

Archaism and Innovation in Latin Poetic Syntax

J. H. W. PENNEY

Summary. A number of syntactic patterns that are familiar features of classical Latin poetry show divergences from the norms of formal prose, and in many instances it has been claimed that an archaic pattern has been preserved or adopted and has become part of the distinctively poetic language. This chapter presents a selection of these patterns and examines some of the problems associated with their classification as archaisms, and the question of their poetic resonance. It may at times be hard to establish whether a pattern is genuinely archaic; some early Latin patterns recur not only in poetry but as features of everyday language; archaisms may have been perceived as such by the poets and used for deliberate effect, but within the tradition they may equally have become mere 'poeticisms'; archaic patterns may have come to be used in innovatory ways; they may have been retained, or even re-introduced, under the influence of Greek, in which case their antique associations may no longer have been felt; an archaic-looking pattern may have arisen simply from developments within the language of poetry. There is no simple opposition between archaism and innovation: rather the innovatory tendencies of Latin poetic language extend to the manipulation of archaisms for literary effect.

MATTHEW ARNOLD'S POETIC version of the Tristan legend naturally includes references to places connected with the story, amongst them King Mark's seat in Cornwall; but unfamiliar British place names can be hazardous, and Arnold was unlucky enough to fall into the trap of supposing a natural pronunciation to be the correct one. The result was unfortunate:

When the feast was loud and the laughter shrill
 In the banquet-hall of Tyntagil

— unfortunate because the place-name is in fact to be stressed on the second syllable, and in a later edition Arnold amended his poem to restore the rhythm:

When the feast was gay and the laughter loud
 In Tyntagel's palace proud

(*Tristram and Iseult* II 114–15).

Part of the solution in this instance was to introduce an inversion of the normal adjective–noun sequence, a feature at once archaic and poetic, and one can see here a clear example of its metrical convenience, and contribution to the rhyme-scheme. When the same phenomenon is found, say, in III 1 *In King Marc's chapel, in Tyntagel old*, one naturally suspects a similar history, and this is borne out in part, since the preceding edition had *At Tyntagil, in King Marc's chapel old*: here, however, the postposed adjective is already present, and indeed there are several other such instances in the poem. It is clear that for Arnold this inversion of the adjective–noun sequence was a standard poetic device, since it is found in other poems too;¹ it can only be a matter for speculation whether the occurrences in *Tristram and Iseult* might in part be accounted for by some subconscious notion that the syntagm was, as an archaism, particularly apt for the early medieval setting.

This English example may serve to introduce a discussion of archaic syntactic patterns in Latin poetry, which can be regarded in much the same light. Archaisms may have some attraction because of their metrical possibilities: the infinitive of purpose, for instance, may generate a convenient dactyl. It is, however, their resonance as archaisms, or at least as traditional poetic features, that will chiefly encourage their use. The distinction between deliberate selection of an archaic pattern because of its antiquity and its adoption simply in imitation of forerunners must be borne in mind,² but naturally there is always the possibility that a poet intends a combination of the two.

In this chapter, I shall review some familiar syntactic features of Latin poetic language to illustrate the variety of ways in which archaisms are used, but also to note the difficulty, in some instances, of determining

¹ A quick count gave the following figures: sixteen instances in *Tristram and Iseult* as against one in *Sohrab and Rustum*, a poem of similar length, but eight in *Thyrsis*, and four in *The Scholar Gipsy*, both considerably shorter poems; the crucial factor accounting for the difference seems to be not that *Sohrab and Rustum* is an epic poem, but that it is unrhymed.

² Cf. the remarks of Leumann (1959: 142ff.) on archaisms and Ennianisms, and the distinction between direct and indirect archaisms made in Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 768f.).

whether an archaism is truly in question, and to point, in others, to the fact that an archaic syntactic pattern may be used in a new way. The classification of archaisms is a more complex matter than it may at first appear.

How conscious Roman poets were that a syntactic pattern was archaic rather than simply part of an established poetic language is often difficult to determine, but the isolation of some examples of archaism must point to deliberate selection for effect: for instance,

urbem quam statuo vestra est (Virg. *Aen.* 1.573).

This is an instance of so-called *tractio inversa*, which may be seen as a continuation of an inherited Indo-European pattern for restrictive relatives with the head incorporated into the relative clause.³ The pattern is well attested in early Latin: cf. Terence, *Eun.* 653 *eunuchum quem dedisti nobis, quas turbas dedit!*; Cato, *Or. fr.* 3,2 *agrum quem vir habet tollitur*; id., *de agr.* 51 *ab arbore abs terra pulli qui nascentur, eos in terram deprimito*, and is even extended, though rarely, to appositive clauses, cf. Plautus, *Am.* 1009 *Naucratem quem convenire volui in navi non erat*. It is, however,

³ On Indo-European relative clauses, see Lehmann (1984) and Hettrich (1988: 467ff.); on Latin developments Lehmann (1979). A distinction is sometimes made between a relative clause with embedded nucleus (i.e. what might traditionally be taken to be the antecedent is incorporated into the relative clause and takes its case from that) and *tractio inversa*, where it is assumed that the antecedent is extracted from the main clause and fronted, with attraction to the case of the relative pronoun: so there would be a difference between the two sentences from Cato cited in the main text, with *ab arbore abs terra pulli qui nascentur, eos . . .* as an example of an embedded nucleus, and *agrum quem vir habet, tollitur* as an example of *tractio inversa*; I follow Hettrich (1988: 505 fn.53) in regarding the distinction as unnecessary in such instances — he would accept *tractio inversa* where a demonstrative precedes the fronted nucleus, as in Plautus, *Capt.* 110ff. . . . *istos captivos duos heri quos emi . . . is indito catenas*. There are numerous Hittite and Vedic Sanskrit parallels for a relative clause with an embedded nucleus, and it seems a secure reconstruction for Indo-European. It is then quite straightforward to suppose that an embedded nucleus might be fronted for emphasis, as seems clearly to be the case in the following Oscan example (Ve. 11): **v. aadirans v.** (name in nom. sg.) **eftiuvam** ('money', acc. sg.) **paam** (rel. pronoun, acc. sg. fem.) **vereiiaf pũmpaiianaf** ('to the Pompeian vereia', dat. sg.) . . . **deded** ('gave', 3sg.), **eisak eftiuvad** ('with that money', abl. sg.) . . .; one may note here that the name of the donor has been placed first, and that 'money', in the accusative as the object of **deded**, has also been positioned before the relative pronoun that agrees with it, and that 'money' is repeated in the main clause in what is there the appropriate case. This pattern, with the nucleus appearing both in the relative clause and the main clause, can be paralleled in Hittite and Vedic Sanskrit, and has been claimed as a feature of Indo-European 'high' style; cf. Watkins (1995: 541), who would derive the Virgilian sentence from a similar construction, with deletion of *urbs* from the main clause, and fronting of accusative *urbem* in the relative clause round the relative pronoun (ibid. fn.2).

