit{Odes} by means of Horace’s frequent use of temporal adverbs. So, the time may be right for Augustus because of causal events in Rome, that make it appropriate for Augustan rule. Horace lived through the civil wars and saw the violence that occurred during those turbulent times. It makes sense that a supporter for peace should rule after such violence had ensued. Since Augustus is a champion of peace, as Horace seems to claim in 4.15, the time is appropriate for him to oversee Rome after a long period of turmoil. While this is not necessarily expressed in
As I have discussed above, Horace alludes to mortality often in his *Odes*. In 4.1, it is present in that the speaker of the poem has aged, and thus is mortal. The inclusion of mortality here would have helped bridge Book 4 to Books 1-3, because the theme was such a staple in the first three books. The idea of growing old would have been a familiar Horatian marker for his audience. The way that mortality is viewed in the *Odes* about Augustus is complex, because of Augustus’ association with the gods in Roman society. Still, by including the theme of mortality in 4.1, Horace seems to be pushing it onto Augustus as well, because all of Book 4 has a focus on Augustus. In *Odes* 3.14, Horace expresses his joy at Augustus’ homecoming, *Herculis ritu modo dictus, o plebs,/morte venalem petiisse laurum/Caesar Hispana repetit penatis/victor ab orae* “Just as in the custom of Hercules, Caesar having been said, O plebs, to have sought a laurel purchased by death is now returning as a victor of the home from the Spanish shore” (1-4).

Based on this ode, it seems that Horace believed that Augustus could die, because he was seeking victory, which has the risk of death. The overall relieved tone of the ode also implies that Augustus’ safety is not guaranteed, and thus he can die. However, even though it seems Augustus can die, Horace still places him on a divine level by comparing him to Hercules. Horace’s comparison to Hercules is significant, because, although Hercules did die, he achieved divinity after death, because he gets to reside with the gods on Olympus. So, by comparing Augustus so frequently to Hercules, Horace is suggesting that Augustus, though he will die, will achieve a similar divine status after his death. Augustus’ ability to die is also less problematic, because it seems that Horace considers an embrace of mortality a virtue. When he praises Lollius...
as *non ille pro caris amicis aut patria timidus perire* “He is not afraid to die for his dear friends or fatherland,” it shows that Horace considers an embrace of mortality a positive characteristic for one to have (4.9.51-52). So, if Augustus is able to die, and he embraces this inevitable fate, he would be seen as virtuous by a Horatian audience.

Moderation, mortality and *tempestivitas* are central themes in all four books of Horace’s *Odes*. Since they are so prevalent in the first three books, including in the introduction to the final book, they seamlessly help tie all books together. These themes interweave to create a picture of virtue for Horace, namely that moderation is necessary given the short amount of time humans have on Earth. There is a right time for everything, and one must be moderate about what time of their life they engage in certain activities as circumstances dictate. Furthermore, by applying all these themes to Rome under Augustus, and as he does in the introduction to the very Augustan-inflected Book 4, he thereby bestows such virtues onto Augustan rule.

**Conclusion**

Using rhetoric, Horace teaches the readers of his *Odes* about how to live moderately and correctly. Mortality is a major theme in the *Odes*, and Horace uses this theme to advocate for moderation, which also aligns with an Augustan ideal. Mortality is used as an equalizer between the rich and the poor. There is no point for someone to pursue riches during life because it will not stop death. The various addresseees that Horace uses also have different statuses in relation to him, even though they are receiving similar messages. This again shows the universality of mortality. Horace uses his poetics, especially in *Odes* 1.4, 1.11 and 1.25, to hammer home the quickness of death in order to warn against immoderate *spes longa*, or ‘long hope.’ He also uses foreboding and dark imagery to intensify the image of death. As in the *Satires*, Horace also
makes use of Lucretius and Epicureanism to further his point. Like Horace, Lucretius implicates death and wealth and warns against letting life slip away from you while pursuing immoderate desires. Mortality is also a significant feature in Book 4 of the *Odes* where Horace begins by worrying about his own age and whether it is appropriate for him to be engaging in love and poetry. Horace’s use of the themes of mortality and *tempestivitas*, which aid in his argument for moderation, are applied to Book 4. Since Book 4 is so focused on Augustus, the virtue of moderation is also placed on Augustus.
CONCLUSION

This thesis has set out to demonstrate how Horace uses rhetoric in order to advocate for moderation in both his Satires and Odes. Both the Satires and Odes aim to teach Horace’s readers to approach life moderately. The goal is to advise, which Horace himself in his Ars Poetica suggests is a goal in all poetry.\footnote{Ars Poetica 333-335: aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae / aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere vitae. / quidquid praeceptis... “whether poets wish to benefit or please, or to speak at once both the delights and proper things for life, whatever you will advise...”} Rhetoric, as Cicero points out, also has the ability to teach and advise, so the two disciplines are compatible in this regard.\footnote{Cicero, De Optimo Genere Oratorum 1.4: docere debitum est, delectare honorarium, permovere necessarium, “to teach is an obligation, to please is complimentary, to move is necessary.”} Horace and Cicero also both use the term delectare in order to define the goals of poets and orators, respectively. Finally, I have suggested that both rhetoric and poetry have performative qualities and, therefore, sound plays a major role in both media. As a result, aural aspects of Horace’s poetry have played a large part in my rhetorical analysis of the text.

