

The Language of Early Roman Satire: Its Function and Characteristics

HUBERT PETERSMANN

Albrecht Dihle septuagenario quinto votis optimis

Summary. The topic of this paper is the satirical language of Ennius and Lucilius. After a brief account of the characteristic qualities of *satura*, there is an analysis of the linguistic variety adopted by Ennius in the scanty remains of his satirical work. He appears to have avoided the use of Greek and of obscenity, and parodied the high style of the *Annales*. His linguistic register displays colloquial and elevated style and even a medley of these expressions within textual units. Ennius wrote for the educated social class and their requirements were kept in mind. He occasionally used language to mock ridiculous traits of human behaviour in general, but not for personal invective. Lucilius on the other hand, whilst continuing the strong parodistic use of language, is more open to the use of Greek, but he always has some special point to make; it is not there for show or because he cannot find a Latin equivalent. In general he was conservative in his linguistic views. It was one of his main literary intentions to reproduce colloquial speech, subordinating the various levels of language to his poetic intentions in his *Saturae*, because he experienced language as a social phenomenon. Lucilius is one of the greatest artists of the Latin language.

BEFORE STARTING WITH the topic of my chapter some preliminary remarks might be necessary in order to avoid any misunderstandings: whenever in the following article we speak of 'Satire' — or use the Latin expression *satura* — we do not mean the ancient stage performances which were

given this title,¹ but the literary genre which Quintilian, *Inst.* 10.1.93 proudly declares to be a Roman invention: *satura quidem tota nostra est.*

The word *satura* originally denoted a play or a poem whose characteristics seem to have been not only a mélange of metre, rhythm, structure and contents, but also a variety of language and style. Lucilius, however, was the first Roman poet to introduce further typical elements into this kind of poetry, which henceforth were regarded as its main characteristics, namely, mockery and invective, both personal and general, concerning various topics, to an extent which had been unusual in Latin literature up to his time. Thus, from Lucilius onwards, the word *satura* received its new meaning (as we understand it today), and it is for this reason that Lucilius was regarded by the ancient literary critics as the inventor of satirical poetry — not, however, of the *satura* as a sort of medley literature on the whole, for which Diomedes *GLK* I 485 (drawing amongst others on Varro) refers to Pacuvius and Ennius. But was Ennius really the *auctor* of this kind of literature, as has been supposed? I am rather sceptical about it.

Festus p. 306.25 L quotes a verse from Naevius' poetry, which he calls *satura* (frg. 61 *FPL* = p. 3 C): *quianam Saturnium populum pepulisti.* The Saturnian metre makes it probable that this verse was not part of a dramatic play. Consequently, *satura* seems to denote here the same literary genre which was cultivated by Ennius. We do not have the slightest idea of the context of this Naevian verse. It is only evident that it is a Saturnian line showing alliteration, a common feature of archaic Roman poetry. The linguistic level of this line seems to be solemn. *quianam* in the sense of *cur* obviously belonged to epic style: it occurs elsewhere in Enn. *Ann.* frg. 127 V² (= 121 Sk = 525 W) and 259 V² (= 246 Sk = 228 W), in Virg. *Aen.* 5.13, 10.6 and perhaps in Stat. *Ach.* 1.498 also. In Naevius' *Satura* it is probably a god or a king who was asked this question. There is, however, no indication that Naevius himself called this kind of literature *satura*. The same holds true for *Satura* or *Saturae* as a title of Ennius' medley poetry.

In investigating the fragments of the Ennian *Saturae*, we do not detect a satiric tendency in the Lucilian manner, but some of his lines suggest that Ennius parodied the metre and language of his own elevated poetry (Jocelyn 1972: 1026). In any case, he proves a master in handling the appropriate metre, style and language. It is obvious that he was acquainted with Greek literature and scholarship. According to the demands of Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.7.1ff. (= 1408.10ff.), he knew exactly when to make use of

¹ Cf. Livy's report (7.2.7) on the origin of Roman dramatic plays called *saturae*; *Satura* is also the title of a *fabula togata* of Atta (frg. 12 R³) and one of Pomponius' Atellanae (frg. 163–6 R³), which obviously had an analogon in Epicharmus' Ὀρῶα or Ὀροῶα 'The Sausage' (frg. 108 *CGF* = 122 *FCG*).

specific linguistic varieties. He was fully aware that the linguistic level of an utterance had to be in accordance with the speaker and the person addressed as well as with the subject matter and the literary intention he had in mind. It is quite natural that in antiquity the style and language of literature always depended on the author's aim, whether he merely wanted to describe or to instruct, to parody, to amuse or to do all these simultaneously. Therefore, tragedy and epic are generally solemn in style, whereas the *satura* as a kind of literary medley could draw on many more registers of Latin speech, as Jocelyn (1977: 136f.) has rightly observed in his subtle analysis of Ennius' *Sat.* frg. 6-8 V² (= 6-8 W = 11-12 C): 'Any personage, human or divine, might range in his discourse up to the highest poeticism or down to the lowest contemporary vulgarism. It would be possible to plot without great difficulty the general stylistic differences between the utterances of personages of different status in an extant *satura* but quite another matter to identify the status of the speaker of a fragment lacking a secure context.'

Nevertheless, even the few fragments of Ennian *Saturae* give us the impression that the author displayed a wide range of different stylistic levels and linguistic varieties depending on the speaker's situation, mood, social rank and background as well as on his geographical origin. But what holds good for Ennius' *Saturae* is also a characteristic of some other minor poems of this author. It has been well observed by Gratwick (1982: 159) that the tone and contents on the whole are so similar to those of the *Saturae* that some of them transmitted under individual titles could be regarded as parts of them. This is especially true of the two minor works entitled *Scipio* and *Euhemerus*.

Since in this respect we cannot be sure, I shall not concentrate on this question. Furthermore, I shall exclude from my discussion the Aesopic fable of 'The Crested Lark and its Chicks', *Sat.* frg. 21-58 V² (= pp. 388f. W = 17 C), not following Courtney ((1993: 13ff.) on frg. 17 with text, annotations and further recent literature on the whole passage), since the transmitted text might be a paraphrase of Gellius 2.29.3ff. (Coffey 1989: 28), except for the proverbial end, which has retained its original metrical form composed in *uersus quadrati* (Scholz (1986b: 48f.)).

This is also the metre of another fable written by Ennius: the story of 'The Piper and the Fish', where in frg. 65 V² (= 20 W = 21 C) the expression *quondam* indicates the beginning of the tale: *subulo quondam marinas propter astatat plagas*. The tone of this line is obviously colloquial. Varro, *L.L.* 7.35 and Festus p. 402.2ff. L, who quote this Ennian verse because of *subulo*, give evidence that the word is of Etruscan provenance. The question here is: was *subulo* in Ennius' times still regarded as a foreign

word or had it already been integrated into Latin? As this is the only passage in Latin in which the word *subulo* 'flautist' occurs, and since Ennius could just as well have used the more common *tibicen*, it seems probable that the poet deliberately introduced this foreign word here in order to evoke a scene in Etruria or an Etruscan person now living amongst Romans. With the exception of Greek words and the Praenestian *tongent* in a fragment of the *Sota* (= var. 28 V² = 3 C = 4 W), this is the only expression from a different language which occurs in the *Saturae* and the other minor poems of Ennius.²

It is perhaps remarkable that in this kind of Ennian literature even the use of Greek is very restricted. This, however, does not happen by chance: it reflects the general linguistic trend of a certain kind of educated member of the upper class of Roman society in the second century BC who, to a high degree, tried to avoid Greek in their speech. This was the attitude of the Scipiones, to whom Terence was attached, and it was praised by the adherents of *sermo purus* in subsequent periods as well: cf. Cic. *Off.* 1.111 *sermone eo debemus uti qui innatus est nobis, ne ut quidam Graeca uerba inculcantes iure optimo rideamur* and *Tusc.* 1.15 *scis enim me Graece loqui in Latino sermone non plus solere quam in Graeco Latine*.

Now we may ask, which were considered the characteristics of good Latin? The *Auctor ad Herennium* 4.17 gives the following answer: *Latinitas est quae sermonem purum conseruat ab omni uitio remotum*, and Diomedes *GLK* I 439.15f., quoting Varro's definition, says: *Latinitas est incorrupte loquendi obseruatio secundum Romanam linguam*, or, in the words of Quintilian, *Inst.* 6.3.107, it is the urbane language of Rome, *in qua nihil absonum, nihil agreste, nihil inconditum, nihil peregrinum neque sensu neque uerbis neque ore gestuue possit deprendi, ut non tam sit in singulis dictis quam in toto colore dicendi, qualis apud Graecos ἀττικισμὸς ille reddens Athenarum proprium saporem*.

In examining the linguistic level of the fragments of Ennius' *Saturae*, *Scipio* and *Euhemerus*, we can see that in the former there is no Greek at all, except for technical terms, and in *Euhemerus* the poet, whenever he introduces a god with his Greek name, also gives the Latin equivalent: cf. frg. 78 V² (= 31f. W) *Pluto Latine est Dis pater, alii Orcum uocant*, and frg. 139 V² (= 131-3 W) *inque sepulcro eius est inscriptum antiquis litteris Graecis ZAN KRONOY, id est Latine Iuppiter Saturni*.

In *Sat.* frg. 3f., 10f. and 66 V² (= 3f., 10f. and 24 W = 9, 13 and 22 C), owing to the subject matter or to the parodic intention, the style is very elevated. In frg. 3f. V² (= 3f. W = 9 C) someone contemplating the sky

² On the etymology of *subulo* and *tongent* see Walde-Hofmann (1930-56: 620f. and 690) and Ernout-Meillet (1959: 622 and 695).

says: *contemplor | inde loci liquidas pilatasque aetheris oras*. The words *inde loci* are interesting. According to Hofmann-Szantyr (1965: 53) the partitive *loci* after local or temporal adverbs usually belongs to colloquial speech: it is quite often used by Plautus and Terence. For later times Hofmann-Szantyr mainly refer to Cicero's letters, Sallust and Vitruvius. The occurrence of this kind of structure in Enn. *Ann.* 22 V² (= 19 Sk = 21 W) *constitit inde loci propter sos dia dearum*, *Ann.* 530 V² (= 544 Sk = 488 W) *inde loci lituus sonitus effudit acutos*, Lucretius (5.437, 741, 791), Cic. *Arat.* 327 and *interea loci* in Pacuv. frg. 76 R³ (= 82 W) clearly demonstrates, however, that this kind of partitive was not primarily colloquial, but an archaic construction belonging to solemn style, and as such, since popular language is often conservative, it had survived into later times. Other examples of elevated style can be found in Enn. *Sat.* frg. 10f. V² (= 10f. W = 13 C), where someone says: *testes sunt | Lati campi quos gerit Africa terra politos*. I cannot agree with Scholz's opinion (1986b: 47) that these lines probably do not refer to a speech of P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus Maior delivered against the *tribunus pl.* M. Naevius in 187 bc. On the contrary, the words *Africa terra* might indicate that this assumption is not too far fetched: they seem to be a reference to Scipio's *terra Africa* (cf. *ORF* frg. 3, pp. 8–9), which was the regular word order of this phrase, and which Ennius might have changed intentionally to suit an elevated poetic style. Apart from our passage, the expression *Africa terra* occurs also in Enn. *Ann.* frg. 310 V² (= 309 Sk with commentary p. 487) and Virg. *Aen.* 4.37, where it also seems to allude to Scipio Africanus (cf. *TLL* I. 1256.54; in prose cf. *Bell. Afr.* 26.3). The difference between *Africa terra* and *terra Africa* is not a semantic but a grammatical one. In its poetic form *Africa* is an adjective, whereas in the regular word order — cf. *terra Africa* (*ORF* frg. 4.3.9), *terra Italia* (Varro, *R.R.* 1.9.1, Liv. 25.7.4 and 30.32.6), *terra Gallia* (Caes. *Gal.* 1.30.3) or *terra Etruria* (Liv. 29.5.6)³ — *Africa* is a postponed noun. In both forms, however, the poetic and the prosaic, the word *Africa* is not applied to the Roman province Africa (to which the adjective *Africanus* refers⁴), but is used to denote Africa in its function as a country, as in the above quoted passage of Ennius' *Satires*. There the poet also mentions Africa's *Lati* or *Magni campi* — Polybius 14.8.2 calls them *Μεγάλα πεδία*, where according to Livy 30.8.3 the Romans fought the Carthaginians in 203 bc. The poet speaks of these fields as *politi*, which was obviously an agricultural term: cf. Non. 66.18 (quoting besides these Ennian lines also Enn. *Ann.* 319 V² = 300 Sk (*rastrors dente*

³ Cf. more examples also from Old Latin in Kühner-Stegmann (1955: II 568).

⁴ Therefore, *Africanus* is used as an agnomen for the two Scipiones, and from Cicero's epoch onwards this adjective occurs also in connection with *bellum*, *legiones* etc. (cf. *OLD* s.v.).

ffabres capsit causa poliendi | agri) on the word *politiones: agrorum cultus diligentes, ut polita omnia dicimus exculta et ad nitorem deducta*. *gerere* in the sense of 'to produce', 'to have', can also be found in epic poetry of later times: cf. Ov. *Met.* 2.15 (in the description of a picture) *terra uiros urbesque gerit siluasque ferasque | fluminaque et nymphas* (cf. OLD s.v. *gero* 2a). The question in this context is: does Ennius parody his own *Annales* here too? Jocelyn (1977: 131ff.) thinks that he did so in *Sat.* frg. 3f. V² (= 3f. W = 9 C), quoted above. The epic traits of our fragment seem to point towards a similar conclusion.

A parody of an epic work could also be assumed in *Sat.* frg. 66 V² (= 24 W = 22 C): *propter stagna ubi lanigerum genus piscibus pascit*. Here someone is feeding sheep, called *lanigerum genus*. That reminds us of the elevated expressions in the *Annales* for birds, *genus pennis condecoratum* frg. 10 V² (= 8 Sk = 10 W) and *genus altiuolantum* frg. 81. V² (= 76 Sk = 85 W). But what does *piscibus* mean in this context? There seems to be a pun on the sense of *pisces*, with which *pascit* alliterates. Perhaps Ennius, in a jocular way, uses the word *piscis* here in the same sense as *raniculus*, which, as a translation of the Greek botanical term *βατράχιον*, could denote a kind of wild flower, i.e. the buttercup (cf. Plin. *N. H.* 25.175). The word *stagna* seems to support this interpretation, which Warmington in his commentary on this line proposed. According to Courtney, however, this verse could also be taken as part of a description of a *θανυμάσιον*. In this case it would not be surprising if sheep were to eat animals instead of plants.

There are many more lines of the *Saturae* where Ennius uses puns: cf. e.g. frg. 64 V² (= 21 W = 20 C): *numquam poetor nisi si podager*. The verb *poetor*, which apart from this passage occurs only in late Latin, and there in its active form, was perhaps a witty invention of Ennius himself. (It would be interesting to know whether it was the poet himself to whom these words refer.)

Sat. frg. 6f. V² (= 6f. W = 11 C), however, certainly deals with the poet Ennius himself. A drinking companion appears to address him as one who toasts with flaming verses drawn from his very marrow: *Enni poeta, salue, qui mortalibus | uersus propinas flammeos medullitus*. Here we have a mixture of elevated and humble styles, as has been pointed out by Jocelyn (1977: 131ff.): *mortalis* and *flammeus* belong to the former register, while *propinare* and *medullitus*, found also in comedy (e.g. Plaut. *Most.* 243, *Truc.* 439, *As.* 772, *Curc.* 359, *Stich.* 425 etc.), were obviously lower in tone.

Sat. frg. 12f. V² (= 12f. W = 14 C) belongs to the same comic register: *neque <ille> triste quaeritat sinapi | neque caepe maestum*. The stylistic level of this passage, where someone is said to try to get mustard and

onions, is colloquial: *sinapi* and *caepe* are words found in comedy,⁵ where food and meals play an important role. *tristis* in the sense of *amarus* evidently reflects archaic style: Macrobius 6.5.5, who quotes Virg. *Geo.* 1.75 *tristisque lupini* (on which see Mynors (1990: 17)) and our Ennian passage, obviously admired this usage, saying: *tristis pro amaro translatio decens est*. Consequently, *tristis* in the sense of *amarus* was not only felt as an archaic but also as a refined word. It is used by Lucr. 4.634 (*triste et amarum*) as well as by Ov. *Pont.* 3.1.23, and as archaic features are often characteristic of rural life, one must not wonder that the expression occurs also in Virgil's *Georgics* (cf. besides 1.75, 2.126 and 3.448).

