Nominative Personal Pronouns and Some Patterns of Speech in Republican and Augustan Poetry

J. N. ADAMS

Summary. A use of the nominative personal pronouns *ego* and *tu* is discussed. *Ego* and *tu* are not necessarily 'emphatic' or contrastive, but may be attached to emphatic, focused or 'preferential' terms which stand at the head of a clause. The function of the pronoun in such cases seems to be much the same as that of certain patterns of intonation in English. The pronoun highlights the emphatic term on which it hangs. Given its function, the usage certainly belonged to 'speech', which in this paper means 'educated speech'. The distribution of certain patterns (e.g. verb + *ego*: *credo ego* etc.) is discussed in republican and Augustan poetry. It is shown that Catullus (in hendecasyllables and elegiac verse) readily admits patterns which there is reason to believe were commonplace in speech, whereas the practice of Augustan poetry is more variable. Ovid in particular goes far beyond the norms of speech, both in displacing the unit focused term + *ego/tu* from initial position, and in developing complex forms of hyperbaton around the pronoun.

I. INTRODUCTION

THIS CHAPTER WILL BE about the use of the nominative personal pronouns *ego* and *tu*, but particularly *ego*. I will identify and discuss one of the factors determining the use of nominative pronouns in classical Latin,

prose as well as verse.[1] A specific aim will be to explain the motivation
and placement of *ego* in Catullus 16.1 ('pedicabo ego uos'), but I will be
dealing not only with Catullus but also with Augustan poetry (elegy,
Horace and Virgil). The use of nominative pronouns which will be identi-
fied here is not peculiar to poetry, or indeed to 'colloquial' Latin. It had
a place in speech. I use the term 'speech' in a general sense in reference
to educated speech of different degrees of formality; the term is
intended to embrace in particular dialogue in the plays of Plautus and the
oratory of Cicero. The chapter will examine the manner of the transfer to
poetry of certain patterns of speech, and what that transfer has to tell us
about the nature of poetic language in republican and Augustan Latin.
The question arises to what extent these patterns were admitted, avoided,
modified or extended by different poets.

The view is not uncommonly stated or implied that the nominative
personal pronouns *ego* and *tu* are 'emphatic', or if used without emphasis
are 'colloquial' or substandard in some way. Fordyce (1961: 149), for
example, commenting on *legas tu* in (1),

> (1)   Catull. 22.9   haec cum legas **tu**, bellus ille et urbanus
>   Suffenus unus caprimulgus aut fossor
>   rursus uidetur

suggested that *tu* may be no more than a 'metrical stopgap', i.e. it is
apparently 'unemphatic', and must therefore lack proper motivation.
Goold (1983) was moved to change *tu* to *tum* (*tum* g: *tu* V). Kroll too
(1922) was bothered by nominative pronouns in Catullus which seem to be
without emphasis. On Catull. 6.14, for example, he notes that an example of
tu is unemphatic, 'wie oft in der Umgangssprache'.

A common type of emphasis expressed by *ego* and *tu* might be called
'contrastive emphasis', as in (2)–(3), where *ego* and *tu*, at the head of their
cola, are in antithesis:

> (2)   Cic. *Brut.* 151 de Seruio autem et **tu** probe dicis et **ego** dicam
>   quod sentio
> (3)   Cic. *Phil.* 8.17 immo uero **ego** D. Bruto faueo, **tu** M. Antonio.

But in any classical text, and I do not refer only to 'colloquial' texts, it is
easy to find examples of *ego* and *tu* which do not participate in obvious
contrasts of this type. I mention here a few other conditions which seem
to have been influential, up to a point, in motivating the use of *ego* in
Cicero and Plautus. I do not claim to be exhaustive.

First, 'subjective' verbs, that is verbs signifying feelings, belief, sense

---

[1] See in general Marouzeau (1907), Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 173–4, 400), Adams (1994*a*:
141–51).

perception etc. (e.g. *existimo, uolo, nolo, scio, credo*) are often used in association with *ego*, and *ego* does not necessarily have 'contrastive emphasis'. There are however variations in the frequency of the pronoun from verb to verb which are difficult to account for. *Existimo*, for example, is frequently accompanied by *ego*, but *credo* less commonly so (see below). And it is often difficult or impossible to see why *ego* is used with a particular verb in one passage but not in another. Presumably the strength or personal character of the feelings etc. which a speaker wishes to express is particularly sensitive to the context, and for that reason one and the same verb may sometimes have *ego*, sometimes not.

Secondly, threats, promises, statements of intent and the like, utterances which again have a subjectivity about them, often seem to generate the use of *ego*.[2] The verb is in the future tense (4)–(6):

(4) Plaut. *Amph.* 348 **ego** tibi istam hodie, sceleste, **comprimam** linguam

(5) Plaut. *Amph.* 556 iam quidem hercle **ego** tibi istam / scelestam, scelus, linguam **apscidam**

(6) Ter. *Heaut.* 730 **ego** pol istos **commouebo**.

In some of these passages *ego* is also juxtaposed with *tibi* or a demonstrative; *ego* is often alongside an oblique-case form of *tu* (see below, p. 108). The focus is on the future-tense verbs, and *ego* has no real contrastive emphasis of the type seen in (2)–(3), but collocations such as *ego tibi* may be reflections of the contrastive potential of *ego* and *tu*.

Thirdly, it has been plausibly suggested that a distinction should be made between conversational texts and narrative texts: 'in conversations *ego* (*nos*) and *tu* (*uos*) are either used to identify the speaker or addressee or to carry some form of "focal" ... information ... In narrative texts, however, the nominative forms of the first person pronoun are used to ndicate a change of "Topic"' (Pinkster (1987: 369)).

The factors motivating the use of the nominative pronoun *tu* will often have differed from those motivating the use of *ego*. *Ego* may occur in the statement of feelings, beliefs etc. held personally by the speaker, but *tu* implicates a person other than the speaker in the discourse. Whereas *ego* is found (e.g.) in threats, *tu* is often used when an order is given. A full account of the uses of the nominative personal pronouns would have to treat the functions of *ego* and *tu* separately. I am not attempting such a comprehensive account in this chapter.

A good deal of this chapter will be concerned with standard patterns.

---

[2] See Pinkster (1987: 369).

It will be suggested that there are structures which determine the use of *ego* and *tu*, regardless of their emphasis or pragmatic function.

II. STRUCTURES CONTAINING *EGO*

In subjective statements of the type defined above, or in contexts in which *ego* is motivated in some way by its pragmatic role, it may be placed at the start of its clause, as in (7):

> (7)   Cic. *Pis.* 79 **ego** C. Caesarem non eadem de re publica sensisse quae me **scio**; sed tamen . . . .

It seems to be true of classical prose that if *ego* is expressed for some reason its normal tendency is to go to the head of its clause; it does not, for example, have a special liaison with the verb. One expects to find collocations of the type *ego scio* mainly in contexts in which *ego* is at the start of the clause.

But *ego* is often excluded from first place by what might be called 'preferential' terms of one sort or another,[3] that is terms which characteristically occupy the first place in their clause. If there is a preferential term at the start of the clause, *ego* may be placed second, immediately after that preferential term. I list some categories of words which often precede *ego* (or *tu*) at the start of a clause:

(i) Relatives, including the connective use of the relative, e.g.

> (8)   Cic. *Q.fr.*1.2.16 **quibus** *ego* ita *credo* ut nihil de mea comparatione deminuam.

The use of the nominative pronoun here may, superficially at least, be explained from the subjective character of the verb *credo*, or perhaps even from an element of contrastive emphasis, but that may not be the whole story (see below). *Ego* has been debarred from the first position by *quibus*, which almost inevitably comes first. A comparison of (7) with (8) shows that it would not do to see in (8) the operation of Wackernagel's law, according to which pronouns and certain other clitics are said to occupy the second position in their clause.[4] There is no general rule of second-position placement at work in the two examples; it is the presence of a preferential term, *quibus*, which causes *ego* to be later than first in (8).

If the (connective) relative is adjectival, it may be split by *ego* from the noun in agreement:

---

[3] I take the term from Dover (1968: 20). Latin like Greek had a set of words which more often than not are at the head of the clause.

[4] See Wackernagel (1892); also Adams (1994*a*).

(9) Plaut. *Bacch.* 214 **quam** *ego* **fabulam** aeque ac me ipsum *amo*

(10) Plaut. *Men.* 903 **quem** *ego* **hominem**, si quidem uiuo, uita
euoluam sua

(11) Cic. *Verr. a.pr.* 4 **quibus** *ego* **rebus** uehementissime *perturbor*

(12) Cic. *Verr. a.pr.*18 **quem** *ego* **hominem** honoris potius quam
contumeliae causa nominatum *uolo*

(13) Cic. *Verr.* 4.140 **quas** *ego* **litteras** obsignandas publico signo
deportandasque curaui

(14) Cic. *Att.* 8.16.1 **quem** *ego* **hominem** ἀπολιτικώτατον omnium
iam ante *cognoram.*

The verbs in four of these examples express feelings and the like, and that
might have been at least one of the determinants of the use of *ego.* (10),
on the other hand, is a threat. Note the formulaic character of at least
some of the examples (those with *quem ego hominem*).

