

Stylistic Registers in Juvenal

J. G. F. POWELL

Summary. Juvenal is commonly said to have adopted the 'grand' or 'high' style. In this paper it is argued that statements to this effect are misleading. Over-schematic contrasts between Juvenal and Horace are deprecated, in favour of a recognition of the satiric qualities of both writers. It is contended that Juvenal's references to contemporary or earlier epic, important as they are, are all in the nature of parody, and that a proper appreciation of the difference in style between Silver Latin epic and Juvenal's satire would obviate an over-serious view of Juvenal. Some passages in Juvenal that are commonly alleged to be programmatic statements about his own style are then discussed, with the aim of showing that they do not constitute a proclamation that he will adopt the 'grand' style, or indeed any style foreign to the genre of satire. An attempt is then made to define some of the different things that are meant by 'style', and to distinguish in particular the concept of 'register' from other ingredients of literary style. Against the background of Axelson's work on stylistic register in Latin poetry, it is argued that Juvenal's style is not 'grand' in terms of stylistic register, except when he is parodying epic, and that his passages of epic parody generally include some clear stylistic incongruity which reveals the ironical purpose behind them.

IT IS COMMONLY STATED that Juvenal adopted the 'high' or 'grand' style; indeed, it is sometimes presupposed as a fact, and explanations are looked for.¹ But before one attempts to explain a phenomenon, one ought to

¹ The first major scholarly treatment of this question is apparently that of Scott (1927); see also Anderson (1961), Kenney (1963), and Bramble (1974: 164–73). In (I think) my second

make sure that one has defined and observed it correctly. One should first ask what the high style is (and indeed whether it is one thing or several), and then what precise use Juvenal is alleged to have made of it, before the statement can even be tested against the evidence of the text. I shall argue that, at least in its simple form as just stated, the proposition that Juvenal adopted the high style is misleading. The quest for stylistic categories which are not merely legitimate (whether in ancient or modern terms), but also helpful in enabling us to read the text of Juvenal in an enlightened and appreciative way, is not by any means an easy one. While I have certainly encountered people (particularly young cynics in the late 1980s and '90s) who appreciate the tone of Juvenal's satires with immediate and genuine gusto, without ever having worried much about precise definitions of stylistic features, it is equally certain that the imposition of inappropriate categories will impede reception and stifle understanding. So I think the attempt to be rather more precise about these things is worth while.

This matter of high style is not the only mismatch between my own experience of Juvenal and what I read in some of the secondary literature about him, but it is one of the most persistent. I am seriously quite puzzled as to how any competent Latinist could read even a single satire of Juvenal all the way through, except just possibly the Tenth, and come out thinking that this author is a consistent practitioner of the high or grand style; and yet that is what people say. For an explanation of this, I am tempted to look for factors outside the text. Juvenal does, indeed, occupy a rather peculiar position within the twentieth-century canon of Latin authors. He is the only classical verse writer after Ovid who is generally accorded the first rank, and whose works figure largely in school and undergraduate syllabuses, at least in this country (these observations may be Anglocentric). Hence he tends to be accorded the reverence due to a *premier cru* classic, while the serious poetry of his time is neglected. The modest expansion in recent years of specialist interest in Silver Age epic and tragedy has not substantially affected the position, because those who deal seriously in Silver epic are often not the same as those who work on Juvenal. It is relatively uncommon for Juvenal to be seen in proper perspective within his period. The genuine high style in Silver Latin poetry is to be found in Seneca, Lucan and Statius. The style of Juvenal seems to

term as an Oxford undergraduate, John Bramble set me to write an essay on 'Juvenal's reasons for adopting the high style'. This paper may be said to represent the mature growth from a seed of puzzlement sown in that tutorial. I am grateful to Professor Susanna Morton Braund for comments on a late draft of this paper. Even later, Professor Braund's edition of *Satires* 1-5 (Braund (1996)) came to hand, and it was possible to take it into account in the final stage of revision: see especially the comments at the very end of this paper.

me far different from this and impossible to mistake for it; but that is clearly not how it has seemed to others.

The waters may be muddied by the fact that both Lucan and Statius cultivate striking verbal effects, and both show tendencies towards a bitterly ironical tone: features which may seem to bring them closer to satire in general and to Juvenal in particular. But in the end I would wish to maintain a firm distinction, though with all due sense of the inadequacy and slipperiness of the categories: Lucan and Statius are basically serious, though not by any means always solemn; Juvenal is basically comic, though not necessarily always frivolous. Indeed, given that contemporary epic did contain passages of ironical denunciation, there would be no reason why Juvenal should not parody those along with the rest. In such a case the reader would indeed be faced with a difficult task in determining the tone, if it were not for the fact that Juvenal usually sooner or later undercuts the dramatic pose.

Genre and literary tradition are universally acknowledged to be important for the study of any Roman author; and while Juvenal's relations with other authors of his period may receive insufficient attention, his work is very commonly treated as part of an organic tradition of Roman satire, and the relations between his work and that of Lucilius, Horace and Persius are often studied in detail. While a study of this aspect is indeed necessary for a proper appreciation of Juvenal, this approach has its dangers too. Perhaps paradoxically, it may lead to an exaggerated view of the differences between these four authors, while the generic similarities may be taken for granted.

On a first inspection, it may well seem that Juvenal has little in common with the pedestrian Horace of the *Satires* and *Epistles*; he can easily seem 'high' by comparison. But the similarities between Horace's hexameter style and Juvenal's, and the markedly satirical and un-epic qualities of the latter, can easily be underplayed.

Take in particular the question of metrical technique. 'The central fact about the verse technique of Juvenal,' says Courtney, 'is that it is very different from that used by Horace in his *Satires*.'² But let us look at Courtney's own very useful statistics. We are told, for example, that Juvenal has about 130 monosyllabic line-endings, 'much the same proportion as Horace', as against the far more sparing use of this feature in Virgil and its almost complete absence from Silver epic. As for polysyllabic endings, 'Horace *Satires* has 43 such cases, much the same proportion as Juvenal'.

² Courtney (1980: 49). On the metrical technique of Horace see Nilsson (1952), from whom the selection of diagnostic features is taken. Braund (1996: 29-30) deals with metre along roughly the same lines as Courtney.

(In this case the Virgilian proportion seems to be comparable.) Courtney gives us a scale of frequency of elision, in which it appears that Juvenal is more sparing with elision than Horace in the *Satires* (though we are not told how much more); but Virgil in the *Aeneid* uses more elision and Ovid in the *Metamorphoses* less than either. With the facts as they are, it is very difficult to know what stylistic interpretation to put on the statistics for elision, but certainly the difference between Juvenal and Horace does not seem to stand out. The details given on enjambment are also ambiguously significant. The statistic for *atque* ending a line (two in Virgil, four in Juvenal, 29 in Horace) may merely indicate a Horatian idiosyncrasy. *Et* at line-end, absent from Virgil, is said to occur six times in Juvenal, 12 in Horace; Courtney comments that Juvenal 'stands far behind Horace'; in fact he is just as different from Virgil as from Horace, and it could indeed be argued that the difference between the presence of a feature and its complete absence may be more significant than the difference between twelve occurrences and six. On the other hand, Juvenal takes more liberties than Horace in his use of monosyllabic prepositions at line-end and of relative pronouns in the same position; the former do not occur at all in Horace, of the latter Juvenal has 34 as against 15 in Horace ('a significantly higher proportion' according to Courtney).

Juvenal has fewer pauses at 'unusual' places in the line than Horace, but at the same time significantly more than Virgil. Although on first impression Juvenal may seem more regular than Horace, every now and again he produces a line-ending which clearly signals that we are in the world of satire and not in that of epic. *Nescis | quem tua simplicitas risum vulgo moveat, cum | exigis . . .* (13.35) is as odd as anything in Horace, if not odder (doubtless the dislocation of rhythm suits the meaning); Horace can provide no parallel for 3.273 *ad cenam si | intestatus eas* (the word order highlights *ad cenam*; the unusual rhythm may serve to reinforce this, and the combination of enjambment with hiatus in *si | intestatus* presumably suggests a more deliberate enunciation than would be normal). In two respects, Juvenal makes use of distinctively poetic features which are not used by Horace: hiatus within the line, and spondaic line-endings. Courtney's discussion shows sufficiently that the great majority of these are used for special effect and have a clear nuance of parody.