As for *maestus* in this fragment, we know that it is usually associated with grief, sorrow, distress and gloom (cf. *OLD* s.v.); here it amusingly refers to the smell of onions, which causes tears. In connection with 'odour' this adjective occurs also once in late antiquity: cf. *Drac. Romul.* 9.11 *non docuit quia maestus odor quia putre cadauer | aera tellurem uentos animasque grauabit* (cf. *TLL* VIII. 49.52ff.). In the Ennian passage *maestus* shows that the poet not only plays with the meanings of words (cf. *tristis* referring to the taste and *maestus* to the smell), but also with their sounds (cf. the reiterated *-ae-* in *quaeritat*, *caepe*, *maestum*).

Comic tone is also to be felt in *Sat.* frg. 14–19 V² (= 17–19 W = 15 C) where Ennius introduces a parasite. Here this comic figure is said to devour like a wolf the goods of an angry patron:

quippe sine cura laetus lautus cum aduenis
 infestis malis expedito brachio,
 alacer celsus, lupino expectans impetu,
 mox alterius abligurris cum bona,
 quid censes domino[s] esse animi? pro diuum fidem,
 ille tristis est dum cibum seruat, tu ridens uoras.

Here the words *abligurris* and *uoras* exactly suit the mood of a hungry wolf. *abligurrio* is a rare word (*TLL* I. 106.6ff.); its base-form is *ligurrio*, which in Plaut. *Capt.* 84 is also said of a parasite who compares his life with a hunting dog eagerly consuming what belongs to the hunters. The compound *abligurrire* is used in the same way (cf. Non. 195.24f. L. *ligurrire: degustare, unde abligurrire, multa auide consumere, CGL* IV 201.42 and V 531.10, where *abligurrire* is rendered as *deuorare*). Until the imperial period, besides in Ennius, *abligurrio* is only found in Ter. *Eun.* 235 *patria qui abligurriat bona*. Nevertheless, this is evidence enough to suppose that in our passage, too, *abligurrire* is the right verb (the cod. Vat. has *obligurias*, the Ricc. Oxon. *ablinias*, the vetus codex of Pithou *ablingas*). Vahlen and

⁵ For *caepe* see Naev. com. 18 R³, for *sinapi* Plaut. *Ps.* 817 and *Truc.* 315.

Warmington have adopted the reading of the cod. Leid. *mox cum alterius abligurias bona*. Courtney, however, for metrical reasons has convincingly altered the text to *mox alterius abligurris cum bona*. In addition to Courtney's arguments one can state that the spelling of the word with *-rr-* (cf. also *ligurriant* in Plaut. *Capt.* 84) must be right because it imitates the noise the wolf makes when fearing that his quarry might be taken away by somebody else. This word exactly fits the tone of this passage, in which *uoras* as a technical term for 'swallow' (cf. Adams (1995b: 608–10)) also suits the context.

Ennius' mastery in depicting the atmosphere of real life by means of language is also obvious in frg. 5 V² (= 5 W = 10 C), where the enormous resistance of people to a decision imposed upon them is not only expressed by five heavy trochaics, but also by the prefixes *re-* and *ob-*: *restitant*, *obcurrunt*, *obstant*, *obstrigillant*, *obagitant*. (It is remarkable that *obagito* cannot be found elsewhere in Latin literature.)

Surveying the characteristics and function of the language of the scanty fragments of Ennius' *Saturae*, we can see, according to their pragmatic dimension, a large range of varieties. The linguistic register displays: (a) colloquial speech; (b) the elevated style reflecting epic and tragic language; (c) a medley of colloquial and elevated expressions even within textual units.

On the whole, Ennius seems to have written his *Saturae* for the educated social class of contemporary Roman society, mainly represented by the Scipiones. It was their requirements in respect of language and style that Ennius had in mind when composing his *Saturae*. Therefore, Ennius shied away from any obscene words, so far as we can see. (Among his minor works it is only in the *Sota* that an indecent expression occurs. But this might be an exception, since it is the Ennian version of a coarse poem composed by Sotades, an Alexandrian author, after whom a certain kind of verse often dealing with obscene themes was named.) We can say that Ennius occasionally uses language as a means of mocking and parodying ridiculous traits of human behaviour in general, but not, however, for personal invective. (In fact attacks against persons of higher social standing would not have been possible for Ennius, who was not himself a native Roman citizen. In frg. 63 V² (= 22 W = 19 C) he attributes this mild attitude to his gentle nature, saying: *meum non est, ac si me canis memorderit*.)

His successor Lucilius, however, would not merely retaliate, but also attack and criticize in a personal and often very fierce way. He evidently could

do so, because he was a Roman citizen,⁶ although he was not born in the capital. This new attitude which Lucilius introduced into his medley literature was so unusual as well as stimulating that henceforth *satura* became the term for a *carmen maledicum*, as Varro called it. But this was not the only function of Lucilius' *Saturae*, or rather *Sermones* as he himself seems to have named his invective poetry. Sometimes it serves as a means of recalling remarkable occurrences in his life, or to express his own personal opinion on certain events. Many of his satires were spontaneous. Therefore, the style and language of his poetry very often seem to be non-reflective. He also used to write a large amount of verse within a short time. Varro (*apud* Gell. 6.14) considered Lucilius a representative of *gracilitas*: the characteristics of this style are *uenustas* and *subtilitas* (Leo (1913: 230 and 425)). Horace, however, regarded Lucilius' style and language as contrary to what was expected of educated Romans. He was, therefore, one of his most severe critics. In his opinion, his predecessor was obviously too unrestricted and vulgar in language. And he also failed to satisfy that demand for pure and clear Latin which was explicitly expressed by Cicero, *De orat.* 1.144: *pure et Latine loquamur, deinde ut plane et dilucide*. As a result, Horace at *Sat.* 1.4.11 calls Lucilius *lutulentus, garrulus*, and at *Sat.* 1.10.50 *piger scribendi ferre laborem*.

There seems to have been general agreement, however, that Lucilius was not only a witty, but also a learned author. Furthermore, Cicero at *De orat.* 2.25 informs us that Lucilius used to say that what he wrote was intended neither for the *doctissimi* nor for the *indoctissimi*: *C. Lucilius, homo doctus et perurbanus, dicere solebat ea quae scriberet neque se ab indoctissimis neque a doctissimis legi uelle, quod alteri nihil intellegerent, alteri plus fortasse quam ipse*.

It was due to his frankness and wit that Lucilius was highly appreciated by many learned Romans of later times, who preferred him even to Horace, as Quintilian, *Inst.* 10.1.93f. states.

Cicero at *Fin.* 1.7 records that Lucilius himself had said in a jocular way that, as he was afraid of the judgement of the Scipiones, he was writing for the people of the southern provinces. He said this on purpose since he was born in that part of Italy. From this statement we can also deduce that Lucilius did not conform to the demands of the Scipiones concerning the usage of the Latin language. As was mentioned above, the Scipiones and other *literati* of this period insisted that the *sermo purus Latinus* should not contain any Greek. In Horace's opinion, however, Lucilius did not observe this requirement at all. Therefore, Horace at *Sat.*

⁶ This is rightly deduced from Vell. 2.9.4, according to whom Lucilius served as *equus* in the army of his friend Scipio Aemilianus: cf. Hanslik (1969: 257).

1.10.20ff. ridicules the linguistic mixture in Lucilius' *Satires* and those people who admired this technique. Yet Horace's criticism is evidently prejudiced. Lucilius in general did *not* assent to an indiscriminate use of Greek words in Latin. He looked disapprovingly on this custom when there was no need to use Greek words. This was obviously the case when good Latin expressions were unnecessarily replaced with Greek equivalents, which became more and more the vogue. In frg. 15 M (= 15f. W) Lucilius ridicules this custom perhaps by making somebody use the Greek word $\sigma\epsilon\mu\nu\omega\varsigma$ in a passage where this same person seems to criticize exactly this habit: *porro clinopodas lychnosque, ut diximus $\sigma\epsilon\mu\nu\omega\varsigma$ ante⁷ pedes lecti atque lucernas*. Possibly, Lucilius in this passage mocks the use of *clinopodae* and *lychni* in Ennius' *Annales*.⁸

Another example where Lucilius ridicules not only the unnecessary but in some way also the inappropriate use of the Greek language is frg. 88–94 M (= 87–93 W). In this passage the Roman praetor Scaevola reveals his scorn for the magistrate Albius, whose Graecomania he had publicly mocked in Athens by addressing him officially in Greek. This seems to be even more ridiculous, since Latin until late antiquity was considered the official language of the Roman Empire, even in its eastern parts,⁹ although it was never rigorously practised,¹⁰ and in everyday life often only played a marginal role.

⁷ All the manuscripts of Macr. *Saturn.* 6.4.18 quoting these words transmit *ante*. Since the meaning of *ante* is very close to that of the Greek $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota$, there is no need to alter this form as Warmington following Mueller did.

⁸ *clinopous* does not occur elsewhere in Latin literature; for *lychnus* cf. Enn. *Ann.* frg. 323 V² (= 311 Sk); for *lucerna* in Lucilius, cf. frg. 146 M (= 148 W) and frg. 681 M (= 638 W).

⁹ Cf. Val. Max. 2.2.2 *magistratus uero prisci quantopere suam populiue Romani maiestatem retinentes se gesserint hinc cognosci potest, quod inter cetera obtinendae grauitatis indicia illud quoque magna cum perseuerantia custodiebant, ne Graecis umquam nisi Latine responsa darent. quin etiam ipsos linguae uolubilitate, qua plurimum ualent, excussa per interpretem loqui cogebant non in urbe tantum nostra, sed etiam in Graecia et Asia, quo scilicet Latinae uocis honos per omnes gentes uenerabilior diffunderetur*, Liv. 45.29.3 *Paulus Latine quae senatus quae sibi ex consilii sententia uisa essent pronuntiauit. ea Cn. Octauius praetor — nam et ipse aderat — interpretata sermone Graeco referebat*, Gai. *Inst.* 2.281 *legata Graece scripta non ualent*, Iustin. *Dig.* 42.1.48 *decreta a praetoribus Latine interponi debent*. Latin was also the language of the Roman army: cf. Suet. *Tib.* 71 *sermone Graeco, quamquam alias promptus et facilis, non tamen usquequaque usus est: abstinuitque maxime in senatu . . . militem quoque, Graece testimonium interrogatum, nisi Latine respondere uetuit*, and the Latin commands in Ps.-Maur. *Strategicon* on which see Reichenkron (1961: 18ff.), Lot (1946: 203ff.), Dagron (1969: 23ff.) and Petersmann (1992: 223ff.); one must not forget in this context also the Latin acclamations as testimonies of the official function of the Latin language in Byzantium: see Petersmann (1992: 228ff.) on Constant. VII Porphyrogenn. *De caerimon. aulae Byz.* 1.83f. [74f.], II 169ff. ed. Vogt.

¹⁰ Cf. Kaimio (1979: 94ff.); concerning Egypt cf. especially Bagnall (1993: 231f.).

In other respects, however, Lucilius does not refrain from mixing up Greek with Latin. This was especially the case in letters, since they were regarded as a form of written conversation (cf. Dem. *Eloc.* 225f. and Sen. *Ep.* 75.1). Therefore their language and style on the whole were expected to be colloquial, as Cicero *Fam.* 9.21.1, after inserting in his Latin text a Greek expression (*qua re nihil tibi opus est illud a Trabea, sed potius ἀπότευγμα meum*), says: *uerum tamen quid tibi ego uideor in epistulis? nonne plebeio sermone agere tecum? . . . epistulas cotidianis uerbis texere solemus.*¹¹

This intermixing of Latin with Greek had a long tradition from Plautine comedy onwards. Lucilius makes use of this technique¹² in frg. 181–8 M (= 186–93 W):

ut perisse uelis, quem uisere nolueris cum
 debueris. Hoc 'nolueris' et 'debueris' te
 si minus delectat, quod atechnon et Isocraton
 lerodesque simul totum ac symmiraciodes:
 non operam perdo, si tu hic.

This is Leo's (1906: 845f. = 1960: 230f.) convincing emendation of the text,¹³ which I have adopted with the exception of *Isocraton* (= Housman (1907: 150 = 1972: 687), while Leo (1906: 845f. = 1960: 230f.) writes *Isocratium hoc*; others, following the MSS more closely, prefer *Eissocratium hoc* (Ch. I p. 150, frg. 1) or *Eisocraton* (W), and Marshall (1968: II 550) in his Oxford edition of Gellius (18.8.2) writes *Eisocratium est*. The fragment is part of a letter which Gell. 18.8.2 quotes because of the ridiculous use of the homeoteleuta *nolueris* and *debueris*. It is addressed to a friend whom he reproaches for not having visited him when he was ill. In a witty way Lucilius not only composed this letter in the *uersus heroicus* but also introduced into it rhetorical sound effects which Isocrates had already inappropriately used in his correspondence.¹⁴ The poet is aware that this

¹¹ This statement corresponds with the general rules of epistolography theories: cf. also Dem. *Eloc.* 223ff. and Peter (1901: 21ff.).

¹² On Graecisms of diction in Lucilius cf. Mariotti (1960: 50ff.); in general cf. Leumann (1977: 258, § 249 and 453ff., § 365) and Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 37f.* and 80*).

¹³ M. reads v. 2f. in this fragment: *si minus delectat (quod atechnon) et Eissocratium hoc / lerodesque simul totum ac si miraciodes*, W. *si minus delectat, quod atechnon et Eisocraton / lerodesque simul totum ac sit meiraciodes*, and Ch. (with Marshall (1968: II 550) *si minus delectat quod ἀτεχνον et Eissocratium hoc / ληρώδεςque simul totum ac συμμειρακιώδες*. For a general interpretation of the whole fragment cf. also Fiske (1920: 432f.), Puelma Piwonka (1949: 21–4), and Housman (1907: 149–51).

¹⁴ Cf. Cic. *De orat.* 3.141 . . . *ipse* (= sc. Isocrates) *suas disputationes a causis forensibus et ciuilibus ad inanem sermonis elegantiam transtulisset* . . . For more on Isocrates' epistolary

is against the rules of art (*atechnon*),¹⁵ all rubbish (*lerodes*) and altogether childish (*symmiraciodes*),¹⁶ but says that he will not care about that and will write as Isocrates did, although his friend belongs to the opponents of this kind of style.

Here Lucilius not only mocks the homeoteleuta but also the usage of Greek words. Since they have retained their original inflection they can be interpreted as ridiculous manifestations of 'code switching' for which there is a lot of evidence in Lucilius' *Satires* (Marx (1904: I 156–8)). Cf. e.g. frg. 24f. M (= 28–9 W): *ut contendere possem | Thestiadōs Ledaē atque Ixionēs alochoeo*. The last two words of this passage are a *cento* taken from the end of Homer, *Il.* 14.317, just as frg. 230 M (= 267 W) is part of *Il.* 20.443: <nil> *ut discrepet ac τὸν δ' ἐξέπραξεν Ἀπόλλων | fiat*. In frg. 462f. M (= 491–2W) even a whole line is taken from Homer (*Od.* 11. 491):

non paucis malle ac sapientibus esse probatum

ἢ πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν?

Furthermore, there are often single Greek terms and phrases, mainly of technical, scientific or literary nature, which have been integrated into the Latin text, probably being spelled in Latin,¹⁷ but retaining, under certain circumstances, their Greek morphological inflection. The problem is difficult, and in many cases it becomes even more complicated by the doubtful transmission of the text. Housman (1907: 150 = 1972: 687) had already brilliantly observed that it was Lucilius' practice to give Greek adjectives the Greek inflection (cf. apart from Housman's examples *Atticon*, *dissyllabon*, *empleuron*, *cacosyntheton*, *calliplocamon*, *callispyron*, *pareutacton*, *poeticon*, also *aigilipoe* and *pareutactoe*) and to reserve the Latin ending for substantives (e.g. *exodium*, *zetematium*, *cobium*, *schedium*). According to this practice Lucilius also declined the masculine *o*-stems and the feminine *a*-stems: cf. nom. sing. *echinus*, *atomus*, *cyathus*, dat. *gymnasio*, acc. *ephebum*, nom. pl. *hippocampi*, *oenophori*, *moechocinaedi*, *androgyni*, acc. pl. *cinaedos*, *lychnos* and *propola*, *naumachiam*, *maltam*, etc. In the third declension Lucilius used in the genitive sing. the Latin ending (e.g. *aetheris*), but in the acc. the Greek one (*euphona*). In the gen. plur. of nouns, however, Lucilius made an exception. In this

style, especially concerning the use of homeoteleuta, with testimonies and further bibliography see Marx (1905: II 79f.), comm. ad loc., Leo (1906: 845f. = 1960: 230f.), Kroll (1913: 47) on Cic. *Or.* 37f. and Radermacher (1951: 153ff.).

