

## GATHERING LEAVES

*Horace, Choice of Words, Cyclical Time, and the Production of Presence*

This chapter begins where the previous one left off. Horace's choice of words emerged as something noteworthy where his treatment of wine is concerned: old wines frequently bring the taste of old words to the banquet. In the present chapter, I consider how words can evoke the present rather than the past. Horace's *carpe diem* poems thematise present moments, and I will show that within the underlying architecture of a poem even the smallest elements and mosaic pieces, that is, the individual words, contribute to creating a poetry of the present. I am, of course, alluding to Nietzsche's well-known saying, according to which Horace's poems are a 'mosaic of words, in which every unit spreads its power to the left and to the right over the whole, by its sound, by its place in the sentence, and by its meaning'.<sup>1</sup> My interest in this chapter lies in such mosaic pieces and what they can tell us about the mosaic as a whole.

Horace's choice of words was already much-admired in antiquity: Petronius spoke of *Horatii curiosa felicitas* ('Horace's painstaking felicity', Petron. 118.5) and Quintilian characterised him as *uerbis felicissime audax* ('fortuitously bold with his words', *Inst.* 10.96). Horace's phrasing seems strikingly felicitous to ancients and moderns alike (and in turn the phrases of Nietzsche, Petronius, and Quintilian are at least felicitous enough that they will be quoted in any discussion of Horace's choice of words). In this chapter, I will argue that Horace's words are not felicitous for their own sake but underline the message of *carpe diem* poems by producing effects of presence. 'Producing effects

<sup>1</sup> Nietzsche (1889) 131 in chapter 12 'Was ich den Alten verdanke' section 1. I take the translation from Anthony Ludovici (= Nietzsche (1911)). Fitzgerald (2016) 70–3 discusses the mosaic metaphor in detail.

of presence' may look like an ironically anachronistic term in a discussion about ancient choice of words. Yet, I will show that there exists a good Horatian model for this expression. What I mean by 'producing presence' is that certain words in Horace's odes evoke the momentary present in which they are set.<sup>2</sup> I will analyse Horace's thoughts about choice of words in his literary epistles as well as his actual choice of words in some *carpe diem* poems.

The chapter has three sections. In the first section, I will look at a well-known passage from Horace's *Ars Poetica* which compares words to leaves, in that they become extinct and return again. I will show that Horace's choice of words as well as his treatment of the *carpe diem* motif obeys a principle of cyclical change. In the second part, I will look at Horace's treatment of choice of words in the *Ars* beyond the leaves simile; while his thoughts engage with the linguistic theories of contemporaneous thinkers, his emphasis on cyclicity is unique to him. In the third part, I will show how Horace puts his theory into practice: in several *carpe diem* poems, certain words evoke the present time.

### 3.1 Words That Are Green Turn to Brown: Words and Leaves in the *Ars Poetica*

In the *Ars Poetica*, Horace discusses, among other things, a poet's choice of words and also how the vocabulary of a language changes over time. The passage in which he does this is generally admired. Brink called it 'perhaps the most remarkable piece of the *Ars*',<sup>3</sup> and it is arguably the passage that best defies Scaliger's damning verdict on the work, 'de arte sine arte tradita'.<sup>4</sup> In this passage, Horace compares a language's linguistic development to

<sup>2</sup> Fitzgerald (1989) offers an interpretation of the pleasure of Horace's text in the tradition of Barthes (1975) [1973]. See, in particular, Fitzgerald (1989) 82 for his take on the Nietzsche quotation and Horace, 92–3 for the Petronius quotation, and 98 for the 'production of aesthetic pleasure'.

<sup>3</sup> Brink (1971a) at 60–72. Thus also Commager (1962) 259: 'perhaps the most exquisite [sc. lines] in the *Ars Poetica*'. Dufallo (2005) 89: 'among the most memorably poetic passages'.

<sup>4</sup> Scaliger *Poetices libri septem* vi.7, which can be consulted in the edition of Deitz and Vogt-Spira (1994–2011) v.402–3.

## Gathering Leaves

leaves falling from a tree. While some words disappear from usage, old ones return (*Ars* 60–72):<sup>5</sup>

ut siluae foliis pronos mutantur in annos, (60)  
prima cadunt \*\*\*\*\* (61A)  
\*\*\*\*\* ita uerborum uetus interit aetas, (61B)  
et iuuenum ritu florent modo nata uigentque.  
debemur morti nos nostraque: siue receptus  
terra Neptunus classes Aquilonibus arcet,  
regis opus, sterilisue diu palus aptaque remis (65)  
uicinas urbes alit et graue sentit aratrum,  
seu cursum mutauit iniquum frugibus annis  
doctus iter melius: mortalia facta peribunt,  
nedum sermonum stet honos et gratia uiuax.  
multa renascentur quae iam cecidere cadentque (70)  
quae nunc sunt in honore uocabula, si uolet usus,  
quem penes arbitrium est et ius et norma loquendi.

**60** pronos] priuos *Bentley fortasse recte* **61** lac. ind. *Ribbeck*  
prima cadunt] priuanturque *Delz* : particulatim *Nisbet* **68** facta]  
cuncta  $\zeta$  : saecla *Peerlkamp* **69** nedum sermonum] sermonum  
haud *Aldus*

As trees with their leaves change their appearance as the years slide on, the first leaves fall \*\*\*\*\* , so the old generation of words dies and words that were just born bloom and flourish like young men. We and what is ours are owed to death; whether Neptune's water is made a basin and protects fleets from the North Wind – an achievement worthy of a king – or a swamp, which had long been barren and usable only for boats, now feels the heavy plough and nourishes neighbouring towns, or a river that had harmed the crops learns better ways and changes its course – still, all mortal works will perish, and still less is it true that the prestige and charm of speech could stay alive. Many words that have already fallen out of usage will be reborn, and many words which now have prestige will fall out of usage if convention wants it. Because in the hands of convention lie judgement, authority, and rule of speech.

Horace describes with gentle melancholy the lexical development of language as he likens words to leaves on a tree. Language, humans, and all their possessions are subject to an eternal cycle of death and rebirth. Commentators have noted the unusual tone of

<sup>5</sup> I depart from Klingner's text in one point; unlike him, I mark a lacuna in line 61. I discuss my choice on page 111.

the passage. Thus, Brink discerns the ‘lyric intensity of the Odes (say, C. I. 4 or IV. 7)’, and Rudd speaks of ‘sombre lyrical resonances’.<sup>6</sup> In the pages that follow, I wish to show that this similarity is not merely superficial; rather, the same concept of time that informs the content of Horace’s lyric poetry also informs his thoughts on lexical change.<sup>7</sup>

The simile of the leaves goes back, of course, to Homer’s *Iliad*, where Glaucus meets Diomedes on the battlefield before Troy and compares generations of men to generations of leaves (6.145–9):<sup>8</sup>

Τυδείδη μεγάθυμε, τίη γενεήν ἐρρεΐνεις;  
οἷη περ φύλλων γενεή τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν.  
φύλλα τὰ μὲν τ’ ἄνεμος χαμάδις χέει, ἄλλα δέ θ’ ὕλη  
τηλεθόωσα φύει, ἔαρος δ’ ἐπιγίγνεται ὥρη·  
ὧς ἀνδρῶν γενεή ἦ μὲν φύει ἦ δ’ ἀπολήγει.

Great-hearted son of Tydeus, why are you asking about my ancestry? Just as there are generations of leaves, so there are also generations of men. The wind sheds some leaves to the ground, but the flourishing forest brings forth others when the season of spring is there. So it is also with the generations of men; one generation sprouts, but another passes away.

The Homeric passage can shed some light on a textual issue in Horace’s *Ars*. Horace’s version includes the first part of the Homeric simile (φύλλα τὰ μὲν τ’ ἄνεμος χαμάδις χέει ~ *prima cadunt*), but lacks the second part of the simile (ἄλλα δέ [. . .]). If we assume that Horace modelled the passage on Homer, this lends further support to Ribbeck’s diagnosis of a lacuna in line 61. For Ribbeck had noted that the paradosis of Horace’s simile illogically compares one thing in the source domain with two things in the target domain: as leaves fall, so do words fall out of usage *and* new ones come about.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Brink (1971a) at 60–72, Rudd (1989) 35.

<sup>7</sup> Commager (1962) 258–9 and Grimal (1964) stress the unity in Horace’s linguistic thoughts and his outlook on life, that is, in Grimal’s words, his ‘Art poétique’ and his ‘art de vivre’. Deschamps (1983) follows Grimal’s approach.

<sup>8</sup> Text: van Thiel (1996).

<sup>9</sup> Ribbeck (1869) *ad loc.* Brink (1971a) and Shackleton Bailey (2001) accept that Housman (1972) [1890] i.155–6 changes the punctuation: *prima cadunt ita uerborum. uetus interit aetas*. This may seem elegant, but the objections of Brink (1971a) *ad loc.* speak against it: the position of *ita* seems wrong and *mutantur* should more naturally mean ‘changed with regard to’ rather than ‘parted from’, which is the meaning Housman requires for his solution. Büchner (1980) 485–7 attempts to defend the paradosis.

