The Arrangement and the Language of Catullus' so-called *polymetra* with Special Reference to the Sequence 10–11–12

H. D. JOCELYN

Summary. It is contended that the order of the first 61 of the items transmitted under the name of 'Catullus Veronensis' shows signs of a conscious design, whether by the author or by some editor, that item 61 should be placed with its predecessors rather than with the seven 'long' poems which follow, that the widely used term 'polymetrum' is a thoroughly confusing misnomer, that metrical pattern requires the division of the 61 items into three distinct groups — ἐπιγράμματα in 'Phalaecian' verse, ἴαμβοι, and μέλη — and, most importantly, that even where they take up apparently similar themes the μέλη distinguish themselves in verbal style markedly from the 'Phalaecian' ἐπιγράμματα and only a little less markedly from the ἴαμβοι. In order to illustrate this last point the lyric item 11 is compared in systematic detail with the two 'Phalaecian' epigrams which precede and follow it in the transmitted collection. Discussion of each feature of items 10, 11 and 12 centres on its relationship with what third- and second-century BC poets might have written and with what first-century speakers of Latin might have said. The character of our record of the Latin of the two centuries following 240 BC makes a degree of tentativeness inevitable.

The three groups of the 61 items in question take us to a linguistic world distant from that of items 62–68. This is not, however, the world of the Latin used in ordinary conversation by members of the Italian élite in the middle of the first century

BC. It is a highly artificial world with its own quite distinct internal boundaries.

I. THE THREE METRICAL TYPES PRESENT IN ITEMS 1–61 OF THE *LIBER CATULLI VERONENSIS*

THE LANGUAGE OF the first sixty items of the collection transmitted through the Middle Ages as the *liber Catulli Veronensis* has often been treated as a unity to be contrasted with the language of all the others, or with that of the next eight, or with that of the final sixty. The purpose of this paper is to deplore such treatments and to suggest that at least two distinct kinds of language, if not three, were perceptible to a first-century BC reader or hearer of the sixty items in question.

The term 'polymetra' has been used of them since the last decade of the nineteenth century[1] and enjoys at present almost universal acceptance.[2] It has a learned ring about it but is in reality a nonsense. If the sixty be treated as a group, the group could be described as 'polymetrical', but no individual item could be called a πολύμετρον/*polymetrum* in any known ancient sense.[3] The term is worse than a nonsense, in so far as it encourages the neglect of significant differences between the items. The application of other apparently ancient terms, like *nugae*, to the sixty is equally perni-cious in its effect. So too the use of terms like 'lyrics', which wander between an ancient and a modern sense.[4]

Items 11, 17, 30, 34, 51 group themselves together metrically against 4, 8, 22, 25, 29, 31, 37, 39, 44, 52, 59, 60 and, in my opinion, against those in sets of the so-called 'Phalaecian' verse. Item 61 ought not to be separated from 11, 17, 30, 34, 51 and put with the hexameters of 62 and 64, the galliambics of 63 and the elegiac distichs of 65, 66, 67, 68 simply on the grounds that it is a 'long poem'. Such a distinction would have made no sense at all to men of the first century BC. There were many μέλη as

---

[1] Cf. Reitzenstein (1893: 103 n. 1).

[2] Cf. Svennung (1945: 21), Tränkle (1967a: 206), Ross (1969: 1), the heading of the second chapter of Wiseman (1969: 7–16), the heading of chapter 2.4 of Lyne (1980: 42–52), Syndikus (1984: 69), E.A. Schmidt (1985: 29), the heading of the fifth chapter of Newman (1990: 138–203), Gaisser (1993: 4). Some, e.g. Goold (1983), avoid the term but not its influence.

[3] For the term see Dionys. Hal. *Comp.* 26, Athenaeus 13.608e. The Latin record has only the unexplained title *Polymetra* attributed to Laevius in Priscian, *Gramm.* II 258.12.

[4] Catullus uses *nugae* in a tone of mock modesty at 1.4. Schuster (1948: 2365–6), Ronconi (1939: 18 = 1953: 26 = 1971: 28; 1940a: 8 = 1953: 114 = 1971: 94; 1940b: 142–4 = 1953: 194–7 = 1971: 174–7) and Heusch (1954: 14–20) may serve to illustrate the modern philological use of the word. Goold (1974) and (1983) resurrects nineteenth-century talk of 'lyrics'.

long as, or longer than, this one among those attributed to the canonical exponents of the genre.

Item 51 adapted the substance of a famous μέλος by Sappho and employed the same metrical pattern. This is also the pattern of 11. The pattern of 34 was one we know to have been used by Anacreon, and there is no reason to suppose that the closely related pattern of 61 did not occur in some μέλος now lost. About the patterns of 17[5] and 30[6] we need be only slightly less certain.

Items 4, 29, 52 deployed a pattern used by Archilochus for iambic poetry; 8, 22, 31, 37, 39, 44, 59, 60 one used by Hipponax for poems thought to belong to the same genre; 25 had likewise a pattern closely associated with Hipponax.[7] It is certainly legitimate to wonder about the differences which the ancients perceived between these three patterns, as about those between the five patterns of lyric verse. For the purpose, however, of the present enquiry I leave such problems aside.

A form of the 'Phalaecian' verse (xx-ᴗᴗ-ᴗ-ᴗ--) had been an element of certain lyric stanzas composed by Sappho, but continuous runs of the verse were perhaps first composed by the fourth-century poet who gave the verse his name.[8] Some ancient metricians analysed the hendecasyllabic verse in the same ways as they analysed the so-called 'Sapphic', 'Glyconic' and 'Pherecratean' verses used in the stanzas of items 11, 17, 30, 34, 51, 61.[9] Their particular ways of analysis are no longer fashionable, but the new ways[10] still lead scholars quite willing to keep 4, 8, 22, 25, 29, 31, 37, 39, 44, 52, 59, 60 metrically apart from 11, 17, 30, 34, 51, 61, to refuse to separate off the pieces in stichically arranged 'Phalaecian' verses. Martial included imitations of these in books of so-called *epigrammata*. Since, however, the ἐπιγράμματα in elegiac distichs which form the third part of the *liber Catulli Veronensis* have their own peculiar stylistic features, I shall call the pieces in 'Phalaecian' hendecasyllables Phalaecian epigrams.

[5] Hephaestion, pp. 33–4 Consbruch, cites three successive 'Priapeans' by Anacreon. Horace does not use the system in his *carmina*, but neither does he that of 34 nor that of 61.
[6] What Hephaestion says about Sappho's third book and the 'Sapphic' 16-syllable verse (pp. 34, 63) is not entirely clear. Horace has three *carmina* of the shape of 30 (1.11, 18; 4.10).
[7] On the 'Hipponactean' tetrameter see Hephaestion, p. 16, Schol. Aristoph. *Pl.* 253.
[8] See *A.P.* 13.6. Cf. 5.309 (Diophanes), 6.193 (Statyllius Flaccus), 7.390 (Antipater of Thessalonice), 9.110 (Alpheius), 598 (Theocritus).
[9] For 'antispasts' see Hephaestion, p. 33; for derivation from other lengths see Caesius Bassus, *GLK* VI 258–63, 'Apthonius', *GLK* VI 118, 148, Diomedes, *GLK* I 509, Terentianus Maurus, *GLK* VI 401 (vv. 2539–68).
[10] Hermann (1816: 369; cf. 1796: 214–17, 288–9) analysed the verse as consisting of a 'basis' plus a 'logaoedic' sequence of a dactyl and three trochees. So too, effectively, Christ (1879: 537–9). Wilamowitz (1921: 105, 137–53, 251) came to regard it as a 'Glyconic' verse extended by ᴗ - -; cf. Münscher (1921: 73–7), Vollmer (1923: 15), Schuster (1948: 2395–6), Mette (1956: 35–6), West (1982: 151, 198).

Catullus himself could talk of *hendecasyllabi*, but this chapter is not meant to be a poem.

The question of how Catullus and his ancient audiences heard a poem consisting of 'Phalaecian' verses as compared with, say, item 11 or item 34 has, I think, to be kept separate from the one of how a lyric poet of old Greece related a 'Phalaecian' verse to the other units with which he or she constructed a particular stanza. We know that in Greek-speaking communities from at least the fourth century BC on a sequence of 'Phalaecian' verses seemed to have so little of a musical character as to be capable of use for a public inscription[11] and that there were theorists in Catullus' day who analysed the verse as if it were more closely related to the catalectic ionic trimeter (or 'Galliambic') — the verse of item 63 — than to the 'Sapphic', the 'Glyconic' or the 'Pherecratean'.[12] Theorists of the first century AD thought that Catullus himself accepted such an analysis,[13] and there were even those who blamed him for failing on occasion to keep the first two elements of the verse long and for thus 'roughening' or 'hardening' the ionic rhythm.[14] It is remarkable in fact how many pieces do keep the elements in question long and how relatively rare the alleged licence is in the pieces which permit it.[15] Items 34 and 61 on the other hand positively prefer 'Glyconic' and 'Pherecratean' verses beginning with a trochee and even admit the iambus.[16] The running together of adjacent words is avoided rather less in items 1, 2, 2b, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 14b, 15, 16, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 58b than it is in the indisputable μέλη.[17] Words of more than three syllables, which seemed to Roman connoisseurs of rhythm to have a 'soft' character,[18] terminate with great frequency the

[11] See the poems cited in n. 8 together with two actually preserved on stone, *SEG* 39 (1989), 1334 (between 230 and 220 BC (drawn to my attention by M. D. Reeve)), and no. 1978.17–22 (third or second century BC) in W. Peek's *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*.

[12] See Varro *ap.* Caes. Bass. *GLK* VI 261.18–19.

[13] See Quint. *Inst.* 1.8.6. Cf. 9.4.6 on the effeminate ethos of 'Sotadeans', 'Galliambics' and certain oratorical rhythms.

[14] See Plin. *Nat.* praef. 1, Plin. *Epist.* 1.16.5.

[15] Item 1 has five verses out of 10 with the licence; 3 one out of 18; 7 two out of 12; 10 one out of 34; 27 three out of 7; 32 five out of 11; 35 six out of 18; 36 five out of 20; 38 four out of eight; 40 four out of eight; 41 five out of eight; 42 eleven out of 24; 45 eight out of 26; 47 one out of seven; 49 four out of seven; 50 one out of 21; 53 one out of five; 54 two out of seven; 58 one out of 5. Of the 70 cases *in toto* 39 have an iamb, 31 a trochee.

[16] I count 24 cases of the spondee, 225 of the trochee, two of the iamb. 61.99 would have a pyrrhic if *probra* were syllabified in the normal Latin way.

[17] Neither group shows quite so strongly the aversion manifest in item 64 and the elegies (65–8) against the elision of a long final vowel before an initial short.

[18] See Quint. *Inst.* 9.4.63–6.

verses of these pieces.[19] It is relatively seldom on the other hand that such words terminate lyric systems.[20] The two short syllables which usually come fourth and fifth in the 'Phalaecian' verse are replaced with one long syllable in thirteen of the 22 verses of item 55 and in two of the ten of item 58b. They are rarely divided between words,[21] whereas the pair of short syllables in the allegedly related 'Sapphics', 'Adonians', 'Priapeans', 'Asclepiadeans', 'Glyconics' and 'Pherecrateans' suffers no such restriction.[22]

The springs of the modern view of the 'lyrical' character of Catullus' 'Phalaecian' verses lie, I suspect, in the efforts of sixteenth-century vernacular poets to exploit the Latin poet's work for their own ends and in the prestige which these poets won among later practitioners and readers. By concentrating on ancient Greek poetry theoreticians of classical metre have unwittingly encouraged the view.[23] Close observation of the first-century BC Latin poet's actual practice seems to me to undermine it totally. Quintilian was well aware of certain thematic relationships between lyric poetry, elegy and Phalaecian epigram. Nevertheless he thought it worth maintaining a formal distinction of the three genres.[24]

When consideration of the layout of the *liber Catulli Veronensis* began in the middle of the last century it was quickly observed that the group of eight relatively long items was flanked by groups of shorter items of more or less equal size.[25] Emil Baehrens thought he could detect a verbal style shared by the middle items, one quite different from the style common to the opening sixty.[26] Robinson Ellis wrote with less clarity but in English rather than in Latin and with much greater long-term influence. Statements like 'the diction of Catullus ... seems indeed, if we confine ourselves to the lyrics [Ellis appears to include item 61 with 1–60], to be an exact

---

[19] Cutt (1936: 7–14) counts 138 such polysyllables in 502 verses. There are on the other hand only three genuinely monosyllabic terminations (5.5, 7.7, 24.7; those at 10.31, 13.1, 50.20 and 55.13 are parts of word-groups).

[20] I note 17.3 *rediuiuis*, 6 *suscipiantur*, 30.1 *sodalibus*, 2 *amiculi*, 61.5 *Hymenaee* (also as part of the same ritual cry at vv. 40, 50, 60, 118, 138, 143, 148, 153, 158, 163, 168, 173, 178, 183), 30 *Aganippe*, 86 *uenientem*, 193 *remorare*, 208 *ingenerari*, 223 *Penelopeo*.

[21] Cf. Meyer (1889: 208–27 (215)), Cutt (1936: 15–27). It is only in the antepenultimate element of the 'Galliambic' that a pyrrhic sequence is divided between words, and then not often.

[22] I count 45 cases in 552 verses, i.e. one in thirteen. Where the μέλη are concerned the ratio varies between one in three and one in five.

[23] Wilamowitz changed his mind about the character of the old Greek 'Phalaecian' between 1898 and 1921. He stressed the gulf between the way Catullus thought of the verse and the way Sappho and others did.

[24] *Inst.* 1.8.6.

[25] See particularly Brunér (1863: 601–11), Westphal (1867: 1–24).

[26] (1885: 40–9). Contrast the dissertation of Hupe (1871), who treats the language of all the transmitted items as a unity.

illustration of Wordsworth's paradox, that the language of poetry does not essentially differ from the language of prose. There is an utter absence in it of anything strained, far-fetched, or artificial: the thought clothes itself without effort in the required words, and is passionate, jocose, or homely, as it were spontaneously'[27] had a particular appeal to the British.

Much ink has flowed in efforts to establish a conscious design in the order of items 1–60. The relationship between the themes still dominates the discussion.[28] It has, however, been usefully observed that the ἴαμβοι in the metres of Archilochus and Hipponax distribute themselves at fairly regular intervals: 41 verses (four poems) precede item 4; 42 (three poems) item 8; 198 (eleven poems) item 22; 37 (two poems) item 25; 27 (three poems) item 29; 12 (one poem) item 31; 81 (five poems) item 37; 8 (one poem) item 39; 48 (four poems) item 44; 94 (seven poems) item 52; 66 (seven poems) items 59 and 60.[29] I should like to go on from my demonstration that Catullus distinguished his μέλη metrically from poems in 'Phalaecian' verses to point out that the μέλη distribute themselves in an even more regular manner among the other items: 174 verses (eleven poems) before item 11; 90 (six poems) before item 17; 135 (nine poems) before item 30; 33 (three poems) before item 34; 234 (sixteen poems) before item 51; 80 (ten poems) before 61. The themes of the Phalaecian epigrams have more in common overall with those of the ἴαμβοι than they do with those of the μέλη.

A problem which haunts all theories alleging a deliberate arrangement in an ancient book of poems is that of how an ancient reader would have recognized the arrangement alleged. Proponents of a thematic arrangement of items 1 — 60 or 1 — 61 of the *liber Catulli Veronensis* may answer as they please. A formal arrangement would, however, without doubt have been more easily recognizable. Some ancient editions of lyric poems alerted the user to changes of metre by means of the asterisk.[30] There is no evidence for the existence of an ancient ancestor of the text of the *liber Catulli Veronensis* equipped with a set of critical signs, but the possibility cannot be ruled out. At all events the first-century reader of a group of poems like those in question would have been expected to understand

---

[27] (1876: xxii = 1889: xxix). Cf. Simpson (1879: 180) 'the simplicity and naturalness of his language, . . . in great contrast to the later artificial Latin style . . . His words seem to have fallen of themselves into metre without leaving their natural order and would make good prose — if they were not poetry. His language, in the epigrams, lyrics, and elegies is little removed from ordinary speech . . .' (enthusiastically endorsed by Goold (1983: 7)).

[28] The bracing scepticism of B. Schmidt (1914) still has its value.

[29] See Heck (1950: 33–7, 61–5), Mette (1956: 35–6), Weinreich (1959: 84–90; 1960: 163–70).

[30] See Hephaestion, p. 74 (on the use of the asterisk in the Alexandrian editions of Sappho, Anacreon and Alcaeus).

something of metrical structures. His sense of the natural rhythms of his own language and his experience of listening to priests intoning prayers at public rituals and to orators speaking in the law-courts and at popular assemblies, to say nothing of actors performing comedy and tragedy at the great yearly festivals, would have taught him things now hard to recover. It may be noted that the recurrent metrical unit of five of the μέλη (11, 17, 34, 51, 61) ends like the dactylic hexameter introduced into Latin by Ennius for epic narrative, i.e. in the sequence ‒ ∪ ∪ ‒ ‒. This sequence orators avoided at rhythmically prominent points in their discourse.[31] The sixth μέλος (30) consists of units ending in ‒ ∪ ‒ ∪ ‒, a sequence which orators admitted, although not all that often.[32] Eight of the ἴαμβοι (8, 22, 31, 37, 39, 44, 59, 60) end their verses on the other hand in ‒ ∪ ‒ ‒, the most popular clausular sequence in oratory, and three (4, 29, 52) in ‒ ∪ ‒ ∪ ‒, a sequence tolerated by the orators. The twelfth ἴαμβος (25) and the Phalaecian pieces end their verses in ‒ ∪ ‒ ∪ ‒ ‒, the so-called 'ithyphallic'. This sequence formed the second colon of the 'Saturnian' verse in which Naevius' still often read account of the first Carthaginian War was set.[33] Orators avoided it even more carefully than they avoided ‒ ∪ ∪ ‒ ‒.[34] Catullus' affectation of polysyllabic final words both in the Phalaecian pieces and in item 25 would have been in part to escape the taint of the rude structure of the 'Saturnian', the second colon of which usually had a break of words after the second or third element.

