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

Before starting with the topic of my chapter some preliminary remarks might be necessary in order to avoid any misunderstandings: whenever in the following article we speak of ‘Satire’ — or use the Latin expression *satura* — we do not mean the ancient stage performances which were...
given this title, but the literary genre which Quintilian, *Inst.* 10.1.93 proudly declares to be a Roman invention: *satura quidem tota nostra est.*

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

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

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

---

1 Cf. Livy’s report (7.2.7) on the origin of Roman dramatic plays called *saturae; Satura* is also the title of a *fabula togata* of Atta (frg. 12 R¹) and one of Pomponius’ *Atellanae* (frg. 163–6 R¹), which obviously had an analogon in Epicharmus’ *Upia* or *Opoia* ‘The Sausage’ (frg. 108 *CGF* = 122 *FCG*).
specific linguistic varieties. He was fully aware that the linguistic level of an utterance had to be in accordance with the speaker and the person addressed as well as with the subject matter and the literary intention he had in mind. It is quite natural that in antiquity the style and language of literature always depended on the author's aim, whether he merely wanted to describe or to instruct, to parody, to amuse or to do all these simultaneously. Therefore, tragedy and epic are generally solemn in style, whereas the *satura* as a kind of literary medley could draw on many more registers of Latin speech, as Jocelyn (1977: 136f.) has rightly observed in his subtle analysis of Ennius' *Sat.* frg. 6–8 V² (= 6–8 W = 11–12 C): 'Any personage, human or divine, might range in his discourse up to the highest poeticism or down to the lowest contemporary vulgarism. It would be possible to plot without great difficulty the general stylistic differences between the utterances of personages of different status in an extant *satura* but quite another matter to identify the status of the speaker of a fragment lacking a secure context.'

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

Since in this respect we cannot be sure, I shall not concentrate on this question. Furthermore, I shall exclude from my discussion the Aesopic fable of 'The Crested Lark and its Chicks', *Sat.* frg. 21–58 V² (= pp. 388f. W = 17 C), not following Courtney ((1993: 13ff.) on frg. 17 with text, annotations and further recent literature on the whole passage), since the transmitted text might be a paraphrase of Gellius 2.29.3ff. (Coffey 1989: 28), except for the proverbial end, which has retained its original metrical form composed in *uersus quadrati* (Scholz (1986b: 48f.)). This is also the metre of another fable written by Ennius: the story of 'The Piper and the Fish', where in frg. 65 V² (= 20 W = 21 C) the expression *quondam* indicates the beginning of the tale: *subulo quondam marinas propter asstabat plagas*. The tone of this line is obviously colloquial. Varro, *L.L.* 7.35 and Festus p. 402.2ff. L, who quote this Ennian verse because of *subulo*, give evidence that the word is of Etruscan provenance. The question here is: was *subulo* in Ennius' times still regarded as a foreign
word or had it already been integrated into Latin? As this is the only passage in Latin in which the word *subulo* ‘flautist’ occurs, and since Ennius could just as well have used the more common *tibicen*, it seems probable that the poet deliberately introduced this foreign word here in order to evoke a scene in Etruria or an Etruscan person now living amongst Romans. With the exception of Greek words and the Praenestinian *tongent* in a fragment of the *Sota* (= var. 28 V² = 3 C = 4 W), this is the only expression from a different language which occurs in the *Saturae* and the other minor poems of Ennius.²

