

Introduction

J. N. ADAMS & R. G. MAYER

THE MUSES WERE NOT warmly welcomed by the peoples of ancient Italy. The Etruscans, for instance, who clearly had a dramatic poetry, never produced a literature that we know of. Other peoples in Italy too, though they doubtless composed songs and performed dramas, for instance the Atellan farces, have not left a written literature of texts. (It is significant that Ennius, who claimed to have three hearts — Greek, Latin and Oscan — did not undertake to produce Oscan poems in writing.) The Romans too sang panegyrics, according to Cicero (*Brutus* 75), but of the Italic peoples only they in the course of time embarked upon the enterprise of committing newly composed poems to writing as texts, and that only after their city had been a political and social organism for some five centuries.

To some degree they owed this change of heart to accident; as chief city of the peninsula in the third century, Rome proved a magnet for literary (among other) talents, and some of her earliest authors were *semigraeci*, according to Suetonius, *Gramm.* 1, brought up in the Hellenic tradition of writing. Their first steps were not taken in vain, and for about two hundred and fifty years thereafter Latin-speakers developed an impressive verse literature, generally modelled upon the Greek. Their task was by no means easy, since their medium, the Latin language, was not a match for the suppler forms of Greek, varied by distinct dialects, especially the Attic (Quintilian in the late first century AD still reckoned that Latin was no match for it in comedy: *mihi sermo ipse Romanus non recipere uideatur illam solis concessam Atticis uenerem*, *Inst.* 10.1.100). Indeed, the heart of the problem was that Latin lacked altogether an artificial, yet universally received, poetic diction and syntax, such as we find in Homer and Hesiod (cf. Jocelyn (1969a: 38) 'in third-century Latium there seem to have been no commonly recognised traditions of public poetry . . . in place of the three very distinct vocabularies of the Attic stage they offered one'). The language did however have traditional resources of high style,

for instance, alliteration, lexical and morphological archaism, which had long been exploited in prayers and the terminology of law (cf. Jocelyn (1969a: 39 with notes)). What the first writers of Latin poetry had above all to do was to develop the resources of their language, and so far as possible create the impression of a poetic medium out of what lay to hand. They thus remained true to the character of the native language as they perceived it; for example, poetic compound words were in general more restricted in both frequency and type than in Greek (Palmer 1954: 102–3). But they elaborated it into a medium that satisfactorily ranged from satire and invective through elegy, drama and lyric, to the grandest heroic epos. The study of this process of linguistic development in verse and its results has long occupied professional students of the language (there is a convenient summary in Palmer (1954: 95–118)). But since there are still new things to be said about the ways in which the poets used the Latin language, we decided to organize a symposium at which philological aspects of poetic usage in the classical period would be discussed. The British Academy generously undertook to host the sessions and to publish the proceedings.¹

We have tried to group the essays together so far as their themes suggest relationships within the collection. The order is as follows.

First, R. G. G. Coleman tackles the topic at the heart of the symposium and broadly surveys the concepts of poetic diction, discourse and register. Many of the issues he touches upon, e.g. archaism and the debt to Greek, recur in the later essays, but he widens the focus to include the use of metaphor and of specifically poetic syntax. There follow two studies on word order by J. N. Adams and R. G. M. Nisbet; the former concerns the relationship between ordinary usage and certain ‘poetic’ patterns, the latter the highly artificial structures of Horace. The influence of Greek and the use of technical vocabularies are the themes of the papers by R. G. Mayer on the concept of grecism, D. R. Langslow on scientific language and D. Sedley on Lucretius’ philosophical language; the latter two complement each other. W. Görler and J. H. W. Penney focus upon syntactic matters, Görler upon unexpected usages of transitive verbs which may amount to metaphor, Penney upon features that derive from the oldest stratum of the language’s usage. The remaining studies are all concerned with stylistic variation within particular authors or genres: H. Petersmann and J. G. F. Powell on satirists, H. D. Jocelyn on Catullus, R. Maltby on elegists and E. J. Kenney on Ovid.

¹ Dr S. J. Harrison delivered a paper on Virgil’s etymologizing of names, but, on learning of the imminent publication of J. J. O’Hara’s *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* (Ann Arbor 1996), decided that his own contribution did not advance the matter sufficiently beyond O’Hara’s to justify its inclusion in this volume.

We now attempt neither a summary of the content of the papers published nor a general definition of 'poetic language', but rather seek to highlight some of the recurrent themes of the volume and to clarify some of the terminology used.

Terms such as 'common parlance' (Kenney p. 402), 'ordinary discourse' (Jocelyn p. 343), 'everyday language' (Jocelyn p. 342), 'ordinary language' (Jocelyn pp. 350, 351), 'speech, spoken language' (Coleman p. 33, Adams p. 98), 'colloquialism' *et sim.* (Coleman pp. 38, 39, 43, 84) and even 'Vulgar Latin' (Coleman pp. 40, 46) abound in the volume. Since they may either overlap or be used inconsistently, it is appropriate to offer an overview here.