¹⁵ Cf. Leo (1906: 845f. = 1960: 230f.).

¹⁶ The connection of *miraciodes* with *sym* is a hapax legomenon. It may be a witty word formation by Lucilius himself, in analogy to e.g. *σύμπλεως*, *συμπλήρης* etc. Cf. Leo (1906: 845 = 1960: 230).

¹⁷ On the Latin spelling of Greek words in Lucilius cf. Marx (1905: II 10, 79, 114, 203).

case the inflection is also Greek:¹⁸ cf. e.g. frg. 1100 M (= 397 W): *adde soloecismon genera atque uocabula centum*.

Most examples of the huge number of Greek expressions which Lucilius introduced were probably still regarded by his contemporaries as foreign technical words. At least in two cases, however, it seems strange that Lucilius gives two adjectives the Greek inflection, although in his time they might have been fully integrated already into the Latin language: cf. *Atticon* and *poeticon*. One reason for this practice, however, might be due to metrical convenience, as e.g. in frg. 1199 M (= 1259 W): *lecti omnes; Atticon hoc est* and frg. 495 M (= 542 W): *scit poeticon esse, uidet tunica et toga quid sit*.

Many of these terms had become firmly established in Latin and were used until the end of antiquity; very often, however, attempts were made to replace them with Latin equivalents. Cf. e.g. *zetematium* (frg. 650 M = 675 W) for which Lucilius did not yet have a Latin equivalent: *siquod uerbum inusitatum aut zetematium offenderam*. Here the diminutive *zetematium*, whose base-word has a parallel in *CIL* IV 1877f. and VI 28239.2, is a philological term denoting a pedantic grammatical problem. Cicero *De orat* 1.102 substituted this Greek expression with the Latin word *quaestiuuncula*.

Another illustrative example is frg. 753 M (= 820 W), where Lucilius speaks of Epicurus' *eidola atque atomus*, which in Lucretius' *De rerum natura* became *principia* and *primordia*.

Lucilius, furthermore, does not hesitate to use Greek terms in order to create a specific Greek atmosphere, and he tries to achieve this by special stylistic means. For that reason in his description of his journey to Sicily (frg. 110–13 M = 102–5 W) he calls the steep mountains of Setia *aigilipoe*, comparing them with the highest Greek mountains, Aetna and Athos. It is not by chance that their transmitted epithet is *aigilipoe*, not *aigilipes* as Marx (with Francken) conjectured, since according to the testimony of Hesychius, besides the regular *αἰγίλιψ* (Hom. *Il.* 9.15, Aesch. *Suppl.* 794, Lyc. 1325), there also existed *αἰγίλιπος*, which probably was a form of South Italian Greek (cf. LSJ s.v.).

On the other hand, there is a total absence of Greek expressions where the subject-matter is entirely Roman. Consequently, no Greek word can be found in the verbose Lucilian definition of the concept and nature of Roman *uirtus* in frg. 1326–38 M (= 1196–208 W):

*uirtus, Albine, est, pretium persoluere uerum,
quis in uersamur, quis uiuimus rebus, potesse,*

¹⁸ And this continued to be the practice in later times too: cf. the genitive in book titles like *Petronii libri Satyricon* etc.

uirtus est, homini scire id quod quaeque habeat res,
 uirtus, scire, homini rectum, utile quid sit, honestum,
 quae bona, quae mala item, quid inutile, turpe, inhonestum
 uirtus quaerendae finem re scire modumque,
 uirtus divitiis pretium persolvere posse,
 uirtus id dare quod re ipsa debetur honori,
 hostem esse atque inimicum hominum morumque malorum,
 contra defensorem hominum morumque bonorum,
 hos magni facere, his bene uelle, his uiuere amicum,
 comoda praeterea patriai prima putare,
 deinde parentum, tertia iam postremaque nostra.

This passage evidently reminds us of the numerous reflections on typical Roman moral concepts which are to be found in Ennius and Pacuvius. Here the diction is marked by archaic traits: cf. e.g. Ennius' description of a true friend in *Ann. frg. 234–52 V²* (= 268–86 Sk), his reflections on *otium* and *negotium* in the tragedy *Iphigenia* (frg. 234–41 V² = 195–202 J) or his thoughts on the goddess Fortuna, who, as Warminton puts it, 'on a sudden casts down the highest mortal from the height of his sway, to become the lowliest thrall' (frg. 398–400 V² = 313–15 J).

Lucilius, however, is not only interested in moral questions, but he makes use of his poetry also in order to join in the discussion about literary and linguistic problems of his mother tongue. This is already apparent in his earliest satires (cf. e.g. the above mentioned frg. 650 M = 675 W), but it becomes more and more evident in book IX, which was written later than books XXVI–XXX.

In this book IX Lucilius deals with numerous philological aspects of the Latin language. One of them is orthography, so e.g. the graphematic reproduction of long vowels which according to Quintilian, *Inst. 1.7.14* had an old tradition (*usque ad Accium et ultra*) and was common in Oscan (Leumann (1977: 12f.)). Lucilius, however, disapproved of it: cf. frg. 350–5 M (= 368–72 W):

'a' primum est, hinc incipiam, et quae nomina ab hoc sunt,
 deinde —
 'aa' primum longa, 'a' breuis syllaba; nos tamen unum
 hoc faciemus et uno eodemque ut dicimus pacto
 scribemus pacem: placide; Ianum, aridum: acetum,
 Ἄρες Ἄρες Graeci ut faciunt.

In frg. 362f. M (= 375f. W) the poet proposes the spelling *i-* in the genitive singular of *-io* stems, since by his time the spelling *-ei* had come into fashion, and subsequently Varro (frg. 252 *GRF*) recommended the spelling *-ii* (Leumann (1977: 424f.)). In frg. 356f. M (= 373f. W) Lucilius prefers the older form *feruëre* to *feruëre*, but he does not seem to have a

dogmatic opinion concerning this matter: *feruëre, ne longum. uero: hoc lectoribus tradam.*

In general one can say that Lucilius was conservative in his linguistic views. If there were two reasonable linguistic options, he preferred the older standard form, but he explicitly mocked solecisms.

In frg. 1215–17 M (= 398–400 W) he offers two examples, namely the colloquial confusion of *apud* and *ad* and *intro* and *intus*:

nam ueluti *intro* aliud longe esse atque *intus* uidemus,
 sic <item> *apud te* aliud longe est, neque idem ualet *ad te*:
intro nos uocat, at sese tenet *intus*.¹⁹

Most essential to Lucilius was the common *usus* (Hor. *Ars* 71f. and Quint. *Inst.* 1.6.43) or *consuetudo* (Cic. *Or.* 159) in language. Perhaps this is the reason why our poet has eleven instances of an *ablatiuus qualitatis*, which in common language prevailed until the end of the republican period, whereas there is no example of a *genetiuius qualitatis* to be found in his satires (cf. Marx (1904: I 160), Index gramm.) and Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 68 and 118)). Lucilius was neither a purist like the Scipiones nor did he approve of the linguistic innovations which the Scipiones proposed as analogists. Therefore, he rejected forms like *pertisum* instead of *pertaesum*, and *rederguisse* instead of *redarguisse*, which according to Festus p. 334. 28ff. L. Scipio Africanus is said to have used (cf. also Cic. *Or.* 159: *quidam pertisum etiam uolunt, quod eadem consuetudo non probauit*). In frg. 963f. M (= 983f. W) Lucilius obviously addresses Scipio:

quo facetior uideare et scire plus quam ceteri
 pertisum hominem, non pertaesum, dicere humanum genus.

In addition, there is another example which clearly demonstrates that Lucilius did not agree with Scipio's recommendation to use a generalized form *ue-* instead of *uo-* in the paradigm of *uertere*, as Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.7.25 says: *quid dicam uortices et uorsus ceteraque ad eundem modum, quae primus Scipio Africanus in e litteram secundam uertisse dicitur?* Krenkel's view (see his commentary on frg. 349 K = 357 M = 374 W) that the form *uortere* is older than *uertere* is incorrect. The fact is that the present tense of this verb initially always was *uertere*, whereas the forms of the past tense were *uorti* and *uorsus*. This is due to the Indo-European apophony, which can still be observed in the corresponding German present form *werden*, in the past tense *wurde*, *ge-worden*, and in Umbrian present tense *couertu* and Ppp. *trahuorfi* (cf. Leumann (1977: 48)). Unfortunately, in Old Latin inscriptions there are no present forms of *uertere*,

¹⁹ Cf. also Quint. *Inst.* 1.5.50 *intus et intro sum soloecismi sunt* and Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 277) and Svennung (1935: 388f.).

whereas there are perfect forms such as *CIL* I² 586.4 *aduortit* and *SC* Bacch. *aruorsum*. We can observe that in this matter, too, Lucilius' linguistic attitude is conservative: he uses the stem *uert-* in the present forms (frg. 139 M = 132 W *uertitur*, 899 M = 858 W *auertat*, 745 M = 838 W *uertenti*) whereas *uort-* occurs in the forms of the past tense: frg. 988 M = 1082 W *uorsus*, 1197 M = 1188 W *uorsum*.²⁰

It was one of Lucilius' main literary intentions to reproduce colloquial speech in most parts of his *Saturae*, which he himself frg. 1039 M (= 1039 W) probably called *ludus ac sermones* (the latter expression appears also in frg. 1015 M = 1085 W). This kind of speech is often very informal and ignores linguistic regulations. As has been mentioned already, it is sometimes very conservative in phonetics and morphology as well as in syntax. Therefore the occurrence of archaisms is not surprising. Numerous examples of them can be found in Lucilius' *Saturae*. In most cases, however, when they do occur, owing to the fragmentary character of Lucilius' poetry, we are not able to say whether they are intentionally introduced to characterize or to make fun of a particular kind of person or to parody another author. Cf. e.g. frg. 328f. M (= 357f. W) where someone mentions a glutton whose name is *Cerco*:

quid ergo, si ostrea Cerco
cognorit fluuium limum ac caenum sapere ipsum?

Unfortunately, we do not know who the speaker of these words is. To my mind, however, it is certain, that it cannot be the poet himself. The language of the passage is individualized by such odd traits, which for the linguistically well-trained poet Lucilius are inconceivable in this context. Therefore the speaker seems to have been a person of lower social standing. Perhaps he was a slave, a cook or a parasite, who in Roman comedy often are characterized by traits of vulgar Latin (cf. Petersmann (1995b: 128 n. 12)). He could also have been a freedman like Trimalchio or one of his uneducated friends in Petronius' *Satyrica*, whose *sermo vulgaris* is sometimes so archaic in tone that these characters are given a ridiculous dignity (Petersmann (1995a: 533–47)).

Anyway, the above-quoted passage is a good example of the language of this kind of person: cf. the form of the genitive plural of the *o-* stems ending in *-um*, which is certainly an archaism. Leumann (1977: 428) declares: 'Literarisch ist *-um* bis in spätere Zeiten nur erhalten in festgeprägten Wendungen oder in Sachgruppen, zumeist von Personenbezeichnungen: *pro deum fidem* und *deum virtute*, *praefectus* und *centuria fabrum*.'

²⁰ On the pres. forms *vort-* in the text of Plautus which seem to have been introduced by grammarians of a later period cf. Leumann (1977: 48).

In older times, however, the usage was much wider, but it was confined mainly to tragedy and epic: cf. Enn. *Ann.* 246f. V² (= 281f. Sk = 222f. W)) *uerbum paucum* instead of *uerborum paucorum*. Consequently, *fluuium* for *fluuiorum* in the context of everyday life here must have sounded funny. The same applies also to the hypercorrect neuter accusative form *ostrea*, which is used here instead of the feminine *ostreas*. One would have expected the latter form, since this noun is a loan-word taken over from the Greek neuter *ὄστρέον* long before Lucilius' time. In Latin it had changed its gender (via the neuter plural) to feminine *ostrea*: cf. e.g. Plaut. *Rud.* 297 *echinos, lopadas, ostreas* and Lucilius frg. 132 M (= 126 W) *ostrea nulla fuit, non purpura, nulla peloris*. Therefore in the context of our fragment as well as in frg. 1201 M (= 1222 W) *luna alit ostrea et implet echinos* . . . the nom. and acc. plur. *ostrea* is a hypercorrect form which was intended to create the same amusing effect as *fluuium*.

Linguistic mockery is also obvious in a series of other words: *collus* (frg. 268 M = 316 W and frg. 703 M = 780 W), *forus* (frg. 146 M = 148 W) etc. Mariotti (1960: 102f.) provides more examples but does not mention *utria* in frg. 1104 M (= 1212 W) instead of *utres*. This form is very interesting. It occurs again in late Latin (e.g. Arnob. *Adu. Nat.* 1.59 R), which demonstrates how long some substandard words continued to be alive. Often they still exist in the Romance idioms. The word *demagis*, meaning 'furthermore' is such an example: Lucilius frg. 527-9 M (= 544-6 W) gives the only literary evidence of this adverb in entire Latinity. As an expression of the popular language it was taken to the Iberian peninsula by Roman colonists and has survived only there: cf. Spanish *demás*, Portuguese *demais*, etc. (*REW*³: no. 2546 and Tovar (1969: 1022ff.) and already Marx (1909: 437)).

Another very illustrative example of this kind is the verb *uannere* 'to winnow' (from *uannus* (= 'the winnow for fodder or cereals'), whose first attestation is found in Col. 2.20.4), which apart from Lucilius does not occur elsewhere in Latin literature, but has survived as a technical term in idioms of the Romance area (*REW*³ no. 9141f. s.v. *uannere* and **uannitare*). In both Lucilian passages where the word occurs it is applied to sexual intercourse (Adams 1982a: 153): frg. 278 M (= 302 W) *hunc molere, illam autem ut frumentum uannere lumbis* and 330 M (= 361 W) *crisabit ut si frumentum clunibus uannat*.

rostrum is another remarkable word, on which Adams (1982b: 103) comments much more accurately than Tovar (1969: 1024): 'lit. "beak" (e.g. Plin. *Nat.* 8.97) or "snout" (e.g. Plin. *Nat.* 8.121) of an animal or bird, was applied to the human anatomy in colloquial Latin, as Nonius noted (p. 729 L)'. Nonius quotes from Plautus, Novius, Lucilius and Varro's Mennipean Satires, to which Petron. 75.10 has to be added. Originally *rostrum* could

be used to denote either the human mouth or face, or both together like the English slang word 'mug' or the vulgar German 'Schnauze', 'Fresse'. Lucilius uses the word three times in this sense (frg. 210 M = 233 W, 336 M = 362f. W and 1121 M = 1184 W). In Varro, *Men.* 419 and Petron. 75.10 the word apparently refers to the human face, in which sense it has survived in the Iberian peninsula, whereas the meaning 'mouth' (already attested in Plaut. *Men.* 89) can be found in Old Romanian (*REW*³ no. 7386). And it is Lucilius, not Cicero, as Walde-Hofmann (1930-56: 439 s.v. *rodo*) state, who gives the first literary evidence for the meaning of the plural *rostra* as 'a speaker's stand'.²¹ Cf. frg. 261 M (= 273 W): *haec, inquam, rudet ex rostris atque heulabit...*

In frg. 557 M (= 590 W) *rugosi passique senes* the word *passi* must not be translated with Warmington as 'shockheaded', but as 'having become wrinkled, dry': cf. Non. 11.28 *passum est proprie rugosum uel siccum... unde et uua passa dicta est quod sit rugis implicata*. The word is used mainly in connection with plants (especially of dried grapes). Therefore in most cases (cf. *TLL* X. 200.23ff.) the adjective occurs as an epithet of *uua* or in metaphorical expressions where somebody's appearance is compared with dry and wrinkled grapes: cf. e.g. *Priap.* 32.1 *uuis aridior puella rugosis*, Claud. 18.111 *passa facies rugosior uua*. According to this image in Lucilius *passus* is applied to old men who look like wrinkled grapes.

A testimony of popular usage is also the plural *ligna* in frg. 131 M (= 125 W) *si dent hi ligna, uidete*, on which Charisius *GLK* I 72.6, quoting the Lucilian fragment, comments: *lignum singulariter dici semper debet in multitudine*. This nom./acc. form *ligna* is also the basis of Ital. *legna*, Span. *leña*, Port. *lenha*, Log. *linna* etc. (cf. *REW*³ no. 5034) denoting firewood, just as e.g. *gaudia* instead of *gaudium* (cf. frg. 98f. M = 94f. W) became the basis of Ital. *gioia*, Span. *joya*, French *joie* etc. (cf. *REW*³ no. 3705).