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

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

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

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

² On the etymology of *subulo* and *tongent* see Walde–Hofmann (1930–56: 620f. and 690) and Ernout–Meillet (1959: 622 and 695).
says: *contemplor | inde loci liquidas pilatasque aetheris oras*. The words *inde loci* are interesting. According to Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 53) the partitive *locri* after local or temporal adverbs usually belongs to colloquial speech: it is quite often used by Plautus and Terence. For later times Hofmann–Szantyr mainly refer to Cicero’s letters, Sallust and Vitruvius. The occurrence of this kind of structure in *Ann.* 22 V² (= 19 Sk = 21 W) *constitit inde loci propter sos dia dearum, Ann.* 530 V² (= 544 Sk = 488 W) *inde loci litus sonitus effudit acutos*, Lucretius (5.437, 741,791), *Cic. Arat.* 327 and *interea loci* in *Pacuv. frg.* 76 R³ (= 82 W) clearly demonstrates, however, that this kind of partitive was not primarily colloquial, but an archaic construction belonging to solemn style, and as such, since popular language is often conservative, it had survived into later times. Other examples of elevated style can be found in *Ann.* Sat. frg. 10f. V² (= 10f. W = 13 C), where someone says: *testes sunt | Lati campi quos gent Afn'ca terra politos*. I cannot agree with Scholz’s opinion (1986b: 47) that these lines probably do not refer to a speech of P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus Maior delivered against the *tribunus pl.* M. Naevius in 187 BC. On the contrary, the words *Africa terra* might indicate that this assumption is not too far fetched: they seem to be a reference to Scipio’s *terra Africa* (cf. *ORF* frg. 3, pp. 8–9), which was the regular word order of this phrase, and which Ennius might have changed intentionally to suit an elevated poetic style. Apart from our passage, the expression *Africa terra* occurs also in *Ann.* frg. 310 V² (= 309 Sk with commentary p. 487) and *Virg. Aen.* 4.37, where it also seems to allude to Scipio Africanus (cf. *TLL* I. 1256.54; in prose cf. *Bell. Afr.* 26.3). The difference between *Africa terra* and *terra Africa* is not a semantic but a grammatical one. In its poetic form *Africa* is an adjective, whereas in the regular word order — cf. *terra Africa* (*ORF* frg. 4.3.9), *terra Italia* (Varro, *R.R.* 1.9.1, Liv. 25.7.4 and 30.32.6), *terra Gallia* (Caes. *Gal.* 1.30.3) or *terra Etruria* (Liv. 29.5.6) — *Africa* is a postponed noun. In both forms, however, the poetic and the prosaic, the word *Africa* is not applied to the Roman province Africa (to which the adjective *Africanus* refers⁴), but is used to denote Africa in its function as a country, as in the above quoted passage of Ennius’ *Satires*. There the poet also mentions Africa’s *Lati* or *Magni campi* — Polybius 14.8.2 calls them *Μεγάλα πέδια*, where according to Livy 30.8.3 the Romans fought the Carthaginians in 203 BC. The poet speaks of these fields as *politi*, which was obviously an agricultural term: cf. *Non.* 66.18 (quoting besides these Ennian lines also *Ann.* 319 V² = 300 Sk (rastros dente

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

⁴ Therefore, *Africanus* is used as an agnomen for the two Scipiones, and from Cicero’s epoch onwards this adjective occurs also in connection with *bellum, legiones* etc. (cf. *OLD* s.v.).
tfabres capsit causa poliendi | agri)) on the word politiones: agrorum cultus diligentes, ut polita omnia dicimus exculta et ad nitorem deducta. gerere in the sense of 'to produce', 'to have', can also be found in epic poetry of later times: cf. Ov. Met. 2.15 (in the description of a picture) terra uiros urbesque gerit siluasque ferasque | fluminaque et nymphas (cf. OLD s.v. gero 2a). The question in this context is: does Ennius parody his own Annales here too? Jocelyn (1977: 131ff.) thinks that he did so in Sat. frg. 3f. V^2 (= 3f. W = 9 C), quoted above. The epic traits of our fragment seem to point towards a similar conclusion.

A parody of an epic work could also be assumed in Sat. frg. 66 V^2 (= 24 W = 22 C): propter stagna ubi lanigerum genus piscibus pascit. Here someone is feeding sheep, called lanigerum genus. That reminds us of the elevated expressions in the Annales for birds, genus pennis condecoratum frg. 10 V^2 (= 8 Sk = 10 W) and genus altiusolantum frg. 81. V^2 (= 76 Sk = 85 W). But what does piscibus mean in this context? There seems to be a pun on the sense of pisces, with which pascit alliterates. Perhaps Ennius, in a jocular way, uses the word pscis here in the same sense as raniculus, which, as a translation of the Greek botanical term βάτραχος, could denote a kind of wild flower, i.e. the buttercup (cf Plin. N. H. 25.175). The word stagna seems to support this interpretation, which Warmington in his commentary on this line proposed. According to Courtney, however, this verse could also be taken as part of a description of a θαυμάσιον. In this case it would not be surprising if sheep were to eat animals instead of plants.