From all this, it is really not clear why the differences between Juvenal's metrical practice and Horace's should be treated as the 'central fact', while the similarities between them are laid on one side. It is a question of emphasis, and there is one fact that needs emphasizing more than any stylistic differences between Juvenal and Horace: the fact that they are both satirists, and that they both do some things (metrically and otherwise) that on the whole only satirists do.

The 'satiric tradition' was never self-contained and self-perpetuating. Braund (1992a: 3-4) has aptly characterized it as 'parasitic'; it was so both in relation to the established classics (the same for us as for Juvenal: mostly Virgil, Horace and Ovid) and in relation to the latest poetic fashions. From the earliest times, satire borrowed the metre of epic and, to some extent, its ways of forcing language into metre: potentially an act of parody in itself; cf. Braund (1996: 21 and 24), who however stops short of admitting that it is parody, and calls it 'counterpoint' instead. Everyone agrees that at least some of Juvenal's references to epic are in the nature of parody (see e.g. Hight (1951: 375ff.); Marache (1964: 476); Cèbe (1966: 320ff.); Townend (1973: 154ff.)). Some have distinguished two different purposes for this: ridicule of a commonplace and unworthy object by dignifying it in elevated language, or ridicule of the conventions and mannerisms of epic itself (Lelièvre (1958); Romano (1979)). This is all very fine. But not everyone has been prepared to go the whole way and to say, as I would be inclined to, that every reference to epic in Juvenal is parodic. Part of the problem is that the word 'parody' is used in different ways. The word *παρωδία* no doubt originally referred to direct parodic imitation of an identifiable passage of some more serious author (there are plenty of well-known examples, including some in Juvenal) and some modern writers seem to confine it to this sense; but we need a word for more general 'sending up' of epic or tragic diction, and there seems to be no objection in modern usage to employing 'parody' in this wider sense as well.

On the other hand, if all that is meant by Juvenal's supposed high style is precisely this tendency to indulge in epic parody (in this wider sense), then the categories are misleading. Epic parody does not constitute the high style. In any case, Juvenal's satires are not full-blown epic parodies; not even the main narrative of Satire 4 comes into this category, for however much of Statius' *De Bello Germanico* lies behind this satire, the style never remains in the realm of high epic for more than a few lines at a time.³ In general, Juvenal's epic parody typically comes in fairly short

³ The narrative begins with parody of an epic scene-setting, lines 37-46. From 46 *quis enim* to 56 *ne pereat* is virtually pure prose (though there are doubtless one or two parodic touches; e.g. the singular for plural *multo delatore* may be one such). Then the style rises again to the level of epic, from 56 *iam letifero* to the end of the fisherman's speech *ipse capi voluit* (69), though we shall note the pointedly incongruous *obsonia* at line 64. Sustained imitation of high epic style is largely abandoned thereafter. Isolated epic mannerisms are employed, but usually in a ludicrous fashion (107 *Montani venter*, 108 the grandiose hyperbaton *matutino . . . amomo* immediately deflated by *quantum vix redolent duo funera*, 109-10 *saevior . . . aperire*, a type of brachylogy brought into poetic usage by Horace and much beloved by the Silver poets; and so on); and there are a number of phrases which strike this reader at least as very clearly prosaic or conversational in tone (e.g. 78 *anne aliud tum praefecti?*, 98 *unde fit ut malim fraterculus esse gigantis*, 106 *et tamen improbior saturam scribente cinaedo*, 128-9 *hoc defuit unum Fabricio . . .*).

bursts (I mean, of course, what would appear to be short bursts to one reading, or listening, at normal speed), and is cast into relief by the contrast with the surrounding style, which is very much not that of epic.

Even so, some have asserted that Juvenal adopted the epic manner, or something less well defined called the grand style, not for purposes of parody but with a serious poetic or at least rhetorical and moralizing aim (Scott (1927); Bramble (1974); (1982a)). We are told that the Roman vices attacked by Juvenal had reached epic proportions and therefore demanded epic treatment. Or Juvenal is alleged to have aimed to supplant a supposedly played-out epic tradition from its privileged place in the hierarchy of genres (Anderson (1962: 284); Braund (1992a: 43); (1996: 22–3)). Such diagnoses, based as they presumably are on an interpretation of Juvenal's own words in Satire 1, must be regarded with caution. In the first place, clearly, Juvenal's programmatic statements, such as they are, are themselves part of the satire and must be taken in that spirit. In the second place, it is not clear that these interpretations accurately represent what Juvenal's words actually claim about his own work. In the first paragraph of Satire 1, and then again in lines 52–4, he does, indeed, ridicule contemporary epic writers as a rhetorical foil for his own writing, but he says nothing directly about transferring their style into satire, nor about any comparison between the material of satire and that of epic, nor about supplanting epic from its position. All these ideas have been imported by interpreters; but there was no need to do this, if only the essentially facetious tone of Juvenal's apologia had been recognized. All that is actually said is (to paraphrase) 'Everyone else is at the writing game: comedy, elegy, tragedy, epic — the lot. (15) Why shouldn't I have a go as well? (19) But I have decided that my field will be satire. Why? (30) Because it's difficult not to write satire with Rome as it is. (51) The iniquities of modern Rome are worthy of Horace's pen. Would you prefer me to write about the deeds of Hercules? (79) I may be no poet but my indignation will see me through. There has been material for satire since the world began, but never more than now . . .'. Explicitly Juvenal claims only to follow Lucilius and Horace; epic is no more than the rejected alternative. Of course, this might have been the prelude to a consistently epic-style narrative of contemporary Roman misdeeds, but what follows in the first satire, and in most of the others with the obvious exception of the fourth, is not even narrative, but argumentative conversational discourse — in fact *sermo*.

The foregoing remarks have been preliminary to my main purpose in this paper, which is to enquire into the ways in which a detailed study of Juvenal's language might help to resolve this question of his seriousness or, as I would contend, absence of seriousness. But first, it is necessary to

clear away a possible objection. Has not Juvenal himself told us that he will adopt the grand style? Many have thought so. In particular, attention has been drawn to a famous passage near the end of Satire 6, one of the three most commonly quoted allegedly programmatic statements in Juvenal.⁴

Juvenal has alleged that mothers, in contemporary Rome, poison their children. He turns aside from the narration to counteract possible disbelief on the part of the audience, in the following words:

Fingimus haec, altum Saturas⁵ sumentem cothurnum,
 scilicet, et finem egressi legemque priorum
 grande Sophocleo carmen bacchamur hiatu
 montibus ignotum Rutulis caeloque Latino?
 Nos utinam vani . . .

The interpreters take this to be a proclamation about style.⁶ But this is surely not right. It is about the credibility of the subject-matter. Juvenal says (to paraphrase): 'I suppose you think I'm making this up? I suppose you think this is the stuff of Greek tragedy, not satire? I suppose you think I'm overstepping the limits of the genre and giving you a grand Sophoclean performance, unknown in Italy? I only wish you were right . . .' The crucial word is the ironical *scilicet*, which qualifies the whole sentence, and is immediately countered by *nos utinam vani* 'I only wish my words had no substance'. The implication, then, to spell it out phrase by phrase, is that Juvenal is *not* making it up; this is *not* the stuff of Greek tragedy; he is *not* overstepping the limits of the genre; he is *not* giving a grand Sophoclean performance unknown in Italy; he is *not* 'vanus', but is telling the plain truth. To take these words as asserting that Juvenal *is* overstep-

⁴ The others are 1.85-6 and 1.170-1. The former, the famous passage containing the word *farrago*, I have myself discussed (Powell (1987)) and hope to have shown that it is not as directly programmatic as it is usually supposed to be. The latter is Juvenal's claim to attack the dead: *experiar quid concedatur in illos quorum Flaminia tegitur cinis atque Latina*. Contrary to the usual belief, this claim, genuine enough in itself (especially if taken with reference to the dead Domitian in satire 4), is neither exclusive nor exhaustive. There is in fact some evidence for living victims, or at any rate the evidence is not all unambiguously for dead ones; see Highet (1954: 291-2), Ferguson (1987). The dogma that Juvenal flogs only dead horses, like some other dogmas attacked in this paper, has had an adverse effect on criticism and appreciation of the satires, and it is refreshing to realize that, in its extreme form, it is not justified by the evidence.