apparently found nowhere else in classical poetry or prose, and it seems a safe conclusion that the stately archaism is deliberately selected to emphasize the solemn pronouncement.⁴ If the poetic tradition has played any part here, it can only be through some specific allusion to an earlier work that escapes us — and seems to have escaped ancient commentators too.⁵

It has been claimed that another example of the deliberate use of an archaism for effect is to be recognized in Propertius' statement of intent to strive for the grand manner:⁶

sumite vires,
Pierides: magni nunc erit oris opus (Prop. 2.10.11f.).

For the genitive rather than the usual ablative after *opus est* an early Latin parallel is provided by Lucilius 294 *nummi opus atque assis*; further instances from classical Latin are regularly cited, two from Livy (22.51.3 *ad consilium pensandum temporis opus esse* and 23.21.5 *in stipendium quanti argenti opus fuit*) and one from Quintilian (12.3.8 *lectionis opus est*). In some of these examples, including the line of Propertius, one might argue that the meaning is essentially 'it is a matter of . . .' rather than 'there is a need for . . .', and see this as evidence for the original nature of the construction, with a genitive that would later have been largely replaced by the ablative under the influence of *usus est*;⁷ this would accord the usage some antiquity, but would perhaps not suffice to show that its tone for Propertius was specifically archaic. Conversely, it has also been maintained that it is the ablative that is in fact original, a relic of the Indo-European instrumental, and the poorly attested genitive due to the analogy of *egeo*;⁸ there need then be no presumption of great antiquity, but this would not necessarily exclude the possibility that Propertius had adopted

⁴ See the excellent note of Austin (1971) ad loc., with further refs.

⁵ Servius remarks on this passage: *hoc schema de antiquioribus sumptum possumus accipere*; he cites parallels but no source for the Virgilian line. (I am grateful to Professor Roland Mayer for advice in connection with Servius' comments here and elsewhere.)

⁶ Cf. Tränkle (1960: 48): 'Der feierlich gehobene Klang liegt offensichtlich in der Absicht des Dichters'.

⁷ See Wackernagel (1926: 65); for an original genitive also Hofmann-Szantyr (1965: 123). In the passage from Propertius, as Professor Jonathan Powell reminds me, it would be quite possible to give *opus* a more definite meaning as 'the work [that I am about to compose]': so various translators and commentators, cf. Rothstein (1966) 'es wird eine Arbeit sein, die ein *magnum os* erfordert', Paganelli (1961) 'cette oeuvre demande une voix puissante', as against e.g. Goold (1990) 'a loftier tone will now be needed'. A preference for this latter interpretation might be justified by appealing to the other attestations of *opus* + genitive, which, few though they are, seem to establish this as a Latin syntagm.

⁸ For an original ablative, Lindsay (1907: 33), Hofmann-Szantyr (1965: 83), and more cautiously Ernout-Thomas (1953: 92).

as a perceived archaism a usage encountered in older texts.⁹ Whatever may be the truth of the matter (and the paucity of attestations must be an obstacle to any very confident assessment of the resonance of the genitive construction), the example may serve to alert us to the possibility that not all 'archaisms' are necessarily archaic.

Alternatively, a genuinely archaic pattern may be used in a way that constitutes an innovation. A case in point, as H el ene Vairel-Carron has convincingly shown,¹⁰ is the use of *ne* + present imperative for negative commands. In early Latin this syntagm has an inhibitive meaning, effectively 'stop doing...'; some clear instances are: Plautus, *Stich.* 20 *ne lacruma, soror*, said by a man comforting his disconsolate sister; id., *Pers.* 227 *ne me attracta*, not so much 'don't touch me!' as 'get your hands off me!'; id., *Am.* 1109f. — * e mihi!* / — *ne pave*, an expression of fear followed by an admonition to be of good courage; Terence, *And.* 868 *ah ne saevi tanto opere*, an attempt to calm someone down. There is a contrast with other constructions (e.g. *ne* + subjunctive) that have a more general prohibitive function, including reference forward in time. *Ne* + imperative is adopted by Virgil (and after him becomes general poetic currency); it may be used with the same inhibitive sense as in early Latin, so:

ne dubita, nam vera vides (Virg., *Aen.* 3.316);
ne saevi, magna sacerdos (Virg., *Aen.* 6.544);

but it is clear that it can also function as a prohibitive with future reference, cf.

foliis tantum ne carmina manda (Virg. *Aen.* 6.74);
tu ne cede malis, sed contra audentior ito (Virg. *Aen.* 6.95);

and that the use of the pattern has been expanded, so that there is no longer a contrast as in earlier times, and direct equation between the usage of Virgil and Plautus is not possible. The antiquity of the expression is remarked by Servius (on *Aen.* 6.544) but not its innovatory applications.

A more straightforward case of continuity might perhaps be sought in the infinitive of purpose, current in early Latin after verbs of motion,¹¹ e.g. Plautus, *Bacch.* 354 *senex in Ephesum ibit aurum arcessere*; id., *ibid.* 631 *militis parasitus modo venerat aurum petere hinc*; id., *Pseud.* 642 *reddere hoc, non perdere eru' me misit*. In classical prose, a single instance is cited from Varro (*R.R.* 2.1.1), but there are frequent occurrences in poetry:

⁹ Note the suggestion of Tr ankle (1960: 48) that the example in Livy 22.51.3 is 'vielleicht aus einem Annalisten'.

¹⁰ 1975: 183ff., esp. 312f.

¹¹ See Bennett (1910: 418f.); Hofmann-Szantyr (1965: 344f.).

nec dulces occurrent oscula nati / praeripere (Lucr. 3.895f);
 non . . . Libyco populare penates / venimus (Virg. *Aen.* 1.527f);
 processerat . . . / quaerere aquam (Prop. 1.20.23f);
 omne cum Proteus pecus egit altos / visere montes (Hor. *Carm.*
 1.2.7f).