Horace was neither the first nor the last to pluck Homer's leaves. Indeed, even in Homer the simile of the leaves has the appearance of a set piece, as ancients and moderns alike have noted. Thus, ancients claimed that Homer took these lines from Musaeus (*fr.* 5 *DK*), while some modern scholars also thought that Homer's simile was not well integrated.<sup>10</sup> Be that as it may, already in Homer the leaves grow again elsewhere, when Apollo describes the generations of men with the same simile (*Il.* 21.461–7). The self-reference in Homer anticipates the many later adoptions of these lines. Lyric poets in particular were fond of quoting them or alluding to them. What arguably facilitated this lyric appropriation is that the lines already had the appearance of lyric poetry in Homer. Hayden Pelliccia has argued in detail that the leaves simile constitutes a rhetorical device, which the ancients called εἰκάζειν: a rhetorical tool of caricaturing someone by using a comparison, which was a popular game at symposia.<sup>11</sup> Pelliccia says that through the usage of the εἰκάζειν Glaucus 'is identifying himself as a member of symposiastic society, and indeed as an adept of the art of conversational "warfare"'.<sup>12</sup> I doubt that we can go that far. There may have been (proto)symposiasts before Homer, but they lie unknown, overwhelmed by perpetual night, since they lack a sacred bard.<sup>13</sup> In other words, Pelliccia's characterisation of Glaucus as a symposiast is arguably anachronistic. But Greek lyric poets might have looked at the passage in the same manner; to them, too, Glaucus seemed to engage in sympotic banter, and they appropriated the passage accordingly. The leaves of *Omero lirico* would find their appropriate(d) generic place in the lyric *carpe diem* poems of Mimnermus and Simonides in particular, and this *Nachleben* of the Homeric passage is most crucial for the simile's function in Horace:<sup>14</sup> Horace underlines his principle of

<sup>10</sup> For example, Fränkel (1921) 40–1, M. L. West (1997) 365, Burgess (2001) 117–26.

<sup>11</sup> Pelliccia (2002) with further examples and references. <sup>12</sup> Pelliccia (2002) 220.

<sup>13</sup> Following Murray (1983) and others, I thus assume that the Homeric feasts anticipate symposia in many ways but do not yet incorporate the sophisticated sympotic codes that Pelliccia posits. Conversely, Węcowski (2014) 191–247 argues that Homer was part of a symposiastic society and created his 'heroic feasts' as a conscious archaism (further references there).

<sup>14</sup> Homer's appropriation in lyric is analysed by R. L. Fowler (1987) 3–52 (32 on the leaves). And see pages 11–13 in the Introduction of this book. For Homer's leaves and



## Gathering Leaves

θνητῶν δ' ὄφρα τις ἄνθος ἔχει πολυήρατον ἤβης, (5)  
 κοῦφον ἔχων θυμὸν πόλλ' ἀτέλεσι τα νοεῖ·  
 οὔτε γὰρ ἔλπειδ' ἔχει γηρασμένον οὔτε θανεῖσθαι,  
 οὐδ' ὑγιῆς ὄτασιν ἢ φροντίδ' ἔχει κλαμάτου.  
 νήπιοι, οἷς ταύτην κείται νόος, οὐδὲ ἴσασιν  
 ὡς χρόνος ἔσθ' ἤβης καὶ βίῳτοιο ὄλιγος (10)  
 θνητοῖς. ἀλλὰ σὺ ταῦτα μαθὼν βίῳτου ποτὶ τέρμα  
 ψυχῆ τῶν ἀγαθῶν τλήθι χαριζόμενος.  
 . . . . . (-) φράζο δὲ παλαῖστέρου λόγον ἀνδρός·  
 ἧ λήθην γλώσσης ἔκφυγ' Ὀμηροσ  
 . . . . ]παδαμά[ (15)  
 . . . . (-)ω ψυδρῆσ ε[  
 . . . . (-) ἐν θαλίησι [  
 . . .] ἔστρεπτοσ  
 . . .]ων, ἐνθα καὶ [  
 . . .] . . . [ (20)

One of the sayings of the man from Chios is the best: 'Just as there are generations of leaves, so there are also generations of men.' Few of the mortals who have heard this take it to heart. For all men have expectations which in their youth sprout in their hearts.

[...] for a short time [...] remain [...]. As long as a mortal enjoys the lovely bloom of youth he is light-hearted and devises many things that are impossible to accomplish. For he does not expect to grow old nor to die, and he doesn't think of illnesses when he is healthy. People are fools who think like this and don't know that mortals have a short time of youth and life. But now that you have learned this at the end of your life, endure and pamper your soul with good things. [...] Consider [the account of the man] of old. Homer escaped [the oblivion] of his words. [...] false [...] in feasts [...] well-plaited [...] here and [...].

Horace's application of the leaves simile to words is daring. But David Sider has shown that Horace may develop a thought of Simonides, who already included poetry in his thoughts on mortality and leaves. For Simonides seems to say that Homer's language escaped oblivion (20.14).<sup>17</sup> There is another aspect of Simonides' poem which makes it particularly apt for Horace's purpose in the *Ars*. Richard Rawles recently noted that Simonides uses a high

<sup>17</sup> Sider (1996) 276–8. Yet, Sider (2020) now prints *fr.* 20.14 as [λήθην γὰρ] γλώσσης ἔκφυγ' Ὀμηροσ ἔης, meaning that Homer escaped oblivion 'as a result of' (ἐκ as a preposition in anastrophe) his words. A poet who follows Horace and applies the image of leaves to the mortality of words is Dante at *Paradiso* 26.136–8 (Boitani (1989) 111, Delz (1995) 12).

number of archaisms in his poem, that is, he uses a number of expressions which were common in the early Greek hexameter poetry of Homer, Hesiod, and the *Homeric Hymns*, or in the early elegy of Mimnermus, Theognis, and others, but which were no longer common at the time Simonides was writing, in the fifth century BC.<sup>18</sup> Of course, these expressions naturally come with the Homeric quotation: once Homer's seeds are planted, their leaves sprout throughout the poem. Simonides thus describes youth metaphorically as a 'flower' (20.5: ἄνθος), originally a Homeric expression he had plucked from early poetry, perhaps from Mimnermus' poem on the leaves (*fr.* 2.3).<sup>19</sup> Homer's language, his γλώσση (20.14), thus does not die: *bits, many bits of Homer dodged all funeral*. Simonides preserves certain Homeric expressions as well as a whole hexameter. But Homer's words have acquired a new context: they are reborn like leaves and now grow on a lyric tree.

It is suggestive that Simonides already made ample use of archaisms in his adaption of Homer's leaves, before Horace in turn would make this simile all about old words that become new again. It is, of course, not certain how many of Simonides' archaisms would have been readily identifiable as such in first-century-BC Rome, but the cumulative force of the evidence surely matters: on the grounds of its content as well as of its expressions, Simonides' poem has the appearance of early poetry.

In Simonides, the archaic words underline the poem's message, which tells its listeners to enjoy the present. Homer's old words survived for centuries and escaped oblivion (or whatever else the supplement in 20.14 might be), while human beings live only for a short time and should enjoy the present. Horace seems to go

<sup>18</sup> Rawles (2018) 114–20, and a list on 116–17. Cf. Parsons (2001) 62: 'a nice old-fashioned bow to Mimnermus'.

<sup>19</sup> Rawles (2018) 116 points to *Il.* 13.484, *Mimn. fr.* 1.4, 2.3, 5.3, *Thgn.* 1007–8, 1069. R. L. Fowler (1987) 45 and 45 n.106 notes that 'the flower of youth' is one of several epic expressions that gains 'particular prominence in lyric because of the subject matter' (cf. Griffith (1975) 79 n.34). Other archaisms Rawles notes in Simonides are στέρνοις ἐγκατέθεντο, πολυήρατος, νήπιοι (in initial position of the hexameter), and lines of thought in combination with certain expressions at 20.5–11 (cf. *Thgn.* 1007–12), 20.9–12 (cf. *Thgn.* 483–4), 20.12 (cf. *Thgn.* 1224). Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1913) 274–5 notes the epic diction of ξείπεν, γηρασμένον, βιότοιο. Such features led, among others, Hubbard (1994: 191–3; 1996) to the conclusion that the poem is in fact an early elegy and should be attributed to Semonides rather than Simonides. I am unconvinced.

a step further. In his account, words are anything but permanent. Words have their seasons. In the *Ars*, language is a consequence of the cyclical change of time and the poet is subject to this change: he chooses his words from a set of current vocabulary, just as he chooses the present moment as a time of merriment. Yet, he also knows that both the present moment and language will change. Horace's *carpe diem* poems are thus works of cyclical time, both in their subject matter and in their theoretical linguistic framework: the cyclical time that is their theme in the description of the seasons is reflected in their vocabulary.

In the *Ars*, Horace's poetry shows some self-awareness of the fleeting, momentary and present nature of its words. Horace's poetry presents a combination of words that can only be fully enjoyed in the present moment, his lifetime, as some words will become extinct later, some will be reused again, and so on. What emerges, then, in Horace is a new poetry of the present moment. While Greek lyric poems were seemingly poems of the present moment by virtue of their occasional nature and their performance in the present, this quality of lyric is lost in Horace's book poetry.<sup>20</sup> Yet, this is supplanted by a linguistic present. Indeed, elsewhere Horace seems to characterise his lyric by its bold and novel choice of words. In the *Epistles*, Horace proudly states his achievement that he was the first who popularised Alcaeus' lyric song in the Latin tongue (*Epist.* 1.19.26–34); he brought 'things untold before' (*inmemorata*) to the Romans. Horace's word-choice, *inmemorata*, neatly underlines the content: just like his lyric, the word itself had been untold before. It is Horace's own coinage, though it is drawn from a Greek source.<sup>21</sup> Both Horace's lyric and his words are strikingly new and yet a repetition of older material.

An ode of Horace becomes the linguistic equivalent to a winter evening at the foot of Mount Soracte: a moment in linguistic time,

<sup>20</sup> See Barchiesi (2000) and my Introduction.

<sup>21</sup> Fraenkel (1957) 347, Mayer (1994) *ad loc.*, who suggests ἀμνημόνευτος as a model. This word, however, strikes me as rather prosaic. I was reminded of ἀμνηστος, which appears at Theocritus 16.42 when Theocritus praises the achievement of lyric in general and Simonides in particular to preserve memory. New adjective formations such as *inlacrimabilis* or *inhospitalis*, which render Greek compounds with a privative α, are typical for Horace, as Bartalucci notes at *EO* ii.927–8 s.v. 'arcaismi' (numerous examples at *EO* ii.927).

which is subjected to seasonal word change and therefore can only be fully appreciated in the present. In the future some words will fall out of use, others reappear, and their specific timely quality as neologisms or archaisms will no longer be naturally understood, until philologists gather again the fallen leaves.