The 'language' of Latin poetry was of course Latin (note the remarks of Coleman p. 25), though admittedly a Latin which sometimes took elements of vocabulary, syntax, morphology, word order and even sound from Greek, or in the case of satire from other languages or dialects of Italy (Petersmann pp. 292, 308-9). It is easy to exaggerate the differences between the varieties and registers of extant Latin. Terms freely used such as the 'language of medicine', 'legal Latin' have the effect of diminishing the common elements shared by technical, colloquial and other varieties of the language. Indeed despite the currency of the capitalized expression 'Vulgar Latin' it is well to remember that in the active voice, at least, a good deal of the verb morphology found in the high literary language of the classical period passed on into the Romance languages; the masses of ordinary speakers were using much the same verb system as the small literate élite, and not a grossly simplified, or different, language. And in poetry there are no extensive differences between the morphology and syntax of the various poets.

'NEUTRAL' TERMS

Powell (p. 324) notes that any language is bound to contain a large number of words and constructions that are neutral as regards register (cf. p. 325: 'much of Juvenal's vocabulary, and more of his sentence construction than is often supposed, is simply neutral for register'). 'Neutrality' seems to us to be a useful concept to embrace the words, morphology and syntax shared at any one time by different forms of writing and speech. If one were to assess the distribution and stylistic level of the words that make up the first seven lines of the *Aeneid* (some 50+), one would find that no more than a small handful of terms (about four) were not 'neutral' Latin, though the issue is complicated by the fact that words in combination have syntax, order and morphology, and in all three areas there are departures

from the strictly neutral in the seven lines. Not that morphological departures amount to much: only *superum* has an ending which is not standard Latin, and even that is not particularly striking (Coleman p. 41, Petersmann p. 305).

We believe that when Kenney (p. 402), speaking of a use of *infundo* in Ovid, attributes it to 'common parlance (rather than colloquial) . . . in Ovid's day', he was thinking of our neutral Latin. And elsewhere (p. 405), commenting on *famam . . . tenebo*, he notes that it is difficult to detect anything in either diction or the combination of words that tends to place a phrase such as this in a specific register: '*In this sense its literary effect can be classified as "neutral"*' (our italics).

'PROSAIC' TERMS

There may be a difference between words that are 'neutral' Latin, and those that are 'prosaic'. If a word were avoided entirely by poets, but used for instance by Cicero in his speeches, it might in theory qualify for some such designation as 'prosaic', 'unpoetic' or the like. But words belonging to the common stock of the language, at home as well in verse as prose — in *Aen.* 1.1–7 note for example *arma, uir, primus, ora, fatum, uenio, litus, multum* (adverbial), *ille, terra, iacto*, etc. — cannot reasonably bear such a designation. Thus, while we agree with the gist of Coleman's observation (p. 55) on epigram 85 of Catullus (*odi et amo*) that it is the 'most remarkable case in Latin of a sequence of prosaic [*sic*] words combining to create a powerful effect' (and cf. his later remark, 'every word here is prosaic'), we would suggest that most of the words in question are not 'prosaic' in the restricted sense defined above, but neutral.²

'FORMAL' SPEECH OR PROSE

Another example of Kenney's may be used to introduce a slightly different category of usage, which further suggests the need for a refinement of the blanket term 'prosaism'. At *Her.* 17.37–40 Ovid has the construction *non quo . . . sed quia*, noted by Kenney (p. 407) as a favourite of Cicero's, and found apparently nowhere else in Latin poetry. Here *par excellence* is a 'prosaism' (Kenney p. 407), but in this case one might feel that that is too

² Mayer (1994: 16 with the references in n. 57) briefly tackled this issue of designating words in poetry as prosaic, by pointing out that the English word bears connotations that do not satisfactorily describe the usage of formal Latin prose.

imprecise a term, since in English 'prose' embraces a vast spectrum of texts or utterances from the most mundane piece of conversation to highly formal rhetoric. The construction was perhaps more at home in *formal* prose or speech (and its attestation in Cicero's letters as well as his speeches does not invalidate that suggestion) than in non-elaborate, functional or colloquial prose or speech. By its very nature it is overtly rhetorical, in that it tends to contrast an actual reason with an attributed or rejected reason (Kenney p. 407), and as such it is a more complex manifestation of the type of opposition which takes the form of 'not A but B'.³

Kenney (p. 412) accounts for Ovid's admission of this usage of what we might label 'formal' prose or speech from the more 'adversarial tone of these epistles as compared with the single *Heroides*'.

The Latin language had resources of word order and collocation for expressing effects carried in English by, say, intonation. Focused terms were typically placed at the head or end of a colon, and an initial focused term could be further highlighted by attaching to it certain types of enclitic, such as focusing particles, e.g. *quidem*, the copula (which statistically is more common after the predicate in the order subject-predicate-copula), or alternatively a nominative personal pronoun (*ego, tu*), even when that pronoun was not motivated by its own emphasis. This type of placement of *ego/tu* was certainly at home in formal speech or prose, and indeed it seems to have given rise to certain hackneyed oratorical collocations such as *credo ego*, which opens Cicero's *Pro S. Roscio* and is found in speeches in Livy (Adams p. 105). It probably occurred across a wider spectrum of speech than the *non quo . . . sed quia* construction, but the categories we are setting up do not have absolutely clear-cut boundaries and the evidence is inadequate to determine how far down the scale of formality a construction such as *credo ego* extended. Certainly the presence of the structure in, say, Catullus would seem to reflect an attempt to catch the tones of formal speech in certain types of verse (hendecasyllabic, elegiac).