There are many more lines of the Saturae where Ennius uses puns: cf. e.g. frg. 64 V^2 (= 21 W = 20 C): numquam poetor nisi si podager. The verb poetor, which apart from this passage occurs only in late Latin, and there in its active form, was perhaps a witty invention of Ennius himself. (It would be interesting to know whether it was the poet himself to whom these words refer.)

Sat. frg. 6f. V^2 (= 6f. W = 11 C), however, certainly deals with the poet Ennius himself. A drinking companion appears to address him as one who toasts with flaming verses drawn from his very marrow: Enni poeta, salve, qui mortalibus | uersus propinas flammeos medullitus. Here we have a mixture of elevated and humble styles, as has been pointed out by Jocelyn (1977: 131ff.): mortalis and 1ammeus belong to the former register, while propinare and medullitus, found also in comedy (e.g. Plaut. Most. 243, Truc. 439, As. 772, Curc. 359, Stich. 425 etc.), were obviously lower in tone.

Sat. frg. 12f. V^2 (= 12f. W = 14 C) belongs to the same comic register: neque <ille> triste quaeritat sinapi | neque caepe maestum. The stylistic level of this passage, where someone is said to try to get mustard and
onions, is colloquial: *sinapi* and *caepe* are words found in comedy, where food and meals play an important role. *tristis* in the sense of *amarus* evidently reflects archaic style: Macrobius 6.5.5, who quotes Virg. *Geo*. 1.75 *tristisque lupini* (on which see Mynors (1990: 17)) and our Ennian passage, obviously admired this usage, saying: *tristis pro amaro translatio decens est*. Consequently, *tristis* in the sense of *amarus* was not only as an archaic but also as a refined word. It is used by Lucr. 4.634 (*triste et amarum*) as well as by Ov. *Pont.* 3.1.23, and as archaic features are often characteristic of rural life, one must not wonder that the expression occurs also in Virgil’s *Georgics* (cf. besides 1.75, 2.126 and 3.448).

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

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

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

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

---

5 For *caepe* see Naev. com. 18 R³, for *sinapi* Plaut. *Ps.* 817 and *Truc.* 315.
Warmington have adopted the reading of the cod. Leid. *mox cum alterius abligrrias bona*. Courtney, however, for metrical reasons has convincingly altered the text to *mox alterius abligrrius cum bona*. In addition to Courtney's arguments one can state that the spelling of the word with -rr- (cf. also *ligurriant* in Plaut. Capt. 84) must be right because it imitates the noise the wolf makes when fearing that his quarry might be taken away by somebody else. This word exactly fits the tone of this passage, in which *uorar* as a technical term for 'swallow' (cf. Adams (1995b: 608–10)) also suits the context.

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

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

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

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

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

It was due to his frankness and wit that Lucilius was highly appreciated by many learned Romans of later times, who preferred him even to Horace, as Quintilian, *Inst.* 10.1.93f. states. Cicero at *Fin.* 1.7 records that Lucilius himself had said in a jocular way that, as he was afraid of the judgement of the Scipiones, he was writing for the people of the southern provinces. He said this on purpose since he was born in that part of Italy. From this statement we can also deduce that Lucilius did not conform to the demands of the Scipiones concerning the usage of the Latin language. As was mentioned above, the Scipiones and other *literati* of this period insisted that the *sermo purus Latinus* should not contain any Greek. In Horace’s opinion, however, Lucilius did not observe this requirement at all. Therefore, Horace at *Sat.*