### 3.2 A Linguistic Turn Around and Around: Horace on Semantic Change

Horace's thoughts on lexical development are highly idiosyncratic; they seem to differ from any notable ancient or modern theory that deals with this matter. Neither Aristotle, nor Varro, nor Caesar, nor Cicero thought that lexical development happened in a cyclical fashion. Ancients were aware of linguistic change over time, but they regarded this as a linear development, and so do modern linguists.<sup>22</sup> Indeed, at first sight one may be tempted to dismiss Horace's thoughts as too bizarre to be taken seriously, or one might argue that Horace's prime interest lies in the beauty of the simile of the leaves rather than in linguistic reflections. Yet, I maintain that we should be attentive to Horace's idiosyncratic thoughts in this passage. For if we are attentive, the passage can tell us a lot about Horace's understanding of his own poetry. Even taken at face value, Horace's theory is perhaps not quite as absurd as it may first seem. A significant number of Latin words, which are found in Plautus and Terence, do not then appear in classical Latin, but are present again in late Latin. Such words, Giuseppe Pezzini says, reappeared in Latin through 'revival, recoinage, and reborrowing (normally from Greek)'.<sup>23</sup> This sounds strikingly similar to Horace's ideas of words that are 'revived' (*renascentur*) or that should come 'from a Greek source' (*Graeco fonte*). And the metaphor of word-'coinage' seems to have been coined by Horace anyway (*Ars* 58–9). Of course, Horace could not have known of

<sup>22</sup> Dufallo (2005) compares Horace's thoughts with contemporaneous linguistic theory. Uhlfelder (1963) offers an overview on ancient awareness of linguistic change (28–9 deal with lexical change). See D'Alton (1962) 81–3 for an overview on archaisms and neologisms and their acceptance in Roman literary theory. See Fögen (2000) for Roman attitudes to their own language. For an account on semantic change from modern linguistics, see Hock (1991) 280–308.

<sup>23</sup> Pezzini (2016) 14. I owe this reference to Barnaby Taylor.

the linguistic phenomenon that Pezzini describes, but his linguistic reflections are at least not completely absurd. Perhaps more to the point, Aulus Gellius argues in the second century AD that archaisms and neologisms are essentially the same thing, since old, uncommon words have the appearance of neologisms when they appear in modern diction (11.7.2): *noua autem uideri dico etiam ea quae sunt inusitata et desita, tametsi sunt uetusta* ('but I maintain that even these words can seem like new [-neologisms] which have been out of use and have become obsolete, although they are in fact old words [-archaisms]'). To be sure, Gellius does not sign up to a universal principle of cyclical lexical change, and he goes on to ridicule the habit of some parvenus who use odd archaisms. Nonetheless, it seems that antiquarians took Horace's linguistic thoughts at least to some extent seriously.

Numerous ancient writers besides Horace have considered the subject of choice of words. Horace thus naturally shares some of his categories and terminologies with these other writers. Yet, this should not blind us to the originality and singularity of his thoughts. Though Aristotle discusses the different quality of words, though Cicero speaks of archaisms, neologisms, and metaphors in his discussion of choice of words, and though Varro even compares the appearance and extinction of words to the generations of men,<sup>24</sup> nonetheless, Horace's key idea of lexical cyclicity does not appear in earlier writers. Thus, Varro strongly denies that old words can reappear (*L.* 5.5): *quare illa [sc. uerba] quae iam maioribus nostris ademit obliuio, fugitiua secuta sedulitas Muci et Brutii retrahere nequit* ('therefore when words were already obsolete in the days of our ancestors, their meaning escapes even the diligence of Mucius and Brutus, who cannot capture their nuances though they pursue the matter').<sup>25</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Arist. *Po.* 22 1458a–1459a, Cic. *de Orat.* 3.149–58 with Oliensis (1998) 221–2, *Inv.* 1.33 with Norden (1905) 484–5, Var. *L.* 5.5 with Brink (1971a) at *Ars* 60–71. Horace's argument in favour of neologisms seems to be a reaction against Julius Caesar's *De Analogia*, in which Caesar strongly argued against using uncommon words. For Caesar's linguistic theories, see Pezzini (2018) with further references.

<sup>25</sup> I have attempted to mirror Varro's wordplay in my translation. Some nuances are lost, though: Varro compares Mucius and Brutus' hunt for etymologies to the hunt for runaway slaves (Melo (2019) ii.653–4).

Horace's linguistic thoughts may even still appear original when we compare them to the theory that is closest to them: Epicurean linguistic thought. Philip Hardie has analysed numerous allusions to the Epicurean poet Lucretius in Horace's lines on choice of words.<sup>26</sup> Lucretius famously wrestled with the poverty of the Latin language (*patrii sermonis egestas* at *Lucr.* 1.832, 3.260; cf. 1.139) and coined numerous new words in his struggle. Allusions to Lucretius are thus highly appropriate when Horace faces similar issues in the *Ars*. The question remains, though, whether the affinity goes further and Horace actually signs up to an Epicurean understanding of linguistics. Some scholars think so, and argue that Horace as well as the Epicureans Philodemus and Lucretius consider letters to be 'semi-animate entities with a strange faculty of forming realities of their own' – just like atoms.<sup>27</sup> Such a theory would be an ingenious explanation for Horace's claim that language is eternal, yet its components, words, are continuously changed. Cyclicity, however, has no place in Epicurean linguistics, but is crucial to Horace's thoughts.<sup>28</sup> Thus, Horace could have justly said about his linguistic thoughts that in this realm, too, he was the first to plant his footsteps in the void.

The following section immediately precedes the simile of the leaves in the *Ars* and sets out Horace's thoughts on choice of words in some more detail (45–59):<sup>29</sup>

|   |      |
|---|------|
| in uerbis etiam tenuis cautusque serendis       | (46) |
| hoc amet, hoc spernat promissi carminis auctor. | (45) |
| dixeris egregie, notum si callida uerbum        | (47) |
| reddiderit iunctura nouum, si forte necesse est |      |
| indiciis monstrare recentibus abdita rerum,     |      |
| fingere cinctutis non exaudita Cethegis         | (50) |

<sup>26</sup> Hardie (2005; 2014: 49–53), pointing in particular to *Lucr.* 3.964–71.

<sup>27</sup> The expression of Armstrong (1995) 231. The case is made in particular by Oberhelman and Armstrong (1995) 249–54. Cf. Grimal (1968) 91–5, Freudentburg (1993) 119–45, Yona (2018) 146–8. This atomological view, which makes an analogy between letters (*elementa*) and atoms (*elementa*), goes back to P. Friedländer (1941), but is controversially discussed among Lucretian scholars. For an overview, see Volk (2002) 100–105. D. Russell (1973) 41, conversely, argues for Stoic inspiration for choice of words in the *Ars*.

<sup>28</sup> On Epicurean linguistic thought, see, above all, Sedley (1998) 35–49, Taylor (2020).

<sup>29</sup> I depart from Klingner's text in two places; at the end of line 49 I read *rerum* instead of *rerum at*, and in line 51 I place a semicolon instead of a comma after *puenter*. In these two cases I follow the arguments of Brink (1971a) 140 against Klingner (1940).

## Gathering Leaves

continget dabiturque licentia sumpta pudenter;  
et noua fictaque nuper habebunt uerba fidem, si  
Graeco fonte cadent parce detorta. quid autem  
Caecilio Plautoque dabit Romanus ademptum  
Vergilio Varioque? ego cur, acquirere pauca  
si possum, inuideor, cum lingua Catonis et Enni  
sermonem patrium ditauerit et noua rerum  
nomina protulerit? licuit semperque licebit  
signatum praesente nota producere nomen. (55)

**46** ante 45 *transpos. ed. Britannici* 1516 : post 45 *codd.* **49**  
rerum B C K R : rerum et a Ψ V σΧ **59** producere nomen]  
procudere *Aldus* nummum *Luisinus*

When it comes to stringing words together delicately and carefully, the endeavouring poet should be choosy and embrace one word but ignore another. It is a sign of a distinguished stylist if an ingenious collocation (*callida iunctura*) makes a familiar word new. If it is necessary to explain obscurities with new signifiers, you will have the chance to invent new words which the kilted Cethegi of old had never heard – and you will be granted the right to do so if you make modest use of it. New words that have just been invented will earn trust if they derive from a Greek source (as long as the trickle is moderate). But why did Romans grant to Caecilius and Plautus the privilege that they deny to Vergil and Varius? Why do people begrudge me to acquire a few words where I can, while the language of Cato and Ennius has enriched our ancestors' speech and brought forth new terms for things? It has been and always will be allowed to produce word coinages of present currency.

In this passage, together with the subsequent one on leaves, Horace names three mechanisms through which cyclical lexical change is achieved. The first category is archaisms, words that have fallen out of use and are revived (70–1);<sup>30</sup> the second category is neologisms, new words that are necessary to describe new phenomena (48–59); and the third category is *callidae iuncturae*, the usage of common words in a new context or different setting (47–8, cf. 240–3).<sup>31</sup> In practice, these three categories cannot

<sup>30</sup> Bösing (1970) thinks that these lines refer to neologisms rather than archaisms. I am not convinced.

<sup>31</sup> These mechanisms naturally receive due attention in numerous studies on Horace. Thus, Conte (1994) [1987] 311–12 singles out the *callida iunctura* as a hallmark of Horace's lyric style. Muecke at *EO* ii.755–87 s.v. 'lingua e stile' is fundamental and offers a rich bibliography. The following studies are also particularly relevant. *EO* offers rich articles on 'arcaismi' (Bartalucci, ii.797–9), 'neologismi' (Viparelli, ii.925–8), 'callida

always be clearly distinguished, and Horace himself, in fact, conflates them: neologisms are not truly new, as they should ideally derive from a Greek source. Further, though archaisms and *callidae iuncturae* are old words, they have the appearance of new ones. Horace is thus less interested in a careful definition of these three categories, which at any rate do not appear as neatly listed and defined in his work as they do in my discussion here;<sup>32</sup> rather, he stresses the cyclical nature of language change, which a number of interrelated mechanisms bring about.