Those who posit a deliberate thematic arrangement of the poems in question seem all to make Catullus himself responsible. Critics have found it easy to uncover a degree of incoherence hard to credit in an author with a conscious plan. Against the two formal distributions for which I am arguing it will doubtless be objected that they are insufficiently symmetrical to be thought more than an accident. If, however, a design is present, a scholarly editor aware of the generic distinctions of verse writing would seem at least as likely as the poet to be responsible.

II. THE THREE POETIC USES OF LATIN IN ITEMS 1–61

If the rhythms of the μέλη take them away from oratory, other aspects of their verbal style are likely to have brought them into the vicinity. The

---

[31] And particularly in the form ‒∪ | ‒‒‒ and ‒∪∪ | ‒‒; see Shipley (1911: 410–18).

[32] See Fraenkel (1968: 196–7).

[33] See Cic. *Brut.* 75–6, Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.53–4.

[34] Cicero's hendecasyllable at *Verr.* 2.3.43 — *successit tibi Lucius Metellus* — long brought ridicule upon him (see Mart. Cap. 5.517 *incurrit etiam in hendecasyllabi phalaecii petulantiam*).

singer and the orator could not avoid a certain formality in addressing their respective publics. What Cicero has to say at *Orat.* 183–4 about the music-accompanied verse of the lyric poets and the spoken *senarii* of the comedians is instructive not only about the character of comic verse but also about the distance which men of Catullus' time perceived between ordinary conversation (*sermo*) and a style of utterance (*oratio*) employed by both the orator and the lyric poet.[35]

An examination which I have made of items 11, 17, 30, 34, 51 and 61 seems to show a set of stylemes which, in conjunction with their metrical patterns, mark them off as a group from both the ἴαμβοι and the Phalaecian epigrams. I have also examined the eleven Phalaecian epigrams (items 10, 12, 16, 21, 28, 32, 33, 35, 49, 50, 53) and the three ἴαμβοι (29, 31, 52) which flank the μέλη in the transmitted collection. In practically every member of the three groups I find words and phrases requiring a pronunciation different from that of everyday, morphemes obsolescent except in certain special registers of the language, like the religious or the legal, or preserved only in the epic and tragic poetry of the third and second centuries, syntagms which had become rare in the everyday language or which were consciously modelled on features of Greek poetic syntax, orderings of clauses, phrases and words unimaginable in first-century BC speech, words and uses of words taken from the higher genres of the poetry of the third and second centuries or newly created within the modules offered by the older poets. A number of these phenomena mass strikingly and significantly in the μέλη. The ἴαμβοι carry more than do the Phalaecian epigrams. Nevertheless it must not be forgotten how few of the last-mentioned class are entirely without one or more of them. The often praised 'naturalness' of the 'diction' of items 1–60, 'the utter absence in it of anything strained, far-fetched, or artificial' is a myth, even if the field of 'diction' is limited, as it often is, to the lexicon.

The distinctive features which have emerged from my examination of the six μέλη concern the lexicon rather more than phonology, morphology or syntax. Nevertheless it seems worthwhile to report at some length the less distinctive features, if only to indicate problems. Sentence structure and the order in which words are placed within the sentence constituents show themselves to be almost as important as the lexicon. The nine Phalaecian epigrams and the three ἴαμβοι prove more remarkable for what they admit than for what they avoid. The variety of their stylemes reflects the variety of their themes.

The choice of words and phrases and their ordering must be, of course, to some extent a function of the different sets of metrical rules applied in

---

[35] Cf. Dionys. Hal. *De im.* 2.2, p. 20 Usener, Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.63 (on the lyric poet Alcaeus).

the three classes. But to some extent only. Theme and mood were important determinants of this choice as they were of that of the particular form of verse. A poet of Catullus' talent was never simply in the position of having to choose between one word and another in a particular part of a verse with the other words of his planned statement already fixed in their eventual pattern. It would thus be unhelpful to point out in connection with the use of *ocelle* at 31.2, for example, that the rules followed by Catullus in composing choliambic verses precluded *ocule* at the beginning and, indeed, everywhere else.

The selection of Catullus' pieces traditionally presented to school children in the company of Cicero's orations, Virgil's *Aeneid*, Horace's *Odes* and Livy's history leaves a superficial impression of straightforwardness, easiness and 'naturalness' which even the well-read find hard to shake off. Nevertheless the positive phenomena which occupy my attention have for the most part been often observed. All I have done is to marshal them in a way which illustrates my general thesis. It has, on the other hand, been less often observed how far the μέλη avoided those words, idioms and syntactical constructions of ordinary discourse which appeared to lack the dignity appropriate to a more formal mode of utterance and how much more receptive the ίαμβοι and the Phalaecian epigrams were in this regard. I should not, however, wish to talk of 'unpoetic' words or the like. The difficulties inherent in such language have encouraged the idle to neglect the excellent observations made by Bertil Axelson[36] and to leave untrodden the paths he opened up. It was not only the poets who were choosy about what could be used of ordinary Latin speech. Orators too pursued a policy of selectivity.[37] As did those who endeavoured to write on technical themes. A doctor could not describe in a book the sexual parts in the way most of his patients did.[38] It was especially, it seems to me, in the avoidance of certain features of the ordinary language that Catullus differentiated his μέλη from their companions.

Several scholars convinced of the stylistic unity of items 1–60 have presented accounts, occasionally in statistical terms, of the phenomena which appear to them to mark these items off as a group from 61–116,

---

[36] (1945). The criticisms made by Ernout (1947: 55–70) cut deeper than those made by Williams (1968: 743–50). Bömer (1957), Müller (1975: 293–4) and Watson (1985) obtain useful results from the method.

[37] Theophrastus coupled poetry and oratory as preferring dignified words to the commonplace (Ammon. *Aristot. interpr.* Comm. Aristot. Graeca IV 5, pp. 65–6 Busse). For the orator and selectivity see Anon. rhet. *Herenn.* 4.17, Cic. *De orat.* 3.149–70, *Orat.* 79–80; for the poet Hor. *Ars* 46–59, *Epist.* 2.2.109–25.

[38] See Jocelyn (1986: 312–16).

from 61–68, or from 69–116.[39] In seeking to mark off items 11, 17, 30, 34, 51 from those which intervene I should not want to follow an exactly similar method. General statistics about any group of poems give little help in seizing the character of a particular member of the group. They can also be gravely misleading where poems of the kind here in question are concerned. Catullus made use of an unusually wide range of linguistic possibilities and often sought to an unusual degree after novelty of expression. Two features of the Phalaecian epigrams reduce, if they do not completely nullify, the value of statistics in discussing them. The first — shared with the classicizing ἴαμβοι — is a tendency to cast references to heroic saga, ancient history, non-Roman religious cult and exotic geography in language akin to that of the μέλη, language which makes them stand out from the body of the poem in which they are made. The second is a manner of ornamenting the distinctive rhythm of the second half of the verse with a variety of equally distinctive phonetic, morphological and lexical stylemes, some of which also occur in the μέλη and help to give these items their special character.[40]

Nothing separates the language common to the μέλη and the Phalaecian epigrams from what we can imagine to have been ordinary mid-first-century BC upper-class urban Latin to the extent that the language of a late fifth-century tragedy differed from that of Athens' leading citizens. No Catullan μέλος differs from a piece in 'Phalaecian' verses to the extent that the songs of a tragic chorus differed from the actors' speeches and dialogues. One may say, if one likes, that Rome never had a special poetic language with generic subdivisions of the kind Greece had. If, however, account is taken of the way in which certain subsidiary themes of the Phalaecian epigrams attracted both linguistic archaism and linguistic novelty and of some of the ways in which Catullus ornamented the concluding ithyphallic rhythm of the verse, the statistical preponderance of archaizing and neological phenomena in the μέλη takes on a considerable significance. Some of the difficulties of global statistics nevertheless remain. Furthermore, it is not so much in the choice of particular words as in the ways in which they are employed and ordered that the special character of each μέλος manifests itself. Where the choice of words and their ordering are concerned, what the composer of a μέλος has avoided often seems more significant than what he has decided to do. Here the isolation of

[39] See Baehrens (1885: 45–9), Schulze (1920: 47–72), Svennung (1945: 19–34, 47–50), Schuster (1948: 2383–92), Ross (1969: *passim*), Évrard-Gillis (1976: *passim*). Contrast B. Schmidt (1887: LXXX–LXXXVII). An observation by La Penna (1956a: 293) indicates how awkward items 34, 51 and 76 are for the conventional division.
[40] See Jocelyn (1995: 63–82).

countable phenomena becomes difficult and the value of any summation questionable.

There is only space in this volume to set out the results of my linguistic comparison of the μέλος item 11 with the Phalaecian epigrams which flank it. The results for the other sequences[41] point, however, it can be said, in the same direction.

III. THE LYRIC ITEM 11 AND ITS 'PHALAECIAN' COMPANIONS

Whether, as the metrical structure might suggest, item 11 had some well-known particular Greek μέλος as its model we cannot tell. Certainly, ancient readers would have assigned it to the genre of lyric poetry. Martial wrote no epigram in 'Sapphic' stanzas. The poem refers to a situation of the poet's life dateable to late 55 BC or soon afterwards,[42] a situation which, according to himself, he took very seriously. About the status of Furius and Aurelius, the poet's attitude to them, and the tone of his address there has been much unfruitful dispute.[43] Many suppose that Catullus has been in Rome for sometime pursuing an affair with the unnamed woman. It could be, however, that he is about to return. An acquaintance of long standing would expect to receive a message,[44] although not one of the sort that Catullus actually sends. Roman gentlemen in any case regularly terminated relationships of some length and depth in a formal way.[45] It would not have been unseemly or buffoonish to ask two friends[46] to take a message to the woman, however lightly or seriously he had regarded the relationship with her.[47] The faithlessness she had displayed certainly affected Catullus more than the embarrassing request of Varus' friend reported in item 10 or the theft by Asinius complained of in item 12. We should also note how much of item 11 relates to future possibilities as well

---

[41] I plan to publish accounts of these results elsewhere.

[42] All the great foreign adventures of 55 seem to be alluded to, from Gabinius' activities in Egypt to Crassus' expedition against the Parthians.

[43] Ronconi (1940b: 142–4 = 1953: 194–7 = 1971: 174–7 and Traina (1975: 254–6) find, as did Haupt (1841: 24 = 1875: 97), an element of parody in vv. 1–14; Évrard-Gillis (1976: 189–90) does not.

[44] Cf. Cic. *Att.* 4.10.2, Catull. 9.5.

[45] Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 2.70.2, Suet. *Cal.* 3.3, Gaius, *Inst.* 3.151.

[46] Even although slaves or freedmen normally carried such messages (cf. Ter. *Hec.* 314, Cic. *Att.* 10.4.7; 16.5, *Rep.* 1.18, *Ac.* 1.1). In so far as they 'accompany' Catullus on a journey Furius and Aurelius must be of slightly lower status (cf. Hor. *Serm.* 1.6.101–3, *Epist.* 1.7.75–6). Curtius Nicias was a man lower in status than either C. Memmius or Pompey's wife (Suet. *Gramm.* 14.1).

[47] Mayer (1983: 297–8) makes too much of the analogy of the form of Roman divorce procedure alluded to at Cic. *De orat.* 1.183.

as how surrealistically the woman's present activity is described. The other lyric items are likewise all — even item 51 — angled more to the future than to the past.

a. 11.17–20 and 58.4–5

It is the fifth stanza which has caused even those scholars who would allow a special status to items 34 and 51 to set item 11 in both substance and style with the ἴαμβοι and the Phalaecian epigrams.[48] Some philologists have talked of 'obscenity',[49] and some translators have ransacked the lowest registers of English in search of imagined equivalents.[50] Many have noted a similarity between the stanza and the final two 'Phalaecian' verses of item 58. A close comparison reveals on the other hand considerable and highly significant differences. It should be helpful to elucidate these differences before placing item 11 as a whole against its immediate neighbours.

Whether item 58 has Lesbia merely masturbating the descendants of Remus[51] or copulating fully with them,[52] we have to do with an activity of the real world pursued in degrading circumstances (*in quadriuiis et angiportis*) and represented by a crudely vivid agricultural image (*glubit*).[53] The noun *quadriuium* is absent from the rest of the record of Republican and early imperial literature.[54] The metrical shape of *angiportum* would have excluded it from epic but not from tragedy; nevertheless the tragedians seem to have avoided it.[55] The verb *glubere* and its compounds never appear in epic or tragic poetry, or even in oratory. The locution was a sordid one, whether Catullus took it from ordinary discourse or invented it himself. What is said in item 58 and how it is said fit with other passages of 'Phalaecian' verse[56] and with nothing in the μέλη.

---

[48] E.g. Ronconi (1940*b*: 144 = 1953: 174 = 1971: 176).

[49] Cf. Cairns (1972: 80, 216–17), Lateiner (1977: 26).

[50] Two US professors of literature, Myers and Ormsby (1970), have ' . . . she screws with all and never slows her pace, but busts their balls'. Goold (1983) and Lee (1990) display more sense of anatomy and a better appreciation of the tone of the Latin with ' . . . she holds in her embraces, loving none truly but again and again rupturing the loins of them all' and ' . . . hugging she holds, loving none truly but again and again rupturing all's groins' respectively. See also Wiseman (1979: 11).

[51] Jocelyn (1979: 89–90).

[52] O. Skutsch (1980: 21). Tränkle (1981: 245–8) has argued in favour of the view of Parthenius and others that Catullus refers to Lesbia's monetary exactions.

[53] See Cato, *Agr.* 33.5, Varro, *Rust.* 1.48.2. Butchers and tanners took up the verb (see Paul. Fest. p. 87 Lindsay, s.v. *gluma*, Lyd. *Mag.* 1.12). The sexual use (cf. Auson 71.1) is less likely to have developed from theirs.

[54] Significantly, its next appearance in the record is at Juv. 1.63–4.

[55] Horace has it once in his μέλη, in a very harshly worded passage (*Carm.* 1.25.9–10).

[56] E.g. with 6.13–14; 16.1–2; 21.7–8; 12–13; 32.7–8; 41.1–2; 47.3–4.

11.17–20 presents the woman's promiscuity in no realistic way. One female cannot embrace three hundred males simultaneously. Commentators mislead when they cite 9.2, 12.10 and 48.3. Catullus had in fact an epic number in mind, the three hundred Spartans who died at Thermopylae, for example, or the three hundred Fabii who died at the Cremera.[57] The participial phrase *nullum amans uere sed identidem omnium ilia rumpens* contrasts a lack of sexual arousal on the part of the *puella* with the congested state of the organs of the *moechi*. We need only compare passages like Martial 11.81.2 in the first case[58] and Catullus 32.10–11 in the second[59] to realize how reticently Catullus is writing at 11.19–20. The woman's state could have been put in starkly physical terms. It is, however, the psychic aspect which is alluded to by *nullum amans uere*. Likewise *identidem omnium ilia rumpens* diverts attention from the external to the internal organs of her male lovers. The account of the woman's promiscuity fits with that of the cuckolded husband's impotence in item 17, that of the poet's own lust at 51.9–10 and the allusions to past and future sexual activity in item 61 (51–5, 97–148, 164–73, 199–205, 225–8). The verb *rumpere* seems to be at home in all kinds of literature. *ile* is admittedly one of many words relating to the internal or external human anatomy which do not occur in the remains of oratory. It could not, however, be classified as an obscenity. Celsus admitted it freely to his elegant account of the art of medicine.[60] One might even deduce from Virg. *Aen.* 7.499, 9.415, 10.777–8 that with *ilia rumpens* Catullus was adapting some passage of older epic poetry.

The use of the word *moechus* at 11.17 does form a link with the verbal style of the Phalaecian epigrams (cf. 42.3; 11; 12; 19; 20). It and *moecha* are words avoided in epic and tragic poetry, in oratory and in history.[61] No large conclusions need, however, be drawn. The fastidious Horace admits *moechus* to a μέλος (*Carm.* 1.25.9) as does Catullus himself to an

---

[57] On the Spartan three hundred see Hdt. 7.202; on the Fabii Diodor. 11.53.6 (306 according to other accounts). The island of Ilva sent three hundred warriors to join Aeneas' forces (Virg. *Aen.* 10.173–4). Where lyric poetry is concerned, Horace has three hundred oxen sacrificed to Pluto (*Carm.* 2.14.5–7) and three hundred chains loaded on the over-amorous Pirithous (3.4.79–80).

[58] Cf. Ov. *Ars* 2.685–6. For the state of the fully aroused female see Aristoph. *Equ.* 1285, *Pax* 885, Ov. *Her.* 15.134, Mart. 11.16.7–8, Juv. 6.64, 10.321–2. For the desirability of mutual arousal see Plaut. *Pseud.* 1259–61, Catull. 45.19–20, Sulpicia, [Tib.] 3.11.13–16.

[59] Cf. for male tumescence Eurip. *Cycl.* 327–8, Aristoph. *Lys.* 980–1013, Hor. *Serm.* 1.2.116–18, Martial 11.16.5, *Priap.* 23.3–6, 33.5–6.