⁵ The capital *S* is deliberate; it is a personification.

⁶ Scott (1927: 6); Bramble (1974: 165; 1982: 598); cf. also Anderson (1962: 152), Rudd (1986: 107-9), Morford (1972). Smith (1989: 811-23) rightly sees the problem with these interpretations. If he had been more radical in refuting them, this part of my paper would have been rendered unnecessary.

ping the limits of the genre and *is* adopting a tragic style, is clean contrary to the rhetoric of the passage.

A similar rhetorical move occurs in Satire 4 when Juvenal calls upon the Muse to narrate the story of Domitian's council: *non est cantandum, res vera agitur*. 'No need to sing: this is what happened in real life.' The proclamation, if proclamation it is, is that this will be the plain truth told in plain unadorned narrative. Now, of course, this disclaimer is immediately followed by a Tale of a Turbot which obviously *isn't* true, or at least is not the plain unvarnished truth, and is told (at least initially) in what the densest reader could see to be a sustained parody of epic style. That is a comic incongruity, and something of the same sort is also going on in this passage of the sixth satire.

Here, Juvenal's rejection of tragic invention and fable is immediately followed by a direct parody, not actually of tragic style, but of tragic content. Apparently in order to underline the claim that this is the plain truth, Juvenal makes Pontia, who was, it seems, a real murderess⁷, not merely confess but shout her confession (6.638): *sed clamat Pontia 'feci, | confiteor, puerisque meis aconita paravi, | quae deprensa patent; facinus tamen ipsa peregi'*. It is not realistic to suppose that murderesses commonly spoke to that effect. Her brazen unrepentance is being exaggerated, but there is more than that. Murderesses *do* sometimes speak to that effect in tragedy; for example, Medea at the climax of Seneca's play of that name, though for all we know Juvenal may have had in mind some even closer parallel in a play now lost to us. The fateful word *feci* is there, twice (990–1); in fact, Medea shows a twinge of remorse, but not so Pontia. Further, at a stage of the action when Medea has disposed of one son but has not yet started on the second, Jason, wishing to be put out of his suspense, says to her *Iam perage coeptum facinus* (Juvenal: *facinus tamen ipsa peregi*). Again: Juvenal⁸, incredulous, asks Pontia whether she really poisoned two sons at one meal; to which she is made to reply (6.642): *septem, si septem forte fuissent*. Compare, for the content, Seneca, *Medea* 1010–1, *ut duos perimam, tamen | nimium est dolori numerus angustus meo*. At this point Juvenal gives in and says he will believe the tragedians

⁷ She is mentioned as such by Martial; references in Courtney (1980: ad loc.).

⁸ I make no apology for using the name 'Juvenal' to refer to the person who speaks in the satires, even when that person happens to be conducting an imaginary dialogue with some other character. It was always the tradition of Roman satire that the satirist represented himself as speaking in *propria persona*, whether in monologue or in dialogue. The modern use of the rather ill-defined literary-critical term 'persona' carries a danger of obscuring this fact (cf. Braund (1996: 2)). It can, doubtless, be useful for pointing out the distinction between the writer's literary self-portrayal and his ordinary 'off-stage' personality; of course, in Juvenal's case we know virtually nothing about the latter.

after all. One would have thought that the humour of this imaginary interchange was hardly mistakeable, black though it is; and the *fingimus haec?* lines are there to heighten it, just as *res vera agitur* heightens the humour of the tall story in Satire 4.

From the stylistic point of view, indeed, there is a considerable contrast between Juvenal's Pontia and her counterpart in genuine tragedy. Seneca's Medea speaks with interlaced hyperbaton; Pontia speaks ordinary Latin. Her words, despite the possible verbal reminiscence of Seneca (containing only the merest hint of tragic diction), are not above the stylistic level of everyday prose. But they are reminiscent of Medea in tone and subject-matter, and in terms of content Pontia makes the kind of speech that could be made only in tragedy, not in real life. The incongruity between the content (high tragic horror) and the style (everyday and nonchalant) is part of the satirical effect. Juvenal has told us that we are not in the world of tragedy, and that things like this now happen in ordinary life. He has reinforced the idea by a deliberate use of ordinary, uncoloured language. Anything further from a wholesale adoption of tragic style would be difficult to imagine. Yet people still talk of Juvenal overstepping the limits of the genre.

The advocates of altitude also base part of their case on the imagery used by Juvenal in Satire 1 to describe his writing, which, as John Bramble rightly pointed out, is of a kind often used by serious poets to describe their own poetry. At the beginning Juvenal refers to Lucilius, the founder of the genre, using a chariot-driving image (1.19): *cur tamen hoc potius libeat decurrere campo | per quem magnus equos Auruncae flexit alumnus* . . . In summing up at the end of the satire, he states that in the present age vice has reached its highest point, and apparently addresses himself (1.149) in the words *utere velis, totos pande sinus*. And in the concluding dialogue with the cautious interlocutor, satire is envisaged as a battle (not unnaturally, since it involves attacking people). Lucilius, as if with drawn sword, roars in the heat of his anger (1.165): *ense velut stricto quotiens Lucilius ardens | infremuit*; and Juvenal is to consider well before he goes into the fray (1.168): *tecum prius ergo voluta | haec animo ante tubas: galeatum sero duelli | paenitet*. Chariots, sails, battles: not only are these images common in poetry (and high oratory), but the language here is also poetic: *equos flexit*, the paraphrase *magnus Auruncae alumnus*, *ense stricto*, even the archaic *duelli*. The trouble is that the stylistic register of this language is altogether above the normal level in Juvenal's satires. *Ensis* and *duellum* are nowhere else used by him. If these images are really meant to raise expectations about the kind of style that we are in future to expect from Juvenal, those expectations are doomed to disappointment. The truth is, rather, that this particular context of talking about

his own work has inspired Juvenal to parody the style in which serious poets generally talk about *their* own work. If this is the case, it should not necessarily be taken to have any wider implications. The content of the passages is programmatic, but there is no prima-facie reason to suppose that their style also is.

Furthermore, since in the first and third passages the grandiose language is linked in each case with the mention of Lucilius, one may possibly suspect some particular influence from that quarter. It has been held that Juvenal in the first satire misrepresented Lucilius and made him out to be much more like Juvenal himself than he actually was (Bramble (1974), developing a suggestion of Anderson (1961)). I do not think we have sufficient evidence on which to convict Juvenal of this. What we do know is that there was plenty of epic parody in Lucilius, and Professor Petersmann has reminded us that epic and tragic parody was a vital ingredient in Latin satire from the earliest times. There was, at any rate, nothing particularly original in Juvenal's pervasive use of this technique. Juvenal is often said to have deviated from the gentler and more urbane standard set by Horace, but it could just as well be argued that Horace was the deviant, and that Juvenal's style was a true reversion to the Lucilian model; or, alternatively, that both Juvenal and Horace were equally like Lucilius, but imitated different aspects of his writing. Such judgements on literary history should be made, if at all, only with great caution, given that we do not possess all the relevant texts.