In the same passage Horace puts this theory into practice. One example is *pronus* in the leaves simile (60): *ut siluae foliis pronos mutantur in annos* ('as trees change in leaf from sliding year to year').<sup>33</sup> Richard Bentley has noted that Romans do not use descriptive epithets for phrases such as *in annos*, *in dies*, or *in horas*, and he thus reads *priuos* instead. A. E. Housman says with characteristic wit: 'I am told that "pronus" is very poetical: I reply, That question does not yet arise. Bentley has not denied that it is poetical; he has denied that it is Latin.'<sup>34</sup> Yet, the problem is, of course, that the word appears in a passage that is precisely about the unstable nature of the Latin language. In the immediately preceding line, Horace claimed for himself the right to innovate

*iunctura*' (Chersoni, ii.803–8), and 'grecismi' (Ciancaglini, ii.850–6). Waszink (1972) [1964] analyses the passage from the *Ars* and its implication for the *Odes*. See Mayer (1999) and in particular Gitner (2012) on Grecisms, Axelson (1945) 98–113 on unpoetic words, Armstrong (1968), Knox (2013) 538–42 on *callida iunctura* (Ruch (1963) too narrowly defines *callidae iuncturae* as oxymora), Maurach (1995) 83–92 on several of these categories. Also helpful are the categories of 'uocabula noua uel nouata' in the index of Bo (1960) and the categories 'archaisms', 'coinages', and 'colloquial language' in the indices of the commentaries of Mayer (1994) and (2012). Among older studies, there is Rothmaler (1862), Zangemeister (1862), Waltz (1881) 41–137, Ruckdeschel (1911), Brunori (1930) 47–61, 208–9, Immisch (1932) 75–93, Smereka (1935), Cupaiuolo (1942), Leroy (1948). Horace also creates cyclical linguistic dynamics through a device which Maurach (1995) 84 calls 'Rücketymologisierung', that is, Horace uses words in their original, at his time already uncommon meaning, such as *oscula* as 'lips' instead of 'kiss' at *C. 1.13.15*.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Waszink (1972) [1964] 281, who says that Horace writes here with 'bewußter Vermeidung jeder strengen Systematik'.

<sup>33</sup> The German translation of Delz (1995) 9 for *pronus in annos* is wonderful: 'wenn das Jahr jeweils sich neigt'. The verb 'neigen' describes exactly the movement of *pronus*, while 'sich dem Ende zuneigen' is a natural way of referring to time.

<sup>34</sup> Housman (1972) [1890] i.155, referring to Bentley (1713). Shackleton Bailey (2001) prints *priuos*; Klingner should have mentioned it in his apparatus. The issue really is the combination of *pronus* with *in*. On its own *pronus* can easily qualify time, for example, at *Hor. C. 4.6.39–40: pronos [...] mensis*.

Latin. And as an innovation in Latin, a *callida iunctura*, the expression *pronos in annos* is effective: each year glides in a downward slope like heavenly bodies, perhaps reminiscent of the downward motion of falling leaves.<sup>35</sup> Some lines earlier, Horace had already said that new words should derive, literally ‘fall’ (53: *cadent*), from a Greek source. Later, he says that words will reappear that have fallen out of usage, and current words will fall out of usage (70): *cecidere cadentque*. The fall is a universal principle in these lines pertaining to leaves, words, humans, and perhaps also years.

Besides *pronos* or *priuos*, the passage includes a number of other notable expressions which underline its message. Thus, when Horace says that people begrudge him his inventiveness of words, he proves that inventiveness through the usage of a syntactical Grecism that is unparalleled in Latin: *inuideo*, ‘I am begrudged’. For the verb *inuideo* normally takes the dative in Latin and the passive construction here follows the Greek φθονοῦμαι.<sup>36</sup> Pointedly, this first-person verb is the only time in the *Ars* when Horace explicitly mentions his own poetry, as Carl Becker has noted.<sup>37</sup> We are thus justified in connecting Horace’s theoretical thoughts in these lines with his lyric work – the more so as *inuidia* is a mark of lyric achievement in the sphragis of *Odes* 2.<sup>38</sup> Further striking expressions include *callida iunctura*, which may itself be a *callida iunctura*, as the word *iunctura* was perhaps not used previously in a stylistic context.<sup>39</sup> In the same sentence, the ‘known word’, *notum uerbum*, is ironically not known at all: the usual word in this context is *usitatum* rather than *notum*.<sup>40</sup> Then, in line 50, when the Cethegi of old times are surprised about

<sup>35</sup> Thus Sider (1996) 277 n.24. On the other hand, *priuos* would have welcome Lucretian connotations in a very Lucretian passage (Hardie (2005) 37). Furthermore, *priuos* in the meaning of *singulos* would be an archaism (Brink (1971a) *ad loc.*), which fits the passage rather well.

<sup>36</sup> This is already recognised by the scholiasts. Ps-Acro is particularly attentive to the issue: *mire, dum de fingendis uerbis loquitur, secundum Graecos ipse finxit ‘inuideo’*. Also see Marx (1925) 186–94, Brink (1971a) *ad loc.*, Gitner (2012) 163–4. Cf. *inuider* at Hor. *S.* 2.6.83–4 with Quintilian *Inst.* 9.3.17, Mayer (1999) 161–2, and Gitner (2012) 133–4.

<sup>37</sup> Becker (1963) 81 n.6.

<sup>38</sup> Becker (1963) 81 n.6 sees the connection to *C.* 2.20.4. Cf. *C.* 4.3.16.

<sup>39</sup> Thus Oberhelman and Armstrong (1995) 252 n.69. Compare and contrast Brink (1971a) *ad loc.*

<sup>40</sup> Hardie (2005: 36; 2014: 50–1), building on observations by Brink (1971a) *ad loc.*

modern words, they would be most surprised about the adjective that qualifies themselves, *cinctutis*, ‘kilted’, which is a neologism.<sup>41</sup>

It seems, though, that perhaps the most remarkable of Horace’s wordplays has gone unnoticed. This wordplay can be found at the crucial point at which Horace summarises his thoughts on choice of words in one sentence (68–9): *mortalia facta peribunt, | nedum sermonum stet honos et gratia uiuax* (‘still, all mortal works will perish, and still less is it true that the honour and grace of speech could stay alive’).<sup>42</sup> Horace’s choice of words here is programmatic and wittily underlines the sense. For neither have the word *honos* nor the word *gratia* always stood in honour and favour. The learned Aulus Gellius informs us that *honos* was not at all times an exclusively positive term in Latin, but used to belong to a category of so-called *uocabula ancipitia* (12.9; cf. 11.12). This describes words which can denote a positive as well as a negative quality. *Gratia* is an example for such a word, which Gellius indeed mentions. For *bona gratia* denotes favour, popularity, and esteem, whereas *mala gratia* denotes disfavour and unpopularity.<sup>43</sup> Gellius says that Quintus Metellus Numidicus in the late second century BC spoke of *peior honos*, which supposedly denotes disrespect rather than respect. This meaning of the word was already lost in Horace’s day (if it ever existed outside of the inventive minds of antiquarians).<sup>44</sup> Yet, that is precisely the point of the passage: now in the present moment and the present context *honos* and *gratia* enjoy honour and grace, but this has not always been so, nor will it always be so.<sup>45</sup> This is also how Horace describes trees,

<sup>41</sup> Noted by Brink (1971a) *ad loc.* Cf. Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.117: [*sc. uocabula*] *priscis memorata Catonibus atque Cethegis*. Hardie (2005) 37 mentions a connection to Ennius *Ann.* 304–8 Skutsch, where *Cethegis* is a *flos delibatus*, a flower that has long withered. As Hardie says, this possible reference neatly picks up the imagery of the leaves in the simile that follows in the *Ars*.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.112, where Horace says that a good poet should do away with any words that are ‘unworthy of honour’ (*indigna honore*).

<sup>43</sup> In addition to Gellius, see *OLD* s.v. ‘*gratia*’ 5.

<sup>44</sup> *TLL* s.v. says that Metellus simply uses *honos* ironically. For the present purpose it matters little whether or not Gellius is right. It is much more significant that Horace might have thought the same way. Strikingly, Horace uses two out of ten terms in Gellius’ list.

<sup>45</sup> Additionally, *honos* is an archaism that receives new honour again in the present passage; Horace also uses *honor* (Muecke at *EO* ii.756 s.v. ‘*lingua e stile*’). In the same sentence, the prosaic word *nedum* also receives new-found poetic honour (Axelson (1945) 85–6, 96, Brink (1971a) *ad loc.*, cf. *autem* in line 53 and Porphyrio

which do not always have their leafage or *honos*.<sup>46</sup> And this is, of course, also exactly the message of Horace's *carpe diem*. Thus, in one *carpe diem* poem, Maecenas is asked to enjoy the present moment as Fortune's favours (*honores*) are fickle (C. 3.29.51–2). In another *carpe diem* poem, Horace tells a certain Quinctius to drink, as spring flowers do not always have the same *honor* (C. 2.11.9–10): *non semper idem floribus est honor | uernis*.