[60] 2.7.4 *et al.*

[61] Catullus has *adultera* at 61.98. It is odd that, while adultery is a frequent theme of oratory and history, *adulter* occurs frequently in Cicero and Sallust but *adultera* not at all. Livy has neither.

elegy (68.103) and Propertius to a poem of the same genre (4.5.44). *cum suis uiuat ualeatque moechis* quite lacks the crudity of *nunc in quadriuiis et angiportis glubit magnanimi Remi nepotes.* After the words employed hitherto the vulgar borrowing from Greek causes surprise, but it would have very effectively underscored the difference between the poet's feelings towards the woman and those towards Furius and Aurelius without destroying the lyric tone of the whole piece.

b. 11.21–4 and 58.2–3

It would also be worth setting the elaborate simile constructed in the final strophe of item 11 against the comparative statement at 58.2–3. The latter goes in form with several in the Phalaecian epigrams (3.5; 14.1; 23.12–14, 19, 21; 27.3–4; 35.16–17; 38.7–8; 48.5–6) and in the ἴαμβοι (22.14; 25.1–4; 39.16). The μέλη on the other hand have only the two in 17.15–16. The extended simile of 11.21–4 has many companions in the μέλη (17.12–13, 18–19, 20, 25–6; 61.16–20, 21–5, 33–5, 87–9, 102–5, 186–8, 219–23) and four in the ἴαμβοι (8.5; 25.12–13; 29.8; 37.12). In the Phalaecian epigrams on the other hand there can be found only two highly intellectualizing instances, at 2b.1–3, where reference is made to the heroic world, and at 7.3–9, where it is a question of parts of the contemporary world distant from Rome.[62] The tone of the simile of 11.21–4 can also be felt by contrasting a vulgar expression of the same idea: *tam perit quam extrema faba.*[63] The type of simile had its original home in epic narrative[64] and the more expansive kinds of lyric poetry.[65] It was usually the warrior struck by a weapon or missile who fell like part of a growing plant. Here it was the lover deprived of the will to live by the flight of his loved one.[66] One might, if one pleases, detect irony, as in vv. 1–16. But there can be no doubt about the essentially lyric stamp the use of such a simile puts on the item.

Item 11 may now be treated as a whole and the details of the extra-metrical ways in which it differs from the Phalaecian epigrams which flank it in the tradition considered.

---

[62] See Jocelyn (1995: 63–71).
[63] Cited by Fest. p. 496 Lindsay ('in prouerbio est').
[64] Cf. Hom. *Il.* 8.306–8 (Gorgythion dies), 11.67–71 (Trojans and Achaeans are slain), Catull. 64.353–5 (Trojans will be slain), Virg. *Aen.* 9.435–7 (Euryalus dies).
[65] Cf. Stesich. *Suppl. Lyr. Gr.* 15 col. ii 14–17 (Geryon dies).
[66] *meum . . . amorem* in v. 21 must be interpreted as the equivalent of *me . . . amantem.* The loved one was often addressed as *mea uita* (Plaut. *Cas.* 135 *et al.*) and the parted, betrayed or abandoned lover often complained that he no longer wished to live (cf. Plaut. *Merc.* 471–3).

c. Item 11: Phonetic Features

Two kinds of purely phonetic repetition accompany the repeated rhythms of item 11: alliteration of successive initial phonemes and assonance of neighbouring syllables. There is only one case of the termination of successive grammatically related words with the same long vowel or diphthong.

The μέλη tend to favour alliteration (6.1 cases per hundred words in 11; 4.3 per cent in 17; 4.2 per cent in 30; 5.0 per cent in 34; 6.8 per cent in 61) and to spread the figure evenly. The Phalaecian epigrams have on the whole much less (1.6 per cent in 10 and 3.4 per cent in 12; 0.0 per cent in 1, 2b, 3; 2.9 per cent in 5; 3.5 per cent in 6; 0.0 per cent in 9, 13; 4.5 per cent in 15; 1.2 per cent in 21) and aim the figure at particular targets. Nevertheless the ratio can drop as low as to 1.4 per cent in a μέλος (51) and rise as high as to 7.7 per cent in an epigram (2; 5.2 per cent in 7; 4.5 per cent in 15; 6.3 per cent in 16). We cannot therefore make too much of the 1.6 per cent–6.1 per cent–3.4 per cent sequence in items 10–11–12.

It is difficult to define assonance in a way which facilitates comparative measurement of its incidence. However the figure is defined or measured, differences between individual members of a genre seem as great as they are between the genres themselves. I note therefore only that neither item 10 nor item 12 has much that is comparable with 11.3–4 *longe resonante Eoa tunditur unda* or 13–14 *omnia haec quaecumque feret uoluntas caelitum* or 18 *complexa tenet trecentos.*

It has been noticed that where grammatically related words are concerned homoeoteleuton involving a long vowel or diphthong is freely allowed by Catullus in the Phalaecian epigrams but avoided in the epic items 62 and 64 and in the elegies 65–69.[67] In the μέλη he seems to me to have been equally shy, with only one case in item 11 (15), none in item 17, one in item 30 (10), none in items 34 and 51, one in item 61 (100). Much more significant than the one case in item 11 (15 *meae puellae*) are the six occasions when hyperbaton prevents it (2, 3–4, 6–7, 10, 17, 21) and the two when obsolescent conjunctions stand in the way (6, 11–12). I note by the way that the emotionally charged *meae puellae* occurs four times in the epigrams (2.1; 3.3, 4, 17 (cf. 36.21)) and that those genres and authors hostile to homoeoteleuton of noun and attribute are more relaxed where the latter is a pronominal adjective.

The repetition of whole words and whole phrases has of course a

---

[67] Shackleton Bailey counts 54 cases in the Phalaecian epigrams (1992: 69). On the epic and elegiac pieces see the same scholar (1994: 7–9, 16–18).

semantic as well as a phonetic aspect. The two genres differ in their own ways both of exploiting and avoiding such repetition.

In item 11 there is a striking case of the figure anaphora (2–12 *siue . . . siue . . . seu . . . siue . . . siue*). This figure appears as well in all the other μέλη, in some of them a number of times (17.17–18, 21; 30.2–3; 34.13–20; 51.1–2, 13–15; 61.46–9, 51–9, 110–11). Many Phalaecian epigrams do not on the other hand have it at all. Where it does appear in this genre it tends to be of the unremarkable character of *neque . . . nec* (10.9–10; 21).

Item 11 presents no example of the multiple repetition of a single thematic word like that of *pons* in item 17, of *fides* and related words and of *factum* in 30, of *bonus* in 61, and none of the repetition of a thematic statement like that of *quendam de tuo uolo ponte ire praecipitem* in item 17 (8–9; 23) and none of the incantatory repetitions of item 61 (*o Hymenaee Hymen, o Hymen Hymenaee* at vv. 4–5, 39–40, 49–50, 59–60, 117–18, 137–8, 142–3, 147–8, 152–3, 157–8, 162–3, 167–8, 172–3, 177–8, 181–2; *quis huic deo compararier ausit?* at vv. 64–5, 69–70, 74–5; *uiden ut faces splendidas quatiunt comas* at vv. 77–8, 94–5; *abit dies, prodeas noua nupta* at vv. 90–1, (96), 105–11, 112–13; *concubine nuces da* at vv. 128, 133). Such repetitions as item 10 presents (e.g. 20 *parare*, 30 *parauit*, 32 *pararim*) look on the other hand to be without semantic or rhetorical purpose, the result of an artful artlessness.

In the epic item 64 Catullus followed the model of Ennius' *Annales* in only occasionally putting words together in such a way that the final vowel of one ran into the initial vowel of the next.[68] This inevitably helped to make the sound of a piece of epic poetry very different from that of a story narrated in the ordinary language.[69] Catullus was not as hostile to synaloephe in either item 11 or its two companions (12.4 per cent; 12.6 per cent; 13.9 per cent ≠ 4.4 per cent in 64). Nevertheless, to judge by what went on in comedy, he did not try to ape the freedom of the ordinary language. The amount of synaloephe in the Phalaecian epigrams is not significantly greater than that in the μέλος. On the other hand one notes in item 11 *Furi et* (1) and *prati ultimi* (22–3) and no synaloephe at all of a monosyllable, in item 10 *sane illepidum* (4), *octo homines* (20), *quaeso inquit* (25) and two cases of synaloephe of a monosyllable (7, 28), and in item 12, *belle uteris* (2), *ioco atque* (2), *te inepte* (4), *quare aut* (10) and *exspecta aut* (11).

The paradosis of vv. 11–12 of item 11 — often emended in conse-quence[70] — requires the assumption of a hiatus difficult to parallel in other

[68] See Vollmer (1923: 20–1), Soubiran (1966: 600–3), O. Skutsch (1985: 52–3).
[69] See Cic. *Orat.* 152.
[70] Most recently by McKie (1984: 74–8): *horribiles uitro ultimosque Britannos.*

verse of the time, to say nothing of a very peculiar tricolon: *Caesaris uisens monimenta magni, Gallicum Rhenum, horribilesque ultimosque Britannos.* The hiatus between the directly quoted *mane* of 10.27 and *inquii* (Scaliger: *me inquit*) may on the other hand be justified by supposing a pause in delivery.

The prosody of words in classical Latin verse is remarkable for its regularity. Whether ordinary speech was ever as regular may be doubted. The verse of the third and second centuries shows a large amount of oscillation. Catullus was clearly out to reduce the amount. The metrical pattern of item 11 demanded two fairly clear artificialities. Others may be hidden by our ignorance of the facts of ordinary first-century BC speech.

How far in Catullus' time upper-class urban speakers of Latin always gave full value to a final sibilant is uncertain. Nowhere in the μέλη, the ἴαμβοι or the Phalaecian epigrams does anything like *tu dabi' supplicium* (116.8) appear. For Catullus the poet the sibilant regularly made position (e.g. at 11.7, 10, 22). That does not necessarily mean it did for Catullus the Roman gentleman.

It is very likely that in making *siue* a trochee in vv. 7 and 9 Catullus diverged from the normal pronunciation of his time.[71] About iambic *meae* in v. 15, *suis* in v. 17 and *meum* in v. 21 and cretic *illius* in v. 22 one cannot be sure.[72] The prosodical treatment of the pronominal adjective in comedy and its spelling in private letters of the first and second centuries AD indicate at least an oscillating pronunciation in the ordinary language, while the behaviour of both the old comedians and the first-century BC poets suggests that various measurements were possible of the relatively uncommon and apparently anomalous genitive of the deictic pronoun.

The other lyric items show equally little certain variation from the norm. Iambic *tibi* at 17.5; 51.13; 61.149 and 151 very probably had an

---

[71] A word beginning in a consonant was regularly preceded by monosyllabic *seu* in comedy (at Plaut. *Amph.* 69, 70, 71, as elsewhere) and tragedy. Lucretius has trochaic *siue* ten times (1.861 *et al.*) in his hexameters.

[72] It is unlikely that ordinary speakers were clearer about the prosody of the pronominal adjective than they had been in the previous century or were to be in following centuries (for *ma = mea* see Tab. Vindol. 292b. back 2–3, Pap. Michig. 8.471.34, Adams (1995a: 120)). As for cretic/dactyl *illius*, this form is also found at 3.8, 10.31 (Phalaecian epigrams), at 61.219 (μέλος), 64.348 (epic), 66.85, 68.44 (elegies). The molossic form (see *GLK* IV 233, 234) occurs only at 67.23. Lucretius on the other hand has the molossus 13 times, the cretic/dactyl only four. How much observation of the facts lies in the doctrine of the grammarians (*GLK* IV 233, 234) that the classical writers of prose always used the molossic form is hard to say.

archaic sound.[73] About dactylic *totius* (17.10) and *illius* (61.219) and trochaic *iste* (17.21), *ille* (51.1 and 2), and *ipse* (61.57)[74] uncertainty must prevail.

It may be chance that nowhere in item 11 does Catullus diverge from the practice of contemporary speakers of Latin in syllabifying words and word-groups involving the conjunction of a so-called 'mute' and 'liquid' or any of the collocations [sp], [st], [sk], [fr], [fl]. 17.6 has *sac-ra*, 17.24 *po-te s-to-li-dum*, 34.19 *ag-ri-co-lae*, 61.23 *Ha-mad-ry-a-des*.[75] Less a matter of chance would be the relatively large number of instances of the Graecizing syllabification in the ἴαμβοι (4.6, 7, 9; 22.7, 10, 12; 25.7; 29.4, 22; 31.8; 39.11; 44.18) and the relatively small number in the Phalaecian epigrams (3.11, 13; 28.15; 36.15; 55.2; 58.4), most of which occur in the ithyphallic close.

d. Item 11: Morphology and Syntax

In morphology item 11 could not be said to diverge much from ordinary Latin speech, something which is also true of other lyric items. There is nothing in item 11 or in 17 or in 51 as archaic as the *forent* of 30.8, the *deposiuit* of 34.8, the *sonantum* of 34.12, the *citarier* of 61.42, the *compararier* of 61.65, 75 the *ausit* of 61.65, 75, the *nitier* of 61.68. The Greek termination of *Arabas* (v. 5)[76] has parallels not only elsewhere in lyric poetry (61.30 *Aganippe* and 187 *parthenice*), in epic (64.15 *Nereides*; 35 *Tempe*; 53 *Thesea*; 85 *Minoa*) and in elegy (66.46 *Athon*; 48 *Chalybon*; 67 *Booten*; 68.116 *Hebe*) but also in iambic poetry (4.7 *Cycladas*; 9 *Propontida*; 13 *Amastri*) and even in Phalaecian epigram (36.13 *Ancona*; 14 *Amathunta*; 45.1 *Acmen*; 10 *Acme*; 58b.1–3 *Cretum . . . Ladas . . . Perseus*). The Arabs were known to the Romans at this time perhaps only through Greek literature.

The syntax of item 11 has aspects both of archaism and of modernizing

---

[73] As in the Phalaecian epigrams at 32.6 and 50.16 (≠ 1.3, 8; 13.2; 14.7, 9, 16; 15.1; 23.5, 15, 19; 35.16; 38.6; 40.3; 49.4). The iambic measurement was already relatively uncommon in comedy (c. 8 examples in Plautus' *Pseudolus* against c. 25 of the pyrrhic). Lucretius has it as an iambus 11 times, as a pyrrhic 52 times. Ancient students of prose thought it always had the value of a pyrrhic (*GLK* IV 232).

[74] Catullus has the dactylic form also at 37.9. The only genitive form recorded for comedy is *toti* (fem.) at Afran. 325. Lucretius has the dactylic form 17 times, the molossic 4 times. On *illius* see above, n. 72. The Phalaecian epigrams have trochaic *ille* (6.9; 47.4; 57.8; 58b.1) and *ipse* (55.9). In about 28 instances out of 173 in Plautine comedy *ille* can only be given the value of a long monosyllable. *iste* has been treated similarly at Plaut. *Persa* 520; *ipse* similarly at Plaut. *Asin.* 714, *Bacch.* 1160, *Epid.* 47, Ter. *Hec.* 560. Lucretius has trochaic *ille* and trochaic *ipse* often.

[75] The syllabification of *probra* in 61.99 must remain uncertain. See above, n. 16.

[76] Contrast Plaut. *Curc.* 443. The manuscripts have *Arabas*, however, at Cic. *Fam.* 8.10.2.

artificiality. The local use of the conjunction *ut* (v. 3) recurs at 17.10 and elsewhere in recorded Latin only in translations of Aratus' ἧχι (*Phaen.* 231: Cic. *Arat.* 2, Germ. 233) and in Manilius' *Astronomica* (2.273). The local use of ἵνα in epic and lyric texts would have been Catullus' model. The only clear cases of such Graecism in the other lyric items are 51.5 *dulce ridentem* (≠ Sappho's ἆδυ φωνείσας), 61.7 *suaue olentis*, 61.212 *dulce rideat*. The plural, or perhaps rather collective, use of *unda* (v. 4) was related to uses of the singular form in the ordinary language but had its immediate source in the practice of the old poets.[77] The phenomenon occurs twice in item 17 (13,19) and pullulates in item 61 (3–4, 9–10, 51, 54–5, 56–9, 108, 155, 161, 199, 202–3, 213). It appears three times in the ἴαμβοι (37.20; 39.20; 44.15) and seven times in the Phalaecian epigrams 6.17; 14.22; 23.21; 35.15; 43.2; 56.2; 58b.4). The singular — or perhaps again one should say collective — use of the plural *aequora* (v. 8) likewise came from old poetry.[78] The phenomenon occurs five times in item 61 (14, 28, 103, 110, 224) but not at all in the ἴαμβοι. The only clear case in the Phalaecian epigrams (apart from the affectionate uses of *mei amores* and *meae deliciae*) is at 35.15. The use of an accusative object with the participle in *-nt-* at vv. 10–12 and 19–20 occurs in other lyric items (17.20; 30.7–8; 34.17–18; 61.9–10, 12–13, 17, 26, 33, 54, 80, 99, 154, 211–12). In the previous century it had been largely restricted to the higher genres.[79] Orators contemporary with Catullus used it, but restrainedly. It occurs once in the ἴαμβοι (59.4), ten times in the Phalaecian epigrams (9.6–7, 8; 21.7; 35.3–4, 9–10; 45.1–2, 10; 50.4, 6; 53.4), with what tone it is hard to say. There are no grounds for calling *nec . . . respectet* (v. 21) either archaic or colloquial.

The other obsolescent syntagms detectable in the lyric items are few and open to doubt: the adjectival use of the ethnic noun *Ligus* at 17.9; the jussive use of the second person singular of the subjunctive at 34.21 and 24 and 61.91, 96, 106, 113 (refrain);[80] the use of the perfect subjunctive after *non . . . periculum est ne* at 61.83–6;[81] the use of *in* and the ablative

---

[77] Cf. Enn. *Ann.* 302.