No less interesting is the way in which Lucilius uses diminutives. It has been often stated that in familiar or vulgar speech diminutives are sometimes employed where elevated speech normally would have used the base-forms. But this is only partly right. Adams in a most illuminating chapter of his recent book on *Pelagonius and Latin Veterinary Terminology in the Roman Empire* (1995b: 543ff.) has demonstrated the inadequacy of the general term 'vulgarism', for in such contexts many diminutives are not used in a colloquial or vulgar manner, but are chosen deliberately with a special meaning as technical terms: cf. e. g. *auricula* in Lucilius frg. 266 M

²¹ Cf. also the other two testimonies of the word in pre-Ciceronian times: *CIL* I.583.36 (= lex rep. a. 123/122 BC) *iudices... omnes pro rostreis in forum [uorsus iouranto]* and Varro, *L.L.* 6.91 *collegam roges ut comitia edicat de rostris*.

(= 298 W):²² *ne auriculam obsidat caries, ne uermiculi qui*. In this passage, as in the veterinary treatises of later periods, *auricula* is not a mere substitute for the base-form *auris* but is used technically for the inner ear, just as in the same fragment *uermiculi* is not simply said of worms in general but of a special kind of worms affecting the ear (cf. in addition to Adams (1995b: 560), on *uermiculus* Cels. 6.7.5 *ubi uero uermes orti sunt, si iuxta sunt, protrahendi oriculario specillo sunt . . . cauendumque ne postea nascantur*, and more in Marx (1905: II 100f., commentary ad loc.)). The same holds good also for *pellicula* in frg. 534–6 M (= 559–61 W):

‘ibat forte aries,’ inquit, ‘iam quod genus, quantis
testibus! uix uno filo hosce haerere putares,
pellicula extrema exaptum pendere onus ingens.’

Here *pellicula* seems to have a special connection to the skin of the ram’s belly (cf. the localizing adjective *extrema*). In Pelagon. 3.6.1 the same word is applied to the skin of the chicken’s *uenter* (Adams (1995b: 544)). Lucilius, furthermore, gives evidence that this manner of using diminutives in a technical sense is not restricted to veterinary contexts but is to be found elsewhere too: cf. frg. 1143 (= catal. p. 420 W) *corolla*, which is not only the diminutive of *corona*, but according to Isid. *Et.* 19.30.1, who quotes this word, it has a special meaning: *corona insigne uictoriae siue regii honoris signum . . . haec a Lucilio corolla, ab Homero στεφάνη dicta est*.

There might be one Lucilian passage in which a real diminutive occurs instead of the base form. It is *muliercula* in frg. 565–7 M (= 592–3 W):

peniculamento uero reprehendere noli,
ut pueri infantes faciunt, mulierculam honestam.

Marx (1904: I 162, Index gramm.) thinks that in this fragment the diminutive *mulierculam* is used *metri causa*. If his interpretation is right (which is doubtful since the tone of *muliercula* might be affectionate), we could also explain the shorter form *guberna* instead of *gubernacula* in frg. 578 M (= 622 W). In this fragment a seaman gives the following command: *proras despoliate et detundete guberna*. Here *guberna* is not an artificial form as Marx, Krenkel (frg. 579) and Charpin (XX frg. 5) in their editions of Lucilius believe. I cannot see any reason, however, why a seaman in ordinary speech should have imitated epic style. Therefore, we should rather assume that *gubernum* instead of *gubernaculum* was a colloquial form. This can be proved by the fact that the word signifying *helm* in Old Italian is also *governo*, in Old French *gouver* and in the language of Provence it is *governe* (cf. *REW*³: no. 3905).

²² I am very grateful to Professor J. N. Adams for his highly illustrative remarks on this word in a letter to me.

Another colloquial element seems to occur in the above-mentioned command, frg. 578 M (= 622 W): cf. the form *detundete*, which Marx conjectured *metri causa* for the transmitted *detundite*, whose meaning here is 'dismantle'. It is not clear, however, whether *detundete* replaces *detundite* (from *de* + *tundere* as Charpin thinks) or *detondete* (from *de* + *tondere*), in which case *detundete* might be explained as a rustic form instead of *detondete* (cf. Marx (1905: II 215 ad loc.)).

It is beyond doubt that Lucilius enjoyed ridiculing rustic or dialect speech: see e.g. frg. 1130 M (= 232 W) where Lucilius mocks the monophthongized pronunciation of *e* instead of *ai* used by one of his opponents. This was probably the designated *praetor urbanus* C. Caecilius Metellus Caprarius who by his way of speaking Latin would turn out to be a *praetor rusticus*: *Cecilius pretor ne rusticus fiat*.

Lucilius, who was born at Suessa Aurunca in Campania, obviously had some knowledge of Oscan-Umbrian dialects. According to Strabo 5.3.6. (= C 233) his birthplace was a Roman colony that was close to the Oscan-speaking territory (Leo (1967: 406)). The influence of this idiom on Latin is evident in frg. 1318 M (= 1237 W) where someone says: *uasa quoque omnino redimit non sollo, dupundii*. Festus 384.29f. L comments on *sollo*: *Osce dicitur id quod nos totum uocamus*. Mras (1927/28: 79f.) regarded the ending *-o* in *sollo* as the exact Oscan morpheme of the accusative neuter plural corresponding to Latin *-a*. Vetter (1953: 374), on the other hand, assumed a compound *sollodupundi* as e.g. in frg. 1058 M (= 1048 W) *moechocinaedi*.

In another passage (frg. 1249 M = 1209 W) the poet mocks the verb *pipas*: '<quare me insidiis> petis, pipas? da.' 'Libet' <inquit>. The verb *pipare* obviously is of rural origin (cf. Varro, *Men.* 3 B *gallina pipat*). It is an onomatopoeic word. In the above fragment it has the meaning of 'to bewail in a shrill voice': cf. Festus in *CGL* IV p. xviii where the word is quoted and interpreted thus: *pipatio est clamor plorantis acerba uoce*, and Paul. Fest. p. 235.11 L *pipatio clamor plorantis lingua Oscanorum* testifies that word formations with *pip-* in this sense have also parallels in other Italic idioms.

Even more evident is the rural tone of frg. 581 M (= 623 W), which is documented by the dialect pronunciation of *abiit* as *abzet*, and where I as well as Charpin (XXII frg. 5) have adopted the punctuation of Terzaghi (= frg. 617): *primum Pacilius: tesorophylax, pater, abzet*. Glossaries (cf. Marx (1905: II 216)) explicitly comment on *abzet*: *extincta est uel mortua*. The word *abzet* has a parallel in a Pelignian inscription which says of a priestess: *afðed = abiit* 'she passed away' (*CE* 17.6 and Vetter (1953: no. 213)). Moreover, the name *Pacilius* recalls the Oscan name *Paakul*, but above all the pronunciation *tesorophylax* instead of *thesaurophylax* sug-

gests a kind of artificial rustic Latin. Charpin (1979: II 266) following Mariotti (1960: 97) remarks on this Lucilian fragment: 'La langue de ce fragment est très composite; il semble que Lucilius ait voulu créer une atmosphère non romaine, plutôt que restituer un dialecte donné.'

To my mind, Lucilius here and in some other passages also tried to individualize persons of lower social standing by the same linguistic methods which later on were used by Petronius in his portrayal of Trimalchio and the other freedmen (Petersmann (1995a: 533–47)). This is evident, above all, in the field of lexicography: here Lucilius, for the sake of ridicule, sometimes introduces more or less Latinized expressions which the *sermo plebeius* had taken over not only from Greek-speaking territory but also from other peregrine regions, such as the Celtic word *bulga* (frg. 244–6 M = 279–81 W), the Syrian *mamphula* (frg. 1251 M = 1056 W), the Etruscan *mantisa* (frg. 1208 M = 1225 W), the Umbrian *gumia* (frg. 1066 M = 1029 W and frg. 1237 M = 203 W), and *carissa* (frg. 1129 M = catal. W p. 419), whose linguistic provenance is completely uncertain.²³

It is quite natural that different ethnic groups mingling with each other as they did in Italy also left traces of their original idioms in Latin. As a result the standard Latin language, whose ideal was the *sermo purus* of the capital Rome, became more and more corrupted. This was already the opinion of Lucilius himself, who in frg. 1242f. M (= 1255 W) ridicules someone because of his or her wrong pronunciation by imitating it with the words *ore corrupto* instead of *ore corrupto*.

The *os corruptum* is one of the main targets of criticism not only of the authors of the classical period — Cicero, *Brut.* 258 speaks of the foreign population of contemporary Rome *inquinata loquentes* — but also of the grammarians of later times: cf. e.g. apart from *CE* 1012.2, above all Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.1.13 and 1.5.55f. In the latter passage, where Quintilian talks about the *oris plurima vitia in peregrinum sonum corrupti et sermonis*, he informs us that Lucilius satirically ridiculed a certain Vettius for speaking Latin like the inhabitants of Praeneste (frg. 1322 M = 1138–41 W). And it is this idiom which already in Plautus' comedies was an object of mockery (cf. *Truc.* 691 and *Trin.* 609).

Thus Lucilius proves to be one of the greatest artists of the Latin language. There cannot be any doubt that Lucilius in his satires not only continued what Ennius had started to do in his *Saturae*, but also tried to surpass his predecessor in many ways: first of all by introducing personal ridicule and harsh invective, and secondly by subordinating the various levels of language to his poetic intentions. His skill in characterizing

²³ On the etymology of these words see the relevant articles in Walde–Hofmann (1930–56), and Ernout–Meillet (1959) s.vv.

persons by an individual style and marking situations by an appropriate choice of words was already acknowledged by Fronto p. 57.3 v.d.H. (ed. Teubn.): *in uerbis cuiusque artis ac negotii propriis*. Lucilius uses language as a means of satiric mockery in order to excite laughter as well as to instruct. He is not only a master of parody when imitating Latin epic, tragic and comic style,²⁴ but he is also fully acquainted with the representatives of the various genres of Greek literature (cf. Marx (1904: I 100) and Coffey (1989: 41ff. and 54ff.)). Above all, Lucilius is a brilliant artist in reproducing the different varieties of the Latin language in all its nuances from the refined heights down to its vulgar and obscene depths (Coffey (1989: 51)).

As a Roman citizen, Lucilius' own linguistic model obviously was that type of language which Aristophanes too regarded as ideal: a *διάλεκτος μέση* of the city, which was neither sophisticated nor vulgar nor rustic in tone (frg. 706 *PCG* III 2, p. 362). Therefore, Lucilius disapproved of the analogical and artificial manipulation of language by the Scipiones, and he also mocked dialect traits which he himself at times introduced in order to individualize his characters. But he also rejected the typical *Graecomania* of certain groups of Roman society. On the whole, one can state with Puelma Piwonka (1949: 28) that Lucilius experienced language as a social phenomenon. And he did so to a degree matched by no poet before him nor by any of the subsequent verse satirists, Horace, Persius and Juvenal. It was Petronius who, to a certain extent, not only imitated the function Lucilius attributed to language and style, but also continued to develop this technique of early Roman satire as a literary creation *sui generis*.

Note. I should like to express my sincere thanks to Professors J. N. Adams and R. Mayer for their helpful suggestions and corrections.

²⁴ Cf. Marx (1904: I 100), *index auctorum*, quoting from Ennius, Plautus, Terence, Caecilius, Pacuvius, and Coffey (1989: 41ff. and 52ff.) on Accius; on Afranius cf. Krenkel frg. 1106 = 1029 M (= 1074 W).

Bibliography

- Adamietz, J. (ed.) (1986), *Die römische Satire* (Grundriß der Literaturgeschichten nach Gattungen) (Darmstadt).
- Adams, J. N. (1971), 'A type of hyperbaton in Latin prose', *PCPhS* 17: 1–16.
- (1976), 'A typological approach to Latin word-order', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 81: 70–99.
- (1980a), 'Latin words for woman and wife', *Glotta* 50: 234–55.
- (1980b), 'Anatomical terminology in Latin epic', *BICS* 27: 50–62.
- (1982a), *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London).
- (1982b), 'Anatomical terms transferred from animals to humans in Latin', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 87: 90–109.
- (1983), 'Words for "prostitute" in Latin', *RhM* 126: 321–58.
- (1992), 'Iteration of compound verb with simplex in Latin prose', *Eikasmos* 3: 295–8.
- (1994a), 'Wackernagel's law and the position of unstressed personal pronouns in Classical Latin', *TPhS* 92: 103–78.
- (1994b), *Wackernagel's Law and the Placement of the Copula esse in Classical Latin* (Cambridge Philological Society, Suppl. vol. 18) (Cambridge).
- (1995a), 'The language of the Vindolanda writing tablets: an interim report', *JRS* 85: 86–134.
- (1995b), *Pelagonius and Latin Veterinary Terminology in the Roman Empire* (Studies in Ancient Medicine, 11) (Leiden).
- Allen, W. S. (1973), *Accent and Rhythm. Prosodic Features of Latin and Greek: a Study in Theory and Reconstruction* (Cambridge).
- (1978, 2nd ed.), *Vox Latina. A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Latin* (Cambridge).
- Alfonso, S., Cipriani, G., Fedeli, P., Mazzini, I., Tedeschi, A. (1990), *Il poeta elegiaco e il viaggio d'amore* (Scrinia, 3) (Bari).
- Anderson, R. D., Parsons, P. J. and Nisbet, R. G. M. (1979), 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaşr İbrîm', *JRS* 69: 125–55.
- Anderson, W. S. (1956; 1964; 1970; 1981), 'Recent Work in Roman Satire', *CIW* 50: 33–40; *CIW* 57: 293–301; 343–8; *CIW* 63: 181–94; 199; 217–22; *CIW* 75: 273–99.
- (1961), 'Venusina lucerna: the Horatian model for Juvenal', *TAPA* 52: 1–12. (Reprinted in Anderson (1982) 103–14.)
- (1962), 'The Programs of Juvenal's Later Books', *CPh* 57: 145–60. (Reprinted in Anderson (1982), 277–92.)
- (1982), *Essays on Roman Satire* (Princeton).
- André, J. (1949), *Étude sur les termes de couleur dans la langue latine* (Paris).
- (1967), *Les noms d'oiseaux en latin* (Paris).

- ____ (1980), 'Deux remarques sur le volume du mot latin', *RPh* 54: 7–18.
- ____ (1987), *Être médecin à Rome* (Realia) (Paris).
- ____ (1991), *Le vocabulaire latin de l'anatomie* (Paris).
- Arens, J. C. (1950), '-fer and -ger: their extraordinary preponderance among compounds in Roman poetry', *Mnemosyne*⁴ 3: 241–62.
- Argenio, I. (1963), 'I grecismi in Lucilio', *CRSt* 11: 5–17.
- Artymowicz, A. (1909), 'Der Wechsel von *et* und *que* zu Beginn lateinischer daktylischer Verse von Ennius bis Corippus', *Wiener Studien* 31: 38–81.
- Atherton, C. (1996), 'What every grammarian knows?', *CQ* NS 46: 239–60.
- Austin, R. G. (ed.) (1964), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus* (Oxford).
- ____ (ed.) (1971), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus* (Oxford).
- ____ (ed.) (1977), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus* (Oxford).
- Avotins, I. (1980), 'Alexander of Aphrodisias on vision in the atomists', *CQ* NS 30: 429–54.
- Axelson, B. (1945), *Unpoetische Wörter. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache* (Lund).
- Bader, F. (1962), *La formation des composés nominaux du latin* (Paris).
- Baehrens, E. (ed.) (1885), *Catulli Veronensis liber* (Leipzig).
- Baehrens, W. A. (1912), *Beiträge zur lateinischen Syntax*. Philologus, Suppl. 12 (Leipzig).
- Bagnall, R. S. (1993), *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton).
- Bailey, C. (ed.) (1947, corr. ed. 1949, 3 vols), *Titi Lucreti Cari de rerum natura libri sex* (Oxford).
- Baratin, M. (1989), *La naissance de la syntaxe à Rome* (Paris).
- Barnes, J., Mignucci, M. (edd.) (1988), *Matter and Metaphysics* (Naples).
- Bartalucci, A. (1968), 'La sperimentazione enniiana dell'esametro e la tecnica del saturnio', *SCO* 17: 99–122.
- Bauer, C. F. (1933), *The Latin Perfect Endings '-ere' and '-erunt'* (Ling. Soc. America, Language Diss. 13) (Philadelphia).
- Beck, M. (1996), *Die Epistulae Heroidum XVIII und XIX des Corpus Ovidianum. Echtheitskritische Untersuchungen* (Paderborn).
- Bell, A. J. (1923), *The Latin Dual and Poetic Diction* (London and Toronto).
- Benediktson, D. T. (1977), 'Vocabulary analysis and the generic classification of literature', *Phoenix* 31: 341–8.
- Bennett, C. E. (1910), *Syntax of Early Latin, Vol. I—The Verb* (Boston).
- Bentley, R. (ed.) (1711), *Q. Horatius Flaccus* (Cambridge).
- Benz, L., Stärk, E., Vogt-Spira, G. (edd.) (1995), *Plautus und die Tradition des Stegreifspiels*. Festgabe für E. Lefèvre zum 60. Geburtstag (Tübingen).
- Berkowitz, L. and Brunner, Th. F. (1968), *Index Lucilianus* (Hildesheim).
- Binder, G. (ed.) (1988), *Saeculum Augustum II* (Wege der Forschung 512) (Darmstadt).
- Biville, F. (1987), *Graphie et prononciation des mots grecs en latin* (Paris).
- ____ (1989), (ed.) 'Grec et latin: contacts linguistiques et création lexicale. Pour une typologie des hellénismes lexicaux du latin', in Lavency and Longrée (1989), 29–40.
- ____ (1990), *Les emprunts du latin au grec: approche phonétique* vol. I (Bibliothèque de l'information grammaticale, 19) (Louvain—Paris).