It is of some interest that the incomplete utterance of Neptune at Virg.
Aen. 1.135 takes the form *quos ego* —!

(ii) Another constituent which often precedes *ego* is the demonstrative
hic, which of course is interchangeable with the connective relative. In
(15),

(15) Cic. *Fam.* 11.20.1 **hoc** *ego* Labeonem *credo* illi rettulisse aut
finxisse dictum

the verb (*credo*) is again subjective, and again, in (16)–(20), we see the
tendency for *ego* to split the demonstrative from a noun:

(16) Cic. *S. Rosc.* 47 nihil intersit utrum **hunc** *ego* **comicum**
adulescentem an aliquem ex agro Veienti nominem

(17) Cic. *Diu. Caec.* 25 **huic** ego **homini** iam ante denuntio

(18) Cic. *Verr. a. pr.* 2 **huic** *ego* **causae**, iudices, cum summa
uoluntate et exspectatione populi Romani actor accessi

(19) Cic. *Cat.* 3.17 **hunc** *ego* **hominem** tam acrem, tam audacem,
tam paratum . . . nisi . . . compulissem

(20) Cic. *Verr.* 3.104 duarum mihi ciuitatum reliquos *feci* agros,
iudices, fere optimos ac nobilissimos, Aetnensem et
Leontinum. **horum** *ego* **agrorum** missos *faciam* quaestus
trienni.

Hunc ego hominem in (19) should be compared with *quem ego hominem.*
In (20) *feci* in the first sentence is without *ego*, whereas *faciam* in the
second has an accompanying subject pronoun, and it is only in the second
that a demonstrative is present. Or could it be that the future tense
(expressing intent) is the determinant of *ego*? It is not immediately obvious
in some of the other examples what has motivated *ego.* Is it possible that
the pattern *hic ego* had formulaic status such that the semantic content
of the verb or of *ego* itself was not necessarily a determinant of its use?

(iii) *Ego* often follows interrogative words, particularly *quis*, e.g.

> (21) Cic. *Verr.* 1.75 **quid** *ego* nunc in altera actione Cn. Dolabellae
>   spiritus, quid huius lacrimas et concursationes proferam . . .?

The examples in (22) have a formulaic structure which recurs over a long period:[5]

> (22) a Ennius, *Ann.* 314 Skutsch **sed quid ego haec** memoro?
>   b Lucil. 1000 **sed quid ego haec** animo trepidanti dicta
>   profundo?
>   c Cic. *Mil.* 18 **sed quid ego illa** commemoro?
>   d Catull. 64.164 **sed quid ego** ignaris nequiquam conquerar
>   auris?
>   e Ovid, *Her.* 9.143 **sed quid ego haec** refero?
>   f Livy 8.32.5 **sed quid ego haec** interrogo?
>   g Livy 38.48.6 **sed quid ego haec** ita argumentor?

The verb is one of saying or the like, and the answer expected is that the speaker should not be saying what he is saying, or that it is being said in vain. *Sed* precedes *quid*, and *ego* is usually followed by a neuter demonstrative. Since this type of question implies a personal view on the part of the speaker which he attempts to impose on the hearer, the presence of *ego* may originally have been explicable from the subjectivity of the utterance. But it had surely become a mere manner of speaking, with the use of *ego* triggered as much by the interrogative *quid* and the collocation of words as by the semantic contribution which the pronoun might have to make.

If the interrogative is adjectival, it may in the usual way be separated from its noun by *ego*:

> (23) Plaut. *Bacch.* 357 **quas** *ego* hic **turbas** dabo! (the exclamatory
>   use of *quis*)
> (24) Cic. *Att.* 1.16.1 **quas** *ego* **pugnas** et quantas strages edidi! (note
>   the contextual similarity of this to the previous example)
> (25) Cic. *Att.* 2.15.3 **quos** *ego* **homines** effugi cum in hos incidi?

In (24) it might be said that the boastful nature of the claim determines the use of *ego*; (23) is a threat.

For *tu* used in the same structure, see:

> (26) Plaut. *Pseud.* 1195 **quem** *tu* **Pseudolum, quas** *tu* mihi praedicas
>   **fabulas**?
> (27) Cic. *Cat.* 1.13 **cui** tu **adulescentulo** . . . non aut ad audaciam
>   ferrum aut ad libidinem facem praetulisti?

(iv) A strongly focused term, whether e.g. a word in antithesis, or

---

[5] See Skutsch (1985: 363; also 493) on Enn. *Ann.* 314.

participating in a rhetorical anaphora, will often be placed at the head of a clause. If *ego* is expressed for some reason, it will be prevented from adopting first position by the focused term. In (28) *ego*, as often, is expressed as subject of *uidi* (see below, pp. 123–4), but the first position goes to *alios*, which is part of an extended anaphora; *ego* is attached to it:

> (28)   Cic. *Pis.* 21 **alios** *ego* uidi **uentos, alias** prospexi animo procellas, **aliis** impendentibus tempestatibus non cessi.

In (29)

> (29)   Cic. *Cat.* 3.26 **in animis** *ego* **uestris** omnis triumphos meos, omnia ornamenta honoris, monumenta gloriae, laudis insignia condi et conlocari *uolo*

Cicero has said that he wants no *concrete* memorial. It is enough for him to be retained in the citizens' *minds. Animis* is part of a loose contrast. The verb (*uolo*) is subjective. *Ego* has moved towards the start of the sentence, attaching itself to the antithetical term *animis* and separating thereby *animis* from *uestris.*

See further:

> (30)   Plaut. *Men.* 978 nam magis multo patior facilius **uerba. uerbera** *ego* odi.

Here the verb (*odi*) is a subjective one which elsewhere has *ego* expressed as its subject (see below, (97)–(99); *ego* is placed after one of a pair of overtly (alliterative) antithetical terms.

(v) Negatives are frequently at the head of a clause. *Ego*, motivated by one of the factors identified earlier, may move towards but be prevented from adopting first place: e.g.

> (31)   Plaut. *Pers.* 533 **numquam** *ego* te tam esse matulam credidi
> (32)   Cic. *Marc.* 8 **non** *ego* eum cum summis uiris comparo, sed simillimum deo iudico
> (33)   Cic. *Att.* 1.12.1 **nihil** *ego* illa impudentius, astutius, lentius uidi.

I summarize. *Ego*, if expressed, is often placed at the head of its clause. But it may be prevented from adopting that position if one of a variety of preferential terms normally placed first is present in the sentence: for example a relative, *hic*, an interrogative, a focused or rhetorical or antithetical term, a negative. In such sentences *ego* is constantly found attached to the preferential term. It is probably true to say that in prose if *ego* is not in first place in the clause, it will usually follow a preferential term. Many of the examples so far quoted show quasi-formulaic structures of one sort or another, e.g. *hunc ego hominem, sed quid ego haec.* The question arises whether in such cases *ego* is motivated only by its own

'emphatic' or 'subjective' or 'focal' character. Is it possible that certain types of preferential terms placed at the head of a sentence in effect attracted *ego*, or even generated its use if the verb was first person?

I ask this question partly because in some of the examples quoted so far it is difficult to see any other reason why *ego* should have been expressed, but particularly because there is evidence in Latin that certain preferential and focused terms attracted enclitics of other kinds.[6] Consider first (34):

> (34)   Cic. *Fam.* 13.73.2 sed mihi ita persuadeo (potest fieri ut fallar) //
>   eam rem **laudi** *tibi* // potius quam **uituperationi** fore.

The double lines mark off colon division. *Tibi*, the unemphatic enclitic oblique case pronoun, ought, by Wackernagel's law, to be in second position in its colon. Instead it is right at the end of the colon, attached to the antithetical term *laudi*, which stands in a contrast with *uituperationi*. *Tibi* has been attracted to the right by the antithetical term, and this is a common process in classical Latin. The antithetical or focused term exercises an attracting power over enclitics. Take again (35):

> (35)   Caes. *Gall.* 6.40.7 quorum non nulli **ex inferioribus** ordinibus
>   reliquarum legionum // uirtutis causa // **in superiores** *erant*
>   ordines huius legionis *traducti*.

Here a transfer from lower ranks (*ex inferioribus ordinibus*) to higher (*in superiores ordines*) is described. *Inferioribus* and *superiores* are antithetical. The auxiliary *erant*, which would usually follow *traducti*, has moved to the left and attached itself to one of the antithetical terms.

I would suggest that *ego* often behaves in a similar way to oblique case pronouns, and the copula or auxiliary, in that it seeks out focused or preferential terms and links itself to them, even in contexts in which it appears to have no particular emphasis itself and is apparently redundant. Consider (36)–(39):

> (36)   Plaut. *Aul.* 322 **coquom** *ego*, **non furem** rogo
> (37)   Plaut. *Aul.* 457 **coctum** *ego*, **non uapulatum**, dudum
>   conductus fui
> (38)   Cic. *Att.* 14.14.2 ita Brutos Cassiumque defendis quasi eos ego
>   reprehendam; quos satis laudare non possum. **rerum** *ego* uitia
>   collegi, **non hominum**
> (39)   Cic. *Verr.* 5.130 itaque ad me, iudices, hanc querimoniam
>   praeter ceteras Sicilia detulit; **lacrimis** *ego* huc, **non gloria**
>   inductus accessi.