By extension the infinitive of purpose comes to follow verbs that express not only motion but also impulsion:

quaerere terras agimur (Virg. *Aen.* 3.4);
 ardor agit nova quaerere tecta (Virg. *Aen.* 7.393);
 quisquamque virum perquirere silvis / egit amor (Val. Fl. 3.684f).

This particular use of the infinitive is adopted by the historians: so in Livy, for instance, the infinitive occurs after *impellere* and *subigere*.¹² Tacitus uses the infinitive after these, but also after an unusually wide range of other verbs and expressions (*certare, accingi, agitare, hortari, cura est*, etc.);¹³ this suggests, given his general avoidance of the everyday, an artificial literary extension of usage, in which connection it is probably significant that he seems not to use the infinitive after ordinary verbs of motion, the pattern so familiar from early Latin and the poetic language (and conceivably current in the spoken language — see below).

The infinitive of purpose is notably more successful than its competitor after verbs of motion, the supine in *-tum* (the old accusative form of a verbal noun), which occurs with some frequency in early Latin, e.g.:

ob portum obvagatum ito (*XII Tab.*)
 de nocte qui abiit piscatum ad mare (Pl. *Rud.* 898);
 neque te derisum advenio . . . (Pl. *Trin.* 844);
 nunc hinc parasitum in Cariam misi meum
 petitum argentum a meo sodali mutuom (Pl. *Curc.* 67f);

but it turns out to be remarkably rare in classical poetry,¹⁴ though there are a few instances, e.g.:

vastatum finis iverat Assyrios (Catullus 66.12);
 non ego . . . / . . . Grais servitum matribus ibo (Virg. *Aen.* 2.785f);¹⁵

¹² See Riemann (1885: 281ff.).

¹³ For the usage of Tacitus, see Draeger (1882: 59f.).

¹⁴ See Kühner–Stegmann (1955: I 723f.); for early examples see Bennett (1910: 453ff.).

¹⁵ I am not convinced by the contention of Austin (1964) ad loc. that the supine is to be regarded as a feature of familiar language in early Latin and so here marks the ordinary everyday tone of the conversation between Creusa and Aeneas. It is true that one finds *cubitum ire* in general use (Cato, Cicero, Suetonius, etc., and cf. Horace, *Serm.* 1.5.48 *lusum it Maecenas, dormitum ego Vergiliusque*) and that there are some obviously popular expressions such as *cacatum ire* (CIL IV 5242; cf. also C. Titius, *orat.* 2 *iudex testes poscit, ipse in minctum*) but this simple pattern consisting just of *ire* + supine may best be regarded as a set idiomatic type; as an indication that freer use of the supine was a feature of colloquial

vidimus flavum Tiberim . . . ire deiectum monumenta regis (Hor.
Carm. 1.2.13ff.).

One may note in these examples the apparent restriction to use after forms of *ire*,¹⁶ although there is a further remarkably bold use of the supine by Virgil:

si fortuna permittitis uti,
quaesitum Aenean et moenia Pallantea, . . . (*Aen.* 9. 240f.),

on which Wackernagel (1926: 278f.) justly observes that the poet has chosen the more *altertümlich* expression in preference to a more usual *ut*-clause or *ad* + gerundive.

In preferring the infinitive to the supine to express purpose after verbs of motion, poetry may agree perhaps with everyday language: direct evidence to this effect is lacking for the classical period, and the argument would rest on an assumption that the infinitive of purpose that appears in late Latin (and survives everywhere in Romance, while the supine is hardly continued at all) continues the early Latin construction that was avoided in classical prose but persisted in the spoken language. This is beyond demonstration, and separate developments at various periods cannot be ruled out: the influence of Greek has been invoked¹⁷ — certainly a plausible suggestion for classical poetry, and quite probably a factor in late Latin developments. The question then arises as to whether it is appropriate after all to speak of the perpetuation of an archaism: some qualification is surely needed, if the old usage has had to be reinforced by external influence.¹⁸

The use of the infinitive with the verb 'give' seems to show a similar blend of inheritance and Greek influence. There is a well-established early Latin imperatival expression *da bibere*:¹⁹

bibere da usque plenis cantharis (Pl. *Pers.* 821);
meridie bibere dato (Cato, *de agr.* 89);

but some of the uses of the infinitive with *do* in classical poetry, as in:

argenti magnum dat ferre talentum (Virg. *Aen.* 5.248),

Latin, one might be tempted to cite Petronius 71.8 *ne in monumentum meum populus cacatum currat*, with a different verb of motion, but this is clearly just an elaboration of *cacatum ire* and offers no independent testimony. Certainly no colloquial tone is obviously detectable in *Aen.* 4.117f. *venatum Aeneas unaque miserima Dido / in nemus ire parant*; and Tacitus shows no tendency to avoid the construction, cf. Draeger (1882: 88f.).

¹⁶ This is predominantly the case with Tacitus too, though note *miserant . . . oratum* (*Ann.* 14.25).

¹⁷ Cf. Kühner-Stegmann (1955: I 680).

¹⁸ On the question of the revival of obsolescent Latin syntactic patterns under the influence of Greek, see Coleman (1975).

¹⁹ See Bennett (1910: 418f.).

seem to have as much to do with Greek models ($\delta\acute{\omega}\kappa\epsilon\ \delta' \acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\iota\upsilon$) as early Latin,²⁰ and particularly so in examples such as:

dederatque comam diffundere ventis (Virg. *Aen.* 1.319);
 praebuit ipsa rapi (Ovid *Her.* 5.132);
 tristitiam et metus / tradam protervis in mare Creticum / portare
 ventis (Hor. *Carm.* 1.26.1ff.).

Further 'Greek' usages can be seen in connection with the granting of prayers by the gods:

tu das epulis accumbere divum (Virg. *Aen.* 1.79);
 da flammam evadere classi (Virg. *Aen.* 5.689);
 da . . . Latio considerare Teucros (Virg. *Aen.* 6.66f.);
 nova da mihi cernere litora ponti / telluremque novam (Lucan
 1.693f.).