This leaves the second passage, a mere five words: *utere velis, totos pande sinus*. A grand image, certainly, but surely a hackneyed one in the literary circles of the time, as we may see, for example, from comparison with a Pliny letter often quoted in this context (8.4.5 *immitte rudentes, pande vela, ac si quando alias, toto ingenio vehere*), noting in particular Pliny's self-conscious parenthesis '*cur enim non ego quoque poetice cum poeta?*', which immediately follows, but tends to be left out by commentators on Juvenal who quote the passage. Given that even Pliny could not use this well-worn image without a certain irony, it stretches the imagination to believe that Juvenal's use of the same image, in a satirical context, is not also ironical. The satirist's hoisting of sails is at most a facetious mimicry of the orator's or poet's. Kenney (1962: 33) says of this passage: '... these phrases are rhetorical claptrap, and are obviously meant to be read as such' (cf. Smith (1989: 814 and note 6)).

In sum, Juvenal has not told us in advance what style we are to expect from him; and the only way to find out more about Juvenal's style is to look and see. But what, in this context, is 'style'? This question may seem Socratic, but it is, I think, capable of a more analytical answer than has sometimes been provided. I apologize in advance for the rather general

and theoretical nature of what follows next, but I think it is necessary in the interests of clarity. Inevitably, also, I shall be going over points already made by other contributors to this volume.

There are at least five different things that can be referred to by the word 'style' (this analysis is not, of course, meant to be exhaustive). First, there is the bread and butter of rhetoric: tricks of sentence construction such as tricolon, anaphora, asyndeton and the rest; figures of speech or thought such as similes and metaphors; and forms of argument such as *exempla*, *praeteritio* or *anticipatio*. The occurrence of these in Juvenal has been usefully documented, principally in the dissertation of De Decker (1913) entitled *Juvenalis Declamans*, in Courtney's introduction (Courtney (1980)) and in Braund (1996: 19–21 and 27–9). De Decker's treatment, still often cited, needs to be used with caution. He does not distinguish sufficiently between generalized rhetorical features and specifically declamatory ones, i.e. those that belong to the specialized environment of the rhetorical schools.⁹ These schools, it should be noticed, are treated by Juvenal with profound disrespect, and the tendency to see them as the key to his work (apart from their general educational influence on first-century Roman culture) seems to me to be yet another scholarly illusion. De Decker is also prone to criticize Juvenal for tasteless hyperbole, in passages where one would have thought the exaggeration was clearly made deliberately for satirical effect (see e.g. his discussions of 10.190ff., 15.51ff.).

It is a mistake to suppose that rhetorical vehemence and the use of rhetorical figures in itself constitutes the grand style. At the very least, grand rhetorical style should be distinguished from grand poetic style. The former is natural in prose; the idea that it can be transferred unchanged into verse is not without its problems. The attempt to manipulate anaphora, asyndeton, accumulation and the rest in verse can sometimes result in a clearly prosaic effect. Simple examples of this may be found on occasions when Juvenal's sentences (deliberately for comic effect) outrun the metre, as in 2.145ff. *et Capitolinis generosior et Marcellis | et Catuli Paulique minoribus et Fabiis et | omnibus ad podium spectantibus, his licet ipsum | admoveas cuius tunc munere retia misit*. Rhetorical figures may be found in conjunction with features of vocabulary or content that would naturally

⁹ Nor is it always clear, in these discussions, whether we are to think merely of habits of speech and thought which Juvenal caught from his rhetorical training and put to good use in satire (habits whose presence nobody doubts), or of a more systematic and conscious use of rhetorical modes. Braund (1996: 19) certainly implies the latter: 'Satire 6, for example, gains from being read as a *progymnasma*'. 'Gains' in what way? What marks would this essentially irreverent composition have got from a real rhetorical teacher? At the most — to risk labouring the point once more — it might gain from being read as a *parody* of the sort of things that were said in such exercises.

be associated with low style, as for example in the *accumulatio* of 3.31–3 *quis facile est aedem conducere flumina portus, | siccandam eluviam, portandum ad busta cadaver, | et praebere caput domina venale sub hasta*. Processing sewage and carrying corpses are not dignified activities, and the latter is described in the brutally concrete terms *portandum cadaver* rather than e.g. *ducendum funus*. One should allow above all for an element of self-mockery in Juvenal's rhetoric.

In the second category of style I would include together what may be called texture (simplicity and complexity, and so forth) and tempo (rapidity or retardation of argument or narrative) and any other features that have to do with the broader structure of a piece of writing. Thirdly, there is what we more specifically mean when we talk of the style of a particular author; the peculiarities in vocabulary or phrasing favoured or avoided by an individual, the sort of thing that makes attributions possible on the basis of stylometric analysis; what we might call the author's thumbprint. These two features have no necessary correlation with the categories of 'high' or 'low'.

Fourthly, there is the question of what may be called tone: the way an author treats his envisaged audience. In this context we may talk of a serious or flippant style, a moralizing or didactic style, or whatever. The attempt to judge the tone (or, in this sense, the style) of a piece of writing is very closely related to the attempt to judge the intention behind it. For that reason it is often very difficult, at least where other evidence for the intention is lacking (and, as some of our friends in the profession never tire of pointing out, this is quite frequently the case). It is possible entirely to mistake the tone of a piece of writing. A competent author should be able to avoid this kind of problem in the short term, but no author, however careful, can ensure that the tone of his work will not be misjudged at some time or other in the next couple of millennia. Comic and satirical writers are particularly prone to misunderstanding of this sort, since they often presuppose a large shared background in their readership and the ability to pick up signals of considerable subtlety. A modern example that occurs to me often in this context is Chekhov, who I believe is generally regarded in Russia as a great comic writer, although his humour does not come over at all well in English translation. Of course, in the case of Juvenal, there are no native readers left to ask, so we have to argue from our own experience and try to back up our view with evidence; but there must once have been a right answer to the question, and there may yet be one more plausible than its rivals.

Fifthly, and here we come to my central point, there is what is sometimes by traditional critics called diction or stylistic level, and by linguists, register.

Stylistic register has two characteristics that mark it off from some of the other features normally thought to belong to style. To speak in broad general terms, it is public, not individual; it belongs to the linguistic code shared by the community, and there are fairly circumscribed limits to the extent to which any individual writer or speaker can interfere with it. I illustrated this with a class of students by giving them the following four English sentences: (1) Orestes killed his mother; (2) Orestes committed matricide; (3) Orestes slew her that bore him; (4) Orestes did in his mum. There was absolutely no disagreement as to how those four sentences should be described in terms of their stylistic register. While the set of registers available in a given linguistic community at a particular time may be different from what is available in another, nevertheless some kind of public definition of registers is possible, even across cultural boundaries, and even though the actual manipulation of register within a speech-community is in most cases largely unconscious.

The second characteristic, doubtless a corollary of the first, is that the register of words can to some extent be measured objectively by looking at the kinds of texts in which they occur. Some of the difficulties inherent in this procedure have been pointed out by Professor Robert Coleman. To his remarks I shall add merely that negative tests are a good deal easier to apply than positive ones. Comparative statistics are often difficult to evaluate, but if a word is entirely absent from a particular author or genre, it is easier to draw conclusions.

The fundamental work on register in Latin poetry is, of course, B. Axelson's *Unpoetische Wörter* (1945). This deals with only one part of the subject, albeit perhaps the most important part: that concerned with vocabulary. However, syntax, word order and sentence construction are also relevant. In English, for example, the phrase *twitched his mantle blue* contains both a poetic item of vocabulary (mantle) and a poetic feature of word order (postposition of adjective). Anyone going into Marks and Spencer's and asking for a 'coat blue' would be looked at in a strange way.¹⁰ In Latin, the most obvious feature of poetic register as regards word order is persistent hyperbaton of noun and adjective (see Pearce (1966), who however does not deal with post-Augustan poetry). One of the things I would like to see done by way of research in this field is to determine a hierarchy of register for different types of hyperbaton. It might seem, for example, that an emphatic adjective separated from its noun by a main

¹⁰ But not e.g. in the army, where, in official references to clothing or equipment, the logical principle that *genus* comes before *differentia* overrides natural English word order, giving rise to items such as 'socks thick woollen'. On poetic word orders, cf. also J. H. W. Penney's chapter in this volume, pp. 263-8.

verb, as in *bonos habemus consules*, is quite ordinary and prosaic, while the interlaced hyperbaton of *saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram* is distinctively poetic (in classical Latin: medieval prose writers imitate it indiscriminately); but for cases between these extremes, things are not so clear.