---

[6] See Adams (1994a, 1994b).

In each case *ego* has moved towards the start of the sentence, but instead of reaching first position has been attached to antithetical terms, which stand in an 'A *non* B' structure. *Ego* seems usually to be semantically redundant. In (38), for example, the first sentence contains a contrast between Atticus, the subject of *defendis*, and Cicero, who refers to himself by means of the contrastive use of *ego*. But in the third sentence the primary contrast is between *rerum* and *hominum*. The main motivation of *ego* seems to be its tendency to occur as enclitic on certain categories of focused terms.

I wish to consider further the possibility that the use of *ego* may sometimes be determined not by its own emphatic or contrastive potential, but by its mechanical place in certain structures, in attachment to a limited range of focused or preferential terms. Two pieces of evidence are offered (*ego* used as subject of *credo*, and of *accuso*).

I take first *ego* used in conjunction with the verb *credo* (in the present tense, indicative). *Credo* might seem to be the archetypal subjective verb which would often be accompanied by *ego*. However, in Cicero, *credo* occurs 337 times, and *ego* is expressed with it only 6 times. The 6 examples are set out at (40):

(40) a *S. Rosc.* 1 **credo ego** uos, iudices, mirari quid sit quod . . .
      b *Dom.* 134 **quem ego** tamen credo
      c *Nat.* 3.14 **quibus ego** credo
      d *Att.* 1.16.12 **quod ego** non credo
      e *Q. fr.* 1.2.16 **quibus ego** ita credo
      f *Fam.* 11.20.1 **hoc ego** Labeonem credo illi rettulisse aut finxisse dictum.

There is evidence here that the use of *ego* is structurally determined. In four places (b — e) *ego* follows a connective relative, and in a fifth (f) it follows *hoc*. It seems to be the presence of the preferential term which generates the use of *ego*, in attachment to it.

Of particular note is (40a), which is the opening of the *Pro Roscio Amerino*. The same expression opens the *Stichus* of Plautus —

(41) Plaut. *Stich.* 1   **credo ego** miseram
                            fuisse Penelopam

— and is found elsewhere in speeches:

(42) C. Sempronius Gracchus frg. 34, p. 184 Malcovati **credo ego** inimicos meos hoc dicturum
(43) Livy 21.21.3 **credo ego** uos, inquit, socii . . .
(44) Livy 24.38.1 **credo ego** uos audisse, milites . . . .

I take it that the emphasis of (40a) is 'I IMAGINE, gentlemen, that you

are surprised'. The focus is on *credo*. *Ego* is neither genuinely contrastive nor emphatic, but appears to be attached to a focal initial verb. It could not be argued that the order *ego credo* has been reversed to throw the verb into relief, because, as we have seen, *ego* is not necessarily expressed in combination with *credo* in Cicero. It would seem to be more accurate to say that the use of *ego* has been motivated by the presence of a focused term at the start of the sentence which Cicero wishes to highlight. Speeches of Cicero often have a first-person verb in the first sentence, but usually it is unaccompanied by *ego* or *nos*; it would not do therefore to suggest that the orator had a habit of expressing *ego* as a mannered speech opening to stress (e.g.) his personal involvement in or commitment to the case. At *S. Rosc.* 1 then it is both the presence of *ego*, and its placement, which have to be explained. Positioned thus, the pronoun virtually has a focusing role.

I move on to my second piece of evidence. At (45) Cicero poses a number of rhetorical questions, each introduced by *quis*:

> (45) Cic. *Verr.* 4.104 pro di immortales! **quem** *ego* **hominem** accuso? quem legibus aut iudiciali iure persequor? de quo uos sententiam per tabellam feretis?

Ego does not seem to have any special emphasis. Could it be that its use has been determined by the verb *accuso*? There are 15 examples of *accuso* (first-person present indicative) in Cicero.[7] Only four times is *ego* expressed with it. There is a second case of the pronoun attached to an interrogative:

> (46) Cic. *Verr.* 3.137 pro deum hominumque fidem, **quem** *ego* accuso?

The context is virtually identical to that of (45), and in both passages the emphasis seems to be on the interrogative: '*what sort of man is this* that I am accusing'.

In a third example *ego* begins a sentence, and may be intended to be emphatic *(Att.* 13.22.3). It is also subject of another, coordinated, verb *(libero)*. Finally, at *Sull.* 48 *ego* is contrastive:

> (47) Cic. *Sull.* 48 'inimicum ego', inquis, 'accuso'. et amicum ego defendo meum.

There are then no grounds for thinking that the presence of *ego* is related to the nature of the verb *accuso*; in two places it is the interrogative *quis* which must surely have determined its use. Whereas the two questions of the form *quem . . . accuso?* both have *ego* attached to *quem*, in none of

---

[7] *S. Rosc.* 94, *Verr.* 3.16, 3.17, 3.187, 4.104, 5.166, *Planc.* 17, *Sull.* 48, *Att.* 3.15.4, 3.15.7, 4.16.1, 10.5.3, 13.22.3, 13.22.5, *Q.fr.* 2.2.1.

the places where *accuso* occurs *without ego* is it preceded by the interrogative.

Further evidence could be cited suggesting that *ego* is often expressed because the structural conditions are right to motivate it, but the two cases discussed above are enough for our purposes.

I summarize. The infrequency with which *ego* is expressed as subject of (e.g.) *credo* shows that the subjectivity of the verb was not sufficient cause in itself to determine the use of the pronoun. *Ego* seems to be motivated by the presence of a restricted range of preferential terms — that is, terms which habitually come at the head of their clause and to which it might attach. I refer, in the case of *credo*, to the emphatic deictic demonstrative *hic*, to the connective relative *qui* which is interchangeable with *hic*, and to the miscellaneous category of focused initial terms placed at the head of the clause, represented by initial *credo* at *S. Rosc.* 1. The tendency which *ego* shows of linking itself to such preferential terms has a parallel in the tendency which oblique case pronouns, and the copula *esse*, also show of seeking out preferential terms as their host. What is different about the nominative pronoun *ego*, as compared for example with an oblique case form such as *mihi*, is that logically it is redundant. If its use is related to the presence of a preferential term in the clause, then one would have to say that the preferential term not only attracts it, but in many cases even causes it to be expressed.

III. CATULLUS: VERB + *EGO/TU*

I turn now to Catullus. I will be arguing that Catullus falls constantly into the patterns of speech, with a minimum of adaptation or innovation. I begin with one type of attachment of *ego/tu* to preferential terms, that is their attachment to emphatic or antithetical verbs, as in Cicero's expression *credo ego*.[8] The nature of the phenomenon may be even more clearly illustrated from (48)–(50):

> (48) Cic. *Caec.* 38 **reieci ego** te armatis hominibus, **non deieci**
> (49) Cic. *Scaur.* frg. (f) non enim tantum **admiratus sum ego** illum uirum, sicut omnes, sed etiam praecipue **dilexi**

---

[8] There are 20+ examples of *ego* placed immediately behind a first-person verb in Cicero, and 30+ examples of *tu* after a second-person verb. The structure is not particularly common, but it was clearly available as a functional form of placement. Many of the examples of both *ego* and *tu* so placed fit the pattern discussed here (e.g. in (48)–(50)), but the use of *tu* in particular in a comprehensive account of pronoun placement would require a detailed treatment.

(50)   Cic. *Verr.* 1.124 **das** possessionem ei qui non iurauit; concedo;
praetorium est. **adimis tu** ei qui iurauit.

In (48) the argument turns on the question whether Caecina was
'ejected' (*deicere*) from a farm, or excluded, i.e. prevented from entering
it. Here Cicero's opponent is imagined as making the defence 'I *rejected*
you, I did not *eject* you'. There is an explicit antithesis between the two
verbs, or rather between their two prefixes, as Cicero in effect goes on to
observe: 'ut tantum facinus non in aequitate defensionis, sed *in una littera
latuisse* uideatur'. The structure is again 'A *non* B' (cf. (36)–(39)). Neither
ego nor *te* carries any discernible emphasis. The pronouns are, it is true,
in the familiar first-person/second-person pattern, but that is not sufficient
to cause *ego* to be used here; *te* is often subject of a first-person verb
without a juxtaposed *ego*.[9]

In (49) two verbs are again in antithesis, with the second a deliberate
intensification of the first. There is a secondary contrast between *ego* and
omnes, but the main focus lies undoubtedly on the two verbs. In (50) there
is contrast of complete opposites, with *tu* attached to the second of the
pair. The presence of *tu* here can only be explained as a manifestation of
a usage whereby a nominative pronoun follows an antithetical or focused
verb at the start of its clause, and thereby, one assumes, sharpens the
focused character of that verb, much as if the emphasizing particle *quidem*
had been tacked on instead. Even if one were to maintain that in, say,
(49), *ego* is required because of contextual factors other than its focusing
function, it would still have to be allowed that its position is significant,
behind a markedly antithetical term.[10] Regular positioning of this kind in

[9] In reference to the collocation *ego te* a referee comments: 'the very regular way in which
[*ego*] is followed (or embraced) by an accusative (phrase) might suggest that what comes
after [it] may be just as relevant as what comes before. And the same could be true of
datives too.' I have collected every example of first-person verbs in the first 20 letters to
Atticus (as published in Shackleton Bailey's edition) which are accompanied either by the
direct object *te* or the indirect object *tibi*. In 21 cases *ego is not expressed at all*. Four times
where *ego* (or *nos*) *is* expressed, it is separated from *te/tibi*. And only once is *ego* followed
immediately by the second-person pronoun (*tibi*). These figures do not support the possibility
that the use of *ego* could be determined by the presence of a second-person pronominal
object. Where *ego* and *te/tibi* occur in juxtaposition, it must be assumed that *ego* is indepen-
dently motivated. The figures given here from Cicero do not include those cases in which *te/
tibi* is in an embedded clause, and *ego* would have been in the matrix clause, had it been
expressed. If such cases had been included, the argument of this footnote would have
been further strengthened.