Here one thinks naturally of Greek $\delta\acute{o}\varsigma$ + infinitive in prayers,²¹ and the extension to addressing humans in a polite formula:

da iungere dextram (Virg. *Aen.* 6.697);
 date tangere vultus (Val. Fl. 4.634);
 da iungere dona, da Scythicas sociare domos (Val. Fl. 5.515f.);

or to impersonal uses of *do*:

sed non ante datur telluris opaca subire / . . . quam . . . (Virg. *Aen.*
 6.140f.);
 nullaque datur considerare terra (Val. Fl. 4.511);
 verum inter medias dabitur si currere cautes (Val. Fl. 4.587);

follows naturally enough. Greek influence here is hardly to be denied, and indeed it was noted by the ancients: Servius on *Aen.* 1.319 states: *graeca autem figura est*, and even adds that this usage is the source of *da bibere*. This last conclusion is unnecessary, but one may well have doubts about simply reversing the derivation and allowing that development of the early Latin figure was responsible for all occurrences of *do* + infinitive in poetic language.²²

The antiquity of *da bibere* may be accepted, but there has been some division of opinion as to whether the infinitive is to be taken as equivalent to an object noun, and so parallel to *da aquam*, or (more plausibly) as related to the infinitive of purpose, and perhaps, if one accepts a parallel with Cato, *de agr.* 5.3 *satui semen dare*, providing evidence for the origin

²⁰ Cf. Williams (1960) ad loc.; Ernout-Thomas (1953: 286f.).

²¹ Cf. Norden (1903) on *Aen.* 6.66f.

²² Despite Hofmann-Szantyr (1965: 345); cf. p. 174 above.

of the Latin *-re* infinitive in a dative case-form.²³ An argument for the infinitive of purpose is seen in the existence of an alternative construction with a 'final' subjunctive:

tum vos date bibat tibi cini (Pl. *Stich.* 757);
dato bubus bibant omnibus (Cato *de agr.* 73);

which is not confined to the verb *bibere*, cf.

vin aquam? — si frustulenta est, da, opsecro hercle, absorbeam
(Pl. *Curc.* 313).

This type of construction, with a dependent subjunctive but no subordinating conjunction, is found after several verbs in early Latin, in competition with *ut* clauses, and can be readily explained as arising from original parataxis:²⁴ This is well attested in the case of imperative forms of *sino*:²⁵

postea amurca spargito bene sinitoque combibat (Cato *de agr.* 91);
noli sis tu illic aduorsari, sine amet, sine quod lubet id faciat . . .
(Pl. *Cas.* 204ff.);
sinite abeam, si possum, uiua a uobis (Pl. *Mil.* 1084).

The plain subjunctive after the imperative of *sino* recurs in classical poetry (and Livy), cf.

sinite instaurata revisam / proelia (Virg. *Aen.* 2.669);
sine pascet durus aretque (Hor. *Ep.* 1.16.70);
dem sinite amplexus (Val. Fl. 4.635).

With some verbs instances are rarer, as, for instance, with *deceat*:

deceat animo aequo nunc stent (Pl. *Poen.* 21f.).

²³ Cf. Blümel (1979: 89 with 80 fn.9), and earlier Ernout-Thomas (1953: 260). See also Kühner-Stegmann (1955: I 681); Bennett (1910: 418f.).

²⁴ Cf. Kühner-Stegmann (1955: II 227ff.); the truly paratactic stage, with two separate clauses (as opposed to subordination with no subordinating conjunction), may lie a long way back, cf. Bennett (1910: 245). It seems clear that use of the subjunctive alone, without *ut*, was quite normal in colloquial Latin following *rogo* (standardly at Vindolanda), *volo* and *opto* (see Adams (1995a: 117f.)); it may be no accident that the examples seem to show first-person forms of these verbs, so that they can be seen as simply reinforcing a jussive subjunctive or subjunctive expressing a wish, and this will also fit the occurrence of the pattern with the imperatives of *sino*, *facio*, *dico*, etc. — even *scribe dentur mi* in a Vindolanda letter (343.16f.) is merely a variant of this. More striking is the unusual example in the same letter of the plain subjunctive following a third-person verb, *desiderabat coria ei adsignarem* (343.31f.), on which see Bowman *et al.* (1990).

²⁵ Bennett (1910: 234f.) notes only two instances of non-imperative forms of *sino* with a substantive clause in early Latin: Ter. *Hec.* 590f. *neque sinam ut qui nobis, mater, male dictum velit, mea pertinacia esse dicat factum* (the only instance in early Latin of *sino* with a following *ut*-clause, readily accounted for by the complex structure of the sentence, with the subject of *dicat* given by a relative clause); Plautus *Miles* 54 *sivi viverent*.

This is probably the only good Plautine example,²⁶ and the usage is not continued later, but it is almost certainly old given the Umbrian parallel construction seen in *façia tiçit* 'faciat decet' (*Tab. Ig.* II 17). By the same token then, Umbrian *deitu etaians* 'dicito eant' (*Tab. Ig.* VIb 64), where the subjunctive represents a transformation of the imperative of direct speech as seen in *deitu etato iouinur* 'dicito -"itote, Iguvini"' (ibid. 63), provides support for the antiquity of *dico* + subjunctive in Latin, e.g. Plautus, *Stich.* 624 *dixi equidem in carcerem ires*.²⁷ This continues later, but in everyday language as well as poetry, though not in formal prose:

dices igitur vel amico tuo Suetio . . . vel Labeoni nostro paulum
proferant auctionem (Cic. *Att.* 13.12.4);
dic corpus properet fluviali spargere lympha . . . (Virg. *Aen.* 4.635);
dic Ama[. . .] Antonino acc[i]piat . . . (*O.Max.* 254).²⁸

Given this distribution, the status of the construction must be uncertain: old, it certainly is, but surely too familiar in the spoken language to be perceived as archaic.

A similar problem arises over the use of the subjunctive after forms of *facio*: this is frequent in early Latin after the imperative,²⁹ and this usage recurs in Cicero's letters and in everyday language as well as in classical poetry, with *fac* functioning almost as a sort of imperative particle:³⁰

opera omnia mature conficias face (Cato *de agr.* 5.7);
fac fidele sis fidelis (Pl. *Capt.* 439);
in medium turbae fac memor agmen eas (Ovid *Am.* 1.4.56);
fac (denarios) mi mittas (*Tab.Vind.*: II 343.26).

In early Latin the plain subjunctive is found after other forms of *facio* also, but in only a few of the instances are these second- or third-person forms, e.g.:

nunc haec res me facit festinem (Titinius 98 (Davault));
labeam bifariam faciat habeant (Cato *de agr.* 20.2);

²⁶ There are uncertainties over the text of *Most.* 72f. The example from the *Poenulus* comes in a passage that is full of jussive subjunctives, but that need not detract from its evidential value.

²⁷ Bennett (1910: 212f.) notes only 3 instances of *dico* + subjunctive in early Latin, as against 21 with an *ut*-clause.