---

6 This is rightly deduced from Vell. 2.9.4, according to whom Lucilius served as *eques* in the army of his friend Scipio Aemilianus: cf. Hanslik (1969: 257).
1.10.20ff. ridicules the linguistic mixture in Lucilius' *Satires* and those people who admired this technique. Yet Horace's criticism is evidently prejudiced. Lucilius in general did not assent to an indiscriminate use of Greek words in Latin. He looked disapprovingly on this custom when there was no need to use Greek words. This was obviously the case when good Latin expressions were unnecessarily replaced with Greek equivalents, which became more and more the vogue. In frg. 15 M (= 15f. W) Lucilius ridicules this custom perhaps by making somebody use the Greek word σελινως in a passage where this same person seems to criticize exactly this habit: *porro clinopodas lychnosque, ut diximus σελινως, ante pedes lecti atque lucernas.* Possibly, Lucilius in this passage mocks the use of *clinopodae* and *lychni* in Ennius' *Annales.8*

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

---

7 All the manuscripts of Macr. *Saturn.* 6.4.18 quoting these words transmit *ante.* Since the meaning of *ante* is very close to that of the Greek ἀντί, there is no need to alter this form as Warnington following Mueller did.

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


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

This intermixing of Latin with Greek had a long tradition from Plautine comedy onwards. Lucilius makes use of this technique\(^{12}\) in frg. 181–8 M (= 186–93 W):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ut perisse uelis, quem uisere nolueris cum} \\
\text{debueris. Hoc 'nolueris' et 'debueris' te} \\
\text{si minus delectat, quod atechnon et Isocrati} \\
\text{lerodesque simul totum ac symmiraciodes:} \\
\text{non operam perdo, si tu hic.}
\end{align*}
\]

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

---

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


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

\(^{14}\) Cf. Cic. De orat. 3.141 . . . ipse (= sc. Isocrates) suas disputationes a causis forensibus et ciuilibus ad inanem sermonis elegantiam transtulisset . . . For more on Isocrates’ epistolary
Hubert Petersmann

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

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

non paucis malle ac sapientibus esse probatum

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


16 The connection of miraciodes with sym is a hapax legomenon. It may be a witty word formation by Lucilius himself, in analogy to e.g. ύμαπλεως, ύμαπλήρης etc. Cf. Leo (1906: 845 = 1960: 230).
case the inflection is also Greek: cf. e.g. frg. 1100 M (= 397 W): adde soloecismon genera atque vocabula centum.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

\[
\text{nam ueluti } intro \text{ aliud longe esse atque } intus \text{ uidemus,}
\]
\[
\text{sic } <i> \text{ apud } te \text{ aliud longe est, neque idem ualet } ad \text{ te:}
\]
\[
intro \text{ nos uocat, at se se tenet } intus.\]

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

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

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

\footnote{Cf. also Quint. *Inst.* 1.5.50 *intus et intro sum solecismi sunt* and Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 277) and Svennung (1935: 388f.).}
whereas there are perfect forms such as CIL I² 586.4 aduortit and SC Bacch. aruorsum. We can observe that in this matter, too, Lucilius' linguistic attitude is conservative: he uses the stem uert- in the present forms (frg. 139 M = 132 W uertitur, 899 M = 858 W auertat, 745 M = 838 W uertenti) whereas uort- occurs in the forms of the past tense: frg. 988 M = 1082 W uorsus, 1197 M = 1188 W uorsum.²⁰

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

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

Unfortunately, we do not know who the speaker of these words is. To my mind, however, it is certain, that it cannot be the poet himself. The language of the passage is individualized by such odd traits, which for the linguistically well-trained poet Lucilius are inconceivable in this context. Therefore the speaker seems to have been a person of lower social standing. Perhaps he was a slave, a cook or a parasite, who in Roman comedy often are characterized by traits of vulgar Latin (cf. Petersmann (1995b: 128 n. 12)). He could also have been a freedman like Trimalchio or one of his uneducated friends in Petronius' Satyrca, whose sermo vulgaris is sometimes so archaic in tone that these characters are given a ridiculous dignity (Petersmann (1995a: 53–47)).