COLLOQUIALISM AND ORALITY

Educated speakers may admit in informal utterances or writing 'colloquial' usages which they exclude from their formal performances and tend to associate with the lower social dialects (see Cic. *Fam.* 9.21.1 on *plebeius sermo* as appropriate to epistles). Two cases in point might be Cicero's

³ Compare again the remarks of Mayer (1994: 18) on Hor. *Ep.* 1.8.4 *haud quia*, a poeticization of the Ciceronian formula.

use of *uenire in buccam* in the letters, where *bucca* has the sense of *os* and anticipates, e.g. Fr. *bouche* (see Powell (p. 328)), and Lucilius' use of *demagis*, whence Sp. *demás* (see Petersmann (p. 305)). The colloquial usage of the educated does not however overlap completely with that of the uneducated.

There is another dimension to the colloquial. We refer to various forms of imperfect performance which are associated with oral delivery. Recently attempts have been made to identify universal features of oral performance (Koch 1995), features alluded to by Coleman (p. 24) as 'false starts, nonce mispronunciations, abrupt and ungrammatical transitions, anacolutha, rambling pleonasm and banal repetition, not to mention mere noise'. There is a difference between the deliberate use in colloquial speech, or indeed high literature for that matter, of an item belonging mainly to the lower, non-literary registers (e.g. *bucca* = *os*, *demagis*), and the failure under conditions of stress or in a heated spoken exchange to complete an utterance according to accepted norms of correct grammar. A usage of the first type may be called a 'colloquialism', but features of unsuccessful oral performance are not deliberate, and they may occur even in formal surroundings when the speaker is intent on avoiding colloquialisms. Features of this second type are of limited interest to classical scholars, because real Latin speech does not survive. Nevertheless, even in poetry attempts are sometimes made to reproduce unprepared speech, and it is in such attempts that the imperfections of orality are likely to be found, as for example the aposiopesis in Neptune's speech in *Aen.* 1.135 *quos ego . . .* or the agitation of Nisus at 9.427. In the conversation which Catullus constructs in c. 10 certain features typical of oral performance seem to have been incorporated. At 10.29–30, for example, there is a case of what has been called 'segmentation', whereby a noun which begins a sentence is left suspended, to be picked up by a pronoun: *meus sodalis . . . is sibi parauit*. Koch (1995: 135), claiming the phenomenon as a universal of oral delivery, illustrates it from Plautus and the *Peregrinatio Aetherae*, and there are comparable examples to be found in the letters of Claudius Terentianus (P. Mich. viii.468.27–8), which were probably dictated to scribes. Jocelyn (p. 361) describes some repetitions of *paro* in the same conversation as 'studied unconcern', an expression which we would interpret as descriptive of (deliberately) imperfect oral performance. On repetitions and orality, see Koch (1995: 138); though it has to be said that the determinants of verbal repetition are complex, and cannot be assigned *en bloc* to the imitation of oral performance (Wills (1996)).

Catullus' second speech in the poem also has several pieces of 'syntactic incoherence' (28–9, 32; see in general Koch (1995: 133–4)). There can be no doubt that Catullus was seeking in this poem to capture linguistically

not only the tones of conversation, but more specifically the confusion inflicted by the encounter with the woman and its effects on his syntax and sentence structure.

It can be assumed that, if in a written text such as a poem, a writer admits such incoherence, he will have special reasons for doing so. Oral features introduced into what on the surface is a narrative text (as distinct from a reported conversation) are potentially more interesting. We note in passing that Freudenburg (1993: 13 with notes), arguing that Horace intended to construct *Sat.* 1.1 in accordance with a 'conversational logic', draws attention to one or two features which independently have been ascribed to oral performance.

Linguistic usages associated with oral performance occupy only a marginal place in Latin poetry. Rather more extensive are ordinary colloquialisms, but these are far from easy to classify and their motivation is not always easy to grasp. An obvious function of colloquialism in poetry was to impart a conversational style appropriate to a particular context, or more generally to a genre or type of writing. The dialogue in Hor. *Sat.* 1.9 naturally has colloquialisms, such as the intensive *misere* (14) and *si me amas* (38; familiar from Cicero's letters, and now in a letter from Vindolanda, *Tab. Vind.* ii 233), but it would be difficult to sustain the view that Horace has tried to distinguish the speeches from the narrative portions of the satire in this respect; the whole poem, like the *Satires* in general, has a colloquial veneer. As Coleman (p. 39) remarks, 'in satire . . . occasional echoes of *sermo cottidianus* were appropriate'. And so it is that colloquialisms 'from the ordinary language' in Catullus 10 (Jocelyn p. 363) are not merely to be found in the conversation itself, but in the body of the (hendecasyllabic) poem, which is by this means, as by others which Jocelyn discusses, distinguished from, e.g. the lyric poems (cf. Jocelyn p. 364).

Colloquialisms may be more striking in a 'poetic' setting. Powell shows that one of Juvenal's constant tricks was to introduce what he calls a 'mismatch of registers' (p. 326), 'either between one word and another in the same passage, or between sentence structure or verse structure and vocabulary, or an incongruity between the content and the level of language used to express it'. This procedure may involve the use of a colloquialism in an inappropriate context, as e.g. the deflating *caballus* with *Gorgoneus* of Pegasus, and the cluster of everyday words alongside epic mannerisms in the description of the man killed in the street by the collapse of a cartload of marble (Powell pp. 326, 327).