A full study of Juvenal's use of hyperbaton remains to be done.¹¹ But I note that in the first fifty lines of Satire 1 he has 26 hyperbata, as against 20 in the first fifty lines of the *Aeneid* (in the latter I have not counted three of the trivial type adjective+preposition+noun, as in *una cum gente*), and 17 in the first fifty lines of the first book of Horace's satires. This might make him seem more 'poetic' than Virgil; but Juvenal pales beside Statius, who has about 36 in the first fifty lines of the *Thebaid* (all these figures are approximate and rely on certain arbitrary assumptions about what constitutes a hyperbaton). Again it must be stressed: the true point of comparison for Juvenal's 'epic' style is the epic that was being written in his own lifetime. As for complex hyperbata, Virgil has only *saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram* in the fifty-line passage, while Juvenal has 1.20 *magnus equos Auruncae flexit alumnus*, 32 *causidici nova cum veniat lectica Mathonis*, and 38 *optima summi | nunc via processus*. We should probably not count 8 *Aeoliis vicinum rupibus antrum* and 13 *assiduo ruptae lectore columnae* in quite the same category, since these can be divided clearly into a noun, *antrum* or *columnae*, qualified by an adjectival phrase *Aeoliis vicinum rupibus* or *assiduo ruptae lectore*, whereas a true interlaced hyperbaton cannot be divided into smaller sense-units. Even without these, however, Juvenal clearly outdoes Virgil. But so does the pedestrian Horace, who has S.1.1.28 *gravem duro terram qui vertit aratro*, 29–30 *nautaeque per omne | audaces mare qui currunt*, and (perhaps) 45 *milia frumenti tua triverit area centum*. A larger sample might reveal a clearer pattern, but this modest excursion is enough to show the potential difficulties of such an approach.

Any language is bound to contain a large number of words and constructions that are virtually neutral as regards register. This applies to *Orestes killed his mother* as opposed to the other three ways of saying this. The use of such words is not, in itself, a clear indicator of stylistic level. One can draw significant conclusions only if such words are largely avoided (e.g. in favour of poetic, official or slang equivalents), or if a text is entirely composed of them. Further, register is not the same as literary or generic convention. In a literary culture there may be special conventions about what one can and cannot say in particular sorts of literature. For example,

¹¹ Braund (1996: 27) lists examples of a special case of hyperbaton, the so-called 'golden line'.

problems were apparently experienced in translating *Othello* into French in the eighteenth century, because the conventions of the time did not allow the mention of a *handkerchief* in formal dramatic style. Commentators sometimes seem to think that when Juvenal mentions hoes and mattocks and the like (3.309–11, 11.89, 15.165ff.) he is evoking the poetic world of the *Georgics*: in fact he is pulling us down to earth much more sharply than we might at first suppose. These words (*ligo, marra, sarculum*) are treated with circumspection in dignified writing; Virgil avoids them, even in the *Georgics*, and allows only the evidently more decorous *rastrum*, while Tacitus' periphrasis for them at *Annals* 1.65 is notorious (though Goodyear (1972: 343) rightly points out the occurrence of *ligones* without apology in *Annals* 3.27; the stylistic nuance in any given passage is a matter for delicate judgement). For us, maybe, mattocks and scythes are poetic in themselves because they conjure up an age romantically simpler than our own: this fact is irrelevant and should be dismissed from the mind. If the occurrence of these plebeian words were not enough, it could also be noted that 3.310 contains a highly unepic line ending *ut timeas ne*; 15.165, on the other hand, juxtaposes the hoes with high epic parody, *ast, ferrum letale, include nefanda*.

Axelsson was not primarily interested in Juvenal, and often inexplicably leaves out our author when he gives statistics for all the others in his list. However, he provides some details which are significant. He notes, for example, Juvenal's free use of diminutives, certainly a prosaic feature, and, following Friedländer, he observes Juvenal's use of prosaic turns of phrase such as *quod cum ita sit* (found also in elegy, but not, of course, in epic). Regarding single items of vocabulary, Axelsson notes for example *iumentum, vas (vasis), vehemens*, used by Juvenal and to some extent elsewhere in the 'lower' verse genres, but entirely absent from high poetry. The general picture, which would doubtless be confirmed by further research, is clear: Juvenal belongs firmly on the lower slopes of Helicon, along with the *Satires* and *Epistles* of Horace and with elegy, and does not share the fastidiousness of the epic poets when it comes to avoiding prosaic words.

Indeed, it appears to me that much of Juvenal's vocabulary, and more of his sentence-construction than is often supposed, is simply neutral for register, and that this makes the moments of epic parody all the more effective by contrast. It is difficult to illustrate stylistic neutrality by example. On this central issue I wish I could refer to a paper of which a summary appeared in *REL* 42 (1964) 57–9, but which does not seem ever to have been published *in extenso*. The author, P. Schmid, referred to Juvenal's 'sévérité du style et langue moderne' and observed that he 'se tient également à distance du purisme livresque et du maniérisme litté-

aire', referring on the one hand to his occasional use of everyday or colloquial words (common of course to all the satirists) and on the other to the contrast between Juvenal and his contemporary Tacitus. This is surely right and refreshing.

Juvenal does also use distinctively poetic words, although on the whole sparingly; I have already noticed that *ensis* and *duellum* occur only once each, in a special kind of context, and it would be an insensitive reader who did not see mockery in Juvenal's use of the archaic form *induperator* at 4.29. But more generally, an author as fond of irony and parody as Juvenal raises a particular problem for such lexicographical studies. One may be able, without too much trouble, to recognize the stylistic register of a particular word or construction used by him. But the tone in which he uses it may still escape one. How is one to detect irony or parody when it is there, or to be sure that one is not also detecting it when it is not there? One relatively recent study of Juvenal (Romano (1979)) vouchsafes the statistic that of 171 lines in the first satire, 109 have ironical content. I do not aim to quantify as precisely as this, but rather to establish rational grounds on which one can argue for the presence of irony.

Theoretically, there may not be any difference, on the surface and on paper, between a sentence meant 'straight' and one meant ironically. But on the other hand, there may be. One of Juvenal's commonest tricks is to introduce a mismatch of register, either between one word and another in the same passage, or between sentence structure or verse structure and vocabulary, or an incongruity between the content and the level of language used to express it. The commentators have noticed plenty of individual instances of this type of thing, but it seems to me that it is an even more pervasive feature of Juvenal's style than most people have realized, and that a full recognition of it would simply preclude an over-serious interpretation of his writing.

For example, Courtney (1980: 45) refers to the juxtaposition in 4.28-9 of the 'grand' *induperator* with the low words *gluttio* and *ructo*, but comments on this merely as an illustration of the 'wide range' of Juvenal's diction. This comment, with all respect, is beside the point. *Induperator* is not merely grand but, in this context, absurdly archaic: too archaic for Virgil, let alone the Silver poets. The absurdity is increased all the more by the guzzling and belching. Scott (1927) draws attention to a number of such cases, particularly 3.118, the periphrastic reference to Pegasus as *Gorgoneus* . . . *caballus* (he is *Gorgoneus equus* in Ovid and Statius), while Schmid (1964) notices 5.23 *serraca Bootae*. Similarly, Wiesen (1989) draws attention to 15.66: 'one word, the homely *coxam*, is the key to the irony'. To multiply examples would be tedious, but a cumulative picture begins to emerge. The point is that incongruities of this sort are incompatible

with the grand style in any simple sense of that phrase. The whole point of the grand style is that it has to be sustained. The slightest bathos or incongruity, even if unintentional, will ruin it. Where incongruity is deliberately sought, as it clearly is by Juvenal (unless he did these things in his sleep), it is surely no longer appropriate to talk of grand style.