- Blase, H. (1903), 'Tempora und Modi', in G. Landgraf (ed.), *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. 3. Band *Syntax des einfachen Satzes* (Leipzig).
- Bloch, H. (1940), 'L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus in Samothrace and Herculanum', *AJA* 44: 485-93.
- Blümel, W. (1979), 'Zur historischen Morphosyntax der Verbalabstrakta im Lateinischen', *Glotta* 57: 77-125.
- Boetticher, G. (1830), *Lexicon Taciteum* (Berlin).
- Boldt, H. (1884), *De liberiore linguae Graecae et Latinae collocatione verborum* (Diss. Göttingen).
- Bollack, J. (1965-69), *Empédocle* (3 vols; Paris).
- Bömer, F. (1951), Review of Axelson (1945), *Gnomon* 23: 166-8.
- (1952), 'Excudent alii . . .', *Hermes* 80: 117-23.
- (1957), 'Beiträge zum Verständnis der augusteischen Dichtersprache', *Gymnasium* 64: 1-21.
- (1965), 'Eine Stileigentümlichkeit Vergils: Vertauschen der Prädikate', *Hermes* 93: 130-1.
- (1967), 'Ovid met. I 39', *Gymnasium* 74: 223-6.
- (1969), *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen*. Buch I-III (Heidelberg).
- (1976), *P. Ovidius Naso Metamorphosen*. Buch IV-V (Heidelberg).
- (1982), *P. Ovidius Naso Metamorphosen*. Buch XII-XIII (Heidelberg).
- Bonjour, M. (1984), 'Cicero nauticus', in R. Chevallier (ed.), *Présence de Cicéron*, 9-19 (Collection Caesarodunum 19 bis) (Paris).
- Bonner, S. F. (1949), *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire* (Liverpool).
- Booth, J. (1981), 'Aspects of Ovid's language', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* II.31.4 2686-700 (Berlin-New York).
- (ed.) (1991), *Ovid. The Second Book of Amores* (Warminster).
- Bourgeois, P. (1940), 'L'hellénisme, procédé d'expression dans les Géorgiques', *RÉL* 18: 73-94.
- Bowman, A. K., Thomas, J. D. and Adams, J. N. (1990), 'Two letters from Vindolanda', *Britannia* 21: 33-52.
- Bowman, A. K. and Thomas, J. D., with contributions by Adams, J. N. (1994), *The Vindolanda Writing-Tablets (Tabulae Vindolandenses II)* (London).
- Bowman, A. K. and Thomas, J. D. (1996), 'New writing tablets from Vindolanda', *Britannia* 27: 299-328.
- Bowra, C. M. (1952), *Heroic Poetry* (London).
- Bramble, J. C. (1974), *Persius and the Programmatic Satire* (Cambridge).
- (1982a), 'Martial and Juvenal', in Kenney and Clausen (1982), 101-27.
- (1982b), 'Lucan', in Kenney and Clausen (1982), 533-57.
- Braund, S. H. (1989a), 'City and country in Roman satire', in Braund (1989b), 23-48.
- (ed.) (1989b), *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome* (Exeter Studies in History, 23) (Exeter).
- (1992a), *Roman Verse Satire* (Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics, 23) (Oxford).
- (1992b), *Lucan, Civil War, translated with introduction and notes* (Oxford).
- (ed.) (1996), *Juvenal, Satires, Book I* (Cambridge).

- Brenous, J. (1895), *Étude sur les hellénismes dans la syntaxe latine* (Paris).
- van Brock, N. (1961), *Recherches sur le vocabulaire médical du grec ancien* (Études et Commentaires, 41) (Paris).
- Brown, R. D. (1987), *Lucretius on Love and Sex: a Commentary on De Rerum Natura IV, 1030–1287, with Prolegomena, Text and Translation* (Columbia studies in the classical tradition, 15) (Leiden).
- Bürger, R. (1911), 'Beiträge zur Elegancia Tibullus' in *XAPITEZ. Friedrich Leo* 371–94 (Berlin).
- Brunér, E. A. (1863), 'De ordine et temporibus carminum Valerii Catulli', *Acta Soc. Scient. Fennicae* 7: 599–657.
- Bülow-Jacobsen, A., Cuvigny, H. and Fournet, J.-L. (1994), 'The identification of Myos Hormos. New papyrological evidence', *BIFAO* 94: 27–42.
- Burnyeat, M. F. (1978), 'The upside-down back-to-front sceptic of Lucretius IV 472', *Philologus* 122: 197–206.
- Cairns, F. (1972), *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh).
- (1979), *Tibullus: a Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge).
- (1983), 'Propertius 1.4 and 1.5 and the 'Gallus' of the Monobiblos', *PLLS* 4: 61–104.
- (1984), 'The etymology of *militia* in Roman elegy' in *Apophoreta philologica Emmanuelli Fernandez-Galiano a sodalibus oblata* 2.211–22 (Madrid).
- (ed.) (1986), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar 5, 1985* (Liverpool).
- (1986), 'Stile e contenuti di Tibullo e di Propertio' in *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi su Albio Tibullo* 49–50. (Rome).
- Callebat, L. (1974), 'Le vocabulaire de l'hydraulique dans le livre VIII du *De architectura* de Vitruve', *RPh* 48: 313–29.
- (1982), 'La prose du *De Architectura* de Vitruve', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* II.30.1: 696–722 (Berlin).
- (ed.) (1995), *Latin vulgaire, latin tardif. IV. Actes du 4^e colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif*. Caen, 2–5 septembre 1994 (Hildesheim, Zurich, New York).
- Campanile, E. (1985), art. 'grecismi', in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* ii.805–7 (Rome).
- Casali, S. (ed.) (1995), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroïdum Epistula IX. Deianira Herculi* (Florence).
- Caspari, F. (1908), *De ratione quae inter Vergilium et Lucanum intercedat quaestiones selectae* (Diss. Leipzig).
- Cavenaile, R. (1958), *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum* (Wiesbaden).
- Cèbe, J.-P. (1966), *La caricature et la parodie dans le monde romain*, (Bibl. des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 206) (Paris).
- Charpin, F. (ed.) (1978, 1979, 1991), *Lucilius, Satires. Texte établi, traduit et annoté* (Paris).
- Christ, W. (1879, 2nd ed.), *Metrik der Griechen und Römer* (Leipzig).
- Christes, J. (1971), *Der frühe Lucilius. Rekonstruktion und Interpretation des XXVI. Buches sowie von Teilen des XXX. Buches* (Heidelberg).
- (1972), 'Lucilius. Ein Bericht über die Forschung seit F. Marx (1904/5)', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* I.2. 1182–1239 (Berlin).
- (1986), 'Lucilius', in Adamietz (1986), 57–122.
- Cichorius, C. (1908), *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius* (Berlin).

- Clark, S. B. (1908), 'The authorship and the date of the double letters in Ovid's *Heroides*', *HSCP* 19: 121–55.
- Coffey, M. (1989, 2nd ed.), *Roman Satire* (Bristol).
- Coleman, R. G. G. (1977) 'Greek influence on Latin syntax', *TPhS* 1975: 101–56.
- (1987), 'Vulgar Latin and the diversity of Christian Latin', in J. Herman (ed.), *Latin vulgaire—latin tardif* 37–52. (Tübingen).
- (1989), 'The formation of specialized vocabularies in grammar and rhetoric: winners and losers', in Lavency and Longrée (1989: 77–89).
- (1991), 'Latin prepositional syntax in Indo-European perspective', in Coleman (ed.), *New Studies in Latin Linguistics* 323–38 (Amsterdam).
- (1995), 'Complex sentence structure in Livy', in D. Longrée (ed.), *De Vsua. Études de syntaxe latine offertes en hommage à Marius Lavency*, 71–84 (Louvain-la-Neuve).
- Collinge, N. E. (1962), 'Medical terms and clinical attitudes in the tragedians', *BICS* 9: 43–7.
- Conrad, C. (1965), 'Word order in Latin epic from Ennius to Virgil', *HSCP* 69: 194–258.
- Conte, G. B. (1970), 'Ennio e Lucano', *Maia* 22: 132–8.
- Contino, S. (ed.) (1988), *A. Cornelii Celsi, De medicina liber VIII* (Bologna).
- Coppel, B. (1976), review of Ross (1969), *Gnomon* 48: 559–66.
- Cordier, A. (1943), 'La langue poétique à Rome', *Mémorial des études latines... offert à J. Marouzeau* 80–92 (Paris).
- Courtney, E. (1965), 'Ovidian and non-Ovidian *Heroides*', *BICS* 12: 63–6.
- (1980), *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* (London).
- (ed.) (1993), *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford).
- Cutt, T. (1936), *Meter and Diction in Catullus' Hendecasyllabics* (Diss. Chicago).
- Dagron, G. (1969), 'Aux origines de la civilisation byzantine: langue de culture et langue d'état', *Rev. Hist.* 241: 23ff.
- Daube, D. (1956), *Forms of Roman Legislation* (Oxford).
- De Decker, J. (1913), *Juvenalis Declamans* (Ghent).
- Deichgräber, K. (ed.) (1935), *Hippokrates über Entstehung und Aufbau des menschlichen Körpers, Περὶ σαρκῶν* mit einem sprachwissenschaftlichen Beitrag von Eduard Schwyzer (Leipzig–Berlin).
- (1971), *Aretaeus von Kappadozien als medizinischer Schriftsteller* (Abh. d. Sächs. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Leipzig, Philol.-hist. Kl., 63, 3) (Berlin).
- D'Elia, S. (1961), 'Echi del "de officiis" nell' "Ars amatoria" ovidiana', in *Atti del I Congr. int. di studi ciceroniani*, ii. 127–40 (Rome).
- Della Corte, M. (1958), 'Le iscrizioni di Ercolano', *Rendiconti della Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti*, n.s. 33: 239–308 (Naples).
- Delatte, K. (1967), 'Keywords and poetic themes in Propertius and Tibullus', *RELO* 3: 31–79.
- Delz, J. (ed.) (1987), *Sili Italici Punica* (Stuttgart).
- De Meo, C. (1983), *Lingue tecniche del latino e manuali per l'insegnamento universitario del latino* 16) (Bologna).
- Denniston, J. D. (1952), *Greek Prose Style* (Oxford).
- Deufert, M. (1996), *Pseudo-Lukrezisches im Lukrez. Die unechten Verse in Lukre-*

- zens 'De rerum natura'. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 48 (Berlin and New York).
- Diggle, J. (1972), 'Ouidiana', *PCPS* NS 18: 31–41.
- Diggle, J. and Goodyear, F. R. D. (edd.) (1972), *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman* (Cambridge).
- Dingel, J. (1997), *Kommentar zum 9. Buch der Aeneis Vergils* (Heidelberg).
- Dionisotti, A. C. (1995), 'Hellenismus' in O. Weijers (ed.), *Vocabulary of Teaching and Research Between Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Civacima. Études sur le vocabulaire intellectuel du Moyen Age 8) (Turnhout).
- Domínguez Domínguez, J. F. and Martín Rodríguez, A. M. (1993), 'Dare con infinitivo en latín clásico', *Cuadernos de filología clásica*, 4: 9–22.
- Dover, K. J. (1963), 'The Poetry of Archilochus', in *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 10: 183–212 (Geneva).
- _____ (1968, corrected reprint of 1960 ed.), *Greek Word Order* (Cambridge).
- Draeger, A. (1882, 3rd ed.), *Über Syntax und Stil des Tacitus* (Leipzig).
- Drexler, H. (1967), *Einführung in die römische Metrik* (Darmstadt).
- Dubois, J. (1966), 'Les problèmes du vocabulaire technique', *Cahiers de lexicologie* 9: 103–12.
- Dumortier, J. (1935), *Le vocabulaire médical d'Eschyle et les écrits hippocratiques* (Paris).
- Easterling, P. E. (ed.) (1982), *Sophocles, Trachiniai* (Cambridge).
- Eich, M. (1925), *De praepositionum collocatione apud poetas Latinos inde ab Ovidio* (Diss. Bonn).
- Eklund, S. (1970), *The periphrastic, completive and finite use of the present participle in Latin. With special regard to translation of Christian texts in Greek up to 600 A.D.* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Latina Upsaliensia, 5) (Uppsala).
- Elder, J. P. (1962), 'Tibullus: Tersus atque Elegans' in J. P. Sullivan (ed.) *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy and Lyric*, 65–106. (London).
- Eliot, T. S. (1932 [1917]), 'Tradition and the individual talent', in *Selected Essays*, 13–22 (London).
- Ellis, R. (1876; 2nd ed. 1889), *A Commentary on Catullus* (Oxford).
- Erbse, H. (1953), 'Homerscholien und hellenistische Glossare bei Apollonios Rhodios', *Hermes* 81: 163–96.
- Ernout, A. (1946), 'Infinitif grec et gérondif latin', *Philologica* (Paris).
- _____ (1947), 'Le vocabulaire poétique', rev. of Axelson (1945), *RPh* 21: 55–70 (= 1957b: 66–86).
- _____ (1956), 'VENVS, VENIA, CVPIDO', *RPh* 30: 7–27 (= 1957b: 87–111).
- _____ (1957a), 'METVS — TIMOR. Les formes en -us et en -os (-or) du latin', in 1957b: 7–56
- _____ (1957b), *Philologica* II (Paris).
- Ernout, A. and Meillet, A. (1959; 4th ed.), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*, augmenté d'additions et de corrections nouvelles par J. André (Paris).
- Ernout, A. and Thomas, F. (1953), *Syntaxe latine* (Paris).
- Evans, W. J. (1921), *Allitteratio Latina* (London).
- Évrard-Gillis, J. (1976), *La récurrence lexicale dans l'oeuvre de Catulle: étude stylistique* (Paris).

- Fantham, E. (1972), *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery* (Toronto).
- Farrell, J. (1991), *Virgil's 'Georgics' and the Traditions of Ancient Epic* (New York and Oxford).
- Fedeli, P. (ed.) (1965), *Properzio, Elegie libro IV: Testo critico e commento* (Bari).
- (ed.) (1980), *Sesto Properzio, Il primo libro delle Elegie: Introduzione, testo critico e commento* (Florence).
- (ed.) (1985), *Properzio, Il libro terzo delle Elegie: Introduzione, testo e commento* (Bari).
- Ferguson, J. (1987), *A Prosopography to the Poems of Juvenal* (Brussels).
- Fiske, G. C. (1919), 'The plain style in the Scipionic Circle', in *Studies in Honor of Ch. Forster Smith* (Madison).
- (1920), *Lucilius and Horace. A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature 7) (Madison).
- Fitch, J. G. (1981), 'Sense-pauses and relative dating in Seneca, Sophocles and Shakespeare', *AJP* 102: 289–307.
- Flashar, H. (ed.) (1971), *Antike Medizin* (Wege der Forschung 221) (Darmstadt).
- Fluck, H.-R. (1980), *Fachsprachen: Einführung und Bibliographie* (Munich).
- Flury, P. (1968), *Liebe und Liebessprache bei Menander, Plautus und Terenz* (Heidelberg).
- (1990), 'Beiträge aus der Thesaurus-Arbeit, XXV: *occurrere*', *MH* 47: 225–6.
- Fordyce, C. J. (ed.) (1961; repr. with corrections and additional notes 1973), *Catullus: a Commentary* (Oxford).
- (ed.) (1977), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos libri 7–8*, with a commentary ed. by John D. Christie (Oxford).
- Fraenkel, E. (1922), *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Philologische Untersuchungen 28) (Berlin).
- (1928), *Iktus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechvers* (Berlin).
- (1960 = transl. of [1922] with addenda), *Elementi plautini in Plauto* (Florence).
- (1968), *Leseproben aus Reden Ciceros und Catos* (Rome).
- Freudenburg, K. (1993), *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire* (Princeton).
- Friedländer, P. (1941), 'Pattern of sound and atomistic theory in Lucretius', *AJP* 62: 16–34.
- Gaisser, J. H. (1993), *Catullus and his Renaissance Readers* (Oxford).
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (1991), *Language Selection and Switching in Strasbourg* (Oxford).
- Garvie, A. F. (ed.) (1986), *Aeschylus, Choephoroi, with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford).
- Geymonat, M. (ed.) (1973), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Turin).
- Gianfrotta, P. A. (1987), art. 'Navis', in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* iii. 670–4 (Rome).
- Gigante, M. (1981), *Scetticismo e epicureismo* (Naples).
- Gigon, O. (1978), 'Lukrez und Ennius', in *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 24: 167–91 (Geneva).
- Godwin, J. (ed.) (1986), *Lucretius: 'De Rerum Natura' IV* (Warminster).
- (ed.) (1991), *Lucretius: 'De Rerum Natura' VI* (Warminster).
- Gow, A. S. F. (1931), 'Diminutives in Augustan Poetry', *CQ* 26: 150–7.