The vast majority of the words Horace uses in his poetry may seem unremarkable. These words simply represent the normal diction of Latin in Horace's time.<sup>47</sup> Yet, the *Ars* asserts that these common words, too, are subject to change, as words in general are shaped by the changing 'usage' (*usus*) of society (*Ars* 71–2).<sup>48</sup> Thus, even seemingly simple, unadorned words in the *Odes* are an important part of Horace's diction of the present. Certain words, however, evoke present time more emphatically. Such words – again, archaisms, neologisms, *callidae iuncturae* – enrich Horace's diction at crucial points. For instance, when Horace says that archaisms can enrich language, the expression he uses for enrichment, *ditauerit*, is itself an archaism (*Ars* 57).<sup>49</sup> Horace's attempt to enrich Latin responds to Lucretius' well-known complaint on Latin's paucity (*sermonii patriis egestas*). Horace's solution for this paucity is striking; he is *coining* new words (58–9): *licuit semperque licebit | signatum praesente nota producere nomen* ('It has been and always will be allowed to produce words bearing the mint-mark of the present'). Like coins, words can bear the mark of the time when they were minted.<sup>50</sup> Words

at *Ars* 47). The poetic expression *sermonum haud*, a conjecture in the Aldine edition, is thus unnecessary. Peerlkamp's *saecula* instead of the transmitted *facta* would neatly pick up Homer's γεινή, but is arguably unfounded.

<sup>46</sup> See *Epod.* 11.5–6, *December* [...] *siluis honorem decutit*, with Delz (1995) 10, Mankin (1995) *ad loc.*, *OLD* s.v. 6b, and cf. *Ov. Met.* 1.565. This meaning of *honos* as 'leafage' may faintly ring at *Ars* 70–1, where natural imagery abounds.

<sup>47</sup> Thus Muecke at *EO* ii.772 s.v. 'lingua e stile', Klingner (1964) [1951] 443, Waszink (1972) [1964] 290–3, Wilkinson (1959), Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) xxii.

<sup>48</sup> Brink (1971a) *ad loc.* convincingly argues that *usus* means *consuetudo* here rather than χρεία.

<sup>49</sup> Noted by Brink (1971a) *ad loc.*

<sup>50</sup> The metaphor of coinage is already clear enough in the paradosis (*signatum praesente nota* [...] *nomen*), and it is unnecessary to read *procedere* (Aldine edition) instead of *producere*, or *nummum* (Francesco Luisini) instead of *nomen*. Note, though, that Bentley (1713) and Shackleton Bailey (2001) print both these conjectures, which certainly gives added emphasis to the image of coinage. Bentley (1713) *ad loc.* adduces

thus *produce* effects of presence, according to Horace. Serendipitously, Horace's expression '*producing* a word with a present mark' is reborn in our day as literary theory gives new currency to the expression. As Jonathan Culler says, in lyric, uniquely, 'effects of presence are produced'.<sup>51</sup> The expression may sound less natural in English than it does in Latin; Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, the scholar who coined the expression, stresses that he uses 'production' in the original Latin sense of *producere*.<sup>52</sup> Be that as it may, already Horace theorises about how poetry can produce presence. His answer refers to his choice of words. In the following section, I wish to look at a number of Horatian coinages in more detail and analyse how exactly they produce presence.

### 3.3 Bags Full of Leaves: Coinages in Horace's *Carpe Diem* Poems (C. 4.7, I.11, I.36)

Among Horace's books of *Odes*, Book 4 is the collection that is closest in publication date to the *Ars* (though the exact publication dates of both the *Ars* and *Odes* 4 are a matter of debate). *Odes* 4 is also Horace's book of lyric in which scholars have found the highest number of unusual words.<sup>53</sup> One poem in particular, *Odes* 4.7, thematises cyclical time and thus invites comparison with the leaves passage from the *Ars*. I wish to show that the ode is shaped by Horace's ideas about cyclical time with regard to its content as well as its choice of words. Contemplation of the cycle of the seasons leads to insight into human mortality in this *carpe diem* poem:

Diffugere niues, redeunt iam gramina campis  
arboribusque comae;  
mutat terra uices, et decrescentia ripas  
flumina praetereunt.

a number of other texts which use the metaphor of coinage for words and writing, all post-dating Horace. Besides the English 'coinage', the German 'Wortprägung' also preserves the metaphor. Cf. Smereka (1935) 73–4, Oliensis (1998) 213–14.

<sup>51</sup> Culler (2015) 37 and *passim*.

<sup>52</sup> Gumbrecht (2004) 16–17 and 17 n.4 (cf. Gumbrecht (2006)).

<sup>53</sup> See, for example, Kießling and Heinze (1961a) at *Epist.* 2.2.115, Rostagni (1930) at *Ars* 70, Collinge (1961) 13–14. Becker (1963) 12 and *passim* makes the case for strong unity in thought in Horace's late work.

## Gathering Leaves

Gratia cum Nymphis geminisque sororibus audet  
ducere nuda choros. (5)  
immortalia ne speres, monet annus et alium  
quae rapit hora diem.

frigora mitescunt Zephyris, uer proterit aestas,  
interitura, simul (10)  
pomifer autumnus fruges effuderit, et mox  
bruma recurrit iners.

damna tamen celeres reparant caelestia lunae:  
nos ubi decidimus  
quo pius Aeneas, quo diues Tullus et Ancus, (15)  
pulis et umbra sumus.

quis scit an adiciant hodiernae crastina summae  
tempora di superi?  
cuncta manus auidas fugient heredis, amico  
quae dederis animo. (20)

cum semel occideris et de te splendida Minos  
fecerit arbitria,  
non, Torquate, genus, non te facundia, non te  
restituet pietas.

infernus neque enim tenebris Diana pudicum  
liberat Hippolytum (25)  
nec Lethaea ualet Theseus abrumpere caro  
uincula Pirithoo.

The snow has fled; now grass is returning to the fields, and leaves to the trees. The earth is going through changes, and rivers are subsiding and flowing between their usual banks. The Grace ventures to lead dances naked together with the nymphs and her twin sisters. Don't hope for immortality; that's the warning that the year gives you and the hour that snatches away the nourishing day. Cold weather is softened by the West Wind; then spring is crushed by summer, which in turn is bound to die as soon as apple-bearing autumn pours forth its fruits, and soon lifeless winter returns.

Yet, the moon quickly recovers its losses in the sky; but in our case, once we have come down where pious Aeneas went and rich Tullus and Ancus, we are dust and shades. Who knows whether the gods above are adding tomorrow's tally to the total of today? All the things that you give to your dear soul will escape the greedy hands of your heir. Once you have died and splendid<sup>54</sup>

<sup>54</sup> Thomas (2011) *ad loc.* seems right in arguing that *splendida* is a transferred epithet modelled on Minos' description as Διὸς ἀγλαὸν υἷόν at Hom. *Od.* 11.568. Yet, a literal

## Coinages in Horace's *Carpe Diem* Poems

Minos has made his judgment, Torquatus, not your lineage, nor your eloquence, nor your piety will bring you back. For not even Diana frees chaste Hippolytus from dark Hades, nor is Theseus strong enough to break the Lethean chains that hold his beloved Pirithous.

The poem urges present enjoyment within the revolving cycle of the seasons. Revolving and repetition work on multiple levels. The poem itself is unusually close to an earlier poem, *Odes* 1.4, and it is universally noted that themes as well as many expressions seem to be revived from this earlier poem.<sup>55</sup> The poem's verbs, too, reflect the cyclical change of nature: *redire* (1), *recurrere* (12), *reparare* (13). Nature is all about revival and recurrence, whereas this is not possible for humans: *non, Torquate, genus, non te facundia, non te restituet pietas* ('Torquatus, not your lineage, nor your eloquence, nor your piety will bring you back').<sup>56</sup> The third stanza expresses this idea most clearly; it describes the cycle of the seasons with impressive economy.

The meditation on nature's cycle and human mortality in the poem suggests the image of leaves. We all are falling, Horace says (*C.* 4.7.14): *nos [...] decidimus*. This unusual verb for dying transfers the fall of leaves to humans.<sup>57</sup> Indeed, the first sentence of the poem has already introduced a connection between leaves and humans. While humans would later fall like leaves, the poem begins by describing leaves as human hairs in the description of their return to trees (1–2): *Diffugere niues, redeunt iam gramina campis | arboribusque comae* ('The snow has fled; now grass is returning to the fields, and leaves [literally: hairs] to the trees').<sup>58</sup>

rendering of the transferred epithet sounds unnatural in English (unlike the preceding transferred epithet 'the greedy hands of your heir').

<sup>55</sup> For example, Fraenkel (1957) 419–21, Rudd (1960) 379–83, Woodman (1972), Putnam (1986) 143–4.

<sup>56</sup> For the significance of the verbs with the prefix *re-* and the anaphora of *non*, see, for example, Thomas (2011) at line 1. Syndikus (1972–3) ii.357 n.5 is also good on this. Cyclical and linear time in Horace are amply discussed: Rudd (1960) 380, Commager (1962) 265–91, Davis (1991) 145–88, Lowrie (1997) 50–5. The influence of Catullus 5 on content and diction of the poem is also widely noted (*soles occidere et redire possunt* [...]). For the contrast between human mortality and nature's renewal in Catullus, Horace, and elsewhere, see Fantuzzi (1987), and 104 n.8 on *carpe diem*.

<sup>57</sup> Noted by Davis (1991) 156–7, now widely accepted. Older scholarship saw a connection to falling heavenly bodies, which seems less likely (Rudd (1960) 381, Becker (1963) 150). Still older scholarship thought that *decidere* is a vulgarism here (Smereka (1935) 70).

<sup>58</sup> Becker (1963) 151 n.7 notes another return: the verse ending *gramina campis* is virtually taken from *Ars* 162. Later in Book 4, at *C.* 4.10, *comae* and *decidere* are crucial words

The generations of leaves and humans in a *carpe diem* poem – this naturally evokes Simonides. Indeed, scholars have shown the importance of Simonides for the whole ode, and they have identified certain expressions that seem to allude to Simonides directly.<sup>59</sup> What I wish to stress on the following pages is the significance of the choice of words: like the *Ars*, *Odes* 4.7, too, shows an interest in words that fall to the ground and grow again.

In the fifth stanza, Horace tells his addressee, Torquatus, to enjoy the present (17–20):

quis scit an adiciant hodiernae crastina summae  
tempora di superi?  
cuncta manus avidas fugient heredis, amico  
quae dederis animo.

Who knows whether the gods above are adding tomorrow's tally to the total of today? All the things that you give to your dear soul will escape the greedy hands of your heir.