The first chapter focuses on Horace’s Satires and how Horace advocates for moderation by making the divisions between classes meaningless. Rhetoric is the means by which Horace accomplishes his advocacy. A rhetorician would typically attempt to craft a trustworthy and reliable ethos, and the speaker of the Satires attempts to do this through the optimi viri, who are Maecenas and the speaker’s father. However, I have observed that the authorial persona in the Satires is flawed and inconsistent. The persona is inconsistent in that the individual is of an undefined class, sometimes appearing wealthy, while at other times of a lower-class, and so does not follow the advice he offers. For instance, in Satires 1.3, the speaker condemns Tigellius for his inconsistency, but then proceeds to be inconsistent himself within the actual language of the poetry. For instance, at Satires 1.3.65-66, the speaker says: ut forte legentem / aut tacitum...
*impellat quovis sermone molestus,* “so that perhaps he being a bother interrupts someone reading or quiet in some conversation.” In this instance, Horace is being inconsistent in his language through his use of elision.\(^{165}\) While apologizing for the fault of interrupting, he interrupts himself in his meter, and therefore performs the fault that he criticizes himself for.

Another rhetorical tool that Horace uses in the *Satires* is his use of motifs that feature something that appears to be grander or greater on the outside, but ultimately turn out to be worth the same of less than something mundane. The rhetorical effect of this repeated motif is that even though something is associated with the upper-class, it may not necessarily be greater in value and, therefore, any distinctions made between social classes are meaningless. The motif is especially relevant in food imagery in the *Satires*. For instance, in *Satires* 2.2, Horace compares two poultries: a chicken and a peacock. The peacock would be exotic and associated with the upper class, while the chicken more common. Although they look different externally and have different associations within Roman society, Ofellus points out *carne tamen quamvis distat nil, hanc magis illa/ imparibus formis deceptum te petere!* “even so, there is no difference in the meat, you seek this one (the peacock) more than that one (the chicken) deceived by their different forms” (*Satires* 2.2.29-30). The meat inside each bird is the same, and it is the external appearance that is different, and with which has those class associations. The motif also appears within the school of Epicureanism, with which some scholars have aligned Horace and his satiric characters.\(^{166}\) As a result, Horace also uses this philosophical school to advocate for a moderate way of life, and features as part of his rhetorical strategy.

\(^{165}\) See Chapter 1 for analysis of these lines. *Tacitum* (66) elides into *impellat* (66) and, if they were not on separate lines, *legentem* (65) would elide into *aut* (66).

In Chapter 2 I focus on Horace’s use of rhetoric in the Odes. In the Odes, Horace uses rhetoric in order to teach his readers how to live moderately and correctly. Horace emphasizes the theme of mortality in the Odes, which aids his advocation for moderation. Mortality is a condition of both the upper- and lower-classes. The equalizing power of mortality helps Horace advocate for moderation because it shows that pursuing riches is futile and having more money will not prevent death. Horace uses a variety of addressees in his Odes from different socio-economic backgrounds, which shows that his suggestions about life are applicable to everyone. I examine Odes 1.4, 1.11 and 1.25, in particular, where Horace uses his poetics to emphasize the quickness of death and to warn his readers against expecting too much from life. Again, Horace makes use of the philosophical school of Epicureanism to make his point. Like Horace, Epicureans suggest that one should not be afraid of death, and one should not pursue immoderate desires. I conclude this chapter by examining the first ode of Odes 4. Mortality is also a significant theme in the fourth book of odes, where Horace begins by worrying about his own age and the appropriateness for him to engage in both love and poetry. Moderation is especially significant during the time that Horace was writing the Odes because it is an Augustan ideal. Book 4, which picks up the same themes as the first three books of odes, especially focuses on Augustus, and associates moderation with his rule.

While this thesis has specifically focused on the works of Horace, I have also aimed to show that rhetoric and poetry are inherently compatible. As noted above, Horace himself suggests that a major goal of poetry is to advise, a goal in which rhetoric and persuasion must be naturally involved. Horace has done this ostensibly through the didactic nature of his poetry. Of course, not all Latin poetry is didactic, but Horace still suggests that an aim of poetry is to give
advice about life.\textsuperscript{167} Aristotle would suggest that since poetry is mimetic, it is an imitation of life in itself.\textsuperscript{168} Therefore, even if poetry is not as didactic as Horace’s it may still involve rhetoric and an audience would still be able to use poetry to change the way they view their world. We can even consider this in terms of Cicero’s functions of an orator cited earlier in the thesis. All poets would also likely fall into at least one of the functions (\textit{docere, delectare, permovere}). The aim \textit{delectare}, “to delight” would particularly align with the goals of any poet.\textsuperscript{169} The potential for future projects in this area are abundant. It would be worthwhile to see how any Roman poet uses rhetoric within his work, since rhetoric seems to be an integral part of poetry. Horace was especially useful for this aim because of his self-professed goals and because of the advice-giving nature of his poetry.

\textsuperscript{167} See \textit{Ars Poetica} 334: \textit{aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere vitae} “or at once both to speak the delights and proper things of life at the same time.

\textsuperscript{168} \textit{Poetics} 1448a.

\textsuperscript{169} As noted above, Horace uses the term \textit{delectare} at \textit{Ars} 333 while describing the general goals of poets.
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