[10] Pinkster (1987) does not distinguish between those pronouns which precede the verb and
those which are placed after it. He quotes (1987: 372), for example, Petron. 74.15 'ego ...
accipere potui. *scis tu* me non mentiri', with the comment: 'Fortunata is called as a witness
for the truth of Trimalchio's statements: "others may not know this, but *you* know it damned
well".' But what is the significance of the placement of *tu*? It is at least as likely that the

passages in which *ego* might have been motivated as well by the context opened the way for the pronoun to be given a focusing role in its own right.

At Catull. 22.9 (cited above (1)) *tu* can without difficulty be interpreted as linked to a focused verb. In the previous lines (5–8) the splendid, even luxurious, *appearance* of Suffenus' book of poems is described. But, says Catullus, when you READ them, the truth is revealed.[11] The contrast between superficial appearances and reality is implicitly rather than starkly expressed as in some of the examples discussed earlier.

The focusing usage of *ego* can be clearly seen in Catull. 14.4:

> (51)   Catull. 14.4   nam quid **feci ego** quidue **sum locutus**,
>   cur me tot male perderes poetis?

'What have I *done* or what have I *said* that you should want to destroy me with so many poets?' Here there is a hackneyed antithesis between doing and saying, and *ego*, without real contrastive function itself, follows the first of the antithetical pair. For a comparable use of *ego*, cf.:

> (52)   Plaut. *Capt.* 414 **feci ego** ita ut commemoras, et te meminisse
>   id gratum est mihi

'I DID do as you say' (expressing agreement with the previous speaker).[12]

---

focus is on *scis*: 'you KNOW that I am telling the truth'. See Marouzeau (1907: 27) on the difference between *ego scio* and *scio ego* in comedy: e.g. Plaut. *Pers.* 616–7 'quanquam ego serua sum, / scio ego officium meum' ('although I am a slave, I am WELL AWARE of my duty'), alongside Ter. *Hec.* 849–50 'X. nescio. Y. at ego scio' ('I don't know.' 'But *I* do'). Note too Plaut. *Bacch.* 202 'uide quaeso ne quis tractet illam indiligens; / scis tu ut confringi uas cito Samium solet', 'you KNOW how readily Samian ware breaks'. Similarly I cannot accept that at Petron. 111.12 ('uis tu reuiuiscere? uis discusso muliebri errore ... lucis commodis frui') the emphasis is on *tu*, as in Pinkster's paraphrase (1987: 372), 'Do *you* want to begin life afresh? In that case the body itself ... of your dead husband ought to persuade you.' In fact *uis tu* is a well-established idiom, expressing a strong exhortation = 'WON'T you, CAN'T you', with the emphasis most definitely on the modal nuance of the verb, not on *tu*. Cf. Livy 25.6.22 'uis tu mari, uis terra, uis acie, uis urbibus oppugnandis experiri uirtutem?', Hor. *Sat.* 2.6.92 'uis tu homines urbemque feris praeponere siluis?', Sen. *Dial.* 10.19.2 'uis tu relicto solo mente ad ista respicere'. The idiom was explained, with numerous other examples, by Bentley (1711: 327 on Hor. *Sat.* 2.6.92): note his remark, 'In illis omnibus τὸ VIS non interrogantis modo est ut VIN; sed orantis, hortantis, flagitantis, iubentis'. The Livian example above is particularly telling, as the repetition of *uis* shows that it is this, not *tu*, which is emphatic.

[11] Roland Mayer draws my attention to Tac. *Dial.* 3.3 *leges tu*, where *tu* may have a similar function. It has caused editors some problems.

[12] Often in Plautus a verb preceding *ego* is emphatic (see e.g. the examples cited in n. 10, with Marouzeau (1907)), but his usage is somewhat variable, perhaps partly because of the pressures applied by the metrical form of the text. With (52), compare *Bacch.* 410 '**feci ego** istaec itidem in adulescentia', where it is *ego* which is strongly emphatic. For some factors favouring this placement of emphatic *ego*, see below (116)–(120).

Perhaps the most interesting example of *ego* in this function is at
Catull. 16.1, 14:

(53)   Catull. 16.1, 14 pedicabo **ego** uos et irrumabo.

The word order adopted by Catullus is not haphazard. The structure is of
a type which belonged to speech, but its determinants are complex. *Ego*,
as often, is juxtaposed with a second-person pronoun, but that is not the
main reason for its use. The utterance is a threat, and in threats, as we
saw ((4)–(6)), *ego* is constantly expressed. *Ego* may go to or towards the
start of the threatening utterance, but there can be no doubt that the real
weight of any future-tense threat lies on the verb itself, or in this case on
the pair of verbs, which are of increasing intensity. If translated into spoken
English the line will inevitably have a falling intonation on the verbs, a
sure sign of focus in the sense in which I use that term,[13] and there will
be little or no stress on the pronouns. Because of the inherently focused
character of threatening verbs, there is a tendency for the verb to be
placed at the head of the clause with *ego* following. The structure occurs
repeatedly in Plautus, and is also found in Terence:

(54)   a   Plaut. *Amph.* 295 timet homo: **deludam ego** illum
       b   Plaut. *Bacch.* 571   si pergis paruom mihi fidem arbitrarier,
                                  tollam ego ted in collum atque intro
                                  hinc auferam
       c   Plaut. *Bacch.* 766 **uorsabo ego** illunc hodie, si uiuo, probe
       d   Plaut. *Cist.* 367 **ludam ego** hunc
       e   Plaut. *Most.* 1168 **interimam hercle ego** <te> si uiuo
       f   Plaut. *Pseud.* 382 **exossabo ego** illum
       g   Ter. *Eun.* 803 **diminuam ego** caput tuum hodie, nisi abis.

The object of the verb is usually a pronoun, but it need not be second-
person. If the object pronoun is third- rather than first-person, then the
utterance is strictly a statement of intention rather than a threat, but
the intention is threatening. There is clearly a pattern of speech exemplified
here. It is moreover in contexts of this type that the focusing use of *ego*
might have developed. In this case *ego* is not motivated solely by its habit
of following an antithetical or focused verb. It has its own motivation, in
that a person making a threat may graphically refer to himself as the one
who will carry the action out. But *ego* tends, in its attempt to reach the
start of the utterance, to be blocked by the strong future-tense verb in
the focal initial position. The next stage in the development of *ego* might
have been the mechanical attachment of the pronoun to a focused term
at the head of a clause, even when it was not independently motivated.

---

[13] On 'focus', see Adams (1994*a*: 121; 1994*b*: 18–19).

The practice of Plautus (see further above, (4)–(6)) suggests that a person making such a threat had the choice of either placing the pronoun in initial (or peninitial) position, or of giving priority to the verb. If we leave aside the possible influence of metrical factors in Plautus, we might suggest that the pattern chosen would depend on the speaker's subjective judgement whether in a particular context the focus of the threat should be placed on his personal participation in the act, or on the nature of the act itself.

IV. CATULLUS: (CONNECTIVE) RELATIVE + *EGO/TU*

It was seen earlier that a common pattern in prose is relative (including the connective use) + *ego/tu*, with the relative often separated from an associated term. The use of the pronoun may again originally have been inspired by its own emphasis or by the subjective nature of the verb, but it was suggested that the pattern became a mechanical one, with the preferential term itself causing the pronoun to be expressed. I begin with Catull. 23.22:

> (55)   Catull. 23.21–3   atque id durius est faba et lapillis;
> **quod tu si** manibus teras fricesque,
> **non umquam** digitum inquinare posses.

Kroll (1922: 45) correctly describes *tu* as unemphatic, and he adds a cross-reference to his note on 6.14, where another instance of unemphatic *tu*, as we saw (see p. 98), is accounted for as a colloquialism. That is far from satisfactory as an explanation of the use of the pronoun. Fordyce's note (1961: 154) is equally uninformative: 'for the rare addition of the unemphatic pronoun to a subjunctive of the indefinite second person, cf. . . .'. But *tu* is not an addition to *teras*; it is rather an attachment to the relative *quod*. Not only that, but there are structural parallels between this sentence and various sentences in Cicero. Note first (56):

> (56)   Cic. *Rab. perd.* 25 **quod tu si** audisses aut si per aetatem scire potuisses, **numquam** profecto istam imaginem . . . in rostra atque in contionem attulisses.