[78] Cf. Enn. *Praet.* 4, *Ann.* 505 (hence Lucret. 1.8, 3.1002).

[79] Plautine comedy has only five instances of the present participle with an accusative complement (*Aul.* 8, *Merc.* 57, *Mil.* 204–5, *Persa* 253, *Rud.* 695; the last two in paratragic address to deities). The remains of Ennius' *Annales* on the other hand have a comparatively large number of instances, as does Catullus' epic item 64.

[80] 8.1 and 32.7 and a number of passages of Cicero's correspondence (*Att.* 1.17.11, 4.19.2, 10.15.4) show that it still had some life in the ordinary language. Oratory avoided it (see, however, Cic. *Verr.* II 3.37).

[81] Contrast Plaut. *Asin.* 388, *Pseud.* 289, Cic. *Sest.* 52, *De orat.* 2.69, *Rep.* 1.37, *Tusc.* 5.118, Pollio *ap.* Cic. *Fam.* 10.31.2. Interpreters and translators refer Catullus' *uiderit* to the past. This makes little sense.

with *deditus* at 61.97–8;[82] the use of the supine with *ire* at 61.146;[83] the use of *ne* with the present imperative at 61.193;[84] the volitive use of the third person perfect subjunctive *iuuerit* at 61.196.[85]

e. Item 11: Sentence-Structure and Word-Order

The considerable length of the two periods which form item 11 (of 66 and 38 words respectively) is to be paralleled at 17.1–7 (49 words), 14–20 (48); 34.5–16 (40); 61.1–15 (51), in the ἴαμβοι at 25.1–8 (49); 44.1–9 (55), and in the Phalaecian epigrams at 2.1–10 (51); 7.3–12 (48); 15.2–10 (49); 24.1–6 (36); 45.1–7 (36). Comparatively speaking the number of such periods in the epigrams is rare. The constituents of the periods never overrun strophe boundaries in this item, item 30, item 34, item 51 or item 61. They rarely overrun in item 17. So called 'enjambement' is on the other hand extremely common in the ἴαμβοι and the Phalaecian epigrams. The periods of item 11 do not have the complexity of high oratory, but they lack the parentheses and the inconcinnity that appear to have marked periods of such length in ordinary speech, except perhaps for the collocation *haec quaecumque* (*haec quacumque* Nisbet) at v. 13. Noteworthy is the nominal phrase *comites Catulli* at 11.1.[86] Likewise the number of extended participial phrases (3 *longe resonante*; 10 *Caesaris uisens monimenta magni*; 14 *temptare simul parati*; 19–20 *nullum amans uere, sed identidem omnium ilia rumpens*).

The order of words constituting the phrases and clauses of item 11 varies quite markedly from what can be deduced about the patterns of everyday first-century speech.

Whereas the orators and the historians maintained the ancient position of the accusative complement of the verb, ordinary users of the language had for some time tended more and more to have such a complement follow, at least where principal clauses were concerned.[87] Catullus has two cases of the accusative preceding a finite transitive verb and none of the opposite order in item 11; five and one respectively in 17; three and one in 30; two and none in 34; four and none in 51; thirty-two and fourteen in

---

[82] ≠ Plaut. *Mil.* 567, Cic. *Cael.* 12 *et al.* The parallels at Lucret. 3.647 (≠ Cic. *Fam.* 15.4.16 *et al.*) and 4.815 suggest that it was no new locution.

[83] Cicero has it in only a few set expressions (*cubitum, sessum ire*).

[84] Frequent in Plautus, much less so in Terence, rare in first-century BC and first-century AD prose (Liv. 3.2.9 (reported speech), Sen. *Contr.* 1.2.5 (often challenged by critics), Sen. *Dial.* 2.19.4).

[85] Cf. the prayer *quod di omen auerterint* at Cic. *Phil.* 12.14 (≠ *Flacc.* 104, *Phil.* 3.35, 13.7; 41, 14.26).

[86] Servius interprets *comitum* at Virg. *Aen.* 11.94 as 'comitantium'.

[87] See Adams (1976: 70–99).

61. It is not easy to suggest a reason for the last set of figures. I note that there was an especially strong tendency in the ordinary language for an injunctive verb to precede its object and that ten of the fourteen preposed verbs of item 61 are injunctive.[88]

The ordering of the noun and various types of attribute was already in the early second century undergoing a process of change. Ennius' *Annales* exploited the potentialities of the situation much more than his stage tragedies did. 331 cases of noun and attribute of every type have been counted in the fragments of the old hexameter poem: in 150 the noun precedes, in 181 the attribute; in the latter 181 cases the attribute is disjoined 63 times.[89] In the first 21 verses of Catullus' epic item 64 I count 25 cases of noun and attribute of every type: in three the noun precedes, in 22 the attribute; in the latter 22 cases the attribute is disjoined 19 times.[90] The difference is quite striking and not to be attributed to any change in the ordinary language between Ennius' time and Catullus'. Removal of the type of adjective which had continued in the second and first centuries normally to precede the noun would not significantly affect the statistics. A conscious policy appears to be at work.[91]

Item 11 is remarkable for the small number of nouns it carries without any attribute at all. Of its 24 attributes five follow and 19 precede. Only one of the five following is disjoined (10 *magni*), and this is an adjective which in the ordinary language normally preceded its noun. The disjunction gave it an emotionally heavy emphasis. Five of the nine immediately preceding (6 *sagittiferos*; 11 *Gallicum*; 15 *meae*; 22 *illius*; 22–3 *prati ultimi*) would in the ordinary langue as a rule have followed. Six of the ten preceding at a distance (3 *Eoa*; 7 *septemgeminus*; 10 *Caesaris*; 17 *suis*; 21 *meum*; 23 *praetereunte*) would normally have followed. They thus received an emphasis greater than that given the other four. One could give an account of each case in terms of the liberties the ordinary language allowed, but the impression left by the sheer number of licences which Catullus granted himself in item 11 remains. Items 17, 34, 51 and 61 behave similarly in regard to the position of the attribute; item 30 stands slightly apart. There are clear signs here of the operation by Catullus of a special stylistic agenda for lyric poetry.

---

[88] It is more significant for the tone of item 61 that sixteen injunctives follow the object.

[89] See O. Skutsch (1985: 67). Where the noun precedes, the attribute is disjoined no more than about fifteen times.

[90] Where an attribute follows a noun (vv. 3, 6, 18) it does so immediately.

[91] The history of so-called 'hyperbaton' in Latin as a whole with proper attention to the various kinds of prose and the non-literary material is yet to be written. See, however, Adams (1971: 1–16).

The splitting of the passive periphrasis *tactus est* in vv. 23–4 appears to be unique in the μέλη (contrast 34.23; 61.194), the ἴαμβοι (contrast 22.20; 29.16, 17; 39.2), and the Phalaecian epigrams (contrast 1.5; 3.3; 10.3; 26.2; 28.13; 36.4; 38.5; 58b.9–10). The epic item 64 has one case (v. 147: contrast vv. 6, 79, 268, 304); the elegies three (66.61; 67.9; 68.15; contrast 66.27 (bis), 29, 34; 67.26; 68.39, 80, 106, 125, 154); the elegiac epigrams six (87.2, 4; 99.13; 100.5–6; 102.4; 110.3; contrast 76.8; 83.6; 95.2; 99.7; 101.8; 102.1; 116.5). Contemporary oratory occasionally split the periphrasis in order to emphasize a contrast between the participle in question and another or to assist in the focusing of another element of the whole phrase.[92] At 11.23–4 Catullus appears to be enforcing some unspoken contrast between the *aratrum* and the *flos*.

Related in some degree to this phenomenon is the inversion and separation of participle and auxiliary, of which there are two cases in the μέλη: at 17.14 *cui cum sit uiridissimo nupta flore puella* auxiliary *sit* appears to attach itself to the emphasized pair of subordinators *cui cum*; at 34.21–2 *sis quocumque tibi placet sancta nomine* the volitive character of the phrase drives *sis* to the initial position. The former has parallels in oratory,[93] the latter none. Since, however, the orators avoided the positive use of the second person subjunctive in wishes and exhortations[94] this is not surprising. There are no cases at all in the Phalaecian epigrams of a preposed auxiliary helping to focus another constituent of the colon, but a scatter is to be found in the ἴαμβοι, the epic item 64, the elegies and the elegiac epigrams.[95] It could of course be argued that *sancta* at 34.21–2 is an adjective rather than part of a synthetic perfect passive verb. In that case there are parallels for the position of *sis* in the elegies (68.155) and the elegiac epigrams (100.8).[96]

The incorporation within the relative clause in 11.7–8 of its head *aequora* reflects to some extent an archaic practice still occasionally followed by orators but, it would seem, abandoned by the ordinary language.[97] The only near-parallels in Catullus' entire work are in the elegiac item 68

[92] See Adams (1994*b*: 34–43).

[93] See Adams (1994*b*: 34–40, 44–53).

[94] See above n. 80.

[95] See, where the ἴαμβοι are concerned, 37.13 (44.17 without separation); where item 64 is concerned, vv. 220, 396 (187 without separation); where the elegies are concerned, 67.6; 68.22, 59, 94, 130, 158; where the elegiac epigrams are concerned, 71.4; 75.1 (84.3 and 108.4 without separation).

[96] See further Cic. *Ad Q. fr.* 1.3.10 *sis fortis* (≠ *Fam.* 16.9.4 *cautus sis*), Prop. 1.1.32 *sitis et . . . pares*.

[97] Cf. for such incorporation Plaut. *Amph.* 7, *Cas.* 975, *Curc.* 433, *Epid.* 472–3, *Men.* 707, *Mil.* 73–4, *Most.* 505, Ter. *Andr.* 3, 26, 39, 681, *Eun.* 19–20, 449–50.

(vv. 147–8 as restored in the 1473 edition, 153–4).[98] One can only guess at what effect the poet aimed with such an order.

The placing of *ut* (v. 3) and *postquam* (v. 23) in the second position of their respective clauses had copious precedent in both the higher and the lower genres of older poetry.[99] First-century BC writers of formal prose felt able to position these and other subordinators after a word or group of words which required emphasis. Cicero's private correspondence shows a similar degree of liberty.[100] This liberty survived a long time in the ordinary language but was eventually curtailed in formal prose. It is arguable that the process of curtailment was already under way at some levels in the first century, if not already in the second. Catullus affected the freer order in his other μέλη,[101] and about as much in the epic item 64,[102] the elegies,[103] the elegiac epigrams,[104] and the ἴαμβοι.[105] I say this taking account of the

---

[98] Not, however, 64.207–9.

[99] Cf. Enn. *Trag.* 249, 300, 322 (*ut* ≠ 72, 263, 353, 383), *Ann.* 155, 461, 491, 578 (*postquam* ≠ 63, 137, 143, 225). The same positionings of *ut* and *postquam* can be found in Plautus' comedies; both subordinators normally, however, head their clauses (I count in the first 300 verses of the *Pseudolus* 24 cases of *ut* in the first position, ten of it later; the six cases of *postquam* in the whole script are all in the first position).

[100] It has been estimated from relatively small samples that Cicero postpones the subordinator in his orations between 15 and 20 times in a hundred; Caesar's practice is similar.

[101] Cf. for *ut* 17.10, 26; 30.12; 34. 9, 23; 61.149, 164 (contrast 11.21; 61.34, 41, 77, 204); for *uelut* 61.21, 102, 187 (contrast 11.22; 17.18); for relative *qui* 51.5; 61.29, 62, 139, (contrast 11.17, 22; 17.1; 30.12; 34.7; 51.3; 61.3, 23, 37, 71, 107, 110, 144, 151, 197, 202); for *cum* 17.14. There is no instance of *si* in the second or a later position (contrast 17.20, 24; 30.11; 61.92).

[102] Cf. for *ut* vv. 61, 138, 226, 236, 293, 402 (contrast vv. 117–23 (five cases), 230, 231, 233, 241); *uelut* occurs only at the beginning of a phrase or clause (105, 353, 369); for relative *qui* postponed cf. vv. 30, 48, 56, 71, 73, 95, 157, 216, 322 (contrast vv. 26, 66, 87, 96, 119, 142, 161, 165, 193, 196, 209, 219, 229, 254, 260, 272, 280–3, 284, 286, 296, 317, 325, 330, 340, 358, 359, 369); for *cum* vv. 80, 212, 388 (contrast vv. 4, 101, 237, 243, 305, 344, 350, 363, 392); for *si* v. 228 (contrast v. 158). I note v. 202 *has postquam . . .* and omit a number of subordinators which occur sporadically in item 64 and elsewhere.

[103] Cf. for *ut* 66.3; 68.3, 73, 84, 115 (contrast 65.19; 66.4, 5; 67.16; 68.130; *uelut* occurs at the beginning of a clause at 68.63); for relative *qui* 65.7; 66.1, 17, 79, 83; 67.21, 33, 47; 68.131, 159 (contrast 65.21; 66.2, 9, 11, 14, 27, 28, 43, 49, 68, 84; 67.3, 5, 9, 28, 30, 38, 45; 68.5, 15, 18, 24, 31, 59, 78, 91, 96, 111, 113, 118, 121, 126, 128, 133, 148, 153, 160); for *cum* cf. 66.89; 68.16, 75 (contrast 66.45, 45–6, 47, 52; 67.4; 68.8, 32, 53, 59, 61); for *si* cf. 68.40 (contrast 66.35, 73; 68.31, 86, 147).

[104] Cf. for *ut/uti* 72.4; 76.21, 23; 78.4, 90.5; 116.2 (contrast 72.3; 75.3; 89.5; 99.13; 101.3; 109.3, 5); for relative *qui* 70.3; 73.6; 82.3; 88.3; 101.7; 104.2; 106.1; 115.4 (contrast 69.5; 71.3; 73.5; 74.5; 76.9, 21; 78.1; 78b.1; 79.1; 81.2, 5; 86.5; 88.1; 89.1; 91.6; 98.2; 102.2; 110.8; 114.2); for *cum* 80.3 (contrast 76.2; 80.3; 84.4, 10; 100.7); for *si* 75.4; 82.1 (contrast 69.3; 70.2; 71.1, 2; 74.2; 75.3; 76.1, 16, 17 (bis), 19; 82.1; 83.3; 84.1; 88.8; 90.4; 96.1; 98.3, 5; 102.1; 103.3; 107.1; 108.1).

[105] Cf. for relative *qui* 22.21; 37.19; 44.8; 59.2 (contrast 4.1; 8.2, 7, 10; 22.1, 12, 19; 25.6, 8; 29.3–4, 19; 31.11; 37.11, 39.14, 20; 44.2, 3, 21); for *cum* 8.6; 22.9, 16; 39.5 (contrast 4.23; 8.4, 14; 25.5; 31.8; 39.3; 44.21; 59.4). Neither *ut* (contrast 22.5; 29.8, 13; 39.13, 20; 60.4) nor *uelut* (contrast 25.12) nor *si* (contrast 22.13; 39.2, 4, 10; 44.18) is displaced.

relatively small number of subordinate clauses in the μέλη. In the Phalae-cian epigrams, on the other hand, the subordinator tended rather more to be placed at the head of its clause.[106] It is hard to judge the import of this tendency. Possibly excessive use of the liberty conflicted with the down-to-earth tone normally sought in the epigrams. The position of *litus* at 11.3 stressed the idea, perhaps already stressed by the separation of *extremos* from its noun, that India lay at the eastern edge of the northern landmass. That of *praetereunte* at 11.23 brought out further the contrast being sug-gested between the plant and the plough. There was, it is clear, nothing understated about the general style of lyric poetry.

f. Item 11: Vocabulary

The vocabulary chosen for item 11 would have marked it in both a positive and a negative way; especially for a reader who came to it after item 10 and was immediately to proceed to item 12.

The absence of any particular word can hardly be significant in such a short piece as item 11. Nevertheless it would be worth observing that the class of enclitics and the like is represented only by -*ue* (vv. 5, 6), -*que* (vv. 11, 12, 17) and *est* (v. 24), that *penetrabit* (v. 2), *gradietur* (v. 9), *uiuat ualeatque* (v. 17), *tenet* (v. 18), and *respectet* (v. 21) have no pronominal subject and that *haec* is used rather than *ea* at v. 13 and *illius* rather than *eius* at v. 22. The only forms of *is* which occur in the other μέλη are *id* at 17.22 and *eum* at 17.23.[107] Thirteen of the 114 words which compose the item would have been perceptibly obsolescent in the ordinary language or unknown except to those conversant with the higher genres of the poetry of the previous two centuries, or quite new and decipherable only through acquaintance with the modules of the established poetic language: these are *resonante* (v. 3),[108] *Eoa* (v. 3),[109] -*ue* (vv. 5, 6),[110] *sagittiferos* (v. 6),[111]

---

[106] See below nn. 160, 161, 162.

[107] I have not been able to find another example of the conjunction of *hic* and *quicumque* (≠ *is*: Cic. *Att.* 7.7.7, 8.11b.1, *Fam.* 13.6.1, *Orat.* 123, 237, *Tusc.* 5.33, *Off.* 3.20). On the difficulty see Nisbet (1978: 94–5 = 1995: 79–80). *illi* appears rather than *ei* at 61.169; *illius* rather than *eius* at 61.219.

[108] ≠ *sonante*. Old tragedy has *resonere/resonare* 5 times, *sonere/sonare* 8; comedy has the former only once (Plaut. *Pseud.* 702 (paratragedy)), the latter 7 times.

[109] ≠ *orientali*. *Eous*, a borrowing from Greek poetry with an obviously Greek sound, occurs here first in the record and thereafter largely in verse.