Some scholars reject the whole stanza as un-Horatian.<sup>60</sup> One of its problems is an expression that is unparalleled in Latin: *amico animo* must equal *animo tuo*, but such a usage of *amicus* is not known elsewhere in Latin. It has long been suggested that Horace is here calquing on the Greek, where expressions such as φίλω θυμῷ are natural.<sup>61</sup> Indeed, Kießling and Heinze have wonderfully explained the whole sentence in their commentary; according to them, the expression *dare animo* already introduces a Grecism (ἄτη ψυχῆ δοῦναι) where Latin would prefer *animo obsequi*. As Horace follows Greek texts which urge present enjoyment with the expression 'giving to one's soul', he further heightens the Greek

for transience, on which see Commager (1962) 297–8, D. H. Porter (1975) 220–3. For the motif of anthropomorphised trees (and arboreal humans) in Latin literature, see, above all, Nisbet (1987).

<sup>59</sup> See, above all, Barchiesi (1996a) 33–7. Barchiesi includes *C.* 4.7 in a study that argues for Simonides as a key influence for *Odes* 4 as a whole: through Simonides Horace finds new ways to compose lyric praise. The older studies of Cataudella (1927–8) and Oates (1932) 76–90 remain valuable.

<sup>60</sup> Collinge (1961) 111, Becker (1963) 151–8, Günther (2010) 107 (cf. Rudd (1960) 383, who, however, does not go so far as to reject the stanza). Fredricksmeier (1985) 18–22 praises the lines. Shackleton Bailey (2001) says rightly about these lines: 'a nonnullis sine causa suspecti'.

<sup>61</sup> Already Dacier (1689–97) *ad loc.* suggested the Greek model. In a *carpe diem* context the expression is used at Thgn. 877, 983.

sense of the line through his use of *amicus*.<sup>62</sup> Kießling and Heinze also adduce some Greek passages which might have influenced the Horatian expression. Chief among them is this line from Simonides' leaves elegy (*fr.* 20.12): ψυχῆ τῶν ἀγαθῶν τλήθι χαριζόμενος ('endure and pamper your soul with good things'). Horace's Grecism draws attention to his phrase as a translation from the Greek, something made new. Horace's expression does not mirror Simonides' original very precisely, though. Simonides' model can account neither for *dare* nor *amicus* in Horace. It might be better to say that Horace looks through Simonides at a whole Greek tradition in which the idiom of 'indulging one's soul' is common in a *carpe diem* context. Even a toper could voice this sentiment on his tombstone (*GV* 1368 *apud* Ath. 8.336d, discussed on pages 59–61 of Chapter 1): πῖέν, φαγέν καὶ πάντα τᾶ ψυχᾶ δόμεν ('drink, eat, and give everything to your soul').<sup>63</sup>

The Grecism appears at a crucial moment in Horace's poem: the exhortation to enjoy oneself in the moment, as no one can know if the gods add tomorrow's tally to the total of today (17–18).<sup>64</sup> In Simonides, the exhortation to gratify one's soul would have been delivered at the symposium. Listeners could have followed the exhortation among music and cups. Simonides' addressee, who is described as old, would have had particularly good reason for urgent enjoyment 'at the end of [his] life'. In reperformances, the implied addressee of the poem would have provided an occasion for urgent enjoyment, even though later audiences might be of various ages. Already in Simonides, addressee and occasion thus go some way towards producing presence rather than simply being

<sup>62</sup> Kießling and Heinze (1966) *ad loc.*

<sup>63</sup> This parallel, too, is noted by Kießling and Heinze (1966) *ad loc.*, who also point to Theoc. 16.24. Rawles (2018) 117 thinks that Simonides' poem already reflects earlier ideas such as Thgn. 1224: θυμῷ δειλᾶ χαριζομένη. Expressions of this kind are common in Greek *carpe diem*: Mimn. *fr.* 7.1 = Thgn. 795 = *AP* 9.50.1 (σὴν αὐτοῦ φρένα τέρπε; a Homeric expression: for example, *Il.* 1.474, 9.186), *SH* 335.1 (σὸν θυμὸν ἄεξε), [Alexis] *fr.* 25.5 (τὴν ψυχὴν τρέφειν) with the very rich note of Arnott (1996) 825. Persius 5.151 Romanises the expression in a *carpe diem* piece: *indulge genio*. It is curious when the *carpe diem* exhortation of pampering one's soul appears on a Christian epitaph (*SGO* 16/06/01.18 = *GV* 1905.18): τὴν ψυχὴν εὐφραίνετε πάντοτε. Please note that I regularly translate the idiom simply as 'to make oneself happy' or 'to enjoy oneself' in other chapters, where the literal side of the idiom seems less relevant. Also see page 9 in the Introduction on the idiom.

<sup>64</sup> See Davis (1991) 162–3 on these lines as an 'indirect prescription' of *carpe diem*.

present.<sup>65</sup> Horace's exhortation in turn conveys a different type of presence.<sup>66</sup> He uses a strikingly new Latin expression when he exhorts Torquatus to enjoy the present. The words are stamped with the present mark.

The word that is perhaps the most remarkable in the ode is *pomifer*, 'apple-bearing' (11). Horace usually avoids Greek-style compounds of this type.<sup>67</sup> By contrast, such words are common in Lucretius and Vergil. Indeed, Vergil arguably offers, besides Simonides, the strongest influence on Horace's choice of words in this poem. An expression that would strike even the most superficial reader as Vergilian can be found in line 15: *pius Aeneas*. The less likely *uaria lectio*, which is *pater Aeneas*, is, of course, just as Vergilian. It is thus very much Vergil's Aeneas who offers an example for the universality of death in Horace's poem. Yet, the overt allusion to Vergil only highlights that Horace in fact diverges from Vergil and corrects him: the katabasis of Vergil's Aeneas in Book 6 of the *Aeneid* was a round trip, whereas Horace emphasises that journeys to the underworld are always one-way trips. At the end of the poem, Horace also corrects Vergil's account of the Hippolytus myth and makes his Hippolytus remain in the underworld, whereas Vergil's Hippolytus would be freed.<sup>68</sup> Horace's *pomifer* is another reference to Vergil, *an oppositio in imitando*:<sup>69</sup> Vergil uses *malifer* for the same idea, a *hapax legomenon* in the *Aeneid* and Latin literature as a whole (Verg. *A.* 7.740, just preceding the myth of Hippolytus). In the *Ars*, Horace noted that Vergil coins words, while some of his fellow

<sup>65</sup> Horace would use the device of the addressee to mimic occasion, as Citroni (2009) [1983] analysed. Sider (2020) 299 now suggests that the old addressee of Simonides' poem might be the older poet Mimnermus (as in Solon, *fr.* 20). If right, Simonides already creates a fictional addressee who is made present through allusions to his work. Yet, Sider's suggestion is naturally speculative (compare and contrast Rawles (2018) 125–7). See Hose (2008) 204–6 for how Stobaeus (and others) suppress the addressee in lyric excerpts in order to create lyric without 'pragmatics'.

<sup>66</sup> Again, see Barchiesi (2000) 176 for Horace's poetry in the tradition of reperformance.

<sup>67</sup> For Horace's restraint in that regard, see Gitner (2012) 27–8; Gitner notes at 66–7 that the Greek *Zephyri* instead of the Roman *Fauonius* further enhance the Greek colouring of the stanza. Paschalis (1995) 182–6 comments on some bilingual wordplay in *C.* 4.7.

<sup>68</sup> For these Vergilian intertexts, see Traina at *EO* ii.841–50 s.v. 'Ippolito', Thomas (2011) 180, 183. Vergil also adopted Homer's leaves simile (*A.* 6.309–10). Horace's *semel* in line 21 may offer a contrast to Virbius (*uir bis*), the new name of the resurrected Hippolytus in Vergil.

<sup>69</sup> I take the term from Giangrande (1967), who describes the concept in detail.

Romans find fault with that (*Ars* 55). Horace's *pomifer* seems to have been coined by himself; the word cannot be found before him.<sup>70</sup> The uncharacteristic word hints at Vergil, and offers a learned allusion to his friend's diction: while Vergil uses twenty-four compound adjectives ending in *-fer*, the word *pomifer* is the only word of this type in Horace.<sup>71</sup>

The word *pomifer* also wonderfully illustrates Horace's principle of word change from the *Ars*. The word is old, calqued on Greek καρποφόρος or more likely μηλοφόρος, but is simultaneously reborn and made new.<sup>72</sup> Horace's *pomifer* pointedly evokes the cycle of words in a stanza that is all about time and the cycle of the seasons. Summer is about to die once apple-bearing autumn pours forth its fruits (9–11): *aestas*, | *interitura*, *simul* | *pomifer autumnus fruges effuderit*. The new season is accompanied by a new word; change applies to nature and words. It is also fitting that linguistic change again applies to trees; the generations of apples come and go, each year some apples fall to the ground and new ones grow.

Perhaps the best known of all Horace's *iuncturae* is the expression 'carpe diem' itself. The phrase appears in the poem to Leuconoe (C. 1.11):

Tu ne quaesieris, scire nefas, quem mihi, quem tibi  
finem di dederint, Leuconoe, nec Babylonios  
temptaris numeros. ut melius, quidquid erit, pati.  
seu pluris hiemes seu tribuit Iuppiter ultimam,  
quae nunc oppositis debilitat pumicibus mare  
Tyrrhenum: sapias, uina liques, et spatio breui

(5)

<sup>70</sup> The word is first used by Horace at C. 3.23.8 qualifying *annus*. Admittedly, one cannot say with certainty whether Horace alluded to Vergil or vice versa. Yet, Vergil's fondness for such words and Horace's restraint in using them strongly suggest that Horace is following Vergil rather than the other way around. For Vergilian coinages of adjectives, see Saccone at *EV* i.54. s.v. 'aggettivazione'. In the present instance Vergil seems to offer an etymological pun on an Indo-European ancestor of 'apple' (O'Hara (2017) 92, 197): *maliferae* [...] *Abellae*. Old words die and grow again. . .