The connective relative has attracted *tu*, which in this context may be loosely contrastive, and there is then a conditional clause (with *si* following *tu* as in Catullus), followed by a main clause introduced by *numquam*, which may be compared with Catullus' *non umquam*. Catullus' use of *tu* reflects a mechanical attachment of *tu* to the connective relative originating

from structures of the type seen in (56), where *tu* is perhaps independently motivated.

Similar again is (57), where again a *si*-clause follows connective relative + *tu*:

> (57)   Cic. *Q. Rosc.* 42 **quem tu si** ex censu spectas, eques Romanus est, si ex uita, homò clarissimus est, si ex fide, iudicem sumpsisti, si ex ueritate, id quod scire potuit et debuit dixit.

Here *tu* seems to be without emphasis: the emphasis lies on a series of contrasted terms which follow (*ex censu*, *ex uita*, etc.), and partly also on *quem*, in that various persons are contrasted in the passage. *Quod tu si* is found nowhere in Augustan poetry; Ovid, *Am.* 2.14.20 is not structurally parallel.

Another 'unemphatic' instance of *tu* in Catullus (as noted by Kroll (1922: 30)) is in (58):

> (58)   Catull. 13.13   **quod tu cum** olfacies, deos rogabis, totum ut te faciant, Fabulle, nasum.

For the structure here, cf. the following Ciceronian example:

> (59)   Cic. *Flacc.* 51 **quem tu cum** ephebum Temni cognosses, ... semper nudum esse uoluisti.

With the examples of *tu* from Catullus quoted so far in this section also belong those at 15.11 and 30.5.

I move on to a different pattern in Catullus, but one which again displays *ego* linked to a connective relative. It was noted earlier that in Cicero *ego* so placed may separate the relative from an associated term. This pattern is found in (60):

> (60)   Catull. 66.37   **quis** ego **pro factis** caelesti reddita coetu pristina uota nouo munere dissoluo.

The preposition on which *quis factis* depends (*pro*) follows *ego*. For this structure in Cicero, see (61):

> (61)   a *Verr.* 1.103 **quibus** ego **in** rebus
>   b *Verr.* 5.72 **quorum** ego **de** acerbissima morte
>   c *Cluent.* 106 **quorum** ego **de** sententia
>   d *Sull.* 62 **cuius** ego **de** uirtute
>   e *Dom.* 144 **quorum** ego **a** templis
>   f *Har. resp.* 2 **cuius** ego **de** ecfrenato ... furore.

I note in passing that *ego* in (61a) is undoubtedly emphatic. It must be stressed again that *ego* (or *tu*) in the structures which I am identifying is not necessarily unemphatic. I am suggesting rather that its original motiv-

ation was the carrying of some sort of emphasis or pragmatic function, and that it then became formulaic in certain structures, its emphasis no longer a necessary determinant of its use.

Also of note is the disjunction in the following example:

(62) Catull. 68.25 **cuius** ego **interitu** tota de mente fugaui / haec studia.

Here a genitive form of the relative is separated from the noun on which it depends, as in some of the Ciceronian examples in (61), and those in (63):

(63) a *Cluent.* 194 **cuius** ego **furorem**
b *Cael.* 14 **cuius** ego **facinora**
c *Red. Sen.* 20 **cuius** ego **clientibus.**

Cuius ego is not found in elegy, Horace or Virgil, but note the following examples:

(64) Plaut. *Amph.* 141 **quoiius** ego fero **hanc imaginem**
(65) Lucr. 5.55 **cuius** ego ingressus **uestigia.**

The patterns discussed in this section cannot be dismissed as colloquial, even in those cases where *ego* and *tu* are manifestly unemphatic. Moreover the parallelism between Catullus and Cicero sometimes goes beyond the mere attachment of *ego/tu* to a (connective) relative; there is sometimes a more extensive structural similarity. Catullus has employed in verse some structures of speech.

I discuss in the next section the attachment of *ego/tu* to the demonstrative *hic*, particularly in the pattern *hunc ego hominem.*

V. CATULLUS: DEMONSTRATIVE + *EGO/TU*

In (66) *haec* is separated from *commoda* by *tu*, and again *tu* is noted by Kroll (1922: 45 on line 22) as unemphatic:

(66) Catull. 23.24 **haec** tu **commoda** tam beata, Furi, / noli *spernere.*

Haec tu commoda tam beata is followed by a vocative, a structure which can be seen in Cicero in the examples at (67):

(67) a *Phil.* 8.28 **haec** tu **mandata**, L. Piso, et tu, L. Philippe . . .
b *Mur.* 34 **hunc** tu **hostem**, Cato, *contemnis*
c *Verr.* 3.97 **hunc** tu in hac causa **testem**, Verres, habebis.

Catullus has again fallen into a pattern of wording which is rooted in the spoken language. Note also the similarity of the verb phrase in (66) with

that in Cicero in (67b). In (67a) *tu* is contrastive, but it has lost that function in (66).

A clear-cut instance of a demonstrative, which is focused (antithetical), separated from the word in agreement is found in (68), where *haec (singula)* is antithetical with *(totum) illud*:

> (68) Catull. 86.2   **haec** ego sic **singula** *confiteor.*
>   totum illud 'formosa' nego.

Compare the contrastive use of *hunc (ego)* in Cicero in (16). In (68) *ego* is unemphatic. In the previous line Catullus contrasts himself with others *(multis/mihi)*, but in line 2 *ego* is no longer antithetical. (68) might be compared with the Plautine passage (69), which contains the same verb:

> (69) Plaut. *Capt.* 296 **haec** tu **eadem** si *confiteri* uis.

In (69), however, *tu* is contrastive. I stress again the fact that *ego* and *tu* recur in our various patterns whether or not they are themselves 'emphatic'.

I quote in (70)–(71) two further examples from Catullus where the nominative pronoun, apparently unemphatic, hangs on the demonstrative, which in these cases is not separated from a noun:

> (70) Catull. 56.6   deprendi modo pupulum puellae
>   trusantem; **hunc ego**, si placet Dionae,
>   protelo rigida mea cecidi
> (71) Catull. 24.9 **hoc tu** quam lubet abice.

Note the position of the *si*-clause in (70). A clause is often inserted after an enclitic, thereby isolating the emphatic host term (in this case *hunc*) and its dependent enclitic.[14] For *hunc ego* in a similar context in Plautus (where a form of punishment is at issue), note:

> (72) Plaut. *Pseud.* 447   hic mihi corrumpit filium, scelerum caput;
>   hic dux, hic illist paedagogus, **hunc ego**
>   cupio excruciari.

The combining of the demonstrative *hic* with *ego* or *tu* is common in elegy and Augustan poetry in general, but there are some subtle differences between the way in which Catullus uses the pattern and the way it is used by other poets, particularly Ovid. Catullan usage is directly relatable to that of Cicero. I return to Augustan poetry later.

---

[14] See Adams (1994*b*: 37 on (190)).

VI. CATULLUS: INTERROGATIVES + *EGO/TU*

It was pointed out earlier (see (21)–(27)) that interrogatives, particularly *quis*, often have *ego* or *tu* following. In this section I concentrate by way of illustration on just one interrogative, the old instrumental *qui*, which often means 'how?'. In (73) Catullus uses *qui* with *tu* following:

> (73)   Catull. 67.37 qui tu **istaec**, ianua, nosti . . .?

The emphasis probably lies on *tu*, but perhaps on *istaec* as well. *Qui ego* and *qui tu* are particularly common in comedy. They presumably lingered on in speech, their fading currency in the literary language determined not by the disappearance of *ego/tu* from questions, but by the obsolescence of instrumental *qui*. But the instrumental use of *qui* lasted somewhat longer in the colloquial language than in literature, as a recent attestation in a letter at Vindolanda shows (*Tab. Vind.* II.234). In this case Catullus' usage can with justification be classified as colloquial.

Various observations may be made about (73). First, *qui tu* is followed by the demonstrative form *istaec*, with its deictic particle -*ce*. For *qui ego* in Plautus followed by the same demonstrative term, note the following:

> (74)   a   Plaut. *Men.* 786 qui ego **istuc**, mi pater, cauere possum?
> b   Plaut. *Merc.* 627 qui ego **istuc** credam tibi?

There is a distinct possibility that the whole sequence *qui ego/tu istuc/istaec* was a formulaic way of opening a question in colloquial speech. The augmented demonstratives *illic/istic* had a colloquial character. *Ego* is often associated with *istic* in Plautus, and not only in the structure which we see here:

> (75)   a   Plaut. *Amph.* 925 **ego istaec** feci uerba
> b   Plaut. *Men.* 265 **ego istuc** cauebo
> c   Plaut. *Merc.* 477 omnia **ego istaec** auscultaui.

Secondly, *istaec* in (73) is followed by a vocative. For the identical structure in Plautus, see (74a).