[110] The old disjunctive was already giving way to *aut* and *uel* in second-century comedy (only 14 times in Plautus, 10 in Terence, not at all in the other comedians). The exiguous remains of tragedy on the other hand have as many as five cases. Vitruvius would admit it twice (3.3.8 and 10.9.3).

[111] First here in the record. Tragedy had many such formations (e.g. *frondifer* at Naev. *Trag.* 25); comedy avoided them except in paratragic passages.

septemgeminus (v. 7),[112] *aequora* (v. 8),[113] *gradietur* (v. 9),[114] *-que* (vv. 11, 12, 17),[115] *caelitum* (v. 14),[116] *respectet* (v. 21).[117] Each of the other μέλη, apart from item 17, has much the same proportion of such vocabulary, a proportion rather smaller than the one to be found in the epic item 64, in Cicero's *Aratus* or in Lucretius' *De rerum natura*. The μέλη composed by Horace a generation later will similarly seem less 'poetic' than Virgil's *Georgics* or *Aeneid*. Of the other words of item 11 only *moechus* (discussed above pp. 347–8) would have given the orator qualms as being possibly unfit for a solemn public occasion.

The use of a pair of nearly synonymous words or phrases gave dignity to religious and legal injunctions and to formulae of social courtesy. Tragedy and the grander parts of comedy exploited the way of speaking.[118] Catullus' μέλη have it at v. 17 of the item under discussion (*uiuat ualeatque*); it also occurs at 17.9 (*praecipitem ... per caputque pedesque*), 10 (*totius ... lacus putidaeque paludis*), 30.3 (*prodere ... fallere*), 10 (*uentos ... ac nebulas aereas*), 51.14 (*exultas nimiumque gestis*). *uiuat ualeatque* looks like a formula of the ordinary language poeticised by the use of the particle *-que*.[119]

---

[112] First here in the record and never common. *tergeminus* (Lucret. 5.28, Virg. *Aen.* 4.511, 8.202, Hor. *Carm.* 1.1.8; doubtless coined by Ennius as a choriambic replacement of *trigeminus*) would have been the model.

[113] ≠ *mare*. An old word already restricted to tragic and epic poetry in the second century and rarely applied to anything but the sea. Catullus probably contrasts the calm of the sea in front of the Nile delta with the violence of the Indian shore-line.

[114] ≠ Liv. 21.38.6 *eo magis miror ambigi quanam Alpis transierit*. The simple form of the verb *gradi* appeared in old tragedy (Pacuv. 47) and in grandiose passages of comedy (Plaut. *Poen.* 632, *Pseud.* 859, 1236, *Truc.* 124). Cicero admitted it three time to his philosophical dialogues, twice in reference to the locomotion of four-footed animals (*Nat. deor.* 2.122, *Tusc.* 5.38) and once in a piece of grandiose imagery (*Tusc.* 1.110).

[115] ≠ *et*. Signs of a declining use of the old conjunctive particle *-que* are visible even in Plautus' comedies. Cicero used it more in his speeches than in his letters. In some speeches of a plain style (e.g. the *Pro Roscio Comoedo*) it is hardly to be found at all. The coupling of ... *-que* ... *-que*, whether original or modelled on ... τε ... τε, was outrightly paratragic in Plautus' time; see Fraenkel (1922: 209–11 = 1960: 199–201), Haffter (1934: 119 n. 4; 1956: 363).

[116] ≠ *deum*. *caeles* occurs five times in tragedy and only once in the remains of comedy (Plaut. *Rud.* 2). It remained restricted to the higher genres of poetry.

[117] ≠ *respiciat* (cf. Plaut. *Bacch.* 638a, *Rud.* 1316). The verb *respectare*, rare even in a frequentative sense, cannot have such a sense here. Tragedy had often used the frequentative form in *-tare* with no appreciable difference in sense from the base form (e.g. Ennius' *abnutare* (306), *aditare* (394), *aduentare* (37), *proiectare* (194), *raptare* (92)).

[118] See Haffter (1934: 53–85).

[119] Cf. Plaut. *Mil.* 1340 *bene ualete et uiuite*, *Trin.* 996 *male uiue et uale* (also *Bacch.* 246, *Stich.* 31, *Trin.* 52), Ter. *Andr.* 889 *immo habeat ualeat uiuat cum illa* (also *Haut.* 430).

g. Item 10: Substance and Tone

We move back for the purpose of linguistic analysis to the Phalaecian epigram item 10. It should not, however, be forgotten that the ancient reader moved the other way, coming from a lower to a higher style. The names of some of the persons involved in the incident which the epigram recounts and the references to the province of Bithynia and to certain landmarks of the Capital would have set the scene for the first readers of the poem in the Rome of the spring or summer of 56.[120] The absence of a specific addressee — the ten preceding items have one, likewise the next 31 — suggests that the poet presents himself as talking to a group of sympathetic friends. He describes, in part indirectly but in the main directly, a conversation between himself, one Varus, and a woman fancied by the latter. The low status of the woman prevents her being named, while it is no doubt the high status of the former governor of Bithynia which helps to keep him anonymous.[121] The ninth *sermo* of Horace's first book would not have been the first poem of its type to report a conversation with an obnoxious person at some length. Direct representation of dialogue has been posited for a number of the fragments of Lucilius' *Saturae*, but none is large enough to guarantee certainty. At any rate no other of the first sixty items of the *liber Catulli Veronensis* reports the two parts of a conversation. That needs to be remembered in considering the verbal style of item 10, which in many respects varies as much from its fellow epigrams as it does from the lyric item 11.

h. Item 10: Phonetic Features

There is very little phonetic repetition in item 10 that looks a matter of design. The only alliterations are the unremarkable *me meus* (1), *quibus quid* (6), *nihil neque* (9). Equally unremarkable are the assonances in *non sane illepidum neque inuenustum* (6), *in collo sibi collocare posset* (23), *insulsa male et molesta uiuis* (33) and the non-avoidance of homoeoteleuton in *irrumator praetor* (12–13) and *facerem beatiorem* (17). The triple anaphorae *quid esset iam Bithynia, quo modo se haberet, ecquonam mihi profuisset aere* (6–8) and *neque ipsis nec praetoribus esse nec cohorti* (9–10) had none of the force of the fivefold *siue* of 11.2–12. The recurrence of the verb in 5 *incidere . . . 19 incidisset*; 7 *haberet . . . 28 habere*; 13 *faceret . . .*

[120] C. Memmius (mentioned by name in 28.9) held a praetorship in 58 and was governor of Bithynia in the following year.
[121] The naming of him and Piso in item 28 (the latter also in item 47) made the attack there all the more scurrilous.

17 *facerem*; 20 *parare* ... 30 *parauit* ... 32 *pararim*[122] may be regarded as accidental or even as the result of studied unconcern. It certainly has no structural or semantic significance.

Catullus has *mihi* pronounced as a pyrrhic at vv. 3, 8, 18, 25, as a long monosyllable at v. 21, and as an iambus in the close of v. 32. The monosyllable was perhaps regular in ordinary speech. The iambus could hardly have not sounded archaic and artificial.[123] Likewise the dissyllabic *nihil* in the close of v. 9[124] and the trochaic *sibi* in the close of v. 32 (v.23).[125] The ithyphallic close of the hendecasyllabic verse gathered linguistic oddities.[126] The short forms *comparasti* (v. 15) and *pararim* (v. 32) have been labelled 'colloquial', but we cannot be entirely sure what the practice of ordinary speakers was at the time or what tone the corresponding long forms possessed.[127] The pronunciation of *Gaius* as a dactyl rather than a trochee (v. 30) looks artificial.[128] Nothing can be said about dactylic *illius*[129] or iambic *mei* (v. 31).[130] Pyrrhic *mane* (v. 27) would probably have been normal,[131] but dactylic *commoda* (v. 26) is hard to judge. Comedy shortened

---

[122] The *parare* of v. 20 picked up the compound *comparasti* of v. 15 according to an ancient pattern still alive in the ordinary language (on which see Adams (1992: 295–8)).

[123] The iambus is also found at 15.5. There are on the other hand in the Phalaecian epigrams against these two cases 18 of pyrrhic *mihi*, three of monosyllabic *mi*. The μέλη have the pyrrhic twice, the monosyllable three times and the iambus not at all. The iambus was already rare in comedy (at Plaut. *Pseud.* 192, 387, 934, 1314 against 33 cases of the pyrrhic, 21 of *mih'*, 24 of *mi*). Lucretius has the iambus once (1.845) against eight of pyrrhic *mihi* and two of *mi*. *mi* appears with great frequency in the letters of Rustius Barbarus, those of Claudius Terentianus and those from Vindolanda.

[124] Also at 6.12; 15.6; 16.6; 17.21; 23.8; 42.21; 51.7. Monosyllabic *nil* occurs at 30.2; 42.21. Terence has *nihil* at the end of the senarius *Phorm.* 940 and the trochaic septenarius *Haut.* 896. There is no clear trace elsewhere in comedy of dissyllabic *nihil*. *nihili* and *nihilo* on the other hand seem to have been regularly anapaests.

[125] Contrast also 36.4. The old form had already given way to the pyrrhic in comedy (cf. Plaut. *Pseud.* 23, 125, 186, 884). Lucretius has the iambus seven times against the pyrrhic 32 times.

[126] See Jocelyn (1995: 73–52).

[127] Catullus has in the Phalaecian epigrams also *norat* (3.6), *donarunt* (13.12), *cupisti* (19.3), *putastis* (16.3), *irrumasti* (28.10), *desissem* (36.5), *explicasset* (53.3); in the ἴαμβοι *nosti* (22.1). The first and third conjugation long forms seem not to occur anywhere. They are few in Lucretius in comparison with the short forms. The comic poets seem to have found at least some of them (e.g. those ending in a cretic) metrically useful. Quintilian thought that to use *conseruauisse* rather than *conseruasse* was pedantic (*Inst.* 1.6.20).

[128] Cf. dactylic *Troia* at 65.7.

[129] See above, n. 72.

[130] Monosyllabic or pyrrhic at Enn. *Scaen.* 60, Plaut. *Capt.* 765, 800, *Persa* 494, *Pseud.* 6, Ter. *Eun.* 801, Pacuv. *Trag.* 198 ≠ Plaut. *Amph.* 442, 601, 856, *Aul.* 244, *Bacch.* 379, *Vid.* 67, Ter. *Andr.* 869, *Eun.* 306, *Haut.* 951, 1026, Acc. *Trag.* 355.

[131] For the shortening of an originally iambic dissyllabic imperative see 50.18 *caue* (also in the lyric item 61 (145)). Contrast 1.8 *habe* (and 61.161 *subi*). The pronunciation of *aue* as an

such imperatives in anapaestic verse, while the rules of iambic and trochaic verse tended to the exclusion of words of dactylic shape. What happened in the ordinary language we just do not know.[132] Whether we relate the linguistic features of item 10 to its genre or to its particular theme, it remains curious that overall in the matter of the pronunciation of particular words the item was at least as artificial as item 11.

i. Item 10: Morphology and Syntax

In grammar item 10 shows less outright archaism and modernizing artificiality than item 11. On the other hand there are many more syntactic constructions of the kind that by the middle of the first century BC were being increasingly avoided in more formal Latin speech. Graecizing morphology like that of *Arabas* at 11.5 and of several proper names elsewhere in the Catullan corpus is absent. The Latinizing *Serapim* at v. 26 deserves note.[133] The item is strongly anchored in the life of the city of Rome. Archaising morphology appears only with the third person plural perfect *incidere* in the close of v. 5.[134]

Graecizing syntagms are no more evident in item 10 than in the other Phalaecian epigrams. The use of the supine *uisum* in vv. 1–2,[135] the position of the relative clause together with its lack of exact concordance with the main clause in vv. 14–16,[136] and the adnominal use of the prepositional phrase *ad lecticam* in v. 16[137] are easier to parallel in second- than in first-century BC literature. On the other hand various verbs of the general character of *ducere* certainly continued to be accompanied by the supine in some kinds of first-century writing, and the particular usage was possibly still alive in the ordinary language.[138] The same point could be made about the relationship between *ad lecticam homines* and *quod illic natum dicitur*

---

iambus (cf. Mart. 3.95.1, 5.51.7, 7.39.2) was regarded by some persons at the end of the next century as a pedantry (see Quint. *Inst.* 1.6.21).

[132] The problem is discussed from the angle of textual criticism by O. Skutsch (1976: 19) and Nisbet (1978: 93–4 = 1995: 78–9).

[133] Cf. Varro, *Men.* 128, Cic. *Verr.* II 2.160, *Nat. deor.* 3.47, Tert. *Nat.* 1.10; contrast Martial 9.29.6.

[134] Cf. 49.2 and contrast 12.15; 21.2; 24.2. Cicero felt some life in the form (*Orat.* 157) but used it rarely. It already had an expressive function in early comedy. See in general Bauer (1933), Pye (1963).

[135] Cf. (with *ducere*) Plaut. *Cist.* 90, *Poen.* 20, *Stich.* 139, frg. 89; (with *abducere*) *Pseud.* 520. Hor. *Serm.* 2.4.89 has *ducere me auditum . . . memento*.

[136] On the history of the Latin relative clause see Kroll (1912: 1–18).

[137] Instead of *lecticarii* (Cic. *S. Rosc.* 134, Sulp. Ruf. *ap.* Cic. *Fam.* 4.12.3).

[138] It appears with *mittere* at Cic. *Verr.* II 4.63; with *uenire* at ibid. 145 *et al.* Sallust has the phrase *uisum processerant* (*Iug.* 94.5). *cacatum uenire* was still in use at Pompeii in the next century (*CIL* IV 5242).

esse and about the use of *ad lecticam*.[139] Vv. 14–16 may therefore be regarded as parodying the talk of businessmen and managers rather than as indulging in literary archaism.

Syntax such as that in *quid esset iam Bithynia* (vv. 6–7), *nihil neque ipsis nec* (ed. Ven.: *neque nec in ipsis nea* V: *neque ipsis nunc* Westphal) *praetoribus esse nec cohorti* (vv. 9–10), *cur quisquam caput unctius referret* (v. 11), *irrumator praetor* (vv. 12–13), *ut puellae unum me facerem beatiorem* (vv. 16–17), *non . . . mihi tam fuit maligne* (v. 18), *at mi nullus erat nec hic neque illic* (v. 21), *in collo sibi collocare* (v. 23), *ut decuit (docuit V) cinaediorem* (v. 24), *quod modo dixeram me habere* (v. 28) and *istud . . . is sibi parauit . . . mihi pararim* (*paratis* Estaço) (vv. 28–32) flourished in the ordinary language of Catullus' time and was occasionally, despite its apparent illogicality or redundancy, accepted by users with ideals of correctness. Cicero's speeches have the double negative,[140] the use of *unus* to emphasize a superlative or quasi-superlative,[141] the adverb conjoined with *esse* in a predicate,[142] the formation in *-tor* functioning as an attributive adjective,[143] and the pluperfect exercising a simple preterite function.[144] His philosophical dialogues have the plural denoting a single person[145] and the formation in *-ior/-ius* performing something other than a comparative function.[146] Caesar's *commentarii* have the dative of the third-person reflexive pronoun preferred on at least two occasions to an employment of *suus*.[147] The semi-otiose use of the dative of the reflexive pronoun with *parare* occurs nowhere in Cicero's more formal productions nor in Caesar's *commentarii*, but it does with many other verbs of acquisition.[148] All the syntagms in question, it might be argued, were being

---

[139] For the use of a singular pronoun in regard to a plurality see v. 28 and Cic. *Att.* 4.15.7, 5.5.2, 11.11.2. For the use of *ad* phrases in definitions of slaves and the like see Cic. *Pis.* 61 *scriba ad aerarium*, Livy 34.6.13 *seruos ad remum* (hardly dependent on *dabamus*) and the non-literary material cited by Adams (1995*a*: 112–13).

[140] See *Verr.* II 2.60, *Phil.* 6.7.

[141] See *Prou.* 12, *Phil.* 2.7 for the superlative; *Sull.* 7 for the quasi-superlative. At Catull. 10.16–17 *beatiorem* is no more a genuine comparative than *unctius* at v. 11 or *cinaediorem* at v. 24.

[142] See *Verr.* II 4.95, *Cat.* 1.19, *Deiot.* 19. At Catull. 10.6–7 *quid* functions adverbially, as does *aliquid* at 1.4 (cf. Cic. *Diu. in Caec.* 48, 49).

[143] See *Cluent.* 40 (*uictor*), *Mil.* 50 (*occultator, receptor*).

[144] See *Caecin.* 15.

[145] See *Tusc.* 1.3.

[146] See *Tusc.* 4.47, Cato 41, 55. From the orations *Sest.* 59 can be cited. It is noteworthy that Catullus' Phalaecian epigrams frequently have such forms in the ithyphallic close (see Jocelyn (1995: 76–7)).

[147] See *Gall.* 1.7.3; 36.4. Cicero has *sibi* so used only at *Att.* 10.4.3 (contrast *Verr.* II 3.62).

[148] For *sibi habere* see Cic. *Verr.* II 1.148, 2.61, 4.151; for *sibi uelle Verr.* II 2.150, *Cluent.* 147; for *sibi uindicare Marcell.* 6.

increasingly avoided in the more ambitious literary genres. Nothing comparable is to be found in item 11 or in any of the other μέλη.

k. Item 10: Sentence Structure and Word-Order

The ten periods which form item 10 are comparatively brief. Nevertheless their constituents frequently overrun the boundaries of the hendecasyllabic verses. The longest of the periods (vv. 9–13) reports indirectly Catullus' first reply to the unnamed woman. It contains only 26 words. Its structure could hardly be called a structure at all.[149] Similar looseness marks what Catullus reports directly of his final reply (vv. 27–34). Someone speaking carefully on a formal occasion would hardly have dispensed with a verb as the poet does at vv. 6–8 and 31[150] or have employed only one in relation to two distinct temporal situations as the latter does at vv. 21–3.[151] The dropping of *si* in *utor tam bene quam mihi pararim* (v. 32) is of a piece with earlier apparent sloppiness.[152] The μέλη do not admit such inelegancies. We seem to be here as close as anywhere in the Phalaecian epigrams to the way speakers of Catullus' class used Latin on private occasions in the first century BC. The absence of extended participial phrases is also noteworthy.