A factor which sometimes determined or justified the use of a colloquialism was the influence exerted by the traditions of a genre. Coleman (p. 38) notes that at *Aen.* 6.779 Virgil uses *uiden* in Anchises' solemn address

to his son. The colloquial pronunciation which underlies this form might be justified from the fact that it is located in a speech, albeit a solemn one, but an additional influence noted by Servius was that the usage was Ennian (see *Ann.* 622 Sk with Skutsch's n.). Why Ennius used the colloquialism is another question, since the context is lost, but where Virgil was concerned the presence of a colloquialism in an elevated context could obviously be defended from an ancient precedent (Coleman p. 38).

It is a curious fact brought out by Coleman (p. 43) that sometimes literary prose usage distanced itself more sharply from colloquialism 'than poetic usage felt the need consistently to do'. A nice illustration is provided by an aspectual nuance which could be given to the perfect, particularly the perfect infinitive. A perfect infinitive dependent on a modal verb such as *uolo* may refer to future rather than to past time; that is, it envisages a hypothetical act as already a concrete, accomplished reality at an indeterminate future time. This usage is familiar in prohibitions in early laws, such as *neiquis eorum Bacanal habuisse uelet* in the *S.C. de Bacchanalibus*, where its motivation has been well described by Daube (1956: 37–49). It seems to be absent from classical prose, and one might be tempted to see it as an archaism as used in Augustan verse, particularly in the second half of the pentameter, where the metrical utility of the *-uisse* form is especially clear (for a discussion see Smith's note on Tibull. 1.1.29–32). However, in a letter from Vindolanda written by a *decurio*, the linguistic level of which is shown by the substandard forms *habunt* = *habent* (whence Fr. *ont*) and *rediemus* (future), there is now a vivid use of the perfect infinitive *fecisse* in unambiguous reference to future time,⁴ and the possibility opens up that the perfect infinitive had never lost this aspectual potentiality in spoken colloquial Latin, though it was considered unacceptable for some reason in ordinary literary prose.⁵

Another case in point is discussed by Penney (pp. 258–9): *dico* + subjunctive, a construction which is old and seems to be inherited, is admitted in poetry, but in prose is confined to informal letters, both literary and sub-literary. (This construction perforce will be most likely to appear in speech rather than narrative.)

We would suggest, following Coleman, that the Latin poetic language was not a register whose syntactic, phonetic or morphological norms were determined either by the norms of the educated language at the time of composition, or by the norms obtaining at a particular social or stylistic

⁴ See Bowman and Thomas (1996: 324): *cras quid uelis nos fecisse, rogo, domine praecipias* (Inv. no. 93.1544).

⁵ There are a few examples in Livy, though sometimes clear imitations of legal language, e.g. at 39.14.8, and others in artificial Imperial prose writers such as Pliny the Elder (see Kühner–Stegmann (1955: ii 1.133–4)).

level of the language at any one time. Poets in most genres were more tolerant than orators or historians of usages across a wide stylistic spectrum, from the archaic to the colloquial. A colloquialism, as noted above, might of course have the function of giving an appropriate tone to a genre or a particular context, but equally some colloquialisms which cannot be accounted for in this way may simply have been raised to acceptability because they were potentially useful (e.g. metricaly), or because some other factor gave them respectability in the poet's eyes. Thus in the case of the completive use of the perfect infinitive Coleman suggests (p. 83) that 'Greek influence also helped to re-establish the purely aspectual distinction between infinitives in the complements of certain verbs'.

It seems likely, for example, that poets embraced various phonetic colloquialisms, that is colloquialisms of pronunciation, for the sake of metrical convenience (Coleman p. 33 'the great majority of phonetic devices for overcoming unmetrality can be directly linked to known facts of ordinary Latin speech'), though the evidence is difficult to assess. Latin had a strong stress accent, and unaccented vowels, particularly those in final syllables, were subject to various types of weakening (Coleman p. 36). The shortening of long *o* in final position in verbs no doubt began in words of iambic structure (Coleman p. 38), but in Augustan poetry it is found in words (including verbs) of other structures as well (Coleman p. 38). In Cicero on the other hand in clausulae the *-o* ending of the first-person singular generally seems to be treated as long (e.g. *Fam.* 9.7.2 *exspecto tuas litteras*, where long *o* would give a double cretic; cf. Fraenkel (1968: 164 with n. 4, 166-7, 170) for various verb-endings treated as long), and in the Vindolanda writing tablets (early second century AD) scribes quite often mark the final *o* with an apex, both in iambic (e.g. *rogo*) and other types of verbs. This habit at the very least betrays a lingering awareness well after the Augustan period among careful scribes that a long *o* in this position was more 'correct', however they actually pronounced such words. There is then a possibility that in the Augustan period, in non-iambic words at least, shortening of the final *o* was more a feature of colloquial than of careful formal speech. The fact that in Seneca's later plays short final *o* shows some increase in verbs⁶ suggests that in the first century AD the status of final *o* in verbs had not crystallized in the judgement of the educated; and this in turn implies a certain boldness on the part of earlier poets in exploiting developments which had not fully percolated through to the educated language. Coleman (p. 38) remarks that 'what is characteristic of the poetic register is not so much the intro-

⁶ For discussion see J. G. Fitch, *AJP* 102 [1981], 289ff. and Nisbet (1995: 299-300).

duction of the shortened forms but the retention side by side with them of the older forms'.