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

²⁰ On the pres. forms vort- in the text of Plautus which seem to have been introduced by grammarians of a later period cf. Leumann (1977: 48).
In older times, however, the usage was much wider, but it was confined mainly to tragedy and epic: cf. Enn. Ann. 246f. V² (= 281f. Sk = 222f. W) uerbum paucum instead of uerborum paucorum. Consequently, fluuium for fluuiorum in the context of everyday life here must have sounded funny. The same applies also to the hypercorrect neuter accusative form ostrea, which is used here instead of the feminine ostreas. One would have expected the latter form, since this noun is a loan-word taken over from the Greek neuter ὀστρέον long before Lucilius’ time. In Latin it had changed its gender (via the neuter plural) to feminine ostrea: cf. e.g. Plaut. Rud. 297 echinos, lopadas, ostreas and Lucilius frg. 132 M (= 126 W) ostrea nulla fuit, non purpura, nulla peloris. Therefore in the context of our fragment as well as in frg. 1201 M (= 1222 W) luna alit ostrea et implet echinos . . . the nom. and acc. plur. ostrea is a hypercorrect form which was intended to create the same amusing effect as fluuium.

Linguistic mockery is also obvious in a series of other words: collus (frg. 268 M = 316 W and frg. 703 M = 780 W), forus (frg. 146 M = 148 W) etc. Mariotti (1960: 102f.) provides more examples but does not mention utria in frg. 1104 M (= 1212 W) instead of utres. This form is very interesting. It occurs again in late Latin (e.g. Arnob. Adu. Nat. 1.59 R), which demonstrates how long some substandard words continued to be alive. Often they still exist in the Romance idioms. The word demagis, meaning ‘furthermore’ is such an example: Lucilius frg. 527–9 M (= 544–6 W) gives the only literary evidence of this adverb in entire Latinity. As an expression of the popular language it was taken to the Iberian peninsula by Roman colonists and has survived only there: cf. Spanish demás, Portuguese demais, etc. (REW³: no. 2546 and Tovar (1969: 102ff.) and already Marx (1909: 437)).

Another very illustrative example of this kind is the verb uannere ‘to winnow’ (from uannus (= ‘the winnow for fodder or cereals’), whose first attestation is found in Col. 2.20.4), which apart from Lucilius does not occur elsewhere in Latin literature, but has survived as a technical term in idioms of the Romance area (REW³ no. 9141f. s.v. uannere and *uannitare). In both Lucilian passages where the word occurs it is applied to sexual intercourse (Adams 1982a: 153): frg. 278 M (= 302 W) hunc molere, illam autem ut frumentum uannere lumbis and 330 M (= 361 W) crisabit ut si frumentum clunibus uannat.

rostrum is another remarkable word, on which Adams (1982b: 103) comments much more accurately than Tovar (1969: 1024): ‘lit. “beak” (e.g. Plin. Nat. 8.97) or “snout” (e.g. Plin. Nat. 8.121) of an animal or bird, was applied to the human anatomy in colloquial Latin, as Nonius noted (p. 729 L)’. Nonius quotes from Plautus, Novius, Lucilius and Varro’s Mennipean Satires, to which Petron. 75.10 has to be added. Originally rostrum could
be used to denote either the human mouth or face, or both together like the English slang word ‘mug’ or the vulgar German ‘Schnauze’, ‘Fresse’. Lucilius uses the word three times in this sense (frg. 210 M = 233 W, 336 M = 362f. W and 1121 M = 1184 W). In Varro, *Men.* 419 and Petron. 75.10 the word apparently refers to the human face, in which sense it has survived in the Iberian peninsula, whereas the meaning ‘mouth’ (already attested in Plaut. *Men.* 89) can be found in Old Romanian (*REW* no. 7386). And it is Lucilius, not Cicero, as Walde–Hofmann (1930–56 439 S.V. rodo) state, who gives the first literary evidence for the meaning of the plural *rostra* as ‘a speaker’s stand’.\(^{21}\) Cf. frg. 261 M (= 273 W): *haec, inquam, rudet ex rostris atque heilabit* . . .