Except in one case the order of the words of item 10 may be argued to have corresponded more with that of the spoken language than the order of those of item 11 did.

The placement of an accusative complement after a finite transitive verb, something perhaps already approaching the normal in the ordinary language, at least where principal clauses were concerned, manifests itself five times (vv. 9, 13, 15–16, 24, 29) in eleven comparable cases (≠ 1–2, 7, 11, 17, 26, 28–30). This set of figures coheres with those derivable from

---

[149] The early alteration of the paradosis *nihil neque nec in ipsis nec praetoribus esse* to *nihil neque ipsis nec praetoribus esse* has not been improved upon but is not without its difficulties. Hence some editors print Westphal's *nihil neque ipsis nunc praetoribus esse*. For the grammar see above, n. 140. The coherence of *cur quisquam caput unctius referret* with what precedes is a question more for the logician than the linguist. For the plural *(ei) quibus* following on from *quisquam* cf. Plaut. *Persa* 55–6, *Poen.* 37–9, 483–5, *Pseud.* 134, Ter. *Andr.* 626–7. For the inconcinnity of *quibus esset irrumator praetor nec faceret pili cohortem* cf. Anon. *B. Afr.* 64.1, 97.3.

[150] In vv. 6–8 something like *rogatum est* has to be supplied; in v. 31 *sint* and *attinet* (Plaut. *Aul.* 770 *et al.*). For *quid ad me?* cf. Cic. *Att.* 12.17.

[151] Ellis compared Cic. *Att.* 9.7.2, which relates to the future.

[152] Estaço altered *pararim* to *paratis.* So too at least one recent editor. From the first-century BC record one can compare only the ellipse of *cum* after *quam* at Cic. *Att.* 1.16.11 and 7.21.3.

the preceding and following Phalaecian poems[153] and contrasts significantly with those from the μέλη.[154] Enclitic *me* is forced towards the front of *Varus . . . otiosum* (vv. 1–2), and the heavily emphasized *istud* cannot avoid the head of the chaotic *istud . . . parauit* (vv. 28–30). A desire for emphasis similarly causes *istos* to precede the imperative in *paulum . . . commoda* (vv. 25–6). Where the six subordinate clauses are concerned, the postposition of the complement in *nec . . . cohortem* (v. 13) may have to do with the looseness of the attachment of the clause to its predecessor. That in *ut . . . cinaediorem* (v. 24) looks on the other hand to be the result of metrical compulsion.

The item contains no purely decorative epithets. Many nouns have no attribute of any kind. Of the sixteen attributes nine precede and seven follow; of the nine preceding only three are disjoined; of the seven following again only three. We might attribute a large degree of ordinariness to the poem in respect both of the positioning of the attributes and the employment of disjunction were it not for the pair of epithets preceding a pair of nouns in vv. 21–3. *fractum* and *ueteris* are attributes which might ordinarily have been expected to follow their nouns. The only parallel for the arrangement in comedy seems to be a passage of a highly elaborate canticum, *num quoipiam est hodie tua tuorum opera conseruorum nitidius-culum caput?* (Plaut. *Pseud.* 219–20); in first-century oratory a sentence of an ἠθοποιία of a man pretending to wealth he does not have, which is cited in the rhetorical treatise addressed to Herennius (4.63): *ei dicit in aurem aut ut domi lectuli sternantur, aut ab auunculo rogetur Aethiops qui ad balneas ueniat, aut asturconi locus ante ostium suum detur, aut aliquod fragile falsae choragium gloriae comparetur.* Ten examples occur, however, in the lyric items 17 (v. 5), 34 (vv. 19–20, 22–4), 51 (vv. 5–6), and 61 (vv. 9–10, 19–20, 54–5, 102–3, 154–5, 202–3), and they swarm in the epic item 64 (v. 7 *et al.*) and the elegies (66.1 *et al.*). At 6.10–11 an absurdly bloated

---

[153] Item 1: two in two cases; 2: ___; 3: none in four; 5: two in four; 6: none in three; 7: none in one; 9: one in two; 12: two in seven; 13: two in seven; 14: one in ten; 14b: ___; 15: three in ten; 16: three in eight; 21: one in four; 23: one in four; 24: none in three; 26: ___; 27: one in one; 28: one in five; 32: two in five; 33: ___; 35: one in five; 36: one in three; 38: none in one; 40: none in three; 41: none in two; 42: seven in eight; 43: ___; 45: three in eight; 46: none in one; 47: one in three; 48: none in one; 49: none in one; 50: two in six; 53: two in three; 54: ___; 55: one in six; 56: two in three; 57: ___; 58: one in one; 58b: one in one. Many of the cases of the object preceding the verb occur in subordinate clauses, where the ordinary language seems to have been almost as conservative as the more formal registers.

[154] The figures for the μέλη are: item 11: none in three cases; 17: one in six; 30: one in four; 34: none in two; 51: none in four; 61: twelve in forty (on the figure see above, n. 88).

climax is achieved by the words and their order. What effects the poet seeks at 10.21–3 and 53.2–3 elude me.[155]

A very large number of words which were normally or frequently enclitic inhabit the constituents of the periods of item 10. They all behave as they might have done in the ordinary language. The position of *esse* in v. 10 suggests that *praetoribus* is being contrasted with *cohorti*. We may wonder whether the end of v. 9 has yet been correctly restored. In *quod illic natum dicitur esse* (vv. 14–15) the auxiliary *esse* hooks in a fairly common way[156] onto the principal verb rather than the apparently focused participle. A strong emphasis rests on initial *ego* in vv. 16–20 (*ego … inquam* contrasting with *inquiunt* in v. 14) and on initial *quaeso* in vv. 24–26.[157] Where the punctuation of the latter passage is concerned, editors wrongly attach unemphatic *mihi* to *commoda* rather than to *inquit*.[158] In the parenthesis *Cinna est Gaius* (v. 30) the *est* is where we should expect it to be. Catullus' first thought was to stress the identity of the actual owner of the *lecticarii*, giving the cognomen by which he commonly addressed his friend.[159] He added the praenomen in order to be more specific to persons less intimate. Since the praenomen normally precedes the nomen or the cognomen or both, the disjunction gives Gaius a particularly strong emphasis. Commentators should not talk of metrical compulsion.

The position of *ut* in v. 5 contrasts with that in vv. 3, 16, 19, 24 and elsewhere in the Phalaecian epigrams.[160] Similarly the position of the relative pronouns in vv. 19 and 22 with that in vv. 9, 14, 28 and elsewhere in such epigrams.[161] In all three cases the ordering helps to highlight a word on which the run of the poet's discourse places some emphasis. Often, however, in item 10 where the subordinator comes first it is not easy to see why it rather than another word of the clause should have done so, if the poet had a completely free choice. Overall in the Phalaecian epigrams

---

[155] Nothing should be made of the disjunction *ecquonam mihi profuisset aere* in v. 8. At Plaut. *Merc.* 844 the noun immediately follows *ecquinam*. So too at Cic. *Deiot.* 40, *Phil.* 10.19, *Vatin.* 26, *Brut.* 22, *Part.* 48, *Att.* 9.9.2. Contrast, however, *Fin.* 4.67, *Q. fr.* 1.4.2. Where *ecqui* is concerned, Plautus disjoins the noun more often than not (*Bacch.* 235–6, *Curc.* 341, *Epid.* 441, *Men.* 135, 673, *Merc.* 390, *Mil.* 782, *Pseud.* 482, 971, *Rud.* 125, 971).

[156] See Adams (1994*b*: 28–31(30–1)).

[157] For *quaeso* + vocative + imperative see Plaut. *Asin.* 683–4, *Men.* 742.

[158] Lee (1990) takes no notice of O. Skutsch (1976: 18–20). Thomson (1978) and Goold (1983) do.

[159] See 95.1, 113.1. *est* functions as the copula does in more orderly statements of the type of Livy 8.25.10 *Charilaus fuit qui ad Publilium Philonem uenit* (on which see Adams (1994*b*: 65)).

[160] Cf. 13.14 and contrast 2.8; 15.11, 13, 16; 27.3; 40.5.

[161] Cf. 46.10 and contrast 2.2, 3; 3.5, 11, 14; 12.7, 12; 13.11; 14.7, 13; 15.4, 7; 16.3, 7, 11; 21.10; 23.1, 3, 26; 24.1, 5, 6; 28.7; 36.12–15; 41.5; 42.7; 45.5; 53.2; 55.8; 58.2; 58b.7.

subordinators have the initial position,[162] and very often one of the other words of the clause would seem to deserve as much emphasis as *huc, prouincia* and *fractum* receive in item 10. Epigrams tended to preserve a calm and even tone.

1. Item 10: Vocabulary

Among the 114 words of item 11 there are, I have argued, more than a dozen which would have been recognizable only through the higher genres of the poetry of the previous two centuries and just one which might have caused surprise if uttered on a public occasion. A number of common words of the ordinary language seem to have been consciously avoided. None of the 191 words of item 10 on the other hand has a clearly 'poetic' ring, while many would have been avoided in the more formal kinds of contemporary speech, one at least in any kind of polite social intercourse.

The presence in item 10 of a large number of enclitic words has already been remarked. Remarkable also is the presence of the anaphoric *is* (vv. 9, 30), the deictic *iste* (vv. 26, 28), the interrogative *uter*, the cardinal numeral *octo* (v. 20), the adjectives *beatus* (v. 17 in the sense of 'diues') and *molestus* (v. 33) and the adverb *sane* (v. 4). These were all avoided to one degree or another in the higher poetic genres of the late Republic and early Empire.[163] They may have already had an 'unpoetic' ring.[164]

e (v. 2) might be thought to have had the tone of high poetry. *ex foro* on the other hand occurs nowhere in the record, whereas *e foro* is found at Cic. *Verr.* II 5.33, *Sest.* 77, *Pis.* 7, 23, 30. The fixed phrase preserved the apparent archaism.

scortillum (v. 3), *illepidum* (v. 4), *inuenustum* (v. 4), *irrumator* (v. 12), *grabati* (v. 22) and *insulsa* (v. 33) were in all likelihood either absent from, or rare in, contemporary oratory despite a presence in the ordinary

---

[162] *cum* heads its clause at 1.5; 2.5; 5.5, 10, 13; 7.7; 53.2 and is never displaced. *si* is displaced at 13.6; 21.9; 23.22; 58b.1; contrast, however, 13.2, 3; 14b.1; 15.3; 16.7; 32.4, 9; 35.7, 11; 36.4, 17; 42.5, 14, 23; 48.2, 5; 55.1, 18; 56.6.

[163] On *is, iste, uter, beatus, molestus* and *sane* and classical verse see Axelson (1945: 70–1, 71–2, 90–1, 27, 60, 94). *octo* appears only in the astronomical contexts of Cic. *Arat.* 268, Manil. 3.578; 580, 4.483, 5.339, Germ. 473, in Cicero's translation of *Il.* 2.299–330 (*Diu.* 2.63–4) and at Virg. *Georg.* 1.171 (in a famously prosaic passage).

[164] On the rarity of *is* in Ennius' *Annales* see O. Skutsch (1985: 64). The epic poem has no certain instance of *iste. uter* occurs at vv. 78, 83. Archaic tragedy has instances of *is* and *iste* but much fewer proportionately than comedy. *uter* occurs in the fragments of Pacuvius (62) and Accius (479). *beatus* in the sense of 'diues', *molestus* and *sane* occur in neither epic nor tragedy. Only comedy among the archaic genres of verse has *octo* (Plaut. *Amph.* 160, *Asin.* 564, 574, *Cas.* 122, *Men.* 223, *Mil.* 831, *Persa* 504, fr. 51).

language. The half-affectionate diminutive form of *scortum*[165] would have lacked an appropriate dignity. Something about the tone of adjectival formations in *in-*, especially those whose second element normally conveyed approval, disqualified them.[166] The meanness of the object and the Greek origin of the word put *grabatus* on a black list.[167] *irrumator* could have been (like *basiatio* at 7.1, *irrumatio* at 21.8 and *fututio* at 32.8) Catullus' own invention, but the existence at Pompeii of *cacator* (*CIL* IV 3782), *fellator* (*CIL* IV 1666), *fututor* (*CIL* IV 1503), *pedicator* (*CIL* IV 4008) and *perfututor* (*CIL* IV 4239) cautions against hasty conclusions from the literary record. The softened sense of *irrumare* which the formation implies[168] did not make it any less inappropriate for a formal occasion. Indeed the availability of polite synonyms (e.g. *contemnere*) increased its offensiveness. Such vocabulary marked off other Phalaecian epigrams almost as clearly from their lyric neighbours.

The use of *repente* (v. 3) in the sense of 'primo aspectu',[169] that of *huc* (v. 5) in the sense of 'ad aedes huius',[170] that of *aes* (v. 8) in the sense of 'pecunia',[171] that of *nullus* (v. 21) in the sense of 'nemo',[172] that of adjectival *cinaedus* (v. 24) in the sense of 'improbus',[173] that of *bene* (v. 32) in the sense of 'multum'[174] and that of *male* (v. 33) in the sense of 'valde'[175] are absent from, or rare in, extant contemporary oratory. In informal conversation such uses were doubtless not so offensive to the fastidious.

Cic. *Att.* 16.2.4 *ego enim in uarios sermones incidebam, Fam.* 9.3.1 *in*

---

[165] *scortum* is found often enough in oratory, e.g. at Cato *ap.* Gell. 10.13.2, Titius *ap.* Macrob. *Sat.* 3.16.14, Cic. *Cat.* 2.10; 24, *Har. resp.* 59, *Dom.* 49, *Mil.* 55, *Sest.* 39, *Phil.* 2.44; 105. Catullus has it in a Phalaecian epigram (6.5) with the same tone as in oratory. On this tone see Adams (1983: 324–7).

[166] Oratory has one example of *insulsus*, in a speech with many stylistic pecularities (Cic. *Cael.* 69; for *insulsitas* see *Rab. Post.* 36).

[167] Cicero has the word only at *Diu.* 2.129.

[168] An Ostian inscription, *amice fugit te prouerbium 'bene caca et irrima medicos'* (*Jahrb. d. Arch. Inst.* 51 (1936), 466; *Die Antike* 15 (1939), 103), indicates that neither at 10.12 nor at 28.9–10 was Catullus inventing his use of the verb.

[169] At 17.24 and 63.28 it has its usual sense of 'subito'.

[170] Cf. the use of *huc*, 'ad domum nostram' at Hor. *Serm.* 2.2.128.

[171] The use appears in Cicero's work only at *Rep.* 6.2, where it seems to be a question literally of brass coins. The phrase *aes paucum* was clearly a common colloquialism by the early second century AD (Epist. Claud. Terent. Pap. Mich. VIII 471.10, 13, 31, Gell. 9.4.5, 20.1.31).

[172] At 11.19 *moechum* is to be understood with *nullum*.

[173] Mart. 6.39.12 does not seem exactly parallel.

[174] Contrast Cic. *Verr.* II 4.30 *multum illorum opera consilioque usus est. bene* is more often so used with adjectives and adverbs (Cic. *Att.* 4.9.2 *et al.*).

[175] For *male* enforcing pejorative adjectives cf. Horace *Serm.* 1.3.45 *male paruus*, 1.4.66 *rauci male*, Sulpicia, Tib. 3.16.2 *male inepta*. A similar use with certain types of verbs is evidenced in comedy (*formidare, metuere, timere; macerare, mulcare, perdere; odisse; interire, disperire*).

sermonem incidemus, De orat. 1.111 *uidear . . . fortuito in sermonem incid-isse, Lael.* 2 *memini . . . in eum sermonem illum incidere* taken together suggest that *incidere nobis sermones uarii* is a poet's deliberate upturning of a stock phrase.[176] This is, however, the only such phenomenon in item 10. On the other hand the poem contains a number of locutions absent from extant oratory but either demonstrably or conjecturably present in ordinary speech: *cur quisquam caput unctius referret* (v. 11),[177] *nec faceret pili cohortem* (v. 13),[178] *fugit me ratio* (v. 29)[179] and *tu insulsa male et molesta uiuis* (v. 33).[180]

With *scortillum . . . non sane illepidum neque inuenustum* (vv. 3–4) the poet issued a compliment — not altogether contradicted by his later *tu insulsa male et molesta uiuis* (v. 33) — somewhat more grandly than he would have done in a real address to friends. Such nearly synonymous doublets are often to be found in the Phalaecian epigrams (6.2; 12.5, 8–9; 13.3, 10; 14.8, 10; 15.4, 14; 16.7; 23.15; 24.9; 32.2; 36.10, 17; 38.2, 4; 42.22, 24; 43.8; 45.15, 24; 46.11; 50.7–8; 56.1, 4) and in the ἴαμβοι (22.9, 17; 25.9; 29.6; 31.4; 37.14; 39.8). Although the μέλη, the elegies and the epic item 64 tend to be sparing of them, they seem to have had an elevated tone.[181]

m. Item 12: Substance and Tone

Item 12 has a theme of much lower emotional charge than its lyric prede-cessor. The situation is roughly parallel with that of the Phalaecian item 10. It is less, however, a narrative of a past incident than a statement of the poet's continued irritation. It addresses the object of irritation alone. Mid-first century BC readers would have been able to recognize the situ-ation and the persons involved. The theme was unimaginable in a μέλος.