Coleman (pp. 36–40) discusses various other possible phonetic colloquialisms, but, as he implies (p. 52), it must always be allowed that a development which one might be inclined to see as colloquial, non-standard or informal might in fact by the time of its entry into poetry have become a general trend in the language. Similarly Jocelyn (p. 351) is non-committal about the status of iambic *meae* in Catullus at the time of writing, and (e.g.) dactylic *commoda* (p. 361). On balance the shortened forms such as *comparasti*, *audissem*, *complerunt*, in which *w* was lost with resultant vowel contraction, commented on by Coleman (p. 39) and Jocelyn (p. 361 with n. 127), seem for the period in question to reflect a widespread speech habit (as distinct from a substandard, non-formal pronunciation), despite Jocelyn's reluctance to commit himself (see Cic. *Orat.* 157 with Coleman p. 39).⁷

ARCHAISM

Archaism is dealt with in several papers, e.g. by Coleman (pp. 34–5, 43–4), Penney *passim*, Petersmann (pp. 293, 304). To poets earlier poetry was a reservoir which could be freely drawn on (Coleman (p. 33)), and the poetic register is thus bound to contain usages which at any particular time of writing were old-fashioned. Again Coleman (p. 43 with p. 84) notes that poetic language may align itself with vulgar usage rather than that of educated prose, since a construction which had archaic precedent may have been dropped from the educated language while surviving in lower-class speech. Penney (pp. 251–2) discusses syntactic archaisms used for effect, but particularly important is his demonstration that an 'archaism' may in fact represent an innovation: that is, a genuinely archaic pattern may be used in a slightly different way from its correspondent in early Latin (pp. 253–4). He refers for example to a new use of *ne* + present imperative, which in early Latin had an inhibitive meaning ('stop doing . . .'), but in later poets can 'function as a prohibitive with future reference' (p. 253). It is a moot point whether such developments should be seen as deliberate innovations, or as misunderstandings of earlier idiom. On archaisms which were of uncertain interpretation by the classical period see Coleman (p. 58).

The motivations of a poet in using an archaism may be many-faceted.

⁷ Mayer (1994: 17) drew attention to the fact that such contracted forms are found in Horace's conversational satires, but are absent from the more 'documentary' style of his epistles.

The archaism gives a suitably stately tone to its context, but the poet may have additional reasons for using it. Penney (e.g. p. 255) discusses several cases where a construction might be attributed as well to Greek models as to the influence of earlier Latin. But we would draw particular attention to his observation (p. 260) that various possible features of 'archaic' syntax 'have in common that they make for a denser texture to the sentence, without explicit markers of subordination'. The well-known taste of poets for using various oblique cases in a range of functions unsupported by the prepositions which would have been the norm in prose may look like a carry over from an earlier, 'Indo-European' stage of the language, but in reality the main determinant may have been a desire to keep function words to a minimum. A general aim of this type might on the one hand have the effect of introducing 'archaisms', but equally it might lead to the admission of a current 'vulgarism' (e.g. *dico* + subjunctive; see above p. 8).

THE INFLUENCE OF GREEK

Since poetry was recited, the sounds of the language, and particularly devices such as alliteration and assonance which were achieved by the collocation of appropriate words, were a potential sphere of the poet's inventiveness. Although various inherited potentialities of the Latin language of the types referred to were fully exploited, it is well recognized that foreign, i.e. chiefly Greek, sounds also contributed to the texture of Latin poetry (see Coleman pp. 45–6). The sounds of Greek were in various respects admired by Latin speakers (Quint. 12.10.27–8): Greek was supposedly 'sweet' in sound, Latin 'harsh' (Biville (1990: i.71)), and the poet who wanted his *carmen* to sound *dulce* should adorn it with Greek *nomina*: *itaque tanto est sermo Graecus Latino iucundior ut nostri poetae, quotiens dulce carmen esse uoluerunt, illorum id nominibus exornent* (Quint. 12.10.33). It was obviously a Greek word which was *not* integrated into Latin which would most strikingly retain the 'sweet', or in satire peculiar, sounds of Greek, and into that class fall *par excellence* proper names, which were often inflected as Greek by Latin poets; for that reason Quintilian is likely to have meant chiefly 'proper names' by *nominibus* here (see R. G. Austin's commentary ad loc., and cf. Quint. 12.10.27). Quintilian in another context was of the view, shared by Messala, referred to there, that Greek names should be Latinized in oratory (1.5.58ff.); for him then poetry was a special case in this respect. The exotic character to Latin ears of certain distinctive Greek sounds cannot be underestimated. There is an anecdote at Quint. 12.10.57 (see Biville (1990: i.158)) about an uneducated person who was asked in court whether he knew *Amphionem*. He said 'no', but

when the speaker dropped the aspirate, shortened the *i*, and said *Ampionem* he recognized the man.

On names inflected as Greek in Latin verse see Coleman (pp. 46, 47), Jocelyn (p. 352). On the other hand the Latinizing of an exotic name might be significant, as *Serapim* in the highly colloquial poem Catullus 10 (Jocelyn (p. 362)). In elegy Greek inflections are rare (Maltby (p. 380)), and in Horace there is generic variation (Mayer (p. 158)). The whole question of the use of Greek inflections in Latin poetry (which inevitably has a textual dimension) merits a systematic study.