- Goodyear, F. R. D. (ed.) (1972), *The Annals of Tacitus, I: Annals 1.1–54*, (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 15) (Cambridge).
- (ed.) (1981), *The Annals of Tacitus, II: Annals 1.55–81 and Annals 2*, (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 23) (Cambridge).
- Goold, G. P. (1974), *Interpreting Catullus* (London).
- (1983), *Catullus, edited with introduction, translation and notes* (London).
- (1990), *Propertius* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Görler, W. (1982), 'Beobachtungen zu Vergils Syntax', *Würzburger Jahrbücher* 8: 69–81.
- (1984), 'Zum Virtus-Fragment des Lucilius (1326–1338 Marx) und zur Geschichte der stoischen Güterlehre', *Hermes* 12: 445–68.
- (1985), art. 'Eneide, 6. La lingua', in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* ii. 262–78 (Rome).
- Gransden, K. W. (ed.) (1991) *Virgil Aeneid Book XI* (Cambridge).
- Gratwick, A. S. (1982), 'The Satires of Ennius and Lucilius', in Kenney and Clausen (1982), 156–71.
- Griffin, J. (1985), *Latin Poets and Roman Life* (London) (pp. 1–31 = *JRS* 66 [1976], 87–105).
- Grilli, A. (1978), 'Ennius podager', *RFIC* 106: 34–8.
- Groeber, G. (1884), 'Vulgärlateinische Substrate romanischer Wörter', *ALL* 1: 204–54.
- Guilbert, L. (1965), *La formation du vocabulaire de l'aviation* (Paris).
- Haffter, H. (1934), *Untersuchungen zur allateinischen Dichtersprache* (Problemata, 10) (Berlin).
- (1956), 'Zum Problem der überlangen Wortformen im Lateinischen', *WSt* 69: 363–71.
- Hahn, E. A. (1958), 'Vergil's linguistic treatment of divine beings, part II', *TAPA* 89: 237–53.
- Hakamies, R. (1951), *Étude sur l'origine et l'évolution du diminutive latin et sa survie dans les langues romanes* (Helsinki).
- Halm, C. (ed.) (1863), *Rhetores Latini Minores* (Leipzig).
- Handford, S. A. (1947), *The Latin Subjunctive. Its Usage and Development from Plautus to Terence* (London).
- Hanslik, R. (1969), art. 'Lucilius', in *Der kleine Pauly*, vol. III (Stuttgart).
- Hanssen, J. S. T. (1951), *Latin Diminutives: a Semantic Study* (Bergen).
- Hardie, P. R. (ed.) (1994), *Virgil, Aeneid, Book IX* (Cambridge).
- Harrison, E. L. (1960), 'Neglected hyperbole in Juvenal', *CR NS* 10: 99–101.
- Harrison, S. J. (ed.) (1990), *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford).
- (ed.) (1991), *Vergil, Aeneid 10*, with introduction, translation, and commentary (Oxford).
- Hartung, H. J. (1970), *Ciceros Methode bei der Übersetzung griechischer philosophischer Termini* (Diss. Hamburg).
- Haupt, M. (1841), *Observationes Criticae* (Leipzig) (= 1875: 73–142).
- (1875), *Opuscula I* (Leipzig).
- Heck, B. (1950), *Die Anordnung der Gedichte des C. Valerius Catullus* (Diss. Tübingen).
- Henry, A. (1971), *Métonymie et métaphore* (Paris).

- Herescu, N. I. (1960), *La poésie latine. Étude des structures phoniques* (Paris).
- Heraeus, W. (1937), *Kleine Schriften* (Heidelberg).
- Hermann, G. (1796), *De metris poetarum Graecorum et Romanorum libri III* (Leipzig).
- (1816), *Elementa doctrinae metricae* (Leipzig).
- Hettrich, H. (1988), *Untersuchungen zur Hypotaxe im Vedischen* (Berlin – New York).
- (1990), *Der Agens in passivischen Sätzen altindogermanischer Sprachen* (NAWG, 1. Philologisch-historische Klasse, Nr.2) (Göttingen).
- Heusch, H. (1954), *Das Archaische in der Sprache Catulls* (Diss. Bonn).
- Heurgon, J. (1959), *Lucilius* (Paris).
- Heyne, C. G. and Wagner, G. P. E. (edd.) (1830–33, 4th edn.), *P. Virgili Maronis opera*. (Leipzig).
- Highet, G. (1951), 'Juvenal's Bookcase', *AJP* 72: 369–94.
- (1954), *Juvenal the Satirist. A Study* (Oxford).
- Hillen, M. (1989), *Studien zur Dichtersprache Senecas. Abundanz. Explikativer Ablativ. Hypallage* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 32) (Berlin – New York).
- Hinds, S. E. (1987), 'Language at breaking point: Lucretius 1.452', *CQ* NS 37: 450–3.
- Hofmann, J. B. (1951), *Lateinische Umgangssprache*. 3. Auflage (Heidelberg).
- Hofmann, J. B. and Szantyr, A. (1965), *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II 2.2) (Munich).
- Holford-Strevens, L. (1988), *Aulus Gellius* (London).
- Hollis, A. S. (ed.) (1977), *Ovid, Ars Amatoria Book I, edited with an introduction and commentary* (Oxford).
- Horsfall, N. (1971), 'Numanus Regulus. Ethnography and propaganda in *Aen.* IX.598f.', *Latomus* 30: 1108–16 (= Harrison (1990: 127–44)).
- (1981), 'Some problems of titulature in Roman literary history', *BICS* 28: 103–11.
- Housman, A. E. (1907), 'Luciliana', *CQ* 1: 51–74, 148–59. (= Diggle and Goodyear (1972) ii.662–97.)
- Hunter, R. L. (ed.) (1989), *Apollonius of Rhodes, Argonautica Book III* (Cambridge).
- Hupe, C. (1871), *De genere dicendi C. Valerii Catulli Veronensis. Pars I* (Diss. Münster).
- Hutchinson, G. O. (1988), *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford).
- (1993), *Latin Literature from Seneca to Juvenal. A Critical Study* (Oxford).
- Ilberg, J. (1907), 'A. Cornelius Celsus und die Medizin in Rom', *Neue Jahrbücher* 19: 377–412 (= Flashar (1971), 308–60).
- Jacobson, H. (1974), *Ovid's Heroides* (Princeton, N.J.).
- Jal, A. (1861), *Virgilius nauticus. Études sur la marine antique* (Paris).
- Janni, P. (1967), 'Due note omeriche', *QUCC* 3: 7–30.
- Janni, P. and Mazzini, I. (edd.) (1991), *La traduzione dei classici greci e latini in Italia oggi. Problemi, prospettive, iniziative editoriali* (Atti del Convegno Nazionale, Macerata, 20–22 aprile 1989) (Macerata).
- Janson, T. (1979), *Mechanisms of Language Change in Latin* (Stockholm).

- Janssen, H. H. (1941), *De kenmerken der romeinsche dichtertaal* (Nijmegen – Utrecht).
- Jenkyns, R. (1982), *Three Classical Poets: Sappho, Catullus and Juvenal* (London).
- Jocelyn, H. D. (ed.) (1969a), *The Tragedies of Ennius: the fragments edited with an introduction and commentary* (Cambridge).
- (1969b), 'The fragments of Ennius' Scenic Scripts', *AC* 38: 181–217.
- (1971), 'The Tragedies of Ennius', *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 17: 41–95 (Geneva).
- (1972), 'The Poems of Quintus Ennius', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* I.2.987–1026 (Satires and minor works: 1022–6) (Berlin).
- (1977), 'Ennius, Sat. 6–7 Vahlen', *RFIC* 105: 131–51.
- (1979), 'Catullus 58 and Ausonius, Ep. 71', *LCM* 4: 87–91.
- (1980), 'Marcello Zicàri and the poems of C. Valerius Catullus', *RPL* 3: 55–72.
- (1986), 'The new chapters of the ninth book of Celsus' *Artes*', *PLLS* 5: 299–336 (Liverpool).
- (1995), 'Two Features of the Style of Catullus' Phalaecian Epigrams', *Sileno* 21: 63–82.
- Jouanna, J. (1970), review of Lanata (1968), *REG* 83: 254–7.
- Jouanna, J. and Demont, P. (1981), 'Le sens d' ἰχῶρ chez Homère (*Iliade* V, vv. 340 et 416) et Eschyle (*Agamemnon*, v. 1480) en relation avec les emplois du mot dans la *Collection hippocratique*', *REA* 83: 197–209.
- Kaimio, J. (1979), *The Romans and the Greek Language* (Commentationes Human. Litterarum Soc. Scient. Fenn. 64) (Helsinki–Helsingfors).
- Kaster, R. A. (ed.) (1995), *C. Suetonius Tranquillus, De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus, edited with a translation, introduction and commentary* (Oxford).
- Kenney, E. J. (1958), 'Nequitiae poeta', in N. I. Herescu (ed.), *Ovidiana. Recherches sur Ovide*, 201–9 (Paris).
- (1962), 'The First Satire of Juvenal', *PCPS* NS 8: 29–40.
- (1963), 'Juvenal: Satirist or Rhetorician?', *Latomus* 22: 704–20.
- (ed.) (1971), *Lucretius De Rerum Natura Book III* (Cambridge).
- (1979), 'Two disputed passages in the Heroides', *CQ* NS 29: 394–431.
- (ed.) (1996), *Ovid Heroides XVI–XXI* (Cambridge).
- Kenney, E. J. and Clausen, W. V. (edd.) (1982), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, ii, *Latin Literature* (Cambridge).
- Kingsley, P. (1995), *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery, and Magic: Empedocles and Pythagorean Tradition* (Oxford).
- Knoche, U. (1982; 4th ed.), *Die römische Satire* (Göttingen).
- Knox, P. E. (1986), 'Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and the traditions of Augustan poetry', *PCPS* Suppl. 11 (Cambridge).
- (ed.) (1995) *Ovid Heroides. Select Epistles* (Cambridge).
- Koch, P. (1995), 'Latin vulgaire et traits universels de l'oral', in Callebat (1995: 125–44).
- Korfmacher, W. Ch. (1935), 'Grecizing in Lucilian Satire', *CJ* 30: 453–62.
- Korzeniewski, D. (ed.) (1970), *Die römische Satire* (Wege der Forschung 238) (Darmstadt).
- Krenkel, W. (ed.) (1970; 2 vols), *Lucilius, Satiren. Lateinisch und Deutsch* (Leiden).

- Krause, H. (1878), *De Vergilii usurpatione infinitivi* (Diss. Halle).
- Kroll, W. (1912), 'Der lateinische Relativsatz', *Glotta* 3: 1-18.
- (1913) (repr. 1958), *M. Tullii Ciceronis Orator*. Als Ersatz der Ausgabe von Otto Jahn. Erklärt von W. K. (Berlin).
- (1924), *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart).
- (1925), 3rd ed., repr. 1969, *Die wissenschaftliche Syntax im lateinischen Unterricht* (Dublin).
- (1929), 2nd ed., 1st ed. 1922, reprinted with addenda, 1968), *C. Valerius Catullus* (Stuttgart).
- Kudlien, F. (1963), *Untersuchungen zu Aretaios von Kappadokien* (Mainz).
- Kühner, R. and Stegmann, C. (edd.) (1955; 3rd ed. by A. Thierfelder, 2 vols), *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* (Darmstadt).
- Labate, M. (1984), *L'arte di farsi amare. Modelli culturali e progetto didascalico nell'elegia ovidiana*. (Biblioteca di 'Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei Testi classici', 2) (Pisa).
- Lachmann, K. (1848), 'De Ovidii epistulis', *Prooemium indicis lectionum aestivarum a. 1848 = Kleinere Schriften zur classischen Philologie*, ed. J. Vahlen, 56-61 (Berlin).
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980), *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago).
- Lakoff, G. and Turner, M. (1989), *More than Cool Reason: a Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor* (Chicago).
- Lanata, G. (1966), 'Sul linguaggio amoroso di Saffo', *QUCC* 2: 63-79.
- (1968), 'Linguaggio scientifico e linguaggio poetico. Note al lessico del *De morbo sacro*', *QUCC* 5: 22-36.
- Landgraf, G. (1898), 'Der Accusativ der Beziehung (determinationis)', *ALL* 10: 209-24.
- (1914, 2nd ed.), *Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino* (Leipzig—Berlin)
- Langslow, D. R. (1989), 'Latin technical language: synonyms and Greek words in Latin medical terminology', *TPhS* 87: 33-53.
- (1991), 'The development of Latin medical terminology: some working hypotheses', *PCPS* NS 37: 106-30.
- La Penna, A. (1951), 'Note sul linguaggio erotico dell'elegia latino', *Maia* 4: 187-209.
- (1956a), review of Heusch (1954), *Gnomon* 28: 291-4.
- (1956b), 'Problemi di stile catulliano', *Maia* 8: 141-60.
- Lateiner, D. (1977), 'Obscenity in Catullus', *Ramus* 6: 15-32.
- Lausberg, M. (1990), 'Epos und Lehrgedicht. Ein Gattungsvergleich am Beispiel von Lucans Schlangenkatalog', *Würzburger Jahrbücher* 16: 173-203.
- Lavency, M. and Longrée, D. (edd.) (1989), *Actes du V^e Colloque de Linguistique latine* (Louvain-la-Neuve / Borzée, 31 March-4 April 1989) (*Cahiers de l'Institut de linguistique de Louvain* 15.1-4) (Louvain-la-Neuve).
- Leavis, F. R. (1948, 2nd ed.), *Education and the University, a sketch for an 'English School'* (London).
- Lebreton, J. (1901), *Études sur le langage et la grammaire de Cicéron* (Paris).
- Lee, A.G. (1975), *Tibullus: Elegies* (Cambridge).