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


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

\(^{21}\) Cf. also the other two testimonies of the word in pre-Ciceronian times: *CIL* 1.583.36 (= lex rep. a. 123/122 BC) *iudices . . . omnes pro rostreis in forum [uersus iouranto] and Varro, *L.L.* 6.91 *collegam roges ut comitia edicit de rostris.*
ne auriculam obsidat caries, ne uermiculi qui. In this passage, as in the veterinary treatises of later periods, auricula is not a mere substitute for the base-form auris but is used technically for the inner ear, just as in the same fragment uermiculi is not simply said of worms in general but of a special kind of worms affecting the ear (cf. in addition to Adams (1995b: 560), on uermicus Cels. 6.7.5 ubi uero uermes orti sunt, si iuxta sunt, prostrahendi oriculario specillo sunt . . . cauendumque ne postea nascantur, and more in Marx (1905: II 100f., commentary ad loc.)). The same holds good also for pellicula in frg. 534–6 M (= 559–61 W):

\[ \text{'ibat forte aries,' inquit, 'iam quod genus, quantis testibus! uix uno filo hosce haerere putares, } \\
\text{pellicula extrema exaptum pendere onus ingens.'} \]

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

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

\[ \text{peniculamento uero reprehendere noli, } \\
\text{ut pueri infantes faciunt, mulierculam honestam.} \]

Marx (1904: I 162, Index gramm.) thinks that in this fragment the diminutive mulierculam is used metri causa. If his interpretation is right (which is doubtful since the tone of muliercula might be affectionate), we could also explain the shorter form guberna instead of gubernacula in frg. 578 M (= 622 W). In this fragment a seaman gives the following command: proras despoliate et detundete guberna. Here guberna is not an artificial form as Marx, Krenkel (frg. 579) and Charpin (XX frg. 5) in their editions of Lucilius believe. I cannot see any reason, however, why a seaman in ordinary speech should have imitated epic style. Therefore, we should rather assume that gubenum instead of gubernaculum was a colloquial form. This can be proved by the fact that the word signifying helm in Old Italian is also governo, in Old French gouver and in the language of Provence it is governe (cf. REW²: no. 3905).

²² I am very grateful to Professor J. N. Adams for his highly illustrative remarks on this word in a letter to me.
Another colloquial element seems to occur in the above-mentioned command, frg. 578 M (= 622 W): cf. the form *detundete*, which Marx conjectured *metri causa* for the transmitted *detundite*, whose meaning here is 'dismantle'. It is not clear, however, whether *detundete* replaces *detundite* (from *de + tundere* as Charpin thinks) or *detondete* (from *de + tondere*), in which case *detundete* might be explained as a rustic form instead of *detondete* (cf. Marx (1905: II 215 ad loc.)).

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

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

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

Even more evident is the rural tone of frg. 581 M (= 623 W), which is documented by the dialect pronunciation of *abiiit as abzet*, and where I as well as Charpin (XXII frg. 5) have adopted the punctuation of Terzaghi (= frg. 617): *primum Pacilius: tesorophylax, pater, abzet.* Glossaries (cf. Marx (1905: II 216)) explicitly comment on *abzet: extincta est uel mortua.* The word *abzet* has a parallel in a Pelignian inscription which says of a priestess: *afded = abiiit* 'she passed away' (CE 17.6 and Vetter (1953: no. 213)). Moreover, the name *Pacilius* recalls the Oscan name *Paakul*, but above all the pronunciation *tesorophylax* instead of *thesaurophylax* sug-
gests a kind of artificial rustic Latin. Charpin (1979: II 266) following Mariotti (1960: 97) remarks on this Lucilian fragment: ‘La langue de ce fragment est très composite; il semble que Lucilius ait voulu créer une atmosphère non romaine, plutôt que restituer un dialecte donné.’

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

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

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

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

²³ On the etymology of these words see the relevant articles in Walde–Hofmann (1930–56), and Emout–Meillet (1959) s.vv.
persons by an individual style and marking situations by an appropriate choice of words was already acknowledged by Fronto p. 57.3 v.d.H. (ed. Teubn.): *in uerbis cuiusque artis ac negotii propriis*. Lucilius uses language as a means of satiric mockery in order to excite laughter as well as to instruct. He is not only a master of parody when imitating Latin epic, tragic and comic style, 24 but he is also fully acquainted with the representatives of the various genres of Greek literature (cf. Marx (1904: I 100) and Coffey (1989: 41ff. and 54ff.)). Above all, Lucilius is a brilliant artist in reproducing the different varieties of the Latin language in all its nuances from the refined heights down to its vulgar and obscene depths (Coffey (1989: 51)).

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

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


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