Thirdly, the verb in Catullus is a verb of knowing. Again the idiom can be paralleled in Plautus:

> (76)   a   Plaut. *Capt.* 629 qui tu **scis**?
> b   Plaut. *Pers.* 716 qui ego nunc **scio** . . .?

It should now be clear that Mynors's text (1958) of Catull. 67.37 ((73) above) is incorrect: 'quid? tu istaec, ianua . . .' (*quid* V: *qui* Aldina).

In this section we have identified in Catullus a highly stereotyped pattern of phraseology, a pattern which can be paralleled in this case in

Plautus rather than in Cicero. As such it probably belonged to that col-
loquial register which is extensively represented in Latin comedy, but
which leaves its mark in Catullus as well. This is not the only structural
parallel that we have found between Plautus and Catullus; there was also
the form of the threat *pedicabo ego uos*.

This is not the only example in Catullus, as we will see in the next
section, of a nominative pronoun associated with an interrogative. I refer
finally in this section to (77), which has a formulaic structure already noted
in (22):

> (77)   Catull. 64.164 sed **quid ego** ignaris nequiquam **conquerar**
>   auris?

(77) should be compared with the Ciceronian example (78), where the
verb is much the same:

> (78)   *Cic. Imp. Pomp.* 33 nam **quid ego** Ostiense incommodum atque
>   illam labem atque ignominiam rei publicae **querar**?

Nam quid ego in (78) is, like *sed quid ego*, a formulaic opening. For *nam
quid ego*, see:

> (79)   a   Plaut. *Amph.* 41 **nam quid ego** memorem . . .
>   b   Cic. *Verr.* 1.129 **nam quid ego** de cotidiano sermone
>   querimoniaque populi Romani loquar?

VII. CATULLUS: *QUIN + EGO/TU*

I next consider another type of expression showing nominative pronouns
in association with an interrogative. *Quin* is the negated form of the
instrumental *qui*, and it too may be followed by *ego/tu*.

In the self-address in Catullus 76 *tu* is unemphatic, as Kroll (1922: 14)
noted (on 6.14):

> (80)   Catull. 76.11 **quin tu** animo offirmas atque istinc teque reducis?

Tu is metrically unnecessary, and indeed is omitted by Ovid in his imitation
of the line:

> (81)   Ovid *Met.* 9.745 **quin** animum firmas teque ipsa recolligis . . .?

Quin tu undoubtedly belonged to speech. It occurs 70 times in Plautus:
e.g.

> (82)   a   *Asin.* 659 **quin tu** labore liberas te . . .?
>   b   *Curc.* 240 **quin tu** aliquot dies / perdura
>   c   *Merc.* 942 **quin tu** istas omittis nugas . . .?

In this case the expression was admitted also by Cicero (8 times, scattered across all genres).[15] Its rather stereotyped character may be illustrated by (83a) alongside (83b):

> (83) a Plaut. *Curc.* 611 **quin tu is** in malam crucem . . .?
> b Cic. *Phil.* 13.48 **quin tu abis** in malam pestem malumque cruciatum?

Note *is/abis* immediately after *tu*, and then the prepositional expression. There is only one example of *quin tu* in Augustan poetry:

> (84) Virg. *Ecl.* 2.71 **quin tu** aliquid saltem potius, quorum indiget usus,
> uiminibus mollique paras detexere iunco?

It may have been obsolete by the first century AD. It is not found in Petronius or Martial, and there is only one example in Apuleius (*Apol.* 79).

VIII. CATULLUS: *NUMQUAM* + *EGO*

Negatives, as noted earlier (see (31)–(33)), are often placed at the head of their clause in Latin. Sometimes the negative seems to cause *ego* or *tu* to be expressed after it; that is, an unemphatic, redundant nominative pronoun follows the negative almost as a focusing particle.

At Catull. 65.10 *numquam* is loosely antithetical with *semper* in the next clause. Two clitics (*ego, te*) follow *numquam*, but only *te* is necessary to the sense:

> (85) Catull. 65.10 **numquam ego** te, uita frater amabilior,
> aspiciam posthac? at certe semper amabo.

For *numquam ego*, see above (31).[16]

The combination *numquam ego* is not found in Propertius, Horace, Tibullus or Virgil. There is one example in Ovid:

> (86) Ovid, *AA* 3.519 **numquam ego** te, Andromache, . . . rogarem.

---

[15] *Rosc. Com.* 25, *Sull.* 25, *Pis.* 61, *Phil.* 13.48, *Rep.* 1.61, 6.14, *Fam.* 7.8.2, *Att.* 4.19.1.
[16] Cf. e.g. Plaut. *Cist.* 44, 53, *Mil.* 1202, *Most.* 214, Cic. *Cat.* 2.15, *Pis.* 99, *Lael.* 18. Note too Petron. 134.9 '**numquam tu** hominem tam infelicem uidisti' (quoted by Pinkster (1987: 372)) with the comment 'the personal experience of Oenothea is compared with the dreadful reality'). But it is *numquam* which is emphatic.

IX. CATULLUS: SOME CONCLUSIONS

Some uses of *ego* and *tu* in Catullus can be readily related to uses of nominative pronouns on the one hand in Plautus and on the other in Cicero. Sometimes the pronoun might be classed as 'emphatic' by a speaker of a modern language, sometimes as 'unemphatic', and I have referred to the views of Kroll and Fordyce on individual cases. But Kroll and Fordyce considered *ego* and *tu* in isolation, without reference to the preferential terms, which, in the data considered here, commonly preceded them. These preferential terms are one of the determinants of the use of *ego* and *tu*. Those examples of *ego* and *tu* which, while following preferential terms, themselves appear to be 'emphatic', might partly at least have been motivated by their own emphatic potential. But pronouns which do *not* seem to be emphatic might have been determined by the formulaic place which they had acquired in attachment to certain preferential terms.

It is a mistake, with Kroll, to classify allegedly 'unemphatic' nominative pronouns as colloquial, because equally 'unemphatic' pronouns can be found readily in Cicero following the same categories of preferential terms. I have been able to identify certain colloquialisms in Catullus (the structure of *pedicabo ego uos*, *qui + ego/tu*), but not on the grounds that the pronoun in question was unemphatic. Certain collocations of words or structural patterns in which a nominative pronoun is embedded can be paralleled in Plautus but not Cicero, and these probably belonged to the colloquial registers of the language. Other patterns on the other hand *can* be paralleled in Cicero (or in Cicero as well as Plautus), and these may reflect the spoken language in a wider sense. The patterns of speech, both colloquial and more formal, are definitely to be detected in Catullus.

The question arises to what extent these speech patterns are found in elegy and other Augustan poetry. I make no attempt here to go through all of the categories of uses of *ego* and *tu* discussed earlier. I restrict myself to two phenomena (*a*) the attachment of *ego* to a focused verb, and (*b*) patterns showing *ego/tu* after the demonstrative *hic*.

X. AUGUSTAN POETRY: VERBS + *EGO*

The only Augustan poet who falls into line, up to a point, with Catullus and Cicero in the attachment of *ego* to verbs is Propertius. On the one hand Propertius sometimes makes what might be called a debased use of the pattern, in that *ego* may follow a verb which is not focused or emphatic or at the head of its clause. On the other hand there is an element of the mundane about Propertius' exploitation of the pattern. *Ego* tends to follow

verbs with which it is associated also in prose and earlier Latin, particularly certain subjective or modal verbs, and verbs in the future tense. There are 23 cases of verbs followed by *ego* in Propertius,[17] of which I discuss a selection.

I begin with (87):

> (87) Prop. 2.25.36 at si saecla forent antiquis grata puellis,
> essem ego quod nunc tu: tempore **uincor ego**.

Ego early in the line is obviously contrastive with *tu* (on the structure, see below (116)–(117)). I have stressed throughout that, while *ego* may be unemphatic in this position and tacked on to a verb merely as a means of focusing the verb, there is no theoretical reason why it should not acquire from the context its full contrastive function. In the second half of the line in (87) *ego* is 'given' in the context, and not conspicuously emphatic. The focus would seem to be on *tempore* rather than *uincor*. *Ego* is displaced by the norms of prose, in that it does not follow a term which is either focal or in initial position, but is mechanically positioned after a verb which is in second position in the colon. This example seems to represent a loosening of the connection between speech patterns and poetic discourse which we were able to demonstrate for Catullus.

But this example must be contrasted with (88):

> (88) Prop. 2.8.5 **possum ego** in alterius positam spectare lacerto?

Possum ego begins a question, the expected answer to which is 'no'. I would interpret the force as 'how CAN I look at her in another's arms', or 'CAN I look at her', but certainly not 'can *I* look at her . . .'. (89) is similar:

> (89) Prop. 2.20.28 cum te tam multi peterent, tu me una petisti:
> **possum ego** naturae non meminisse tuae?

'How CAN I not remember your (kind) nature? [It is impossible].'