It was not of course only by inflection of proper names that Greek sounds could be imported into Latin verse. An accumulation of Greek words in a line of verse would no doubt have an exotic sound which might take on a symbolic significance. Sedley (pp. 242–3) observes that the almost Greek line Lucr. 2.412 *ac musaea mele, per chordas organici quae* contrasts with the Latin line that precedes: ‘Where Greece has given us sublime music, Rome’s more characteristic noise is the shrieking sawblades of a workshop’ (Sedley (p. 243)). Similar in effect to the Lucretian line is Tibullus 2.3.60 *barbara gypsatos ferre catasta pedes* (Maltby (p. 381)).

The relationship between Greek syntax and Latin is a complex one, much debated and variously described. There can be no doubt that poets consciously imitated Greek syntax, as readers in antiquity frequently noted (see Mayer *passim* on the comments of scholiasts particularly). Sometimes a particular purpose can be discerned in a special context, as perhaps Catullus 4.2 *ait fuisse nauium celerrimus* (see Coleman (p. 84)), but more usually the borrowed syntax was simply a means of distancing poetic language from the banal. Syntactical grecism is thus arguably one of the factors which contributed to Latin the specifically poetic syntax it lacked from the start. Nevertheless many ‘grecisms’ turn out on closer inspection to be traceable back at least partly to certain native structures which had been extended or revived under Greek impetus: see Penney (p. 263): ‘these [phenomena] could be seen as purely analogical Latin developments, or one might accept that there was reinforcement from Greek’; see further Penney (pp. 255, 256, 262–3), Coleman (p. 79 (adverbial neuter), p. 80 (some uses of the genitive), p. 81 (an accusative use), p. 83 (perfect infinitive; cf. above p. 8)).

Greek words are as interesting in their avoidance as in their use. Petersmann (pp. 301–2) notes the absence of Greek from a Roman context in Lucilian satire (a context enhanced by archaism), and Maltby (p. 380) notes that Tibullus is more sparing in his use of Greek words than both Propertius and Ovid; Propertius on the other hand has more mundane Greek words from humble spheres than the other elegists. Petersmann (pp. 299–300) discusses similar features in Lucilius, 181–8M; but in general

Petersmann addresses himself to the way in which early satire provides evidence of the social tensions surrounding the use of Greek in Roman daily life, and its reflection in literature. He draws attention to the rising tide of linguistic purism in Rome (p. 292 on Ennius) which deprecated at least on formal occasions the employment of Greek. Lucilius carries the debate on further (Petersmann (pp. 298–301)), and is far from indiscriminate in his interweaving of Greek into the Latin texture of his satires.

The papers of Langslow and Sedley are complementary. Both deal to some extent with 'technical terminology' in poetry, terminology which in Latin is often of Greek origin (see Sedley (p. 228) for a definition of the expression 'technical term'; Langslow (p. 190) prefers to speak of 'special vocabulary'). Petersmann (pp. 300–1) draws attention to the vast technical vocabulary — mainly literary critical — borrowed from Greek by Lucilius. But there seems to have been some feeling against the admission of banal (Greek) technical terms in some genres of poetry, at least as used literally within a technical context or to evoke a technical discipline (see below). Lucretius does not borrow, or in Sedley's terminology 'transliterate', the technical terms of Greek philosophy (though Lucilius had: see Petersmann (p. 301)), nor does he even attempt to find a similar Latin term instead of the Greek (Sedley (p. 230)). Instead he uses a *range* of metaphors for a single Greek term (Sedley (p. 230): see below). In using non-technical Greek words he acted not out of 'caprice' (Sedley (p. 238)), but 'to conjure up for the readers a Greek or an otherwise exotic context' (Sedley (p. 238)). The avoidance or use of Greek is thus functional rather than ornamental or merely learned. On the one hand Lucretius enhanced his philosophical aim, by 'making Epicurean philosophy . . . at home in his own native language', as a result of which 'he proves to us its true universality' (Sedley (p. 246)), while on the other he sought to give particular colour to certain contexts.

Langslow notes generic variations in the admissibility of 'special' vocabulary, with the more conversational genres such as comedy, satire and epigram showing no restriction in the use of banal technical terms not allowed in epic (pp. 191–2). Technical (often Greek) vocabulary is not however completely avoided in the 'higher' genres, but it tends not to be banal; Langslow lists (p. 195) three different purposes for which more exotic technical terms are used *sensu proprio* in these genres, particularly epic. On the other hand the desire to avoid terms felt to be inappropriate for some reason provided poets with an opportunity of displaying their inventiveness (Langslow (pp. 195–7)). Lucan, for example, avoids conventional disease names, Latin as well as Greek, and produces some clever periphrases (Langslow (p. 196)).

Langslow (pp. 198ff.) makes the interesting case that in (high) poetry

(Greek) technical vocabulary is often exploited in *metaphorical*, as distinct from literal, usage (see below). In theory the poet who paraphrases a medical term in its literal sense may admit that term as a metaphor. This insight has the additional benefit of opening the way to the identification of technical terms current within various disciplines: the metaphor will depend for its effect on the reader's familiarity with the source domain and its phraseology (Langslow (p. 198)), and the phraseology must therefore be current.⁸

METAPHOR

Ordinary speech in any language tends to be shot through with systematic sets of metaphors, and it has even been suggested that human thought processes are highly metaphorical. Cicero was well aware that metaphors were commonplace in peasant speech (Coleman (pp. 68–9.)). If there is anything 'poetic' about metaphor, it does not lie therefore in the use of metaphors as such, though it was the practice in formal oratorical prose for the speaker to qualify a metaphorical expression with a modest pronoun or adverb or both, e.g. *uelut quidam*, a practice unknown to poetry. 'Density' of metaphor might well be thought to characterize poetry, but claims about the incidence of such an elusive phenomenon as metaphorical usage are bound to be unreliable.