---

[176] Livy 1.57.6 *forte potantibus his apud Sex. Tarquinium . . . incidit de uxoribus mentio* and 32.20.3 *cum de Philippo et Romanis mentio incidit* might suggest that Catullus had some earlier literary model.

[177] Cf. Plaut. *Pseud.* 219–20 *num quoipiamst hodie tua tuorum opera conseruorum nitidius-culum caput?*

[178] Cf. 17.17 *nec pili facit uni*, Petr. 44.17 (also Cic. *Q. Rosc.* 20, *Att.* 5.20.6, *Q. fr.* 2.16.5). A large number of variants were available for the locution *aliquid nihili facere* (Plaut. *Bacch.* 89): e.g. also *non nauci facere* (Plaut. *Bacch.* 1102), *non flocci facere* (Plaut. *Cas.* 332 *et al.*), *non assis facere* (Catull. 42.13), *non hettae facere* (Paul. Fest. p. 88.24–7), *non dupundi facere* (Petron. 58.4).

[179] For *fugit ratio* (the regular order) see Plaut. *Amph.* 386, Anon. Rhet. *Herenn.* 2.24.

[180] Cf. Plaut. *Bacch.* 615 *inamabilis illepidus uiuo*, *Men.* 908, *Trin.* 390, Afran. *Tog.* 253, Cic. *Att.* 3.5, *Fam.* 14.1.2, Catull. 8.10; Virg. *Aen.* 3.493, Tab. Vind. II 346 ii 5.

[181] See above, n. 118.

It had probably appeared in ἴαμβοι[182] and in comedy.[183] Perhaps too in sympotic epigrams.[184]

n. Item 12: Phonetic Features

None of the purely phonetic repetitions of item 12 seem deliberate. The only alliterations are *sudaria Saetaba* (v. 14) and *miserunt mihi muneri* (v. 15). The latter arises from the use of a set phrase,[185] perhaps also the former. None of the assonances draws attention to itself. Two of the three cases of homoeoteleuton (in vv. 6–7, 7, 10) involve the long final syllables of grammatically related words.[186] This signals a positive unconcern for phonetic pattern.

The anaphora *aut . . . aut . . .* in vv. 10–11 solemnizes to a degree the humorous threat.[187] The item concludes with a repetition of words already used earlier (17 *Veraniolum meum et Fabullum* ≠ 15–16 *Fabullus et Veranius*), as do many other Phalaecian epigrams (5.13 ≠ 7–9; 9.11 ≠ 10; 16.14 ≠ 1; 21.13 ≠ 8; 23.27 ≠ 24; 36.20 ≠ 1; 42.24 ≠ 11–12, 19–20; 45.26 ≠ 19; 50.21 ≠ 18, 19; 55.22 ≠ 19; 57.10 ≠ 1), three of the ἴαμβοι (8.19 ≠ 11–12; 44.21 ≠ 12; 52.4 ≠ 1) and none at all of the μέλη.

The reading of the item required no unusual pronunciation, unless it be that *mihi* (a pyrrhic at vv. 6, 11. 15)[188] and *mei* (an iambus at v. 13)[189] as a rule suffered synizesis in ordinary first-century BC speech.

o. Item 12: Morphology and Syntax

No feature of the morphology of item 12 diverges from the norm. We may note that the Greek borrowing *mnemosynum* is given a Latin termination.

Three syntagms would have been hard to find in first-century oratory: the use of a form in *-ior* without a comparative reference (v. 3); the attachment of a prepositional phrase to a noun lacking any verbal force (v. 14); and the attachment of a simple volitive subjunctive to *necesse est* (v.

---

[182] Cf. Catull. 25.

[183] Alciphron's speaking name for a parasite Μαππαφάνισος (3.12) may have originated in comedy.

[184] Cf. Mart. 8.59.8, 12.29. *mappae* were not the only objects stolen at parties (Lukillios, *A.P.* 11.315).

[185] Cf. Plaut. *Mil.* 710, 939, *Pseud.* 777, 781, *Truc.* 430–1, 443, Cic. *Verr.* II 4.62, *Parad.* 40.

[186] See above n. 67.

[187] Contrast Mart. 11.104.1 *uxor, uade foras aut moribus utere nostris.*

[188] Iambic *mihi* was a plain archaism; *mi* perhaps already the regular form. See above, n. 123.

[189] On the pronunciation of the pronominal adjective see above, n. 130.

16). All three nevertheless had firm roots in ordinary speech.[190] Textual uncertainty makes discussion of *est enim leporum* †dissertus† *puer ac facetiarum*[191] (vv. 8–9) fruitless.

p. Item 12: Sentence Structure and Word Order

The periods of item 12 are as brief as those of item 11. They are, however, all tidily, if simply, constructed. Their constituents frequently overrun the verse boundaries. The brevity of *me non mouet aestimatione uerumst mnemosynum mei sodalis* (vv. 12–13) dispenses with exact logic. The apparent ellipse in *fugit te* (v. 4) probably came with the phrase from the ordinary language.[192] The absence of extended participial phrases is again noteworthy.

The order of the words of the constituents of the periods of item 12 seems even closer to that of an utterance of the ordinary language than is that of item 10. The artificiality of the intervening item again comes out very clearly.

The seven finite verbs with accusative complements, even *mouet* (v. 12) and *amem* (v. 16), stand in constituents with a degree of independence. Two, *tollis* (v. 3) and *fugit* (v. 4), have their complements following. It is at first sight surprising that the complements of *exspecta* (v. 11) and *remitte* (v. 11) should precede, given the frequency of the opposite order where injunctions are concerned even in the lyric items. The reason is that the complements *hendecasyllabos trecentos* and *linteum* are more strongly contrasted than the imperative verbs. The position of *mihi* in v. 15 suggests that a fresh constituent begins with *miserunt* and that *sudaria Saetaba ex Hiberis* forms an extended accusative, the very focus of the whole statement. Concern for emphasis would explain the order in v. 12 and v. 16.

The pair of adjectives forming the predicate in *quamuis sordida res et inuenusta est* (v. 5) is separated by another word of the statement, as in 9.11 *quid me laetius est beatiusue?*, 10.33 *tu insulsa male et molesta uiuis*, 15.4 *quod castum expeteres et integellum*, 36.16 *acceptum face redditumque uotum* and 38.2 *male est* (*male si* V) *me hercule et laboriose*.[193] Such an

---

[190] With *sudaria . . . ex Hiberis* compare Plaut. *Merc.* 257 *navem ex Rhodo*. There may have been a growing pressure to use *ut* with *necesse est* (Cic. *De orat.* 2.129); cf., however, Cic. *Verr.* II 2.45 *et al.*

[191] Passerat's commonly accepted *differtus* leaves a genitive still hard to explain in Latin terms.

[192] Cf. Cic. *Att.* 7.18.3, 12.42.2.

[193] Similar pairs of attributes are disjoined in the same way (1.7; 56.1; cf. in the iambic items 22.9; 39.8; 60.3). Contrast the predicates at 6.2; 7.2, 10; 13.10; 36.17; 56.4.

order seems to have been common enough in the ordinary language, but the rationale is by no means clear.[194]

No adjectival attribute stands disjoined from its noun. Straightforward considerations of emphasis explain the position of *Marrucine* (v. 1), *tua* (v. 7), and *mei* (v. 13).

The several enclitics behave according to patterns visible in contemporary prose of both the formal and the less formal kind. *salsum* (v. 4) contrasts very strongly with *sordida* and *inuenusta* (v. 5). Hence it rather than *putas* offers *esse* a post to lean on.[195] *est* is the very focus of the statement made in vv. 8–9 ('he *is*, you must agree,...');[196] likewise of that made in v. 13 ('it *is* on the other hand').

The subordinators *qui* (v. 7), *quod* (v. 12) and *ut* (v. 17) all head their respective clauses.

q. Item 12: Vocabulary

Of the 86 words which make up item 12 none except *ac* (v. 9) and *atque* (v. 2) had anything of the tone of high poetry. Not that these were exclusively poetical. The use of *atque* before an initial consonant raised the tone. Significantly, both connectives stood in the close of a 'Phalaecian' verse, a position which tended to attract words and forms obsolete or obsolescent in the ordinary language.[197] *ex Hiberis* (v. 14) would have sounded

---

[194] Cf. Plaut. *Amph.* 33 *iustam rem et facilem esse oratam a uobis uolo*, 184 *bene quae in me fecerunt ingrata ea habuit atque inrita* (≠ 118, 348, 547, 640, 730), Cic. *Att.* 1.13.2 *consul autem ipse paruo animo et prauo tamen*, 17.9 *ut frequentissimo senatu et liberalissimo uterentur*, 18.1 *illae ambitiosae nostrae fucosaeque amicitiae*, 19.10 *me imprudente erit et inuito* (≠ 1.4.2; 16.2; 16.6; 17.8; 18.1; 19.1; 19.5; 19.8).

[195] In 10.14–15 (see above n. 156), although *natum* bears a certain emphasis, *esse* attaches to the principal verb. Dramatic texts usually kept *esse* with the predicate rather than after *puto* (Plaut. *Amph.* 170–2, 284, 886, *Bacch.* 1083, *Curc.* 557, *Persa* 609, Ter. *Andr.* 330, 717, *Haut.* 151, 912–13, 990, *Eun.* 489–90, *Phorm.* 21, Pacuv. *Trag.* 25, 176), but see Plaut. *Bacch.* 121, Ter. *Haut.* 842–3, *Ad.* 817.

[196] For *est enim* demanding a concession from the hearer see Adams (1994b: 80–1).

[197] Contrast the use on the one hand of *et* at vv. 5, 16, 17 and at 10.33 and on the other of *-que* at 11.11–12, 17. Cato used *atque/ac* frequently in his orations but rarely in his *De agricultura*. Cicero used it sparingly in his dialogues and letters. His epideictic speeches have it much more often than those of an argumentative or expository character. *atque* preceded a vowel in Catullus' Phalaecian epigrams at 5.1; 6.2; 21.9; 45.3; a consonant at 12.2; 13.3; 26.5; 50.6; 58.3. Four of the latter five cases occur in the close of the verse. On the 110 occasions in Plautus' scripts where it occurs before a consonant (≠ 1069 before a vowel) there is something special in the context. A large proportion of the cases in Cicero's writings help to form a clausula. On *atque* and the close of Catullus' 'Phalaecian' verse see Jocelyn (1995: 79).

more erudite, perhaps even more poetical,[198] than, say, *ex Hispania*.[199] *talentum* (v. 7), *hendecasyllabus* (v. 10) and *mnemosynum* (v. 13) were recognizably of Greek origin but had no specifically poetic associations.

As in item 10, there are in item 12 a number of words avoided in the high poetic genres of the late Republic and early Empire — *belle* (v. 2), *inepte* (v. 4), *inuenusta* (v. 5), *enim* (v. 8), *leporum* (v. 8), *facetiarum* (v. 9), *quare* (v. 10), *hendecasyllabos* (v. 10), *mnemosynum* (v. 13), *sudarium* (v. 14)[200] — and perhaps already endowed with a decidedly 'unpoetic' odour.[201] Some of these — *belle*,[202] *inuenusta*,[203] *hendecasyllabos*,[204] *mnemosynum*,[205] *sudaria*[206] — were also avoided in oratory. All of them flourished in the ordinary language. To be noted also are words given a sense avoided in formal modes of speech but admitted at other levels of the language: *tollis* (v. 3) that of 'furaris';[207] *salsum* (v. 4) that of 'lepidum' or 'festiuum';[208] *quamuis* (v. 5) that of 'ualde';[209] *mutari* (v. 8) that of 'compensari';[210] *puer*

---

[198] Greek poets and historians used the same word of the river Ebro and the inhabitants of north eastern Iberia. The Romans seem to have taken over the Carthaginian name of the peninsula. 11.2–8 talks of peoples rather than lands. The *Hiberi* rather than the land manufactured the *sudaria*.

[199] The magistrate under whom Veranius and Fabius served (28.1–3) had the province of *Hispania citerior*.

[200] On *belle, enim, lepos* and *quare* see Axelson (1945: 35, 122–3, 61 and 48). *facetus* is as rare as *facetia*.

[201] At Enn. *Ann.* 364 *enim* is usually emended away. In tragedy it appears with certainty only at Pacuv. 377. *quare* is transmitted in neither epic nor tragedy.

[202] Cicero has the adverb only twice in his speeches (*Mur.* 26, *Quinct.* 93), but 28 times in his letters.

[203] Cicero has it only at *Brut.* 237.

[204] Also at 42.1. Next at Sen. *Contr.* 7.4.7 (of Catull. 53). Outside technical writing on metre, *hendecasyllabus* always denoted the 'Phalaecian' verse. Poetry itself was a topic treated in a very gingerly way by orators.

[205] The word does not occur elsewhere in recorded Latin, which is not to say that men of Catullus' circle did not use it in the sense of 'pignus memoriae'. It would have come from contemporary spoken Greek (cf. Meleag. *A.P.* 5.136.4, Matt. *Eu.* 26.13, Mk. *Eu.* 14.9) rather than from literature.

[206] Also at 25.7. Next at Val. Max. 9.12.7, but clearly a term in common use (Petron. 67.5,13, Mart. 11.39.3 *et al.*).

[207] Cic. *Verr.* II 2.136 and Caes. *Gall.* 6.17.5 are not exactly parallel although they help to explain the semantic development. The date of *CIL* I² 2376 (≠ 498–501) is uncertain.

[208] Cf., of an act, Cic. *Att.* 16.12, Mart. 3.12.3.

[209] Cf. 103.2. Plautus has the usage at *Men.* 318, *Pseud.* 1175 (P: *quam uelis* A), Varro at *Rust.* 2.5.1, Cicero at *Rep.* 1.43, *De orat.* 2.228, *Tusc.* 3.73.

[210] Neither the *TLL* nor the *OLD* register the passage. Baehrens compared Plaut. *Bacch.* 1153, Ter. *Andr.* 40 and Hor. *Ars* 168. Neither these passages nor those cited at *TLL* VIII 1722.72–1723.12 and *OLD*, p. 1150, s.v. *muto* 7a offer any real similarity.

374 H. D. Jocelyn

(v. 9) that of 'adulescens';[211] *trecentos* (v. 10) that of 'plurimos';[212] *aestima-
tione (v. 12) that of 'pretio'.[213] Veranius receives a form of his name in v.
17 which he may have received in private discourse but would never have
on a formal occasion.[214] Thus the vocabulary of item 12 takes the tone of
the collection very decidedly back to that of item 10 and the earlier
Phalaecian epigrams and enforces from yet another aspect the stylistic
isolation of the lyric item 11.

IV. CONCLUSION

Although many present-day scholars find it hard where the first 61 items
of the *liber Catulli Veronensis* are concerned to separate those in stichically
arranged Phalaecian hendecasyllabic verses from those in the longer units
of old Aeolian verse and even from those in the three kinds of iambic
verse, examination of the structure of Catullus' Phalaecian hendecasyllable
and attention to the analyses of all the ancient theorists suggest that
this verse had its own special character. The specialness of the character
transferred itself to the poems formed from runs of the verse. The request
made of Furius and Aurelius in Sapphic stanzas has, I hope, been shown
to differentiate itself from the account of the behaviour of Varus' whore
and the denunciation of Asinius' theft not only in its metrical pattern but
also in its wording and phrasing and in the ordering of its words. The plea
to the anonymous *colonia* for a certain entertainment (item 17) can also
be shown to stand apart in similar fashion from the threats against Furius
and Aurelius (items 16 and 21). So also the complaint about Alfenus'
treachery (item 30) from the iambic attack on Caesar's generosity towards
Mamurra (item 29) and the iambic salute to Sirmio (item 31). So also the
hymn to Diana (item 34) from the curse on Vibennius and son (item 33)
and the invitation to Caecilius (item 35). So also the description of the
effect of looking at Lesbia (item 51) from the account of writing verses in
the company of Calvus (item 50) and the expression of disgust at the
political success of Nonius and Vatinius (item 52). Nevertheless, while
the Phalaecian epigrams and the ἴαμβοι approached much nearer the

---

[211] The Pollio named in v. 6 is clearly one able to mix in adult society, i.e. a youth above
the age of sixteen. Slaves above that age could be called *pueri*. Catullus must be talking
condescendingly of the younger Asinius.
[212] Cf. 9.2, 48.3, Hor. *Serm.* 1.5.12, 2.3.115–16, *Epist.* 2.2.164–5, Mart. 2.1.1, 12.70.7. Contrast
11.18 (see n. 54).
[213] Vitr. 10 pr. 1 is not completely parallel.
[214] Cf. the way Cicero refers to his daughter (*Tullia*) at *Att.* 1.8.3, *Fam.* 14.1 (*Tulliola*). Fabullus
would have been the affectionate form of the name of Catullus' other friend.

ordinary language than did the μέλη, it does not appear that they disdained entirely the archaisms of the high genres of the previous century's poetry or the novelties of contemporary poetry.

Word order and vocabulary enforced differentiation more strongly than patterns of sound or features of grammar, although, where word order was concerned, Catullus took a fairly scrupulous account of ordinary contemporary speech. Where he had room for a conscious decision, whether in syntax or the lexicon, the desire to avoid one form or another of current linguistic behaviour proved as powerful as any more positive consideration. Rarely can metrical exigency have been a very strong determinant. The theme and the tone of a particular poem had their effect, but these were as much tied to the genre as the metre and the type of language were. The extent to which the five μέλη in question all emerge stylistically from their respective contexts gives some support to the view that Catullus or an editor designed the order of items 1–60 of the transmitted collection, although with more attention to form than to substance,[215] and that the designer meant item 61 to stand with these rather than with items 62–68. The common use of the term *polymetra* of items 1–60 is deplorable not merely because it corresponds with no ancient usage but also because, like the term 'lyrics', it diverts attention from the diversity of the poems in question. At all events the notion of a single 'natural' variety of the Latin language informing them all should be discarded.