Some passages, indeed, appear to shift about so quickly from the everyday world to the world of epic and back again that the unwary reader might get an impression of a chaotic mixture of stylistic levels, over which the author may seem to have lost control. In these cases too, however, it would be more charitable to assume that Juvenal is being deliberately facetious. Take for example, almost at random, a passage like 3.257–67, the description of the man killed in the street by the collapse of a cartload of marble:¹²

nam si procubuit qui saxa Ligustica portat
axis, et eversum fudit super agmina montem,
quid superest de corporibus? quis membra, quis ossa
invenit? obtritum vulgi perit omne cadaver
more animae. domus interea secura patellas
iam lavat et bucca foculum excitat et sonat unctis
strigilibus et pleno componit lintea gutto;
haec inter pueros varie properantur; at ille
iam sedet in ripa taetrumque novicius horret
porthmea, nec sperat caenosi gurgitis alnum
infelix, nec habet quem porrigat ore trientem.

In line 257 nothing is poetic except the postponement of *axis* until after the relative clause, but the following phrase *eversum fudit super agmina montem* produces an epic effect, not because the words in themselves are particularly poetic but because of the metaphorical hyperbole: the load of marble has become an upturned mountain (Harrison (1960: 99–101) observes that translators persistently miss this) and the crowds in the streets have become marching columns. Then some rhetorical questions, agitated in manner, but simple and prosaic in style: what is left of the bodies? Who can find limbs or bones? The next sentence, however, brings us into the world of Lucan and Statius. The rhythm of line 260 recalls Lucan 4.787 *compressum turba stetit omne cadaver*, while the content goes one better than Statius *Theb.* 6.884–5 (quoted by Braund (1996: ad loc.)), *penitus fractum obtritumque cadaver | indignantem animam propriis non reddidit astris*. In Statius the soul of the miner as well as his body is trapped

¹² Braund (1989a: 35) also discusses this passage — a fact which I had forgotten until she kindly pointed it out, at a late stage in the preparation of this paper for publication — and makes a number of the same points, but there is enough difference between her discussion and mine to justify letting the latter stand.

under the rock. This makes fairly dangerous play with the high Platonic doctrine of the soul's return to the stars, and may be thought already to hover on the edge of the grotesque; but Juvenal, assuming the common-sense view of the complete disappearance of the soul, implies that no trace remains even of the body. It is difficult not to assume that this is deliberately ludicrous.

Meanwhile, at home the servants, all unknowing, are getting ready for the victims of the accident to return. Of course epic also has its domestic scenes, but the point here is the vocabulary, which is strikingly homely and unpoetic: *patellas* (diminutive), *bucca* (not *ore!*), *foculum* (diminutive), *striglibus* (note the colloquial syncopated form), *lintea*, *guto*. Such everyday words often survived in Romance: *patella* = *poêle*, *bucca* = *bouche*. *Strigles*, so spelt, and *gutus* occur together in a graffito from Herculaneum (see Della Corte (1958: 271, no. 388, with facsimile in Tav. 3, facing pp. 264–5)). It is uncharitable to Juvenal to suppose that his *striglibus* is no more than a distortion for the sake of the metre, as apparently does Braund (1996: 219): it is a genuine colloquial form.¹³ Doubtless without it he could not have mentioned strigils at all, but in that case he would not have mentioned them. This passage, then, is full of prosaic, colloquial language; yet the use of *domus* as the collective designation of the house's inhabitants is on a higher level; and the homely oilflask is drawn into a poetic hyperbaton, *pleno . . . guto*. The next line, *haec inter pueros varie properantur*, is impeccably dignified, and the poetic, perhaps specifically Virgilian twist in *at ille*, with the sudden shift of scene to the banks of the Styx, has been well noticed by the critics (Jenkyns (1982: 191)). One is prepared for some real pathos in the description of the unburied ghost, but the expectation is defeated to some extent by the utterly prosaic word *novicius* ('tiro', or even 'greenhorn'). And does any serious Latin poet use *triens*?

The discussion by Scott just mentioned contains, in addition to many correctly identified examples of epic parody, a section entitled 'serious imitations of epic'. The latter section is, indeed, much shorter than the former, but I think I should spend a little time on it. I must confess that I find it a little difficult to see why some of the passages included in it are classified as 'serious', since Scott herself seems to admit that there is a

¹³ As a syncopation of the correct form *strigilibus*, it would be highly irregular. The syllable that has been lost is actually the accented syllable, while syncope regularly affects only unaccented syllables. If syncopation of (short) accented syllables were generally permissible in verse, poets would have had no difficulty in accommodating e.g. *facilius* or *pepulerat* to dactylic verse by turning them into **facilius* or **peplerat*; but they do no such thing. The only plausible explanation of *striglibus* is that it is remodelled on the stem of the regularly syncopated *striglem* (etc.). There are parallels for this process in sub-standard Latin, e.g. the form *viridia* for *viridia*, attested in an Egyptian ostrakon (Cavenaile (1958: no. 304)).

nuance of parody about them. But in others too it seems to me that there is often an incongruity of the type I have mentioned, of a type to disqualify the passage from being a genuinely serious poetic imitation. For example, Scott quotes in this category the list of deities and divine attributes in 13.78–83, by which the perjurer is alleged to swear:

per Solis radios Tarpeiaque fulmina iurat
 et Martis frameam et Cirrhaei spicula vatis,
 per calamos venatricis pharetramque puellae,
 perque tuum, pater Aegaei Neptune, tridentem,
 addit et Herculeos arcus hastamque Minervae,
 quidquid habent telorum armamentaria caeli.

But even if one passes over the possible disrespect to Mars involved in investing him with a Germanic barbarian's spear (*framea*: perhaps 'assegai' would be a rough near-modern equivalent) and to Diana in calling her *venatrix puella* (cf. 4.36 *prosit mihi vos dixisse puellas*), the whole dignified effect is destroyed by the bathos of the final line *quidquid habent telorum armamentaria caeli*. Of course, if we translate this as 'celestial armoury' or something equally poetic, we miss the point entirely. This is, I think, the only occurrence of *armamentarium* in classical Latin verse of any sort. We would be nearer the stylistic mark if we talked of celestial ironmongery. Many passages in Juvenal are like this: for several lines he appears to be talking in a serious poetic vein, leading us up the garden path, only to end in an abruptly deflationary punch-line (cf. Martyn (1979) for a collection of such passages; cf. also the surprise effects listed by Braund (1996: 26 and 27)). To stop quoting before you get to that point is a sure way to encourage radical misunderstanding.

In some instances the similarity to serious poetry is merely in subject matter, not in style (3.309–11 cf. Virg. *Georg.* 1.505–8; 15.127, on Egypt, cf. *Georg.* 4.287–9; 10.265 cf. *Aen.* 3.1; 267 cf. *Aen.* 2.509–10; 328–9 cf. *Aen.* 5.5–6; etc.); such instances are clearly no help for our present purpose. Sometimes any serious effect is ruined (deliberately, of course) by a ridiculous and whimsical twist given to a familiar *topos*: for example, Scott quotes in her 'serious' category 12.57–9 *i nunc et ventis animam committe, dolato | confisus ligno, digitis a morte remotus | quattuor aut septem, si sit latissima, taedae*; but what genuine poet talking about the dangers of seamanship would speculate about whether you were four or seven inches removed from death? 13.100 is quoted as being similar to *Iliad* 4.160: the gods' anger is slow but sure. In the right context such a sentiment could be taken quite seriously, but this is not the right context. Juvenal's line is actually a reversal of the Homeric sentiment, expressed in an extremely prosaic style for good measure (the locution *ut sit . . . tamen certe* would

hardly be suitable in epic): 'well, suppose the gods' anger *is* great, you have to admit it's slow'; and let us not leave out the next two lines either: 'so if they really take the trouble to punish all wrongdoers, they'll surely take a long time to get round to me'. That such a passage should be included in a catalogue of 'serious imitations of epic' is all but incredible.