A distinction can usefully be made, in the manner of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) (and cf. Lakoff and Turner (1989)), between a metaphorical concept, and the potentially unlimited number of surface realizations of that concept. Lakoff and Johnson paraphrase metaphorical concepts in the form 'A is B' (e.g. 'argument is war'), and under headings of this sort they list examples of particular realizations. Any discussion of the 'originality' of a metaphor might attempt to draw a distinction between the originality of the concept and that of the realization. A good deal of Fantham's book (1972) consists in effect in the identification of metaphorical concepts. Originality or inventiveness is far more likely to be displayed in the devising of new or unusual realizations than of new concepts. The person who first used 'exocet' metaphorically, as in a sentence such as 'the next speaker delivered an *exocet* in the form of a telling counter-example which left his opponent floundering', was operating with a familiar metaphorical concept (Lakoff and Johnson's 'argument is war'; or more specifically, 'arguments are weapons'), of which he invented a striking new manifestation. Certain metaphorical concepts may occupy a significant

⁸ Langslow's observation is relevant to the material assembled by Fantham (1972: 16 n. 8).

place in a particular genre of poetry. An obvious example is the metaphor 'love is slavery' (also 'love is warfare'), which is at the heart of elegy.⁹

Görler looks at the nature of some so-called verbal metaphors from a fresh angle, noting that thanks to its highly restricted vocabulary Latin poetry, especially Virgil's, worked several verbs very hard. These verbs he suggests (p. 282) are in themselves fairly colourless, and form a sort of common denominator in a number of expressions which might be deemed at first glance metaphorical (pp. 282–5). On closer analysis, however, a shift of specific grammatical objects is seen to actualize latent potential in the verb (n. 20), which enhances for the reader the precision of the picture and so produces an 'effect of alienation' (p. 282). Thus perhaps the expression is not best described as metaphorical at all. At any rate he warns against a too easy acquiescence in the use of this term.

The point is often made (see Kenney (p. 401 with n. 11); Coleman (p. 55 n. 52)) that, merely to list, in the manner of Axelson, allegedly 'unpoetic' words without consideration of their function and collocations in particular contexts is to reveal nothing of their true character. This point may be further illustrated in relation to metaphor, from part of Langslow's paper. Disease names, as we saw, tend to fall within the category of mundane entities avoided by poets in the higher genres. But, as Langslow shows (see above), there *are* such terms in poetry, but they are generally used metaphorically or figuratively. A case in point is Horace's use of *hydrops* figuratively in reference to avarice (Langslow (p. 199)). The underlying metaphorical concept is in fact banal: it might be paraphrased conceptually as 'vice is disease' (for the spread of this concept see Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *Odes* 2.2.13). Langslow's observation has various ramifications. In the first place, the underlying metaphor presumably ceases to be mundane once it is given a new surface realization; we do not know of *hydrops* used as a manifestation of this metaphor until a much later date,¹⁰ and it is perhaps an invention of the poet's, though with an oratorical precedent, in that the Latin *intercus* had already been used metaphorically by Cato, *Orat.* 62. It may be a feature of poetry that metaphorical concepts are reinvigorated by the use of unexpected variants in the vehicle of the metaphor, though it would be rash to suggest that such inventiveness was exclusively the preserve of poets. Secondly, *hydrops*, which a poet might well have found unacceptable *sensu proprio*, was clearly capable of a different resonance in metaphorical usage.

Across the full range of technical disciplines, as much today as in antiquity, metaphor is one of the most fruitful sources of new terms (see

⁹ See Wyke (1989).

¹⁰ See *TLL* vi 3.3.37.84.

Coleman (pp. 69–70)). Lucretius indeed creates a technical terminology of Epicurean philosophy by means of metaphors, but paradoxically it is a technical terminology which avoids in a curious way the stamp of technicality. Coleman (p. 69) remarks: ‘What is characteristic of scientific metaphors is their permanence and univocality. Once the new meaning is assigned, it remains purely referential within the register; there is no ornamental function, no contextual variation and no emotive accumulation from previous occurrences.’ Sedley (pp. 230–1, 233), however, shows that Lucretius renders single Greek technical terms not by a single Latin metaphor, but by what he calls ‘metaphorical diversification’: that is, he uses a range of metaphorical terms for a single technical term. This can be seen as a form of subtlety by means of which a wider range of associations could be embraced than would be possible through a single term; and it was also a means of avoiding in poetry a stereotyped technical vocabulary.

WORD ORDER; HYPERBATON

Forms of hyperbaton emerge from the symposium as among the most distinctive features of Latin poetic usage. Powell (p. 323) notes: ‘In Latin, the most obvious feature of poetic register as regards word order is persistent hyperbaton of noun and adjective.’ Both Jocelyn (p. 355 n. 91) and Powell (pp. 323, 324) remark that much work remains to be done on the subject. Powell (p. 323) recommends as a topic for research an attempt ‘to determine a hierarchy of register for different types of hyperbaton’.