²⁸ See Bülow-Jacobsen *et al.* (1994: 34), text no.4; this is an ostrakon of the second century AD from the Red Sea region. (I am grateful to Professor J. N. Adams for drawing my attention to this example.) It will be noted that the subjunctive follows an imperative form, which may be parallel to the tendency to preserve the subjunctive after *fac*, see below.

²⁹ For figures, see Bennett (1910: 224f.).

³⁰ Cf. Hofmann-Szantyr (1965: 530f.); see also *TLL* VI i.105.1ff. for one or two examples even from more formal prose.

paupertas fecit ridiculus forem (Pl. *Stich.* 177);

and the normal pattern here, persisting into the classical period, would seem to be a clause introduced by *ut*.³¹ The plain subjunctive, however, predominates in early Latin after a first-person form, as, for instance, the archaic future *faxo*:³²

ervom tibi aliquis cras faxo ad villam adferat (Pl. *Most.* 65);
ego faxo dicat me in diebus pauculis / crudum virum esse (Pl. *Truc.* 644f.).

The form *faxo* is rare in classical and later Latin, but the usage with a following subjunctive makes the occasional appearance in verse,³³ e.g.:

haud sibi cum Danais rem faxo et pube Pelasga / esse ferant (v.l. putent) (Virg. *Aen.* 9.154f.).

Morphologically and syntactically this might well be accounted archaic, but it might be more appropriate to think in terms of archaic elements surviving in a set idiom that was part of the living language, as the occurrence in Petronius 95.3 *faxo sciatis* might suggest,³⁴ without necessarily having archaic connotations for speakers. One may, however, suspect that the adoption of *faxo* + subjunctive by later poets is more self-conscious:

iam foedera faxo / Haemonii petat ipse viri metuatque morari (Val. Fl. 7.177f.);
te tamen hac . . . formidine faxo / iam tua silva ferat (Val. Fl. 4.191f.);

the Virgilian echoes (*ego foedera faxo / firma manu* (*Aen.* 12.316f.)) and the relentless alliteration combine to suggest that here we have to do not so much with archaism as a resounding epicism.

A progression to mere imitation can be observed also in connection with another rare construction, the use of the impersonal gerundive with a direct object.³⁵ It occurs only once in Plautus:

hercle opinor mi adveniēti hac noctu agitandumst vigilias (Pl. *Trin.* 869),

with isolated instances in other early writers, e.g.

³¹ See the examples given by Bennett (1910: 227).

³² After *faxo*, according to Bennett (1910: 225ff.), a plain subjunctive occurs eighteen times, as against solitary *faxo ut scias* (Plautus, *Asin.* 897).

³³ Cf. also Ovid, *Met.* 3.271, 12.594; Seneca, *Med.* 905 has (unusually) 2nd sg. subj. *faxis*.

³⁴ Similarly Apuleius *Met.* 1.25 *faxo scias*; etc.

³⁵ The examples are collected by Risch (1984: 186ff.). For Blümel (1979: 85f.) this is 'die historisch älteste Konstruktionsweise' for the gerund(ive), but more convincing is the argument of Hettrich (1990: 14ff.) that it is an innovation.

optandum uxorem, quae non vereatur viri (Afranius *com.* 99R).

It occurs a number of times in Varro, who is much given to employing archaisms, it is found ten times in Lucretius, e.g.

aeternas quoniam poenas in morte timendumst (Lucr. 1.111),

and it is once used by Cicero, with what seems to be deliberately archaising effect, to establish the character of the speaker:

... viam ... quam nobis quoque ingrediendum sit (Cic. *Cato* 6).³⁶

An archaic tone is therefore probably to be recognized in the single Virgilian instance:

... alia arma Latinis
quaerenda, aut pacem Troiano ab rege petendum (Aen. 11.229f.),

which is manifestly the inspiration for the later use of the construction in Silius Italicus:

nunc pacem orandum, nunc improba ...
arma reponenda et bellum exitiale cavendum
auctor ego (11.559ff.).³⁷

Several of the features so far mentioned have in common that they make for a denser texture to the sentence, without explicit markers of subordination. Some such factor no doubt encouraged also the tendency to prefer simple case-forms to prepositional phrases, which is such a notable feature of Latin poetic language — including, for instance, a preference for a plain ablative in place of *in* + ablative. This is noted as an archaism by Servius on Aen. 11.686 *silvis te, Tyrrhene, feras agitare putasti?*, where he remarks, no doubt correctly, that *silvis* is *pro 'in silvis'*

³⁶ See Powell (1988: 114) ad loc. Professor Powell has also noted (private communication) that in *Cato* 42, two of the manuscripts read *notandum putavi libidinem*, where again the archaism would suit the speaker, and adoption of this reading might be seriously considered — the generally preferred *notandum* might well be an instance of the regularization that has perhaps removed a number of instances of the less familiar gerund (cf. the next note).

³⁷ The readings in both these passages require discussion. In Aen. 11.230, *petendum* is a correction in one of the ancient capital manuscripts, and was read by Servius and other ancient grammarians (see the *apparatus criticus* in Geymonat (1973)); it has been generally accepted in preference to the *petendam* of the tradition, no doubt rightly, given that the standard gerundive construction is the more likely interloper. In the *Punica* passage, *orandum* rests only on the reading of the lost Cologne manuscript reported by Modius, though the Virgilian parallel is persuasive support (see the *apparatus criticus* in Delz (1987)), and this is a particularly striking illustration of the danger posed to unfamiliar syntactic patterns by widespread regularization in the manuscripts. Other interesting archaic features may in this way have been totally obliterated.

et est archaismos. There is an ablative *campis* with a slightly different sense, 'across the fields', in the well-known half-line *Aen.* 4.404 *it nigrum campis agmen*, borrowed from Ennius: here one may well suppose that the listener or reader is expected to recognize the loan and to appreciate the humorous adaptation to a description of ants of a verse originally relating to elephants, so that any connotations of archaism will be a secondary matter. Such instances would, however, add to the variety of functions of the case-forms, and the deceptively similar *it tectis Argoa manus* of Valerius Flaccus (3.3), where the Argonauts are in fact leaving the palace and the ablative has the value 'from', suggests that poets enjoyed playing with the ambiguities of the simple ablative form.