Note.   I have not as a rule marked my thefts from the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* or the grammars of Kühner and Stegmann and of Leumann, Hofmann and Szantyr. J. N. Adams did more than pick nits from an early draft of the chapter. Some objections put by G. P. Goold to its approach and some of its theses led to sharper formulations.

---

[215] This is not to say that the tradition preserves exactly every detail of the original design. A tidy mind could suppose that between, say, item 46 and item 47 it lost the lyric hymn to Priapus cited by the metricians and that between item 51 and item 52 it lost a Phalaecian epigram. At any rate the problem which the hymn to Priapus poses for the student of the arrangement of the *liber Catulli Veronensis* cannot be circumvented by the notion that some grammarian found it without an author's name in a collection of *Priapea* and ascribed it on no objective grounds to Catullus, let alone by its dismissal from editions of the work ascribed to the poet by our tradition.

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.

_____ (1980*a*), 'Latin words for woman and wife', *Glotta* 50: 234–55.

_____ (1980*b*), 'Anatomical terminology in Latin epic', *BICS* 27: 50–62.

_____ (1982*a*), *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London).

_____ (1982*b*), '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.

_____ (1994*a*), 'Wackernagel's law and the position of unstressed personal pronouns in Classical Latin', *TPhS* 92: 103–78

_____ (1994*b*), *Wackernagel's Law and the Placement of the Copula* esse *in Classical Latin* (Cambridge Philological Society, Suppl. vol. 18) (Cambridge).

_____ (1995*a*), 'The language of the Vindolanda writing tablets: an interim report', *JRS* 85: 86–134.

_____ (1995*b*), *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 Qaṣr Ibrîm', *JRS* 69: 125–55.

Anderson, W. S. (1956; 1964; 1970; 1981), 'Recent Work in Roman Satire', *ClW* 50: 33–40; *ClW* 57: 293–301; 343–8; *ClW* 63: 181–94; 199; 217–22; *ClW* 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 enniana 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 Herculaneum', *AJA* 44: 485–93.

Blümel, W. (1979), 'Zur historischen Morphosyntax der Verbalabstrakta im Lateinischen', *Glotta* 57: 77–125.

Boetticher, G. (1830), *Lexicon Taciteum* (Berlin).

Boldt, H. (1884), *De liberiore linguae Graecae et Latinae collocatione verborum* (Diss. Göttingen).

Bollack, J. (1965–69), *Empédocle* (3 vols; Paris).

Bömer, F. (1951), Review of Axelson (1945), *Gnomon* 23: 166–8.

———— (1952), 'Excudent alii . . .', *Hermes* 80: 117–23.

———— (1957), 'Beiträge zum Verständnis der augusteischen Dichtersprache', *Gymnasium* 64: 1–21.

———— (1965), 'Eine Stileigentümlichkeit Vergils: Vertauschen der Prädikate', *Hermes* 93: 130–1.

———— (1967), 'Ovid met. I 39', *Gymnasium* 74: 223–6.

———— (1969), *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen*. Buch I–III (Heidelberg).

———— (1976), *P. Ovidius Naso Metamorphosen*. Buch IV–V (Heidelberg).

———— (1982), *P. Ovidius Naso Metamorphosen*. Buch XII–XIII (Heidelberg).

Bonjour, M. (1984), 'Cicero nauticus', in R. Chevallier (ed.), *Présence de Cicéron*, 9–19 (Collection Caesarodunum 19 bis) (Paris).

Bonner, S. F. (1949), *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire* (Liverpool).

Booth, J. (1981), 'Aspects of Ovid's language', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* II.31.4 2686–700 (Berlin–New York).

———— (ed.) (1991), *Ovid. The Second Book of* Amores (Warminster).

Bourgeois, P. (1940), 'L'hellénisme, procédé d'expression dans les Géorgiques', *RÉL* 18: 73–94.

Bowman, A. K., Thomas, J. D. and Adams, J. N. (1990), 'Two letters from Vindolanda', *Britannia* 21: 33–52.

Bowman, A. K. and Thomas, J. D., with contributions by Adams, J. N. (1994), *The Vindolanda Writing-Tablets (Tabulae Vindolandenses II)* (London).

Bowman, A. K. and Thomas, J. D. (1996), 'New writing tablets from Vindolanda', *Britannia* 27: 299–328.

Bowra, C. M. (1952), *Heroic Poetry* (London).

Bramble, J. C. (1974), *Persius and the Programmatic Satire* (Cambridge).

———— (1982a), 'Martial and Juvenal', in Kenney and Clausen (1982), 101–27.

———— (1982b), 'Lucan', in Kenney and Clausen (1982), 533–57.

Braund, S. H. (1989a), 'City and country in Roman satire', in Braund (1989b), 23–48.

———— (ed.) (1989b), *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome* (Exeter Studies in History, 23) (Exeter).

———— (1992a), *Roman Verse Satire* (Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics, 23) (Oxford).

———— (1992b), *Lucan, Civil War, translated with introduction and notes* (Oxford).

———— (ed.) (1996), *Juvenal, Satires, Book I* (Cambridge).

Brenous, J. (1895), *Étude sur les hellénismes dans la syntaxe latine* (Paris).

van Brock, N. (1961), *Recherches sur le vocabulaire médical du grec ancien* (Études et Commentaires, 41) (Paris).

Brown, R. D. (1987), *Lucretius on Love and Sex: a Commentary on De Rerum Natura IV, 1030–1287, with Prolegomena, Text and Translation* (Columbia studies in the classical tradition, 15) (Leiden).

Bürger, R. (1911), 'Beiträge zur Elegantia Tibulls' in *XAPITEΣ. 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 Emmanueli 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 Properzio' 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 4ᵉ 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 Heroidum Epistula IX. Deianira Herculi* (Florence).

Caspari, F. (1908), *De ratione quae inter Vergilium et Lucanum intercedat quaestiones selectae* (Diss. Leipzig).

Cavenaile, R. (1958), *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum* (Wiesbaden).

Cèbe, J.-P. (1966), *La caricature et la parodie dans le monde romain*, (Bibl. des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 206) (Paris).

Charpin, F. (ed.) (1978, 1979, 1991), *Lucilius, Satires. Texte établi, traduit et annoté* (Paris).

Christ, W. (1879, 2nd ed.), *Metrik der Griechen und Römer* (Leipzig).

Christes, J. (1971), *Der frühe Lucilius. Rekonstruktion und Interpretation des XXVI. Buches sowie von Teilen des XXX. Buches* (Heidelberg).

────── (1972), 'Lucilius. Ein Bericht über die Forschung seit F. Marx (1904/5)', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* I.2. 1182–1239 (Berlin).

────── (1986), 'Lucilius', in Adamietz (1986), 57–122.

Cichorius, C. (1908), *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius* (Berlin).

Clark, S. B. (1908), 'The authorship and the date of the double letters in Ovid's Heroides', *HSCPh* 19: 121–55.

Coffey, M. (1989, 2nd ed.), *Roman Satire* (Bristol).

Coleman, R. G. G. (1977) 'Greek influence on Latin syntax', *TPhS* 1975: 101–56.

_____ (1987), 'Vulgar Latin and the diversity of Christian Latin', in J. Herman (ed.), *Latin vulgaire—latin tardif* 37–52. (Tübingen).

_____ (1989), 'The formation of specialized vocabularies in grammar and rhetoric: winners and losers', in Lavency and Longrée (1989: 77–89).

_____ (1991), 'Latin prepositional syntax in Indo-European perspective', in Coleman (ed.), *New Studies in Latin Linguistics* 323–38 (Amsterdam).

_____ (1995), 'Complex sentence structure in Livy', in D. Longrée (ed.), *De Vsu. Études de syntaxe latine offertes en hommage à Marius Lavency*, 71–84 (Louvain-la-Neuve).

Collinge, N. E. (1962), 'Medical terms and clinical attitudes in the tragedians', *BICS* 9: 43–7.

Conrad, C. (1965), 'Word order in Latin epic from Ennius to Virgil', *HSCPh* 69: 194–258.

Conte, G. B. (1970), 'Ennio e Lucano', *Maia* 22: 132–8.

Contino, S. (ed.) (1988), *A. Cornelii Celsi, De medicina liber VIII* (Bologna).

Coppel, B. (1976), review of Ross (1969), *Gnomon* 48: 559–66.

Cordier, A. (1943), 'La langue poétique à Rome', *Mémorial des études latines . . . offert à J. Marouzeau* 80–92 (Paris).

Courtney, E. (1965), 'Ovidian and non-Ovidian Heroides', *BICS* 12: 63–6.

_____ (1980), *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* (London).

_____ (ed.) (1993), *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford).

Cutt, T. (1936), *Meter and Diction in Catullus' Hendecasyllabics* (Diss. Chicago).

Dagron, G. (1969), 'Aux origines de la civilisation byzantine: langue de culture et langue d'état', *Rev. Hist.* 241: 23ff.

Daube, D. (1956), *Forms of Roman Legislation* (Oxford).

De Decker, J. (1913), *Juvenalis Declamans* (Ghent).

Deichgräber, K. (ed.) (1935), *Hippokrates über Entstehung und Aufbau des menschlichen Körpers, Περὶ σαρκῶν* mit einem sprachwissenschaftlichen Beitrag von Eduard Schwyzer (Leipzig–Berlin).

_____ (1971), *Aretaeus von Kappadozien als medizinischer Schriftsteller* (Abh. d. Sächs. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Leipzig, Philol.-hist. Kl., 63, 3) (Berlin).

D'Elia, S. (1961), 'Echi del "de officiis" nell' "Ars amatoria" ovidiana', in *Atti del I congr. int. di studi ciceroniani*, ii. 127–40 (Rome).

Della Corte, M. (1958), 'Le iscrizioni di Ercolano', *Rendiconti della Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti*, n.s. 33: 239–308 (Naples).

Delatte, K. (1967), 'Keywords and poetic themes in Propertius and Tibullus', *RELO* 3: 31–79.

Delz, J. (ed.) (1987), *Sili Italici Punica* (Stuttgart).

De Meo, C. (1983), *Lingue tecniche del latino* (Testi 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* (Civicima. 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 clasico', *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 (= 1957*b*: 66–86).

–––––– (1956), 'VENVS, VENIA, CVPIDO', *RPh* 30: 7–27 (= 1957*b*: 87–111).

–––––– (1957*a*), 'METVS — TIMOR. Les formes en -*us* et en -*os* (-*or*) du latin', in 1957*b*: 7–56

–––––– (1957*b*), *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, Choephori, 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 altlateinischen 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' ἰχώρ chez Homère (*Iliade* V, vv. 340 et 416) et Eschyle (*Agamemnon*, v. 1480) en relation avec les emplois du mot dans la *Collection hippocratique*', *REA* 83: 197–209.

Kaimio, J. (1979), *The Romans and the Greek Language* (Commentationes Human. Litterarum Soc. Scient. Fenn. 64) (Helsinki–Helsingfors).

Kaster, R. A. (ed.) (1995), *C. Suetonius Tranquillus, De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus, edited with a translation, introduction and commentary* (Oxford).

Kenney, E. J. (1958), 'Nequitiae poeta', in N. I. Herescu (ed.), *Ovidiana. Recherches sur Ovide*, 201–9 (Paris).

_____ (1962), 'The First Satire of Juvenal', *PCPS* ns 8: 29–40.

_____ (1963), 'Juvenal: Satirist or Rhetorician?', *Latomus* 22: 704–20.

_____ (ed.) (1971), *Lucretius De Rerum Natura Book III* (Cambridge).

_____ (1979), 'Two disputed passages in the Heroides', *CQ* NS 29: 394–431.

_____ (ed.) (1996), *Ovid Heroides XVI–XXI* (Cambridge).

Kenney, E. J. and Clausen, W. V. (edd.) (1982), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, ii, *Latin Literature* (Cambridge).

Kingsley, P. (1995), *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery, and Magic: Empedocles and Pythagorean Tradition* (Oxford).

Knoche, U. (1982; 4th ed.), *Die römische Satire* (Göttingen).

Knox, P. E. (1986), 'Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and the traditions of Augustan poetry', *PCPS* Suppl. 11 (Cambridge).

_____ (ed.) (1995) *Ovid Heroides. Select Epistles* (Cambridge).

Koch, P. (1995), 'Latin vulgaire et traits universels de l'oral', in Callebat (1995: 125–44).

Korfmacher, W. Ch. (1935), 'Grecizing in Lucilian Satire', *CJ* 30: 453–62.

Korzeniewski, D. (ed.) (1970), *Die römische Satire* (Wege der Forschung 238) (Darmstadt).

Krenkel, W. (ed.) (1970; 2 vols), *Lucilius, Satiren. Lateinisch und Deutsch* (Leiden).

Krause, H. (1878), *De Vergilii usurpatione infinitivi* (Diss. Halle).

Kroll, W. (1912), 'Der lateinische Relativsatz', *Glotta* 3: 1–18.

―――― (1913) (repr. 1958), *M. Tullii Ciceronis Orator*. Als Ersatz der Ausgabe von Otto Jahn. Erklärt von W. K. (Berlin).

―――― (1924), *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart).

―――― (1925), 3rd ed., repr. 1969, *Die wissenschaftliche Syntax im lateinischen Unterricht* (Dublin).

―――― (1929), 2nd ed., 1st ed. 1922, reprinted with addenda, 1968), *C. Valerius Catullus* (Stuttgart).

Kudlien, F. (1963), *Untersuchungen zu Aretaios von Kappadokien* (Mainz).

Kühner, R. and Stegmann, C. (edd.) (1955; 3rd ed. by A. Thierfelder, 2 vols), *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* (Darmstadt).

Labate, M. (1984), *L'arte di farsi amare. Modelli culturali e progetto didascalico nell'elegia ovidiana.* (Biblioteca di 'Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei Testi classici', 2) (Pisa).

Lachmann, K. (1848), 'De Ovidii epistulis', *Prooemium indicis lectionum aestivarum a. 1848 = Kleinere Schriften zur classichen 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.

―――― (1956*a*), review of Heusch (1954), *Gnomon* 28: 291–4.

―――― (1956*b*), '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 Vᵉ 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), *Helenae 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 Aetheriae'. 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.

_____ (1991*a*), 'La medicina nella letteratura latina. II. Esegesi e traduzione di Horat. *Epod.* 11, 15–16 e *Od.* I 13, 4–5', in Janni and Mazzini (1991), 99–114.

_____ (1991*b*), 'Il lessico medico latino antico: caratteri e strumenti della sua differenziazione', in Sabbah (1991), 175–85.

_____ (1992*a*), 'La medicina nella letteratura latina. III. Plauto: conoscenze mediche, situazione e istituzioni sanitarie, proposte esegetiche', in Mazzini (1992*b*), 67–113.

_____ (ed.) (1992*b*), *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 Codeswitching* (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 Gegegenwart* 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).

Nowottny, 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', *ClMed* 4: 204–29.

Pascucci, G. (1961), *'consens, praesens, absens'*, *SIFC* 33: 1–61.

Pasquali, G. (1981), *Preistoria della poesia romana: con un saggio introduttivo di Sebastiano Timpanaro* (Florence).

Patzer, H. (1955), 'Zum Sprachstil des neoterischen Hexameters', *MH* 12: 77–95.

Pearce, T. E. V. (1966), 'The enclosing word order in the Latin hexameter' *CQ* ns 16: 140–71; 298–320.

Peppler, C. W. (1910), 'The termination –κος, as used by Aristophanes for comic effect', *AJP* 31: 428–44.

Peter, H. (1901), *Der Brief in der römischen Literatur* (Leipzig).

Petersmann, H. (1986), 'Der Begriff *satura* und die Entstehung der Gattung', in Adamietz (1986), 7–24.

_____ (1989), 'Die Urbanisierung des römischen Reiches im Lichte der lateinischen Sprache', *Glotta* 96: 406–28.

_____ (1992), 'Vulgärlateinisches aus Byzanz' in Müller, C. W. *et al.* (1992), 219–31.

_____ (1995*a*), 'Soziale und lokale Aspekte in der Vulgärsprache Petrons', in Callebat (1995), 533–47.

_____ (1995*b*), '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).

_____ (1995*a*) 'Cicero's translations from Greek', in Powell (1995*b*), 273–300.

_____ (ed.) (1995*b*), *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).

_____ (1940*a*), 'Per la storia del diminutivo latino. Studi esegetici e stilistici', *Stud. Urb.* 14B: 1–45 (= 1953: 107–50 = 1971: 87–130).

_____ (1940*b*), '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 jezyku 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. (1986*a*), 'Der frühe Lucilius und Horaz', *Hermes* 114: 335–65.

———— (1986*b*), '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 Symposion 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', *ClW* 46: 200–5.

Sullivan, J. P. (ed.) (1963), *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Satire* (London).

434 BIBLIOGRAPHY

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 hepatiario', *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 (Leipizig & Berlin).

Wackernagel, J. (1892), 'Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1:333–436 (= *Kleine Schriften* (1955) i. 1–104 (Göttingen)).

efforting55

—— (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 millenia*, 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 griechishen 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 Phalaeceo' 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. (1977*a*), 'A Celtic hyperbaton?', *The Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 27: 207–12.

—— (1977*b*), '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 adverbielle *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).