I think I could do much the same as this for all the items in Scott's list, but I shall not labour the point. All I shall say is that if anyone can find a sustained, serious imitation of epic anywhere in Juvenal, without some incongruity or bathos or parody, I shall be very interested to hear of it.

After all this, some may be tempted to ask me whether I think Juvenal is ever serious at all. To this I reply that I think there are some passages in which he approaches a sort of seriousness, and that they are almost all of one kind: more or less nostalgic expressions of an ideal of moral virtue and simplicity, sometimes in generalized quasi-philosophical terms, as in 10.356ff., but more usually associated with the distant past or the remoter parts of the Italian countryside, as in parts of Satire 3; other such passages are 8.98, 11.77-98, 12.83ff. Even in these passages, however, there is often some incongruity or mockery which may be taken to undermine any serious message.¹⁴ It may easily be supposed that the sacred sausages at the end of the tenth satire cast their frivolous shadow over the moralistic message, and that the reference to *captatio* in 12.95 has a similar effect. Further, it should be noticed that Juvenal, in the earlier satires at least, rarely gives vent to such sentiments in his own person; indeed, one of the most effective passages of this sort is put in the mouth of the pervert Naevolus at the end of Satire 9, a consideration which must have, if anything, an even more unsettling effect on the reader than the revelation in Horace's second *Epode* that the praise of country life was spoken by a speculator on the Roman stock exchange. In any case, the style of these passages is (I submit) never high or grand in any normally accepted sense; they tend rather to be marked by a clear abandonment of the style of epic or rhetorical parody, doubtless accompanied in recitation by a straightening of the features and a quietening of the voice. The occasions on which Juvenal leads us to think that he is letting down the satirical mask to reveal a plain honest Roman or homespun philosopher underneath do, indeed, add greatly to the effect. Without them, the otherwise continually mocking and denunciatory tone might seem forced; but these passages

¹⁴ Cf. Wiesen (1989: 710): 'The past is almost never represented by Juvenal in other than ironic and ridiculing terms.' Yet at the same time, the past and the countryside in Juvenal function largely as rhetorical foils to the present and the city, and the denunciation of the latter depends on the idealization of the former. This would not be so effective if the treatment of the past were to be seen as entirely ironic.

throw the rest into relief. They are the times at which Juvenal comes closest to his predecessor Horace, and retreats furthest of all from anything resembling the grand style. Critics tend to talk of loftiness and sublimity in these contexts; but if there is sublimity, it is the special kind that comes from simplicity, the kind that Longinus found in Sappho and the Book of Genesis. It has nothing at all to do with the *genus grande dicendi*.

To conclude. A satirical writer can suffer no worse fate at the hands of posterity than to be taken too seriously. Persius has suffered in this way: his Stoic moralising has been exaggerated out of proportion and his subtly whimsical, ironical tone often entirely missed; he has been quite unjustly branded as obscure and humourless, and consequently remains largely unread, except by a few specialists. Juvenal is read, indeed, and often with enjoyment. But he has been regarded as something of a problem case; few Latin authors can have been more systematically damned with faint praise or praised more for the wrong reasons.¹⁵ I am fairly sure that failure to understand the subtleties of his manipulation of the stylistic registers of Latin has been one of the major obstacles to his appreciation. At the end of his much-cited, not so much bewildering as bewildered essay entitled 'Is Juvenal a Classic?', H. A. Mason (1963) pointed the way to the next step after clearing away the misleading views of Juvenal as a moralist or social historian, which was, according to him, 'to appreciate Juvenal as a supreme manipulator of the Latin language'. Exactly so; and I am only too conscious that I have been able to do little more in this paper than put forward a manifesto. In order to work out in full the practical implications of what I have said, having first divested oneself of prejudices about the grand style and related matters, one would need to subject the text as a whole to a detailed line-by-line scrutiny, with close attention to context, and without forgetting the larger-scale effects achieved by manipulation of register, tone and tempo over whole sentences and paragraphs. Many of the stylistic effects could be brought out most clearly by a simple translation, if the translation could only be got right; 'ironmongery' for *armamentaria*, for instance, would speak for itself.

It is possible that those of a modernistic turn of mind will tell me that my way of attempting to understand Juvenal, with reference to known or ascertainable facts about the language he used, is no more than one 'reading' out of many and that I have no right to present it as though I believed it to be in any sense correct or demonstrable. For the present

¹⁵ Over the last few years there have been some voices raised in protest against literal and humourless views of Juvenal: see Marache (1964), de St-Denis (1965: 224-36), Martyn (1979), Wiesen (1989). I commend these articles to the attention of anyone still unconvinced by my arguments.

I leave aside the complex and obscure philosophical issues that lie behind this often rather muddled kind of thinking. I reply merely by means of a parallel, which I know to be imperfect, because modern satirical journalism is not as concentrated a literary brew as Roman satire. Nevertheless, let us suppose that in the fortieth century AD, if there are still literate human beings alive at that time, someone gets hold of a copy of *Private Eye* and categorises it as a serious treatise on morals and politics or as an exercise in the mechanical deployment of rhetorical figures on set themes. That person may get great pleasure and even academic credit from doing so, but he or she will be wrong.

After the delivery of a version of the above paper at the British Academy Symposium, I had many very positive reactions from members of the audience. Some simply expressed agreement. A few, however, felt that despite everything I had said, it was still true (and less misleading than the contrary) to say that Juvenal used the grand style. I think that the difference between us is partly a matter of definition, and partly a matter of literary judgement and taste.

First, as regards the definition, it could be urged against me that I have defined the grand style in such a way as to exclude Juvenal from it, and that therefore my argument is ultimately circular. I would claim that I have simply tried to define what I think the grand style is, partly on the basis of the ancient concept of the *genus grande dicendi* and partly on the basis of observable differences of stylistic register among Latin authors. I believe that this category, in rough terms, is one which Juvenal himself would have recognized, and one into which the objects of much of Juvenal's literary parody clearly fall. Juvenal very often imitates the grand style by way of parody, ridicule and deflation; this is universally agreed; but as I said above, I cannot find any passage in which he appears to me to be using it 'straight'.

Regarding the question of taste, the case for grandeur may perhaps be put like this. In the first place, Juvenal parodies the grand style (whether epic, tragic or rhetorical) so much and so consistently that the parody in itself develops a sort of grandeur. In the second place, there is a grandeur in the scale, structure and overall rhetorical conception of the satires, for which the word 'panoramic' is not inappropriate; this, of course, reaches its highest point in the sixth satire.

This latter point has a great deal in it, but it has little to do with style in the sense we have been talking about. On the former point, I repeat that Juvenal's parody of the high style most often works by contrast and incongruity, and that even a relatively long passage of epic style, sustained

over a dozen lines or so, can be punctured by a single prosaic or colloquial word at the end. It is very easy to miss these effects, and if one does miss them, one has no reason not to believe that Juvenal's style is often simply that of epic. Many of us first met Juvenal at an early stage of our Latin studies, when we had not yet been trained to respond accurately to differences of stylistic register in Latin, and it is not easy to displace the impressions received at that stage. Perhaps, too, we are influenced by the views of earlier ages. The eighteenth century saw Juvenal as grand and dignified and translated him accordingly. Dr Johnson did not have the opportunity to benefit from Axelson's researches. I do of course admit that Juvenal has a certain dignity of style. He does not use obscenities in the way that, say, Martial does; though Juvenal's references to obscene doings in decorous language (conveniently listed by Braund (1996: 26)) are often much more striking than Martial's cheap vulgarisms. But decorum is one thing, and grandeur is another. The former can exist without the latter.