<sup>71</sup> For the numbers: Ladewig (1870) 13. Traina at *EO* ii.813–15 s.v. 'composti nominali' discusses *pomifer* and notes Vergil's preference for compounds in *-fer* (more references there). Collinge (1961) 111 is wrong when he calls the neologism *pomifer* an 'uninspired epithet'. At any rate, Horace's words inspired Juvenal to his witty take on revolving seasons, *iam letifero cedente pruinis* | *autumno* (4.56–7), unrecognised apparently by Juvenal's commentators.

<sup>72</sup> Bo (1943–4) 245, no. 32 suggests both καρποφόρος and μηλοφόρος.

## Gathering Leaves

spem longam reseces. dum loquimur, fugerit inuida  
aetas: carpe diem quam minimum credula postero.

Don't ask Leuconoe what end the gods have decided for me and for you – it's not right to know that. And don't meddle with Babylonian horoscopes. How much better is it to accept whatever will be. Whether Jupiter has granted us other winters or this one is the last one, which is now wearing out the Etruscan Sea against rocks of pumice; either way, be wise, strain the wine, and cut down long-term hopes into a small space. While we are talking, begrudging time will have fled. Pluck the day and put minimal trust in tomorrow.

Though the phrase *carpe diem* has become something of a cliché and is probably most commonly imagined as spoken by the actor Robin Williams, it is in fact a daring and unusual coinage of Horace, as David West pointed out: 'We are brought up with *carpe diem* and cannot see what an astounding phrase it is. Nowhere else in Latin is it used of enjoying a period of time.'<sup>73</sup> Horace combines several expressions and models in this phrase: Pindar already spoke of 'plucking youth' (*P.* 6.48: ἥβαν δρέπωω; cf. *fr.* 123.1–2 Maehler); Latin authors applied *carpo* to objects of time at least since Lucilius, though without any implication of enjoyment;<sup>74</sup> yet, plucking fruits is naturally linked to enjoyment (*Epod.* 2.19–20): *ut gaudet insitiua decerpens pira | certantem et uuam purpurae* ('how he [i.e., the happy country-dweller] rejoices as he plucks the pears that he had grafted and the grapes that compete in hue with purple dye'). Horace combines all these connotations in the daring expression *carpe diem*. Each word on its own, *carpe* as well as *diem*, is unremarkable but their combination is a daring *callida iunctura* that gives them splendour and produces presence. Thus, Horace describes in the *Ars* how common words (*de medio sumptis*) can acquire honour or splendour (*honor*) through the usage of a *iunctura* (242–3). In *Odes* 1.11 the

<sup>73</sup> D. West (1967) 58, refuting Collinge (1961) 68: 'Horace does no more than say "carpe diem" in a series of aphorisms piled up in an almost Gilbertian manner.'

<sup>74</sup> Traina (1973) is fundamental for the semantics of the expression 'carpe diem'. Pindar's expression is already noted by Orelli and Baiter (1850) *ad loc.* Pindar's choice of words is daring in its own right and builds on expressions such as ἀνθος ἥβης, which I discussed on pages 11–12, 115 and 115 n.19. Lucilius applied the verb *carpo* to an object of time at *fr.* 917 Marx = 878 Warmington: *hiemem unam quamque carpam* ('let me go through each winter'). For Traina, not Lucilius but Catullus is the first to apply *carpo* to time, as Traina accepts Marx's unlikely conjecture *hieme* in Lucilius (see Dehon (1993)).

*iunctura* is striking: the day has to be plucked like a fruit in the momentarily fleeting season. The words that describe this also appear as new and gain new honour through a *iunctura* within the seasons of words.<sup>75</sup>

If we understand *carpe diem* as a reference to plucking fruits, such as grapes, then this expression is not the only one in the poem that is taken from viticulture. West noted that earlier in the poem Horace already employed expressions from viticulture in his advice to Leuconoe (6–7): *sapias, uina liques, et spatio breui | spem longam reseces* ('be wise, strain the wine, and cut down long-term hopes into a small space'). The tricolon of exhortations blends advice pertaining to Leuconoe's attitude to life with advice pertaining to wine and viticulture. Being wise is a question of her attitude, straining wine is more practical advice, but the third exhortation combines the two spheres. The verb *reseco* describes the pruning of vines and thus belongs to the same imagery as *uina liques*, as West notes.<sup>76</sup> This metaphorical usage of *reseco*, pruning long-term hopes, in turn prepares for the expression *carpe diem*, plucking the day like a grape, according to West.<sup>77</sup> Yet, Horace is not only pruning long-term hopes into a small space (*spatio breui | spem longam reseces*); he is also pruning poetry – none of Horace's odes consists of fewer lines, and the poem is wider than it is long.<sup>78</sup> The poem itself feels pruned to a short

<sup>75</sup> Porphyrio: *metaforicos 'primo quoque' inquit 'die frueri'. translatio autem a pomis sumpta est, quae scilicet ideo carpimus, ut fruamur*. Traina (1973) understands the image differently: day after day (*in dies*) should be slowly and continuously harvested from the *aetas*. But *fugerit inuida aetas* suggests speed, which should be countered with one fast plucking action rather than continuous harvesting. The erotic subtext of the ode also suggests urgency (W. S. Anderson (1992) 121): "'Candy is dandy, but liquor is quicker.'" And his libido says: now! Horace urges Leuconoe to sleep with him on this day rather than encouraging her to savour every day. Mazzoli (1991) agrees with Traina, but argues that that parts of *dies* are harvested, not parts of *aetas*. Görler (1995) repeats Mazzoli's argument ('pflücke den Tag leer'), apparently unaware of either his article or the response to Mazzoli from Traina (1993).

<sup>76</sup> D. West (1967) 58–64.

<sup>77</sup> Similarly, Seneca at *Epist.* 78.14 would later recommend to 'cut off' (*circumcido*) fears for the future (as well as memories of past ills): *circumcidenda ergo duo sunt, et futuri timor et ueteris incommodi memoria*.

<sup>78</sup> C. 1.38 and 4.10 also consist of only eight lines. Epigrammatic models surely influenced the form of these two poems. Yet, the clipped shape of C. 4.10 also underlines the poem's content, which deals with the cutting of hair. I will return to the idea of cutting *carpe diem* poems in Chapter 5.

space. Its form thus mirrors its content, and its metre furthers this impression: the Greater Asclepiad in this poem confines several phrases in a short space.<sup>79</sup>

Pruning poems as if they were vines is one of Horace's recommendations in his literary letters. Thus, Horace tells the Pisones at *Ars* 291–4 that one should thoroughly 'clip' a poem (*coeruit* and *praesectum*).<sup>80</sup> Later, at *Ars* 445–50, he repeats the advice and says that a good critic, in the fashion of a vinegrower, would check useless growth (*reprehendet inertes*), find fault with too-hard wood (*culpabit duros*), mark untrimmed plants for winter pruning (*incomptis allinet atrum | trauerso calamo signum*), and, in order that the plant receive more light (*parum lucem dare coget*), 'prune pretentious ornamentation' (*ambitiosa recidet | ornamenta*).<sup>81</sup> The image is most developed in the Florus letter. There, Horace says that anyone who wishes to write a proper poem should also take up the spirit of a stern censor and rid his diction of words that are undeserving of honour (*honore indigna*). There follow some lines on choice of words, archaisms and neologisms, which are similar in nature to Horace's later discussion of the issue in the *Ars*. The good poet will also need good pruning skills when it comes to his choice of words (*Epist.* 2.2.115–25):

obscurata diu populo bonus eruet atque (115)

proferet in lucem speciosa uocabula rerum,  
 quae priscis memorata Catonibus atque Cethegis  
 nunc situs informis premit et deserta uetustas;  
 adsciscet noua, quae genitor produxerit usus.

uemens et liquidus puroque simillimus amni (120)

fundet opes Latiumque beabit diuite lingua;  
*luxuriantia conpescet, nimis aspera sano*  
*leuabit cultu, uirtute carentia tollet:*

ludentis speciem dabit et torquebitur, ut qui  
 nunc Satyrum, nunc agrestem Cyclopa mouetur. (125)

<sup>79</sup> Schwindt (2016) 130–1 explains this well. Cf. W. S. Anderson (1992) 120.

<sup>80</sup> See Brink (1971a) *ad loc.* for the pruning metaphor.

<sup>81</sup> I follow D. West (1967) 60 and Rudd (1989) 223–4 here, who argue that the viticulture imagery is sustained throughout *Ars* 445–8 (though intertwined with imagery pertaining to prosecutors, censors, and judges). Brink (1971a) *ad loc.* is more sceptical and only accepts one unambiguous expression as a pruning metaphor: *ambitiosa recidet | ornamenta*.

## Coinages in Horace's *Carpe Diem* Poems

He [i.e., someone who wishes to write a good poem] will do well to unearth words that have long been obscure to the people, and he will bring splendid terms to light, which people like Cato or Cethegus of old used to know, but which now lie buried under ugly neglect and desolate old age. And he will admit new words which need has fathered and brought forth. His flow of words will be powerful and clear, and just like the flow of an unpolluted river he will spread prosperity and enrich Latium with the wealth of his language. *He will cut back excessive (otiose!) foliage verbiage, he will smoothen what is too rough with beneficial attention, and he will uproot those words that lack dignity.* Although he torments himself, you would think that he moves between registers with playful ease like a dancer who becomes a satyr in one moment and a rustic cyclops in the next one.