It is metrically convenient to have a disyllabic word (ending in *-m* or *-o*) at the start of a line followed by *ego*. But the collocation is no mere metrical convenience. It is good idiomatic Latin for *possum* when focused to be followed by unemphatic *ego*. The pattern is found in Cicero. Note e.g. (90), where Cicero deals with a problem of translation:

> (90) Cic. *Fin.* 3.35 quas Graeci πάθη appellant — **poteram ego**
> uerbum ipsum interpretans morbos appellare, sed non
> conueniret ad omnia

---

[17] 1.10.15, 1.12.11, 1.13.14–15 (twice), 2.8.5, 2.18b.37, 2.20.28, 2.24c.41, 2.24c.42, 2.25.36 (twice), 2.28.44, 3.8.27, 3.17.21, 3.21.24, 3.25.7, 4.2.53, 4.5.61, 4.5.67, 4.7.36, 4.7.51, 4.7.70, 4.8.81.

'I COULD [translating literally] have called them *morbi*, but that term would not be suitable.' The contrast is between what is possible, and what is appropriate, with the nuance 'possibility' rather than the person of the subject focused. Cicero uses another tense of *possum* with *ego* in (91):

> (91) Cic. *Verr.* 5.179 **potero** silere . . . **potero** dissimulare . . . **potero ego** hoc onus tantum aut in hoc iudicio deponere aut tacitus sustinere?

Potero is used three times. There must be an emphasis of sorts on the series of infinitives dependent on *potero*, but above all Cicero is stressing the *impossibility* of silence, etc. The force of the rhetoric might best be rendered into English: 'how CAN I be silent, etc.', or, in the third clause, 'will it be POSSIBLE for me either to lay aside this responsibility, or to support it while saying nothing?'

Example (92) is again a question, with the same answer implied as in (88), (89) and (91):

> (92) Cic. *Red. sen.* 29 **possum ego** satis in Cn. Pompeium umquam gratus uideri?

It is comparable in all respects to the Propertian examples (88) and (89). Propertius then has used an established idiom which happens to fit well into the first foot of the line.[18]

Possum ego also begins a line in (93):

> (93) Prop. 1.10.15 **possum ego** diuersos iterum coniungere amantes
> 　　　　　　　　　　et dominae tardas **possum** aperire fores;
> 　　　　　　　　　et **possum** alterius curas sanare recentis.

The presence of *ego* is not required by the metre, though it does produce a dactyl at the start of the line. There is a rhetorically insistent repetition of *possum*, which arguably might have been sufficient motivation for the use of *ego*. In this case though there is a personal claim carried by *ego*, which has a certain emphasis. It might have been expected to precede *possum*, but metrical convenience has triumphed over pragmatically determined word order.

Note finally (94):

> (94) Tib. 1.6.70   laudare nec ullam
> 　　　　　　　　**possim ego**, quin oculos appetat illa meos.

Tibullus places *ego* after a verb only twice, and in this case we seem to have a mechanical, metrically convenient placement which cannot be

---

[18] For *possum* + *ego*, cf. also Pacuvius 236, Ter. *Eun.* 712.

attributed to the emphasis of *possim*. The emphasis seems to lie on *ullam* or *laudare*.

Credo ego, I pointed out earlier, was a collocation found in Plautus (cf. *Cas.* 234, *Epid.* 535) and sometimes in oratory. It may have been a hackneyed sentence or speech opening.[19] It never occurs in Virgil, Horace, Ovid or Tibullus, but note first the following Propertian passage:

> (95) Prop. 2.24c.41–2 **credo ego** non paucos ista periisse figura,
> **credo ego** sed multos non habuisse fidem.

This order seems to be adopted when a firm opinion is expressed, without any contrastive emphasis on the pronoun:[20] 'I am SURE that, I IMAGINE that, I TRUST that'. In (96) the emphasis is clearly on *credam*:

> (96) Prop. 2.18b.37 **credam ego** narranti, noli committere, famae •

— 'I will *believe* rumour'. Again Propertius has used an established idiom with its expected implication.

Another subjective verb which not unexpectedly sometimes has *ego* as its subject is *odi*. Propertius has the expression *odi ego* in (97) in a context in which *odi* is obviously the focus, though *ego* may be independently motivated:

> (97) Prop. 3.8.27 **odi ego** quos nunquam pungunt suspiria somnos:
> semper in irata pallidus esse uelim

'I HATE sleep which sighs never punctuate. I would always prefer to be pale in the presence of an angry woman.'

Again the expression may have been a commonplace one. Note (98):

> (98) Plaut. *Capt.*325 **non ego** omnino lucrum omne esse utile
> homini existumo:
> **scio ego**, multos iam lucrum lutulentos
> homines reddidit;
> est etiam ubi profecto damnum praestet
> facere quam lucrum.
> **odi ego** aurum.

I have quoted the passage at length because it illustrates particularly well the function of *ego* which I have been discussing. The three verbs *existumo*, *scio* and *odi* are all verbs of the type which I have called 'subjective'. If the presence of *ego* is in part determined by that feature, it is nevertheless true that it is attached in each of the three lines to a focused preferential

---

[19] It may be significant that Cicero employed the collocation in one of his earliest speeches, and never thereafter; it is possible that it had become banal in oratory. See further Landgraf (1914: 14) ad loc.

[20] Cf. Marouzeau (1907: 28).

term: 'I do NOT think . . .', 'I am WELL AWARE', 'I HATE gold'. *Odi ego* is also found in Pacuvius:

> (99)   Pacuvius 348 **odi ego** homines ignaua opera et philosopha
>   sententia.

Verbs of asserting or revealing often have *ego* as subject, in Propertius and in the language in general. I offer a few observations on the motivation of the pronoun before turning to Propertius.

The legal formula quoted by Gaius (100) displays the formulaic *hunc ego hominem*, but *ego* is not determined only by its place in the collocation of words:

> (100)   Gaius *Inst.* 4.16 **hunc** ego **hominem** ex iure Quiritium meum
>   esse **aio**.

A strong assertion may reflect the personal conviction of the speaker, or an undertaking to which he is personally willing to be held, or new information which he is prepared to stand by, or is claiming as his own, etc. The marked personal commitment to the assertion inspires the use of *ego*. This can be seen from an example such as (101), where the speaker's claim is underlined by his invocation of the gods.

> (101)   Plaut. *Men.* 990 per **ego** uobis deos atque homines **dico**.

To describe a pattern such as this as manifesting 'Wackernagel's law' would be to miss the point entirely. *Ego* is not unemphatic, as second-position pronouns are supposed to be according to the conventional understanding of Wackernagel's law. It is not in second position *qua* second position, but has rather been blocked from *first* position by *per*, which in such old formulae began its clause for some reason. If a writer chooses not to give *per* the initial position, then that place is freed for *ego*: e.g.

> (102)   Plaut. *Amph.* 436 at ego per Mercurium iuro tibi . . . .

If there is no preferential term to debar it from first position, *ego*, as subject of a verb of asserting *sim.*, often begins its clause:

> (103)   Ter. *Andr.* 375 X. quor simulat? Y. **ego dicam** tibi
> (104)   Ter. *Phorm.* 837 **ego** me ire senibus Sunium / **dicam** ad
>   mercatum.

A future-tense form, expressing intent, may act as an additional trigger to the use of the pronoun here.

But in an assertion or revelation containing *ego* the focus may readily be interpreted as being on the verb, and such an interpretation may entail

initial placement of the verb. Thus (105) and (106), in both of which the verb expresses a revelation ('I TELL you', 'I shall TELL you'):

> (105) Plaut. *Epid.* 668 **dico ego** tibi iam, ut scias
> (106) Mart. 10.41.4 quid, rogo, quid factum est? subiti quae causa doloris?
> nil mihi respondes? **dicam ego**, praetor erat.

Into this class falls the following Propertian example:

> (107) Prop. 3.17.21 **dicam ego** maternos Aetnaeo fulmine partus.

In this case the revelation is to take the form of poetic composition, but this is merely a contextually determined nuance. *Ego* is as often metrically unnecessary. Another verb of asserting in initial position is at (108):

> (108) Prop. 4.7.51 **iuro ego** Fatorum nulli reuolubile carmen / . . . si fallo

'I SWEAR by the song of the Fates which cannot be unravelled by anyone (that I was loyal) . . . If I LIE . . .' There is a contrast between asserting the truth on oath, and lying, and *iuro* is accordingly emphatic.

Not unlike (107) is a case of *scribam*:

> (109) Prop. 2.28.44   pro quibus optatis sacro me carmine damno:
> **scribam ego** 'per magnum est salua puella
> Iouem'.

In return for the survival of Cynthia Propertius undertakes to Jupiter to write a poem.

Another hackneyed collocation is *uidi ego*.[21] The fairly frequent use of *ego* as subject of *uidi*, whether placed before or after the verb, no doubt derives in part from the speaker's/writer's desire to stress that his own personal observation was involved. Sometimes indeed the appeal to the evidence of one's own senses is made even more explicit, as e.g. in (110), where the *-met* form of the pronoun occurs:

> (110) a Ter. *Ad.* 329 **hisce oculis** egomet uidi
> b Hor. *Sat.* 1.8.23 uidi egomet.