To some extent hyperbata (in interlacing patterns) may be seen as reflecting patterns adopted by Hellenistic poets (Nisbet (p. 137); Mayer (p. 159) notes in passing some word orders characteristic of Greek and borrowed by Latin poets), but there were types which were rooted in native Latin speech, as for example when a demonstrative, e.g. *hic* with *ego/te* attached, was separated from its noun (Adams (p. 127)). A native pattern such as this, well represented in prose, is obviously not a defining characteristic of poetic language. Where some poets, such as Ovid, differed from prose writers was partly in their readiness to take an inherited pattern and increase its complexity (Adams (pp. 130ff.)), and partly in the much greater frequency of hyperbata which they allowed (see Nisbet (p. 137)). Forty per cent of Horace’s adjectives are separated from their nouns (Nisbet (p. 137)), and there is an extraordinary incidence of such separations in Catullus 64 (Jocelyn (p. 355)). In Catullus generic variations are discernible, with separations not so common, it seems, in hendecasyllables (Jocelyn (p. 365)).

In prose hyperbaton is often functional, in that (e.g.) inherently

emphatic adjectives such as *magnus* are often separated from their noun, or, in exploitation of the emphatic potentialities of the final position in a clause, a focused or climactic noun is left to the end. An expectation of its eventual use is created in the reader/hearer by the use of an adjective or genitive which demands, but does not immediately receive, an associated noun (Adams (pp. 128–30)). Nisbet (p. 139) draws attention similarly to the way in which in Horace ‘the ear is kept waiting for the corresponding noun’, which ‘sometimes . . . may surprise the reader’. Horace in this respect was again no more than drawing on a pragmatic resource of the language, rather than of ‘poetic language’ in particular. Nevertheless his exploitation in the *Odes* for the purpose of emphasis not only of emphatic positions in clauses and sentences in the conventional sense, but also of significant positions in the line of verse, is a phenomenon of greater complexity than anything in prose (Nisbet *passim*; note e.g. p. 145 for the suggestion that ‘when the pronoun [out of the Wackernagel position] follows the central diaeresis in the Asclepiad line, . . . it is usually emphatic and perhaps always so’).

It has been argued that ‘since speaking is correlated with time and time is metaphorically conceptualized in terms of space, it is natural for us to conceptualize language metaphorically in terms of space. Our writing system reinforces this conceptualization. Writing a sentence down allows one to conceptualize it even more readily as a spatial object’ (Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 126)). It seems likely that some Latin poets had, up to a point, a spatial concept of the structure of their verses. Thus the device of ‘vertical responsion’, whereby ‘a word in one line is sometimes picked up by a corresponding word at the same place in a following line’ (Nisbet (p. 146)). The relationship between the words is reinforced by their identical position in the pair of lines viewed as a spatial object. Paradoxically a separation (hyperbaton) may have the effect of juxtaposing (artificially by the norms of prose) two words which enter into some sort of relationship in the meaning of the line. The spatial contiguity underlines the semantic relationship. So at Hor. *Odes* 1.3.10–11 *qui fragilem truci commisit pelagoratem* the double disjunction of the adjectives from their nouns, which creates what is known as a golden line, produces also the juxtaposition of *fragilem* and *truci*, such that ‘the fragility of the boat is set against the savagery of the sea’ (Nisbet (p. 139)). At *Odes* 1.5.3 *grato, Pyrrha, sub antro* the vocative intrudes into the prepositional phrase and finds its place next to an adjective appropriate to the person named: ‘the cave is welcome to Pyrrha’ (Nisbet (p. 140)). There may be more to it than that: Pyrrha is enclosed by the cave, spatially in the words of Horace, and in the world he describes. Also worth mentioning here is the phenomenon which Sedley (p. 236), following David West, calls ‘syntactical onomatopoeia’: that is,

'intellectual contortion is symbolized by contorted grammar'. Sedley gives two examples from Lucretius, though perhaps the term 'grammar' is less than appropriate in the context: it is rather the (contorted) order of words that may arguably have symbolical significance.

It would not do, however, to make too much of spatial symbolism in the structure of verses. Hyperbaton in verse seems usually to be purely mechanical, without any semantic function in a particular context other than to create a recognizably 'poetic' disjunctive pattern.

Finally, we wish to express our gratitude to the institutions which enabled the symposium to take place (in April 1995) and to the many individuals who supported the undertaking and made it such an agreeable occasion for all who attended. We thank first and foremost the British Academy for supporting the undertaking from the beginning, and for lodging the symposiasts; Rosemary Lambeth's cheerful and ready help was particularly welcome. The Institute of Classical Studies hosted an afternoon session at Gordon Square, and provided refreshments afterwards; we thank the then Director, Professor Richard Sorabji, for his hospitality. The Classics Department at King's College London also hosted a drinks party at the Academy, and we thank the then Head of the Department, Professor Michael Silk, for making this possible. (The College itself however made no contribution from its research funds to this symposium.) The University of Manchester also contributed to that party, and in addition paid the fare of one of the symposiasts, a generous donation. The Swiss Cultural Fund in Britain and the German Embassy generously contributed towards the cost of lodging their symposiasts in London.

Individual colleagues were very supportive, and some who did not give papers acted as chairmen. We are grateful for this service to Sir Keith Thomas PBA, Dr John Briscoe and Professors K. Coleman, E. Fantham, G. J. P. O'Daly, M. D. Reeve, M. Winterbottom. All of the papers were refereed anonymously, either by members of the symposium or by colleagues who generously responded to our appeal; we wish to thank them too for their help.

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*', *HSCPh* 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', *HSCPh* 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* (Civcima. 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 Callebaut (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), *Helena 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. Esegesi 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).