- (ed.) (1990), *The Poems of Catullus, Edited with an Introduction, Translation and Brief Notes* (Oxford).
- Lehmann, C. (1979), 'Der Relativsatz vom Indogermanischen bis zum Italienischen. Eine Etüde in diachroner syntaktischer Typologie', *Die Sprache* 25: 1–25.
- (1984), *Der Relativsatz* (Tübingen).
- Lehmann, Y. (1982), 'Varron et la médecine', in Sabbah (1982), 67–72.
- Leishman, J. B. (1956), *Translating Horace* (Oxford).
- Lelièvre, F. J. (1958), 'Parody in Juvenal and T. S. Eliot', *CPh* 53: 22–6.
- Leo, F. (1896), *Analecta Plautina de figuris sermonis I* (Progr. Göttingen) = Fraenkel, E. [ed.], [1960] *Friedrich Leo. Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Erster Band: *Zur römischen Literatur des Zeitalters der Republik*: 71–122 (Rome).
- (1906), 'review of Lucilii carminum reliquiae ed. Marx, vol. I–II, *GGA*: 837–61 (= Fraenkel, E. [ed.] [1960], *Friedrich Leo. Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Erster Band: *Zur römischen Literatur des Zeitalters der Republik*: 221–247 (Rome)).
- (1967), *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. Erster Band: *Die archaische Literatur*. Im Anhang: 'Die römische Poesie in der Sullanischen Zeit' (Darmstadt) (= Unveränderter Nachdruck der Ausgabe Berlin 1913).
- Leumann, M. (1947), 'Die lateinische Dichtersprache', *MH* 4: 116–39 = *Kleine Schriften* (Zürich-Stuttgart 1959) 131–56 = Lunelli (1980) 131–78.
- (1950), *Homerische Wörter* (Basel).
- (1977, 6th ed.), *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II 2.1) (Munich).
- Levinson, S. C. (1983), *Pragmatics* (Cambridge).
- Lévy, C. (1992), 'Cicéron créateur du vocabulaire latin de la connaissance: essai de synthèse', in *La langue latine, langue de la philosophie* (École française de Rome, 161) (Rome).
- Lewis, N. (1959), *Samothrace, the Ancient Literary Sources* (London).
- Leyhausen, J. (1893), *Helenaë et Herus epistulae Ovidii non sunt* (Diss. Halle).
- Linde, P. (1923), 'Die Stellung des Verbs in der lateinischen Prosa', *Glotta* 12: 153–78.
- Lindsay, W. M. (1893), 'The Saturnian metre', *AJP* 14: 139–70, 305–34.
- (1907), *Syntax of Plautus* (Oxford).
- (ed.) (1913; repr. Hildesheim 1978), *Sexti Pompeii Festi de verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome* (Leipzig).
- (1922), *Early Latin Verse* (Oxford).
- Linse, E. (1891), *De P. Ovidio Nasone vocabulorum inventore* (Progr. Dortmund).
- Löfstedt, B. (1990), 'Notizen zu Sprache und Text von Celsus, *De medicina*', *MH* 47: 60–2.
- Löfstedt, E. (1911), *Philologischer Kommentar zur 'Peregrinatio Aetherae'. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache* (Uppsala).
- (1928 [vol. 1]; 1933 [vol. 2]; 1942 [2nd ed. of vol. 1]), *Syntactica. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins I & II* (Lund).
- (1959), *Late Latin* (Oslo).
- Lohmann, A. (1915), *De Graecismorum Vergiliano usu quaestiones selectae* (Diss. Münster).

- Long, A. A., and Sedley, D. N. (1987, 2 vols.), *The Hellenistic Philosophers* (Cambridge).
- Lot, F. (1946), 'La langue du commandement dans les armées romaines', in *Mélanges dédiés à la mémoire de F. Grat* (Paris).
- Luck-Huyse, K. (1996), *Der Traum vom Fliegen in der Antike* (Palingenesia 62) (Stuttgart).
- Lunelli, A. (ed.) (1980, 2nd ed.), *La lingua poetica latina* (contains Italian versions of Janssen (1941) and Leumann (1947) with updated bibliography and annotations) (Bologna).
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1980), *The Latin Love Poets: from Catullus to Horace* (Oxford).
- (1989), *Words and the Poet: Characteristic Techniques of Style in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford).
- McGlynn, P. (1963, 2 vols), *Lexicon Terentianum* (Glasgow).
- McKeown, J. C. (ed.) (1987), *Ovid: Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary* (Liverpool).
- McKie, D. (1984), 'The horrible and ultimate Britons: Catullus, 11.11', *PCPS* NS 30: 74–8.
- Madvig, J. N. (ed.) (1869), *M. Tullii Ciceronis De finibus bonorum et malorum*. 2nd ed. (Copenhagen).
- Maltby, R. (1991), *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (Leeds).
- (1993), 'The Limits of Etymologising', *Aevum Antiquum* 6: 257–75.
- Marache, R. (1964), 'Rhétorique et humour chez Juvénal', in Renard and Schilling (1964), 474–8.
- Marganne, M.-H. (1993), *L'ophtalmologie dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine d'après les papyrus littéraires grecs* (Studies in Ancient Medicine, 8) (Leiden).
- Marichal, R. (1992), *Les ostraca de Bu Njem* (Suppléments de 'Libya Antiqua' 7) (Tripoli).
- Mariner, S. (1963), 'Traiectus lora (Virg. En. II 273)', *Estudios Clasicos* 7: 107–19.
- Mariotti, I. (1954), 'I grecismi di Lucilio', *Stud. Urb.* 28: 357–86.
- (1960), *Studi Luciliani* (Florence).
- Mariotti, S. (1991, 2nd ed.), *Lezioni su Ennio* (Urbino).
- Marouzeau, J. (1907), *Place du pronom personnel sujet en latin* (Paris).
- (1922), *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine, I: Les groupes nominaux* (Paris).
- (1949a), *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine, III: Les articulations de l'énoncé* (Paris).
- (1949b), *Quelques aspects de la formation du latin littéraire* (Collection linguistique 53) (Paris).
- (1962; 4th ed.), *Traité de stylistique latine* (Paris).
- Marshall, P. K. (ed.) (1968, 2 vols), *A. Gellii Noctes Atticae* (Oxford).
- Martyn, J. R. C. (1979), 'Juvenal's Wit', *Grazer Beiträge* 8: 219–38.
- Marx, F. (1882), *Studia Luciliana*. Diss. Bonn.
- (ed.) (1904, 1905), *C. Lucilii carminum reliquiae*. Vol. prius: Prolegomena, testimonia, Fasti Luciliani, carminum reliquiae, indices, Vol. posterius: Commentarius (Leipzig).
- (1909), 'Die Beziehungen des Altlateins zum Spätlatein', *NJb. f. d. class. Altertum*: 434–48.

- ____ (ed.) (1915), *A. Cornelii Celsi quae supersunt* (CML, i; Leipzig-Berlin).
- Mason, H. A. (1963), 'Is Juvenal a Classic?', in Sullivan (1963), 93-176.
- Maurach, G. (1975), 'Ovid, Met. I, 48 und die Figur der "Umkehrung"', *Hermes* 103: 479-86.
- Mayer, R. G. (1983), 'Catullus' divorce', *CQ* 33: 297-8.
- ____ (ed.) (1994), *Horace, Epistles, Book I* (Cambridge).
- Mazzini, I. (1988), 'La medicina nella letteratura latina. I. Osservazioni e proposte interpretative su passi di Lucilio, Lucrezio, Catullo e Orazio', *Aufidus* 4: 45-73.
- ____ (1990), 'Il folle da amore', in Alfonso *et al.* (1990), 39-83.
- ____ (1991a), 'La medicina nella letteratura latina. II. Esegese e traduzione di Horat. *Epod.* 11, 15-16 e *Od.* I 13, 4-5', in Janni and Mazzini (1991), 99-114.
- ____ (1991b), 'Il lessico medico latino antico: caratteri e strumenti della sua differenziazione', in Sabbah (1991), 175-85.
- ____ (1992a), 'La medicina nella letteratura latina. III. Plauto: conoscenze mediche, situazione e istituzioni sanitarie, proposte esegetiche', in Mazzini (1992b), 67-113.
- ____ (ed.) (1992b), *Civiltà materiale e letteratura nel mondo antico* (Atti del Seminario di Studio, Macerata, 28-29 giugno 1991) (Macerata).
- Meillet, A. (1965; 7th ed.), *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque* (Paris).
- Menière, P. (1858), *Études médicales sur les poètes latins* (Paris).
- Mette, H. J. (1956), rev. of E. V. Marmorale, *L'ultimo Catullo, Gnomon* 28: 34-8 (part repr. in R. Heine (ed.) [1975] *Catull* [Wege der Forschung 308, Darmstadt]: 19-23).
- Meyer, W. (1889), 'Caesur im Hendekasyllabus', *SB Bayr. Ak., philosoph.-philol. und hist. Cl.* 2: 208-27.
- Migliorini, P. (1990), *La terminologia medica come strumento espressivo della satira di Persio* (Quaderni di Anazetesis 2) (Pistoia).
- Mignot, X. (1969), *Les verbes dénominatifs latins* (Paris).
- Miller, H.W. (1944), 'Medical terminology in tragedy', *TAPA* 75: 156-67.
- ____ (1945), 'Aristophanes and medical language', *TAPA* 76: 74-84.
- Mohler, S. L. (1948), 'Sails and Oars in the Aeneid', *TAPA* 79: 46-62.
- Momigliano, A. (1957), 'Perizonius, Niebuhr and the character of the early Roman tradition', *JRS* 47: 104-14.
- Morford, M. P. O. (1972), 'A Note on Juvenal 6.627-61', *CPh* 67: 198.
- Mras, K. (1927/28), 'Randbemerkungen zu Lucilius' Satiren', *WS* 46: 78-84.
- Mudry, Ph. (1982), *La préface du De medicina de Celse: Texte, traduction et commentaire* (Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana 19) (Rome).
- Mühmelt, M. (1965), *Griechische Grammatik in der Vergilerklärung*, (Zetemata 37) (Munich).
- Müller, C. F. W. (1869), *Plautinische Prosodie* (Berlin).
- ____ (1908), *Syntax des Nominativs und Akkusativs im Lateinischen* (Leipzig and Berlin).
- Müller, C.W., Sier, K. and Werner, J. (edd.) (1992), *Zum Umgang mit fremden Sprachen in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Palingenesia 36: Kolloquium der Fachrichtungen Klassische Philologie der Universitäten Leipzig und Saarbrücken am 21. und 22. November 1989 in Saarbrücken) (Stuttgart).

- Müller, H. M. (1980), *Erotische Motive in der griechischen Dichtung bis auf Euripides* (Hamburg).
- Müller, K. (ed.) (1975), *T. Lucreti Cari: De rerum natura libri sex* (Zurich).
- Münscher, K. (1921), 'Metrische Beiträge II. Erstarrte Formen im Versbau der Aiolier', *Hermes* 56: 66–103.
- Munari, F. (1971), 'Textkritisches zu mittellateinischen Dichtern' in Coseriu, E. and Stempel, W.-D. (edd.) *Festschrift für Harri Meier zum 65. Geburtstag* (Munich).
- Murgatroyd, P. (1980), *Tibullus I: A Commentary* (Pietermaritzburg).
- (1994), *Tibullus: Elegies II* (Oxford).
- Myers, R. and Ormsby, R. J. (1970), *Catullus. The Complete Poems for Modern Readers* (New York).
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993), *Duelling Languages. Grammatical Structure in Code-switching* (Oxford).
- Mynors, R. A. B. (ed.) (1958), *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina* (Oxford).
- (ed.) (1990), *Virgil, Georgics, edited with an introduction and commentary* (Oxford).
- Nagle, B. R. (1980), *The Poetics of Exile: Program and Polemic in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto of Ovid*. (Collection Latomus, 170) (Brussels).
- Naiditch, P. G. (1988), 'Three notes on "Housman and Ennius"' *Housman Society Journal* 14: 46–9.
- Naylor, H. D. (1922), *Horace, Odes and Epodes: A Study in Poetic Word-Order* (Cambridge).
- Neue, F. and Wagener, C. (1892–1905; 3rd ed.), *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* (Berlin).
- Neumann, G. (1968), 'Sprachnormung im klassischen Latein', *Sprache der Gegenwart* 2: 88–97.
- Newman, J. K. (1990), *Roman Catullus and the Modification of the Alexandrian Sensibility* (Hildesheim).
- Nilsson, N.-O. (1952), *Metrische Stildifferenzen in den Satiren des Horaz* (Stockholm).
- Nisbet, R. G. M. (1978), 'Notes on the text of Catullus', *PCPS* NS 24: 92–115 (=1995: 76–100).
- (1995), S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Collected Papers on Latin Literature* (Oxford).
- Nisbet, R. G. M. and Hubbard, M. (1970), *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book 1* (Oxford).
- (1978), *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book II* (Oxford).
- Norden, E. (ed.) (1903; 1957, repr. of 2nd ed., 1915), *P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis Buch VI* (Leipzig and Stuttgart).
- (ed.) (1910), *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* (Berlin).
- Nowotny, W. (1962), *The Language Poets Use* (London).
- Nutton, V. (1993), 'Roman medicine: tradition, confrontation, assimilation', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW*, II.37: 1, 49–78 (Berlin).
- Önnerfors, A. (1963), *In Medicinam Plinii studia philologica* (Lunds Univ. Årsskrift. N.F. Avd. 1. Bd 55, Nr 5) (Lund).
- (1989), 'Dare und Auris/Auricula im Spätlatein', *Symb. Osl.* 64: 130–57.

- (1993), 'Das medizinische Latein von Celsus bis Cassius Felix', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* II.37: 1, 227–392 (Berlin).
- Ortony, A. (1979), *Metaphor and Thought* (Cambridge).
- Paganelli, D. (1961), *Properce: Élégies* (Paris).
- Page, D. L. (1936), review of Dumortier (1935), *CR* 50: 17–18.
- Palmer, A. (ed.), (1898) *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides with the Greek translation of Planudes* [Completed by L. C. Purser.] (Oxford).
- Palmer, L. R. (1954), *The Latin Language* (London).
- Paludan, E. (1941), 'The development of the Latin elegy', *CIMed* 4: 204–29.
- Pascucci, G. (1961), 'consens, praesens, absens', *SIFC* 33: 1–61.
- Pasquali, G. (1981), *Preistoria della poesia romana: con un saggio introduttivo di Sebastiano Timpanaro* (Florence).
- Patzer, H. (1955), 'Zum Sprachstil des neoterischen Hexameters', *MH* 12: 77–95.
- Pearce, T. E. V. (1966), 'The enclosing word order in the Latin hexameter' *CQ* NS 16: 140–71; 298–320.
- Peppler, C. W. (1910), 'The termination *-κος*, as used by Aristophanes for comic effect', *AJP* 31: 428–44.
- Peter, H. (1901), *Der Brief in der römischen Literatur* (Leipzig).
- Petersmann, H. (1986), 'Der Begriff *satura* und die Entstehung der Gattung', in Adamietz (1986), 7–24.
- (1989), 'Die Urbanisierung des römischen Reiches im Lichte der lateinischen Sprache', *Glotta* 96: 406–28.
- (1992), 'Vulgärlateinisches aus Byzanz' in Müller, C. W. et al. (1992), 219–31.
- (1995a), 'Soziale und lokale Aspekte in der Vulgärsprache Petrons', in Callebat (1995), 533–47.
- (1995b), 'Zur mündlichen Charakterisierung des Fremden in der Komödie des Plautus', in Benz et al. (1995), 123–36.
- (forthcoming), 'Language and style as means of characterization in the comedies of Plautus', *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*.
- Phillips, J. H. (1984), 'Lucretius and the (Hippocratic) *On Breaths*: Addenda', in Sabbah (1984), 83–5.
- Pigeaud, J. (1980), 'La physiologie de Lucrèce', *REL* 58: 176–200.
- (1982), 'Virgile et la médecine. Quelques réflexions sur l'utilisation de la pensée physiologique dans les Géorgiques', *Helmantica* 33: 539–60.
- (1988), 'Die Medizin in der Lehrdichtung des Lukrez und des Vergil', in Binder (1988), 216–39.
- Pinkster, H. (1987), 'The pragmatic motivation for the use of subject pronouns in Latin: the case of Petronius', in *Études de linguistique générale et de linguistique latine offertes en hommage à Guy Serbat*, 369–79 (Paris).
- Pinotti, P. (ed.) (1988), *Publio Ovidio Nasone, Remedia Amoris* (Edizioni e saggi universitari di filologia classica, 39) (Bologna).
- Platnauer, M. (1951), *Latin Elegiac Verse* (Cambridge).
- Ploen, H. (1882), *De copiae verborum differentiis inter varia poesis Romanae antiquioris genera intercedentibus* (Diss. Strasbourg).
- Poncelet, R. (1957), *Cicéron traducteur de Platon. L'expression de la pensée complexe en latin classique* (Paris).