It is worth considering in more detail two ways of using a case-form to express direction. From Indo-European, Latin will have inherited an accusative of direction (which accounts, *inter alia*, for the use of the supine in *-tum* after verbs of motion); this is continued in the use of the simple accusative with names of towns, but in early Latin a freer use is found, in that names of countries can also appear with a simple accusative and no preposition (in competition with *in* or *ad* + acc.)

partim errant, nequinox Graeciam redire (Liv. Andr. *Od.* 14);
parasitum misi nudiusquartus Cariam (Pl. *Curc.* 206).³⁸

This is picked up by the later poets, who use the simple accusative for countries, e.g.

ibitis Italiam (Virg. *Aen.* 3.254),

or equivalent expressions:

Italiam fato profugus Laviniaque venit / litora (Virg. *Aen.* 1.2f.);
quo regnum Italiae Libycas averteret oras (Virg. *Aen.* 4.106);

and more generally for expressions of place:

ea . . . loca cum venere volantes (Lucret. 6.742);
devenere locos ubi . . . (Virg. *Aen.* 1.365);³⁹
speluncam Dido dux et Troianus eandem / devenient (Virg. *Aen.* 4.124f.).

This extension to common nouns (other than *domum*) is essentially a

³⁸ It is now generally accepted that there is no reason to suppose that Plautus believed Caria to be the name of a town. Lindsay (1907: 25 fn. k) argues that Plautus simply does not follow the strict rules of classical Latin, but Wackernagel (1928: 223ff.) points out that the rules apply in Old Latin to Italian placenames but that there is fluctuation in the use of prepositions with towns as well as countries with non-native names, suggesting that usage was simply less well established for these.

³⁹ Servius ad loc. remarks: '*ad*' minus est, without further comment.

feature of poetry, and once again it is a question of innovatory use of an archaic pattern.

More complex is the dative of direction, where Greek influence has often been recognized and as often disclaimed.⁴⁰ In early Latin we find a construction that seems to be native, and where indeed a dative of goal is barely distinguishable from an indirect object (particularly if there is any suggestion of personification of 'death' or 'sleep'):

Quiris leto datus (Festus 245M);
 quattuor viros sopori se dedisse autumat (Pl. *Am.* 306);
 ibo ad medicum atque ibi me toxico morti dabo (Pl. *Merc.* 472);
 ob sutelas tuas te morti misero (Pl. *Capt.* 692).

A natural extension of this usage can be seen in classical poetry:

multos Danaum demittimus Orco (Virg. *Aen.* 2.398);
 corpora non leto missa trecenta forent (Ovid *Fast.* 2.664);
 si quis casus puerum egerit Orco (Hor. *Serm.* 2.5.49);

yet at the same time echoes have been perceived of Homeric Ἄιδι προΐαψεν. Another fairly straightforward use of the dative might be seen in the notion of stretching out one's hands in imploration to the gods:

quas (manus) pro vobis diis immortalibus tendere consuevit (Cic. *Font.* 48),

by extension to the all-powerful Romans:

quae paulo ante Romanis de muro manus tendebant (Caes. *B.G.* 7.48.3),

and to heaven in general:

Anchises . . . / . . . caelo palmas cum voce tetendit (Virg. *Aen.* 2.688f.).

In the last case there is the possibility of a shift in interpretation from person to place, which results in:

it clamor caelo (Virg. *Aen.* 5.451),

where the sense is rather 'sky', and so to other terms, yielding the poetic dative of direction, e.g.

pelago Danaum . . . dona / praecipitare iubent (Virg. *Aen.* 2.36f.).

There may even be an example of the usage with a proper name in:

⁴⁰ Greek influence is admitted by Kühner-Stegmann (1955: II 320), Hofmann-Szantyr (1965: 100f.); but Leumann (1959: 146) firmly denies that this is a Graecism.

tum Cilicum liquere solum Cyproque citatas / immisere rates
(Lucan 8.456f.).⁴¹

These could be seen as purely analogical Latin developments, or one might accept that there was reinforcement from Greek. A further factor may well have been the increasing degree of competition in many contexts between the dative and *ad* + accusative (compare, for instance, with *morti dabo*, etc. cited above, Plautus *Capt.* 1019 *ego hunc ob furturn ad carnificem dabo*, or the variation between *Capt.* 360 *quae ad patrem vis nuntiari* and 400 *numquid aliud vis patri nuntiari?*): this could provide a basis for artificial extension of the use of the dative.⁴² At all events, in the poetic dative of direction, something new has arisen that involves more than simply the maintenance of an archaism.

These instances of case-syntax seem to reflect, as was previously noted, a preference for avoiding prepositions: this can no doubt be associated with reaction to the general tendency of Latin, which — as the Romance languages abundantly show — was towards increasing use of prepositional phrases rather than simple cases. But is avoidance of the new to be counted as a penchant for archaism?

Prepositions are also involved in my final examples, which concern word order.⁴³ It seems that in classical Latin, indeed from Plautus on, an attributive genitive normally followed the governing noun, though it might precede it to mark antithesis or for other stylistic reasons.⁴⁴ These patterns are maintained when there is a preposition governing the head, so that in the classical period one would normally find, say, *per finis Sequanorum* but marked in *Allobrogum finis* and residual set phrases like *de senatus consulto*; the preposition will normally come first. An inspection of

⁴¹ Professor J. N. Adams has drawn my attention to the fact that in imperial Latin the ablative in *-o* came largely to replace the locative in *-i* in place names of the second declension (e.g. *Londinio* for *Londini*), and that just as directional forms in *-ae* of the first declension (e.g. *Alexandrie* (= *-ae*) 'to Alexandria') are most plausibly to be taken as locatives rather than datives of direction, so directional forms in *-o* (2nd decl.) are more likely to be locative ablatives (see Adams (1995a: 108ff.)). This might allow an alternative explanation of Lucan's *Cypro*, but one that is probably not to be projected back onto the Virgilian examples of the dative of direction.

⁴² See Löfstedt (1942: 187ff.); more briefly Ernout-Thomas (1953: 69f.).

⁴³ Strictly speaking, variations in word order that are not grammatically significant would be classified as stylistic rather than syntactic features, but there is some advantage in linking them in the present context, when the same issues of apparent innovation within poetic language are in question.

⁴⁴ See Adams (1976: 73ff.). The validity of his contention that in an earlier period the genitive normally preceded the governing noun (cf. *senatus consultum*, *Marci filius*, etc.), except in special cases (*paterfamilias*, *tribunus militum*, names of temples such as *aedes Bellonae*, etc.), cannot be discussed here, though I am inclined to accept it.

examples in the *Aeneid* and in Lucan,⁴⁵ to see what orders occur and with what frequency, yields the results tabulated below. The first set of figures (with percentages adjusted to the nearest half per cent) includes instances where adjectives are present that do not disrupt the basic pattern, and instances of discontinuity, discussed later. The abbreviations used are: P[reposition], S[substantive], [Attributive] G[enitive], A[djective in agreement with the Substantive = As, or with the Genitive = Ag].