There are quite a few different metaphors in play here. Neologisms can enrich the Latin language as a river enriches the countryside (120–1),<sup>82</sup> but old words are also similar to precious metals that are brought to the surface (115–16). Further, Horace compares the ideal poet's effortless motions between different words and registers to a dancer who seamlessly changes from one style to the other as he represents different characters in a pantomime (124–5). Horace's words, then, have the performative quality of momentary dance, as they evoke presence.<sup>83</sup> Other images from this passage would be echoed in the *Ars*. Thus, words are likened to human beings when they are oppressed by old age (118).<sup>84</sup> Finally, Horace again uses imagery taken from vegetation when he says that words need pruning (122–3). *Odes* 1.11 already anticipates in practice Horace's theoretical thoughts.<sup>85</sup> The poem is cut back so that certain striking expressions can shine and are not overshadowed by pretentious ornamentation: *carpe diem quam minimum credula postero* ('pluck the day, and put minimal trust in tomorrow').

In *Odes* 1.36, Horace celebrates the return of Numidia from Spain and describes a drinking party. This is a special day, and Horace says that the day should accordingly be marked with an auspicious white

<sup>82</sup> On this passage, see Freudenburg (2018) 142–8.

<sup>83</sup> See Lowrie (2009a) 70 on links between performative discourse and performance media.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Hor. C. 1.4.16: *iam te premet nox fabulaeque Manes*.

<sup>85</sup> D. West (1967) 59–60 already noted that the pruning metaphors at *Ars* 445–8 and C. 1.11.6–7 are similar.

mark (*nota*) in the calendar (10): *Cressa ne careat pulcra dies nota* ('don't forget to mark this beautiful day with white chalk [literally: with a Cretan mark]').<sup>86</sup> As we will see, Horace also marks the present day again with a word coinage that bears the mark (*nota*) of the present (*Ars* 59: *signatum praesente nota producere nomen*; 'to produce words bearing the mint-mark of the present').

The party will include 'long-lived celery' and 'short-lived lily', and this contrast in bloom brings the *carpe diem* motif into the poem (*C.* 1.36.16).<sup>87</sup> Earlier in the poem, Horace describes the revelry that should take place at the party and says that 'Damalis, that drinker of much neat wine, must not be allowed to beat Bassus at downing the Thracian cup' (*C.* 1.36.13–14): *neu multi Damalis meri | Bassum Threicia uincat amystide*.<sup>88</sup> The word *amystis* seems to appear here for the first and only time in Latin. The term ἄμυστις can describe both a long draught and a type of large cup that is well suited for heavy drinking.<sup>89</sup> It has long been recognised that this Grecism points to a well-known passage from Callimachus' *Aetia*, in which the poet is present at a symposium and is delighted to see that another guest also dislikes heavy drinking (*fr.* 178.11–12 Harder):<sup>90</sup>

καὶ γὰρ ὁ Θρηικίην μὲν ἀπέστυγε χανδὸν ἄμυστιν  
ζωροποτεῖν, ὀλίγω δ' ἤδετο κισσυβίω.

For he [i.e., the other guest] also detested drinking neat wine with his mouth wide open in large draughts as the Thracians do; but he liked small cups.

<sup>86</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) *ad loc.* are convinced that this expression has nothing to do with the 'white day' (ἡμέρα [...] λευκόν) at Callimachus, *Aetia fr.* 178.12 Harder, but Horace makes much of this Callimachean passage in what follows.

<sup>87</sup> D. West (1995) 179–80.

<sup>88</sup> T. S. Johnson (2002) suggests *nunc* instead of *neu*, which should be given serious consideration; it makes much more sense if Horace finds it worthy to report that a woman (Damalis) would defeat a man (Bassus) in drinking. One might still agree with Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) *ad loc.*, though, that 'one is reluctant to give up a single *neu*'. At Hedylyus 3 *HE apud* Ath. 11.486a a woman engages in a drinking competition, and Hedylyus, like Horace, seems to engage with Callimachus, *Aetia fr.* 178 Harder, since some form of the important word ζωρός is almost certainly lurking behind the corrupt ἄζωρεσμιτρησι (Hedylyus' text is most recently discussed by Ypsilanti (2019) 630–2, who offers the conjecture ζωρόν κρητῆρσι θωωθέν).

<sup>89</sup> Porphyrio *ad loc.*, Ath. 11.783d–e, Hilgers (1969) 104, Richard Hunter at Sider (2017) 194.

<sup>90</sup> Already Orelli and Baiter (1850) *ad loc.* recognised this. I will return to textual issues in the Callimachus passage in Chapter 4.

Horace reverses the situation and positively encourages heavy drinking. It is clear that Horace's *Threicia amystide* picks up Callimachus' Ἐρηϊκίην ἄμυστιν, but Horace's translation is even neater, as the similarities with Callimachus go further. The Grecism *amystide* drenches the whole sentence with Greekness and alerts the reader to further Grecisms. There is indeed another expression in the line which has a Greek feeling to it. The genitive of description, *multi meri*, is mannered, and Horace regularly uses such genitives of description when he renders Greek compounds in Latin.<sup>91</sup> In the present case, the compound ζωροπότης might be lurking behind Horace's *multi meri*. Admittedly, *potor meri* would have been a closer translation of this Greek word than *multi meri*, and Nisbet and Hubbard rather think of πολύοινος as a Greek equivalent of *multi meri*.<sup>92</sup> Nonetheless, ζωροπότης seems the more likely model; πολύοινος is not used in poetry, and it is difficult to see how a random word from Thucydides and other historians would have influenced Horace's diction here. Second, and more importantly, the Callimachean intertext is crucial for the passage; Horace translates Callimachus' striking expression Ἐρηϊκίην [. . .] χανδὸν ἄμυστιν ζωροποτεῖν: *multi Damalis meri Threicia uincat amystide*.

The word ζωροποτεῖν is an important word in the *Aetia* fragment and it would be odd if Horace did not pay attention to it in his allusion to the passage. For the word is modelled on the Homeric *hapax legomenon* ζωρός, which (presumably) means 'neat' and appears at *Iliad* 9.203. In the following chapter, I will look at this term and its usage in some more detail, as I discuss the importance of cups of neat wine and other objects for the poetics of *carpe diem*.<sup>93</sup> For now, I just wish to stress that ζωρός is an important term in *carpe diem* poems from Asclepiades in the third century BC

<sup>91</sup> Succinctly explained by Mayer (2012) *ad loc.* See, further, Muecke at *EO* ii.760 s.v. 'lingua e stile', with many examples and references, and my discussion of *aeui brevis* at *Hor. S.* 2.6.97 on pages 200–1 in Chapter 5.

<sup>92</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) *ad loc.* Also see the detailed discussion of Bo (1943–4) 250, no. 19, who suggests as models both πολύοινος and οἰνοπότης. Mayer (2012) *ad loc.* notes that literary prose prefers an apposition instead of a genitive directly attached to a noun, for example, 'Damalis, puella multi meri'. Then why not 'Damalis, potor multi meri'?

<sup>93</sup> See Chapter 4.1 for references.

to Marcus Argentarius in the first century AD. Horace writes his *carpe diem* poetry into this tradition of drinking wine neat. Horace's choice of words again fits the model of the *Ars*: the new word *amystis* produces presence and lets us imagine a moment at the party when this word is used. And yet, the word is, of course, also old, revived from Callimachus, and much the same is true of *multi meri*, which also points to a Greek source. The words evoke the present moment of Horace's party, but they also evoke other older parties, such as Callimachus despising Thracian drinking rites, and even Achilles pouring wine for his guests in his tent. The words mark a Horatian *now* that exists always again.

Perhaps it is also possible to look at *amystis* from a slightly different angle by considering its register. Adam Gitner observed that many of Horace's Greek terms for drinking vessels belong to an informal register; though such terms may evoke literary precedents, they are essentially colloquial, intimate words, used at drinking parties.<sup>94</sup> Gitner illustrates his case with a wonderful example from English poetry. In his example, Housman pointedly uses the informal word 'can' in the refrain of one of his poems in order to stress the intimate atmosphere: 'Pass me the can, lad.'<sup>95</sup> The term *amystis* is not discussed by Gitner, but, as I noted, this term, too, can describe a drinking vessel as well as a manner of drinking. The unusual word *amystis* would then evoke the intimacy, revelry, and music of the drinking party where people would often simultaneously drink from a large *Amystis* cup and sing, as Athenaeus informs us in his discussion of cups (Ath. 11.783d–e, quoting the *carpe diem* poem PMG 913 *apud* Amipsias *fr.* 21, which mentions the *Amystis* cup).<sup>96</sup> This discussion of Horace's Thracian cup of song gives some taste of the next chapter, where I will discuss cups in some more detail – yet, before this cup is downed in one draught here, it is perhaps time to finish the present chapter.

<sup>94</sup> Gitner (2012) 112–15. For the practice of using Greek words for drinking vessels in Latin, see Macr. 5.21. Cf. Fitzgerald (2021) chapter 4, who argues that the simple, repetitive language of the *Anacreontea* creates the intimate sympotic present.

<sup>95</sup> Gitner (2012) 114, pointing to Housman's 'The chestnut casts his flambeaux' in A. Burnett (1997) 79–80.

<sup>96</sup> For Lyons (2010) 72 this is evidence that Horace's *Odes* were genuinely sung.

## Coinages in Horace's *Carpe Diem* Poems

There are a few more leaves left to gather in Horace. A comprehensive treatment of Horatian style which pays careful attention to his choice of words is still a desideratum.<sup>97</sup> In this chapter, I have confined myself to a smaller task – instead of soaring over the whole Horatian forest of words, I have, like a bee, gathered some lovely thyme here and there: I hope to have shown how Horace produces effects of presence through his choice of words. Just as the motif of *carpe diem* is the overarching ethos of the *Odes*, although it is not, of course, included in all of them, so the choice of words in *carpe diem* odes has a particular significance, although similar techniques can also be observed in other odes; but it is in *carpe diem* poems where lyric and linguistic presence programmatically merge. Horace's *carpe diem* poems as well as the individual words of which they consist evoke present moments that occur within the cycle of the seasons.

<sup>97</sup> Thus Muecke at *EO* ii.756 s.v. 'lingua e stile', confirming an assessment of Brink (1971a) x: 'the aspect of style in Horace needs to be opened up afresh, from vocabulary to the structure of sentence and paragraph'.