- Powell, J. G. F. (1987), 'The *farrago* of Juvenal 1.86 reconsidered', in Whitby, Hardie and Whitby (1987).
- (ed.) (1988), *Cicero: Cato Maior De Senectute* (Cambridge).
- (1995a) 'Cicero's translations from Greek', in Powell (1995b), 273–300.
- (ed.) (1995b), *Cicero the Philosopher* (Oxford).
- Puelma Piwonka, M. (1949), *Lucilius und Kallimachos. Zur Geschichte einer Gattung der hellenistisch-römischen Poesie* (Frankfurt am Main).
- Pye, D. W. (1963), 'Latin 3rd plural perfect indicative active — Its endings in verse usage', *TPhS*: 1–27
- Radermacher, L. (1951), *Artium Scriptores (Reste der voraristotelischen Rhetorik)*. (Österr. Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl., Sitzungsberichte, 227. Bd., 3. Abh.) (Vienna).
- Ramage, E. S. (1957), *Urbanitas, rusticitas, peregrinitas: the Roman view of proper Latin* (Cincinnati).
- Rand, E. K. (1925), *Ovid and his Influence* (London, Calcutta, Sydney).
- Rawson, E. D. (1969), *The Spartan Tradition in European Thought* (Oxford).
- (1985), *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic* (London).
- Reichenkron, G. (1961), 'Zur römischen Kommandosprache bei byzantinischen Schriftstellern', *Byz. Zeitschr.* 54: 18–27
- Reitzenstein, R. (1893), *Epigramm und Skolion. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der alexandrinischen Dichtung* (Giessen).
- (1907), art. 'Epigramm', *RE* 6.1: 71–111.
- (1912), *Zur Sprache der lateinischen Erotik* (Sitzungsab. d. Heidelberger Ak. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl., 12. Abh.) (Heidelberg).
- Renard, M., and Schilling, R. (edd.) (1964), *Hommages à Jean Bayet*, (Collection Latomus 70) (Brussels).
- Riemann, O. (1885; 2nd ed.), *Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Tite-Live* (Paris).
- Risch, E. (1984), *Gerundivum und Gerundium. Gebrauch im klassischen und älteren Latein. Entstehung und Vorgeschichte* (Berlin–New York).
- Risselada, R. (1993), *Imperatives and Other Directive Expressions in Latin* (Amsterdam).
- Roby, H. J. (1896), *A grammar of the Latin language from Plautus to Suetonius. Part II Syntax* (London).
- Romaine, S. (1995; ed. 1, 1989), *Bilingualism* (Oxford).
- Romano, A. C. (1979), *Irony in Juvenal* (Hildesheim and New York).
- Ronconi, A. (1938), 'Stile e lingua di Catullo', *A & R* III 6: 139–56 (= 1950: 23–47).
- (1939), 'Allitterazione e stile in Catullo', *Stud. Urb.* 13B: 1–77 (= 1953: 9–82 = 1971: 11–86).
- (1940a), 'Per la storia del diminutivo latino. Studi esegetici e stilistici', *Stud. Urb.* 14B: 1–45 (= 1953: 107–50 = 1971: 87–130).
- (1940b), 'Atteggiamenti e forme della parodia catulliana', *A & R* III 8: 141–58 (= 1953: 193–212 = 1971: 173–92).
- (1950), *Da Lucrezio a Tacito* (Messina–Florence).
- (1971; ed. 1, 1953), *Studi catulliani* (Bari–Brescia).
- van Rooy, C. A. (1965), *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory* (Leiden).

- Rösler, W. (1989), 'Typenhäuser bei Aischylos?', in Schuller *et al.* (1989), 109–14.
- Ross, D. O. (1969), *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, Mass.)
- Rothstein, M. (1966; 3rd ed.), *Sextus Propertius: Elegien* (Dublin — Zurich).
- Rudd, N. (1960), 'Horace on the origins of *satura*', *Phoenix* 14: 36–44.
- (1986), *Themes in Roman Satire* (London).
- Ruijgh, C. J. (1957), *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique* (Assen).
- Sabbah, G. (ed.) (1982), *Médecins et médecine dans l'antiquité* (Centre Jean Palerne: Mémoires, iii) (Saint-Étienne).
- (ed.) (1984), *Textes médicaux latins antiques* (Centre Jean Palerne: Mémoires, v) (Saint-Étienne).
- (ed.) (1991), *Le latin médical. La constitution d'un langage scientifique* (Centre Jean Palerne: Mémoires, x) (Saint-Étienne).
- Safarewicz, J. (1965), 'Uwagi o języku Lucyliusza', *Eos* 55: 96–105.
- Sager, J. C., Dungworth, D. and McDonald, P. F. (1980), *English Special Languages: Principles and Practice in Science and Technology* (Wiesbaden).
- de Saint-Denis, E. (1935), *Le rôle de la mer dans la poésie latine* (Paris).
- (1965), *Essais sur le rire et le sourire des Latins* (Paris).
- Schäublin, C. (1988), 'Housman and Ennius', *Housman Society Journal* 14: 42–5.
- Schawaller, D. (1987), 'Semantische Wortspiele in Ovids Metamorphosen und Heroides', *Gräzer Beiträge* 14: 199–214.
- Scherer, A. (1963), 'Die Sprache des Archilochos', in *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 10: 89–107 (Geneva).
- Schmid, P. (1964), 'Juvénal. Essai d'une définition stylistique'. Résumé, in *REL* 42: 57–9.
- Schmid, W. and Stählin, O. (1929), *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, I: i (Munich).
- Schmidt, B. (ed.) (1887), *C. Valeri Catulli Veronensis carmina* (Leipzig).
- (1914), 'Die Lebenszeit Catulls und die Herausgabe seiner Gedichte', *RhM* 69: 267–83.
- Schmidt, E.A. (1977), 'Lucilius kritisiert Ennius und andere Dichter. Zu Lucilius fr. 148 Marx', *MH* 34: 122–9.
- (1985), *Catull* (Heidelberg).
- Schmitt, R. (1967), *Dichtung und Dichtersprache im indogermanischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden).
- Scholte, A. (ed.) (1933), *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Ex Ponto Liber Primus commentario exegetico instructus* (Amersfoort).
- Scholz, U.W. (1986a), 'Der frühe Lucilius und Horaz', *Hermes* 114: 335–65.
- (1986b), 'Die *satura* des Q. Ennius', in Adamietz (1986), 25–53.
- Schreiber, G. (1917), *De Lucili syntaxi* (Diss. Greifswald).
- Schünke, E. (1906), *De traiectione coniunctionum et pronominis relativi apud poetas Latinos* (Diss. Kiel).
- Schuller, W., Hoepfner, W. and Schwandner, E. L. (edd.) (1989), *Demokratie und Architektur: Der hippodamische Städtebau und die Entstehung der Demokratie* (Konstanzer Symposium vom 17. bis 19. Juli 1987) (Munich).
- Schulze, K. P. (1920), 'Bericht über die Literatur zu Catullus für die Jahre 1905–1920', *Bursians Jahresb.* 183: 1–72.
- Schuster, M. (1948), art. '(123) C. Valerius Catullus', *RE* II.7.2: 2353–410.

- (ed.) (1949), *Catulli Veronensis liber* (Leipzig).
- Schweizer, H. J. (1967), *Vergil und Italien* (Aarau).
- Sconocchia, S. (ed.) (1983), *Scribonii Largi Compositiones* (Leipzig).
- (1993), 'L'opera di Scribonio Largo e la letteratura medica latina del 1. sec. d. C.', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW II.37: 1*, 843–922. (Berlin).
- Scott (Ryberg), I. G. (1927), *The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal* (Smith College Classical Studies 8) (Northampton, Mass.).
- Sebeok, T. A. (ed.) (1960), *Style in Language* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Sedley, D. N. (1988), 'Epicurean anti-reductionism', in Barnes and Mignucci (1988), 295–327.
- (1989), 'The proems of Empedocles and Lucretius', *GRBS* 30: 269–96.
- (1992) 'Sextus Empiricus and the atomist criteria of truth', *Elenchos* 13: 21–56.
- Segal, C. (1990), *Lucretius on Death and Anxiety* (Princeton).
- Segebade, J. (1895), *Vergil als Seemann. Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung und Würdigung des Dichters*. Progr.d.Gymn. (Oldenburg).
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (ed.) (1965), *Cicero's Letters to Atticus. II 58–54 B.C. 46–93 (Books III and IV)* (Cambridge).
- (ed.) (1977), *Cicero: Epistulae ad Familiares. I 62–47 B.C.* (Cambridge).
- (1992), 'Homoeoteleuton in non-dactylic Latin verse', *RFIC* 120: 67–71.
- (1994), *Homoeoteleuton in Latin Dactylic Verse* (Stuttgart—Leipzig).
- Sharrock, A. R. (1994), *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's Ars Amatoria 2* (Oxford).
- Shipley, F. W. (1911), 'The heroic clausula in Cicero and Quintilian', *CPh* 6: 410–18.
- Silk, M. S. (1974), *Interaction in Poetic Imagery with Special Reference to Early Greek Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Simpson, F. P. (1879), *Select Poems of Catullus* (London).
- Skutsch, F. (1892), *Plautinisches und Romanisches. Studien zur plautinischen Prosodie* (Leipzig).
- Skutsch, O. (1934), *Prosodische und metrische Gesetze der Iambenkürzung* (Forschungen z. griech. u. latein. Grammatik 10) (Göttingen).
- (1964), 'Rhyme in Horace', *BICS* 11: 73–8.
- (1969), 'Metrical variations and some textual problems in Catullus', *BICS* 16: 38–43.
- (1976), 'Notes on Catullus', *BICS* 23: 18–22.
- (1980), 'Catullus 58.4–5', *LCM* 5: 21.
- (1985), *The 'Annals' of Quintus Ennius edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford).
- Smith, K. F. (1913), *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus* (New York).
- Smith, W. S. (ed.) (1989), 'Heroic models for the sordid present: Juvenal's view of tragedy', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW II.33.1*: 811–23 (Berlin).
- Soubiran, J. (1966), *L'élision dans la poésie latine* (Paris).
- Spies, A. (1930), *Militat omnis amans* (Diss. Tübingen).
- von Staden, H. (1989), *Herophilus: the Art of Medicine in Early Alexandria* (Cambridge).
- Stevens, E. B. (1953), 'Uses of hyperbaton in Latin poetry', *CIW* 46: 200–5.
- Sullivan, J. P. (ed.) (1963), *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Satire* (London).

- Summers, W. C. (1910), *Select Letters of Seneca edited with introductions and explanatory notes* (London).
- Svennung, J. (1935), *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache* (Uppsala).
- (1945), *Catulls Bildersprache. Vergleichende Stilstudien I* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 3) (Uppsala—Leipzig).
- Swanson, D. C. (1962), *A Formal Analysis of Lucretius' Vocabulary* (Minneapolis).
- Syndikus, H. P. (1984), *Catull. Eine Interpretation. Erster Teil. Die kleinen Gedichte (1–60)* (Darmstadt).
- Terzaghi, N. (ed.) (1934, 2nd ed.), *Lucilio*, (Turin) (Repr. Hildesheim, New York 1979).
- (ed.) (1966), *Saturarum Reliquiae* (Florence).
- Thierfelder, A. (1955), 'De morbo hepaticario', *RhM* 98: 190–2.
- Thill, A. (1979), *Alter ab illo. Recherches sur l'imitation dans la poésie personnelle à l'époque Augustéenne* (Paris).
- Thomas, R. F. (ed.) (1988, 2 vols), *Virgil, Georgics* (Cambridge).
- Thomson, D. F. S. (ed.) (1978), *Catullus. A Critical Edition. Edited and Introduced* (Chapel Hill).
- Tovar, A. (1969), 'Lucilio y el latín de España', in *Studi linguistici in onore de V. Pisani*, ii.1019–32 (Brescia).
- Townend, G. B. (1973), 'The literary substrata to Juvenal's satires', *JRS* 63: 148–60.
- Tracy, V. A. (1971), 'The authenticity of *Heroides* 16–21', *CJ* 66: 328–30.
- Tränkle, H. (1960), *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache* (Hermes Einzelschriften 15) (Wiesbaden).
- (1967a), 'Ausdrucksfülle bei Catull', *Philologus* 111: 198–211.
- (1967b), 'Neoterische Kleinigkeiten', *MH* 24: 87–103.
- (1981), 'Catullprobleme', *MH* 38: 245–58.
- Traina, A. (1975), 'Orazio e Catullo' in *Poeti latini (e neolatini). Note e saggi filologici*: 253–75 (Bologna).
- Untermann, J. (1971), 'Entwürfe zu einer Enniusgrammatik', *Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt* 17: 209–51 (Geneva).
- (1977), 'Zur semantischen Organisation des lateinischen Wortschatzes', *Gymnasium* 84: 313–39.
- Väänänen, V. (1966, 3rd ed.), *Le Latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes* (Berlin).
- Vairel-Carron, H. (1975), *Exclamation. Ordre et défense* (Paris).
- Van Sickle, J. B. (1968), 'About form and feeling in Catullus 65', *TAPA* 99: 487–508.
- Vechner, D. (1610, ed. 1, Frankfurt; ed. 2 Strasburg 1630; ed. 3 Leipzig 1680; ed. 4 Gotha 1733 (Heusinger)), *Hellenolexia*.
- Vessey, D. W. T. C. (1969), 'Notes on Ovid, *Heroides* 9', *CQ* NS 19: 349–61.
- Vetter, E. (1953), *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*, I. Band: Texte mit Erklärung, Glossen, Wörterverzeichnis (Heidelberg).
- Vollmer, F. (1923), *Römische Metrik*, in A. Gercke and E. Norden (edd.), *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*. I. Band: 8. Heft (Leipzig & Berlin).
- Wackernagel, J. (1892), 'Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1:333–436 (= *Kleine Schriften* (1955) i. 1–104 (Göttingen)).

- (1926 [vol. 1], 1928 [vol. 2]), *Vorlesungen über Syntax* (Basel).
- Walde, A. and Hofmann, J. B. (1930–1956, 2 vols), *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg).
- Waszink, J. H. (1971), 'Problems concerning the Satura of Ennius', *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 17: 97–147. (Geneva).
- Watkins, C. W. (1982), 'Aspects of Indo-European poetics', in E. C. Polomé (ed.), *The Indo-Europeans in the fourth and third millennia*, 104–20 (Ann Arbor).
- (1989), 'New parameters in historical linguistics, philology and cultural history', *Language* 65: 783–99.
- (1995), *How to Kill a Dragon. Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (New York – Oxford).
- Watson, P. (1983), 'Puella and Virago', *Glotta* 61: 119–43.
- (1985), 'Axelson revisited: the selection of vocabulary in Latin poetry', *CQ* NS 35: 430–48.
- Weinreich, O. (1959), 'Catull c. 60', *Hermes* 87: 75–90.
- (1960), *Catull. Liebesgedichte und sonstige Dichtungen* (Hamburg).
- (1962; 2nd ed.), *Römische Satiren* (Zürich und Stuttgart).
- Weis, R. (1992), 'Zur Kenntnis des Griechischen im Rom der republikanischen Zeit', in Müller, C. W. et al. (1992), 137–42.
- Weise, F. O. (1882), *Die griechischen Wörter in Latein* (repr. 1964 Leipzig).
- Wellmann, M. (1931), *Hippokratesglossare* (Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Medizin, 2) (Berlin).
- West, D. A. (1969), *Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius* (Edinburgh).
- West, M. L. (1982), *Greek Metre* (Oxford).
- Westphal, R. (1867), *Catulls Gedichte in ihrem geschichtlichen Zusammenhange* (Breslau).
- Whitby, M., Hardie, P., and Whitby, M. (edd.) (1987), *Homo Viator. Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol).
- Wiesen, D. S. (1989), 'The verbal basis for Juvenal's satiric vision', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* II.33.1: 708–33 (Berlin).
- Wifstrand, A. (1933), *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos* (Lund).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1898), 'De uersu Phalaecei' in *Mélanges Henri Weil* (Paris), 449–61 (revised in 1921: 137–53).
- (1921), *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin).
- Wilhelm, F. (1925), 'Zu Ovid Ex Ponto I,3', *Philologus* 81: 155–67.
- Wilkinson, L. P. (1959), 'The language of Virgil and Homer', *CQ* NS 9: 181–92.
- (1963), *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge).
- Williams, G. W. (1968), *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford).
- Williams, R. D. (ed.) (1960), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quintus* (Oxford).
- Wills, J. (1996), *Repetition in Latin Poetry. Figures of Allusion* (Oxford).
- Winterbottom, M. (1977a), 'A Celtic hyperbaton?', *The Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 27: 207–12.
- (1977b), 'Aldhelm's prose style and its origins', *Anglo-Saxon England* 6: 50–1.
- Wiseman, T. P. (1969), *Catullan Questions* (Leicester).
- (1974), *Cinna the Poet, and Other Roman Essays* (Leicester).

- _____ (1979), 'On what Catullus doesn't say', *Latin Teaching* 35 n. 6: 11–15.
- Wölfflin, E. (1882), 'Über die Aufgaben der lateinischen Lexikographie', *RhM* 37: 83–121.
- _____ (1885), 'Das adverbelle *cetera, alia, omnia*', *ALL* 2: 90–9.
- _____ (1886), 'Der substantivierte Infinitiv', *ALL* 3: 70–91.
- Wyke, M. (1989), 'Mistress and metaphor in Augustan elegy', *Helios* 16: 25–47.
- Zanker, G. (1987), *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry: a Literature and its Audience* (London–Sydney–Wolfeboro, NH).
- Zicàri, M. (1964), 'Some metrical and prosodical features of Catullus' poetry', *Phoenix* 18: 193–205 (= 1978: 203–19).
- _____ (1978), *Scritti catulliani* (Urbino).
- Zwierlein, O. (1986), *Kritischer Kommentar zu den Tragödien Senecas* (Akad. d. Wiss. u. d. Literatur Mainz, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Einzelveröffentlichung 6) (Wiesbaden).