Last of all, a few words are called for in connection with the reassertion of Juvenal's grandeur by his latest editor. Braund (1996: 17) states: 'Juvenal writes in "the grand style". His adoption of the grand style — which is continually punctured or debased — seems to be an innovation within the genre . . .'. But as I have argued, if it is continually punctured or debased it is not the grand style in any simple sense, since the effect of the genuine grand style depends precisely on not being punctured. It is interesting to look at Braund's list of examples of the grand style (p. 26). Out of the first five satires (nearly a thousand lines), twenty-nine passages are listed. Braund suggests that the list is not exhaustive, but it would not be easy to find many more. Of these, fourteen are accounted for by the explicit epic parody of Satire 4, and a further four by the programmatic passages of Satire 1 discussed above. This leaves eleven. Four of these are single words: 1.100 *Troiugenas* and 2.154 *Scipiadae* (both in very clearly parodic contexts), and the word *proceres* in two passages (2.121, 3.213) apart from two instances of the same word in Satire 4, already counted. This is Juvenal's standard term for lords or nobles. In fact, if one looks at the usage of *proceres* in general, it does not seem by any means to be confined to high poetry; it is doubtless a dignified word, but it is not uncommon in prose, and it has the advantage that (unlike *nobiles* or *principes* or *optimates* — though *primores* would have done well enough) its nominative plural will fit into dactylic verse. Then, in 5.49, there is a double *-que* (the lightest of epic touches, in the context of a rich patron's indignation). 1.52–3 is included in the list, though I do not see why, since it seems merely to contain allusions to epic titles and subject matter rather than any particular hint of epic style. 1.81–4 burlesques the Deucalion and Pyrrha myth. 1.88–9 is a description of gambling in what are claimed to

be epic terms; the style is more rhetorical than poetic, though perhaps slightly like Lucan. 5.78–9 is a clearly parodic description of a *saluator* drenched with rain on a wet spring morning, and finally we have 5.93 and 5.100, slightly poetic-sounding local descriptions of the provenance of mullets and lampreys. I think I can safely rest my case.

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

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

- zens 'De rerum natura'. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 48 (Berlin and New York).
- Diggle, J. (1972), 'Ouidiana', *PCPS* NS 18: 31–41.
- Diggle, J. and Goodyear, F. R. D. (edd.) (1972), *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman* (Cambridge).
- Dingel, J. (1997), *Kommentar zum 9. Buch der Aeneis Vergils* (Heidelberg).
- Dionisotti, A. C. (1995), 'Hellenismus' in O. Weijers (ed.), *Vocabulary of Teaching and Research Between Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Civacima. Études sur le vocabulaire intellectuel du Moyen Age 8) (Turnhout).
- Domínguez Domínguez, J. F. and Martín Rodríguez, A. M. (1993), 'Dare con infinitivo en latín clásico', *Cuadernos de filología clásica*, 4: 9–22.
- Dover, K. J. (1963), 'The Poetry of Archilochus', in *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 10: 183–212 (Geneva).
- _____ (1968, corrected reprint of 1960 ed.), *Greek Word Order* (Cambridge).
- Draeger, A. (1882, 3rd ed.), *Über Syntax und Stil des Tacitus* (Leipzig).
- Drexler, H. (1967), *Einführung in die römische Metrik* (Darmstadt).
- Dubois, J. (1966), 'Les problèmes du vocabulaire technique', *Cahiers de lexicologie* 9: 103–12.
- Dumortier, J. (1935), *Le vocabulaire médical d'Eschyle et les écrits hippocratiques* (Paris).
- Easterling, P. E. (ed.) (1982), *Sophocles, 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. Esegese e traduzione di Horat. *Epod.* 11, 15-16 e *Od.* I 13, 4-5', in Janni and Mazzini (1991), 99-114.
- (1991b), 'Il lessico medico latino antico: caratteri e strumenti della sua differenziazione', in Sabbah (1991), 175-85.
- (1992a), 'La medicina nella letteratura latina. III. Plauto: conoscenze mediche, situazione e istituzioni sanitarie, proposte esegetiche', in Mazzini (1992b), 67-113.
- (ed.) (1992b), *Civiltà materiale e letteratura nel mondo antico* (Atti del Seminario di Studio, Macerata, 28-29 giugno 1991) (Macerata).
- Meillet, A. (1965; 7th ed.), *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque* (Paris).
- Menière, P. (1858), *Études médicales sur les poètes latins* (Paris).
- Mette, H. J. (1956), rev. of E. V. Marmorale, *L'ultimo Catullo, Gnomon* 28: 34-8 (part repr. in R. Heine (ed.) [1975] *Catull* [Wege der Forschung 308, Darmstadt]: 19-23).
- Meyer, W. (1889), 'Caesur im Hendekasyllabus', *SB Bayr. Ak., philosoph.-philol. und hist. Cl.* 2: 208-27.
- Migliorini, P. (1990), *La terminologia medica come strumento espressivo della satira di Persio* (Quaderni di Anazetesis 2) (Pistoia).
- Mignot, X. (1969), *Les verbes dénominatifs latins* (Paris).
- Miller, H.W. (1944), 'Medical terminology in tragedy', *TAPA* 75: 156-67.
- (1945), 'Aristophanes and medical language', *TAPA* 76: 74-84.
- Mohler, S. L. (1948), 'Sails and Oars in the Aeneid', *TAPA* 79: 46-62.
- Momigliano, A. (1957), 'Perizonius, Niebuhr and the character of the early Roman tradition', *JRS* 47: 104-14.
- Morford, M. P. O. (1972), 'A Note on Juvenal 6.627-61', *CPh* 67: 198.
- Mras, K. (1927/28), 'Randbemerkungen zu Lucilius' Satiren', *WS* 46: 78-84.
- Mudry, Ph. (1982), *La préface du De medicina de Celse: Texte, traduction et commentaire* (Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana 19) (Rome).
- Mühmelt, M. (1965), *Griechische Grammatik in der Vergilerklärung*, (Zetemata 37) (Munich).
- Müller, C. F. W. (1869), *Plautinische Prosodie* (Berlin).
- (1908), *Syntax des Nominativs und Akkusativs im Lateinischen* (Leipzig and Berlin).
- Müller, C.W., Sier, K. and Werner, J. (edd.) (1992), *Zum Umgang mit fremden Sprachen in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Palingenesia 36: Kolloquium der Fachrichtungen Klassische Philologie der Universitäten Leipzig und Saarbrücken am 21. und 22. November 1989 in Saarbrücken) (Stuttgart).

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

- (1993), 'Das medizinische Latein von Celsus bis Cassius Felix', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* II.37: 1, 227–392 (Berlin).
- Ortony, A. (1979), *Metaphor and Thought* (Cambridge).
- Paganelli, D. (1961), *Properce: Élégies* (Paris).
- Page, D. L. (1936), review of Dumortier (1935), *CR* 50: 17–18.
- Palmer, A. (ed.), (1898) *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides with the Greek translation of Planudes* [Completed by L. C. Purser.] (Oxford).
- Palmer, L. R. (1954), *The Latin Language* (London).
- Paludan, E. (1941), 'The development of the Latin elegy', *CIMed* 4: 204–29.
- Pascucci, G. (1961), 'consens, praesens, absens', *SIFC* 33: 1–61.
- Pasquali, G. (1981), *Preistoria della poesia romana: con un saggio introduttivo di Sebastiano Timpanaro* (Florence).
- Patzer, H. (1955), 'Zum Sprachstil des neoterischen Hexameters', *MH* 12: 77–95.
- Pearce, T. E. V. (1966), 'The enclosing word order in the Latin hexameter' *CQ* NS 16: 140–71; 298–320.
- Peppler, C. W. (1910), 'The termination $-\kappa\omicron\varsigma$, 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* (Sitzungsb. 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).