The basic patterns are:

		<i>Aeneid</i>	Lucan
G—P—S	(<i>reginae ad limina</i>)	42.5%	24.0%
P—G—S	(<i>in Eurotae ripis</i>)	10.0%	20.5%
P—S—G	(<i>ad sidera caeli</i>)	30.0%	33.0%

One must also allow for some patterns where the positioning of an adjective can create a semblance of ambiguity (e.g. in *nigri cum lacte veneni* the order of the main constituents is P—S—G, but the case of the preceding adjective can give an initial impression of a pattern G—P—S); the figures for these are:

G—P—Ag—S	(<i>rupis ab Illyricae scopulis</i>)		
P—As—G—S	(<i>ex alto delubri culmine</i>)	15.5%	20.0%
Ag—P—S—G	(<i>nigri cum lacte veneni</i>)		
P—Ag—S—G	(<i>in duri certamina Martis</i>)		

and it can be seen that these make up a hefty part of the instances. (The rare pattern, S—P—G and its variants, discussed below, accounts for the remainder percentages.)

The G—P—S pattern is strikingly frequent in Virgil in comparison with the usual marked variant P—G—S, while even the 'standard' P—S—G has only a medium frequency. The G—P—S pattern is very rare in prose: in Book I of Caesar's *De bello Gallico*, for instance, amongst numerous instances of the other two patterns (*in finis Vocontiorum, in Santonum finis*), G—P—S is found only once in *quorum per finis* (28.1), where the usual fronting of the relative pronoun is responsible for the different order.⁴⁶ Nor does the pattern seem to be a regular feature of early Latin — there is no example in the *Captivi* of Plautus, nor in the

⁴⁵ The choice of Lucan for comparison is motivated simply by a desire to see how closely the Virgilian pattern was followed by a later epic poet. It would be interesting to have a more comprehensive set of figures, especially those for other Augustan poets.

⁴⁶ Note the other prose examples given by Marouzeau (1949: 60).

Rudens (despite frequent occurrences in this play of *in fanum Veneris* and *in Veneris fanum*, and similarly with other prepositions, there is not a single instance of *Veneris in fanum* or the like); it is, however, found in Ennius, cf. *Ann.* 260V. (Skutsch 222) *sulpureas posuit spiramina Naris ad undas*; *Satur.* 41V. (from the *Hedyphagetica*) *Nestoris ad patriam hic capitur magnusque bonusque*, where it already occupies the two positions within the hexameter that are its preferred sites in classical poetry.

Given this distribution, it hardly looks as though the G—P—S pattern can be reckoned as an archaism. It is interesting to note that in Umbrian, which retains a number of postpositions as bound forms, the normal order is S—P + G, cf. *vuku-kum kuretias* 'ad lucum Coredii' (*Tab. Ig.* Ib4), etc.,⁴⁷ with the genitive preceding S—P only when it is a pronominal form, e.g. *erer nomne-per* 'pro eius nomine' (*Tab. Ig.* VIa34).⁴⁸ This seems to afford a parallel to Latin prose usage, and surely suggests that a more general use of G—P—S is a poetic innovation, perhaps associated with the development of hexameter verse and imitation of Greek (cf. Homeric patterns of the type οὔρεος ἐν κορυφῆς (*Il.* 2.456)), although adaptation of the Latin pattern As—P—S (*magnis de rebus*) with replacement of the adjective by an attributive genitive might have played a part. A further phenomenon may point to one of the reasons for its usefulness: if we take the simple cases of three-word groups, and look at the frequency of discontinuities, we find (with number of occurrences):

G—P—S: G <> P—S (*Libyae vertuntur ad oras*)
Aen. 39: 18; *Lucan* 17: 8.

In as many as one third of the examples, the genitive is actually separated from the rest of the prepositional phrase: there are instances already in Lucretius (e.g. 5.707 *quantum solis secedit ab orbi*). This provides a way of breaking up the phrase, comparable to the separation of adjective and noun, without disrupting the association of the preposition and the noun it governs.

This cannot be said of another pattern of discontinuity, P—G <> S, of which there are instances from Lucretius on; in the earlier examples, the

⁴⁷ There are a number of good examples in the description of the city boundaries of Iguvium given in *Tab. Ig.* VIa12–14, e.g. *presoliaf-e nurpier, tettom-e miletinar, randem-e rufrier*, all showing a noun in the accusative governed by postposition -e 'to' and a following genitive; unfortunately the meaning of most of the words is obscure.

⁴⁸ Adams (1976: 3) cites *erer nomne-per* as showing that in Umbrian a genitive normally preceded its head, but the immediate juxtaposition of *erer* (masc.) *nomne-per* and *erar* (fem.) *nomne-per*, referring back to the Fisian mountain and the city of Iguvium respectively, suggests that the pronouns are fronted for contrast.

inserted element seems most commonly to be a single word, some form of the verb:

in equi conscendere costas (Lucr. 5.1297);
 in luminis erigit oras (Lucr. 5.1455);
 sub luminis edidit oras (Virg. *Aen.* 7.660);
 ad Hesperiae venturos litora (Virg. *Aen.* 3.186).

This persists later, as in:

et prior in Nili pervenit litora Caesar (Lucan 8.641),

but now further elements, e.g. the object of the verb, may also intervene, as in

in Magni viventem ponite castris (Lucan 6.233),

or instead of a verb, another noun:

conlapsaque flebat iniquae / in Veneris Medea sinus (Val. Fl. 7.251f.).

This pattern sets up a considerable tension by leaving the preposition before the genitive, which it cannot possibly govern. In another pattern that produces this result without discontinuity, S—P—G, one might be tempted to see a simple inversion of S and P, so:

cava per calamorum (Lucr. 5.1382);
 corpus in Aeacidae (Virg. *Aen.* 6.58);
 litus harenosum ad Libyae (Virg. *Aen.* 4.257);
 Hyperboreae plaustrum glaciale sub Ursae (Lucan 5.23).

It seems likely, however, that this pattern (if it is not simply modelled on Greek 'anastrophe' of prepositions) is based on the type S—P—As (*rebus in arduis*), where the preposition is inserted between the noun and the adjective that agrees with it, a poetic variant of the more frequent type As—P—S (*magnis de rebus*).⁴⁹ The curious thing about this S—P—G pattern is that it reproduces the one that seems to be normal in Umbrian, where postpositions are involved (see above on **vuku-kum kureties**, etc.). Since it is widely believed that Latin also originally had postpositions, and still shows traces of them in forms such as *mecum*, etc., it looks as though, paradoxically, Latin has created as a poetic feature a sequence that might be supposed to be very archaic indeed. This is quite a new hazard to be reckoned with in the quest for archaisms.

There is the possibility of discontinuity with this pattern too, S <> P—G, and the result is something startlingly new, and thereby no doubt

⁴⁹ See Marouzeau (1949: 57ff.) and p. 159 above.

poetically arresting, with the preposition stranded before a genitive, far from the noun it governs:

metasque dati pervenit ad aevi (Virg. *Aen.* 10.472),

the only instance I have noted in the *Aeneid*, but echoed by Lucan:

Cambyses longi populos pervenit ad aevi (Lucan 10.280),

in a nice instance of variation. There are further examples from several poets:⁵⁰

magni speciem glomeravit in orbis (Ovid *Met.* 1.35);

dum vada tendis ad Hebri (Ovid *Her.* 2.15);

patriae sedes remeamus in urbis (Lucan 1.690);

ipsius aspectu pereant in velleris (Val. Fl. 7.551).

This can no doubt be seen as part of the general trend towards the adoption by poets of word orders that result in the wilful separation of elements that naturally go together; this seems quite foreign to archaic Latin, and nowhere else, perhaps, can the innovatory tendencies of Latin poetic syntax be quite so clearly seen.

In this paper, I have naturally not attempted to cover all possible syntactic features that might be classified as archaic (let alone those that involve some form of innovation), but rather to give some idea of the problems inherent in any such classification: the need to know whether something is truly archaic, or perceived as such; whether its use is to be explained by that fact, or whether it was just felt to be a 'poeticism'; whether the poetic use is the same as the archaic use, or shows adaptation and development; whether changes, or indeed retentions, can be accounted for purely within Latin, or whether Greek influence is to be recognized (I have ignored here Graecisms pure and simple, like the accusative of respect); or whether we may at times have been duped into thinking that something is an archaism whereas it has in fact arisen through a process of change that has come full circle.

It may be remarked, in cautionary conclusion, that Latin poetic language, with its fondness for parataxis and unmarked subordination arising from it, and its use of plain case-forms rather than prepositional phrases, shows a remarkable similarity to the syntactic patterns reconstructed for the Indo-European parent language; but this should not be taken to imply continuity. Very little of what might be reconstructed as Indo-European

⁵⁰ For a useful collection of examples from Ovid onwards, see Eich (1925).

poetics seems to have survived the development, from the third century BC, of an essentially innovative literary language at Rome under the heavy influence of Greek,⁵¹ and there is no reason to suppose that poets had access to a remoter poetic past, except in so far as features of it were preserved in religious or legal usages, and the connotations of these were not necessarily archaic rather than technical. The interplay between archaism and innovation surveyed above is concerned with a relatively small span of time, and with the reaction within the poetic tradition both to the usages of the early Latin authors and to trends in the development of the language as a whole. The 'Indo-European look' of certain characteristics of Latin poetic syntax illustrates only that apparent archaism may in fact result from rampant innovation.

⁵¹ Cf. Watkins (1995: 62).

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* (Civacima. Études sur le vocabulaire intellectuel du Moyen Age 8) (Turnhout).
- Domínguez Domínguez, J. F. and Martín Rodríguez, A. M. (1993), 'Dare con infinitivo en latín clásico', *Cuadernos de filología clásica*, 4: 9–22.
- Dover, K. J. (1963), 'The Poetry of Archilochus', in *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 10: 183–212 (Geneva).
- (1968, corrected reprint of 1960 ed.), *Greek Word Order* (Cambridge).
- Draeger, A. (1882, 3rd ed.), *Über Syntax und Stil des Tacitus* (Leipzig).
- Drexler, H. (1967), *Einführung in die römische Metrik* (Darmstadt).
- Dubois, J. (1966), 'Les problèmes du vocabulaire technique', *Cahiers de lexicologie* 9: 103–12.
- Dumortier, J. (1935), *Le vocabulaire médical d'Eschyle et les écrits hippocratiques* (Paris).
- Easterling, P. E. (ed.) (1982), *Sophocles, Trachiniae* (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), *Helenaë et Herus epistulae Ovidii non sunt* (Diss. Halle).
- Linde, P. (1923), 'Die Stellung des Verbs in der lateinischen Prosa', *Glotta* 12: 153–78.
- Lindsay, W. M. (1893), 'The Saturnian metre', *AJP* 14: 139–70, 305–34.
- (1907), *Syntax of Plautus* (Oxford).
- (ed.) (1913; repr. Hildesheim 1978), *Sexti Pompeii Festi de verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome* (Leipzig).
- (1922), *Early Latin Verse* (Oxford).
- Linse, E. (1891), *De P. Ovidio Nasone vocabulorum inventore* (Progr. Dortmund).
- Löfstedt, B. (1990), 'Notizen zu Sprache und Text von Celsus, *De medicina*', *MH* 47: 60–2.
- Löfstedt, E. (1911), *Philologischer Kommentar zur 'Peregrinatio Aetherae'. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache* (Uppsala).
- (1928 [vol. 1]; 1933 [vol. 2]; 1942 [2nd ed. of vol. 1]), *Syntactica. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins I & II* (Lund).
- (1959), *Late Latin* (Oslo).
- Lohmann, A. (1915), *De Graecismorum Vergiliano usu quaestiones selectae* (Diss. Münster).

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

- (ed.) (1915), *A. Cornelii Celsi quae supersunt* (CML, i; Leipzig–Berlin).
- Mason, H. A. (1963), 'Is Juvenal a Classic?', in Sullivan (1963), 93–176.
- Maurach, G. (1975), 'Ovid, Met. I, 48 und die Figur der "Umkehrung"', *Hermes* 103: 479–86.
- Mayer, R. G. (1983), 'Catullus' divorce', *CQ* 33: 297–8.
- (ed.) (1994), *Horace, Epistles, Book I* (Cambridge).
- Mazzini, I. (1988), 'La medicina nella letteratura latina. I. Osservazioni e proposte interpretative su passi di Lucilio, Lucrezio, Catullo e Orazio', *Aufidus* 4: 45–73.
- (1990), 'Il folle da amore', in Alfonso *et al.* (1990), 39–83.
- (1991a), 'La medicina nella letteratura latina. II. 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).