The order *uidi ego* originally must have conveyed a particular nuance, e.g. 'I DID see', 'such and such did not go UNNOTICED', as in (111):

> (111) Cic. *Planc.* 76 et mihi lacrimulam Cispiani iudici obiectas. sic enim dixisti: '**uidi ego** tuam lacrimulam'

---

[21] For *uideo* (*uidi* etc.) + *ego* (or *tu*), see e.g. Plaut. *Cas.* 349, Accius 647, Titinius 18, Ter. *Heaut.* 563, Cic. *Sull.* 41, *Flacc.* 53, *Fam.* 1.9.22, Livy 1.39.3, 6.29.1, 7.34.4 etc.

'I SAW your little tear, it did not ESCAPE me.'[22] This same type of nuance is readily identifiable in Propertius:

> (112)   Prop. 1.13.13–15   haec non <sum>[23] rumore malo, non
> augure doctus;
> **uidi ego**: me quaeso teste negare potes?
> **uidi ego** te toto uinctum languescere collo.

There is a contrast, the force of which is roughly: 'I did not HEAR about these things, for example from rumour: I SAW them. I SAW you in his embrace.'

But *uidi ego* seems to have become a banal expression, particularly in poetry, the force of which in any context may be difficult to discern. There are some problematical examples of the phrase in Propertius (4.2.53, 4.5.61, 4.5.67), and numerous ones in Ovid (see below).

Very similar to *uidi ego* (and particularly the example in Cicero at (111)) is the expression *sensi ego* in the following passage:

> (113)   Prop. 4.7.36 **sensi ego**, cum insidiis pallida uina bibi.

Cynthia's ghost is the speaker. When she drank the poisoned wine, it did not escape her notice: 'I NOTICED, I was well AWARE, when I drank the poison.' The emphasis clearly lies on *sensi*,[24] though since the verb is one of perception, the pronoun may also have a secondary justification.

I draw attention to one further example of a focused initial verb in Propertius:

> (114)   Prop. 3.21.24 **scandam ego** Theseae bracchia longa uiae.

Propertius is announcing a plan to go abroad to Athens. Various stages of the journey and its culmination are set out. *Scandam* expresses one of these, and is loosely focused as expressing an intention.

I have not considered all the evidence from Propertius, but it should be clear that the functional postponement of *ego* is fairly common in his work, that his use of the pronoun can be paralleled both in Catullus and Cicero, and that he has a habit of using *ego* in hackneyed collocations. Notable among these is *credo ego*, an expression which Cicero used in the *Pro Roscio Amerino*, but thereafter apparently rejected. We have also seen in Propertius a case of mechanical placement of *ego* behind a verb

---

[22] See Marouzeau (1907: 29) on Plaut. *Cas.* 349. Note also Cic. *Sull.* 41 '**uidi ego** hoc, iudices, nisi . . . testatus essem, fore ut . . .', 'I REALIZED, gentlemen . . .'. Here the emphasis is on the fact of the realization, not on the person who made that realization.

[23] So Rossberg (*non* N: [*ego*] *non* A).

[24] Cf. Plaut. *Pers.* 534 and Marouzeau (1907: 29).

(87) in a context in which the order is difficult to explain as functional. What I have called the 'debased' use of *ego* is also found in Tibullus (94).

I turn now to other Augustan poets. *Ego* never follows a verb in Virgil.[25] In Tibullus and the *corpus Tibullianum* there are just two examples, one of which has been seen (94). Note also (115), where *ego* is contrastive (with *alias*):

> (115)   [Tib.] 4.5.5 uror ego ante alias.

Ego can have contrastive emphasis in this position in classical prose (see also above, n. 12), but it is relatively rare. Consider (116):

> (116)   Cic. *Sen.* 68 sensi **ego** in optimo filio, **tu** in exspectatis ad amplissimam dignitatem fratribus, Scipio, mortem omni aetati esse communem.

A double antithesis is developed here after the verb, between *ego* and *tu* on the one hand, and two prepositional expressions on the other. *Ego*, placed after the verb, may be the marked focus if a contrast is expressed with another pronoun. A pattern of this type seems to have been favoured if both pronouns were subject of the same verb. Cf.:

> (117)   Prop. 2.35.36 **essem ego** quod nunc **tu** (= (87) above).

Here a determinant of the initial placement of *essem* may have been the mood of the verb.[26]

Slightly different again is the following:

> (118)   Cic. *S. Rosc.* 60 adsedit; surrexi **ego**.

Surrexi stands in a contrast of opposites (with *adsedit*). But there is a secondary contrast, between the first- and second-person subjects of the two verbs, with *ego* marking the change of subject.[27] A verb participating in such an antithesis may be followed by a pronoun which itself is contrastive. Cf.:

> (119)   Cic. *Verr.* 5.121 **laetaris** *tu* in *omnium* **gemitu**.

Laetaris is in contrast with *gemitu*, and *tu* with *omnium*. Similar to (118) is the following Propertian example:

> (120)   Prop. 4.8.81 indixit legem: respondi **ego** 'legibus utar'.

---

[25] It is a curiosity, as Professor Powell points out to me, that Virgil happily places *equidem* after a verb, but not *ego* (e.g. *Aen.* 4.12 *credo equidem*; cf. 2.704, 3.315, 4.382 etc.). Collocations of the type *credo ego* may have had some sort of nuance (such as a banal oratorical flavour) which made them less than acceptable in high epic.

[26] See Adams (1994b: 60 (on (295)), 76).

[27] Change of 'Topic', in the terminology of Pinkster (1987: 369).

Respondi contrasts with *indixit*, and *ego* with the subject of *indixit*.

In Horace there are six examples of verb + *ego*:

(121) a *Sat.* 2.1.74 quidquid **sum ego** quamuis / infra Lucili censum ingeniumque

b *Sat.* 2.3.235 ut aprum / **cenem ego**? **tu** piscis hiberno ex aequore uerris, / segnis **ego**

c *Sat.* 2.7.80 nam / siue uicarius est qui seruo paret, uti mos / uester ait, seu conseruus, **tibi** quid **sum ego**?

d *Epist.* 1.16.32 nempe / uir bonus et prudens dici **delector ego ac tu**

e *Epist.* 1.17.19 **scurror ego** ipse mihi, populo **tu**

f *Odes* 3.5.21 arma . . . / derepta **uidi; uidi ego** ciuium / retorta tergo bracchia libero.

Five of these are in the *Satires* and *Epistles* and only one in the *Odes*, but, contrary to what one might be tempted to conclude, this distribution cannot be used to argue that in the *Satires* and *Epistles*, but not the *Odes*, Horace was influenced by the usage of speech. In all five cases *ego* is itself contrastive, usually with *tu*. A use of *ego* which in prose in this position was rare, has become the norm in Horace; examples *d* and *e* are of the pattern seen in (116) and (117). *Vidi ego* (*f*) is, as we saw, a hackneyed collocation, and it is in the *Odes*.

I turn finally to Ovid. There are just 24 examples of the phenomenon in the whole of Ovid's work, scattered across the various genres, and 13 of these consist of the expression *uidi ego*.[28] It does not seem meaningful to attempt to analyse *uidi ego* in Ovid in terms of focus; it is a metrically useful line opening. Given that there are so few examples (11) outside this formula,[29] it is obvious that Ovid has not exploited our enclitic pattern. Moreover it is not certain in any of these 11 examples that the verb is focused. In (122), for example, both *quartus* and *ego* are in antitheses with earlier terms:

(122) Ovid *Her.* 16.330 quartus in exemplis **adnumerabor ego.**

Ego can usually be interpreted as emphatic in some sense in the other cases.

In Catullus' insubstantial corpus *ego* and *tu* do not often follow a verb, but when this placement does occur it is functional in the manner of prose and comedy. No poet of the Augustan period so faithfully represents this spoken usage. In Horace and Ovid *ego* tends to be emphatic when it

[28] *Am.* 1.2.11, 2.2.47, 2.12.25, 3.4.13, *AA* 3.487, *RA* 101, *Met.* 12.327, 15.262, *Trist.* 2.143, 3.4.37, 3.5.11, 5.8.11, *Pont.* 1.1.51.
[29] *Am.* 2.8.13, *Trist.* 3.11.25, *Her.* 3.90, 7.82, 16.330, 17.50, 17.122, 18.117, 21.54, *Met.* 2.570, 7.38.

comes after the verb. In Propertius and Tibullus we have what I describe as a debased postpositive use of *ego*. Propertius, however, admits a number of banal collocations verb + *ego*, and it is Propertius in this respect who is closest to Catullus.

XI. SOME DISJUNCTIONS

We saw in Section II some disjunctions, whereby a connective relative or *hic* was separated from a noun by *ego*, and such patterns were illustrated in Catullus. In the Catullan examples, with the minor exception of (123), the pronoun alone effects the separation:

> (123)   Catull. 86.2 **haec** ego sic **singula** confiteor.

In Augustan poetry the disjunction is often much longer, as for example in (124), where *hunc ego* begins the line, but *dolorem* does not come until the end of the line:

> (124)   Virg. *Aen.* 4.419 **hunc** *ego* si potui tantum sperare **dolorem.**

Since disjunctions and so-called 'enclosing' patterns of word-order are thought to be characteristic of Augustan poetry,[30] I consider in this section the nature and distribution in poetry of those separations of which the first element comprises relative or demonstrative + *ego* (*tu*). Though there are obvious differences between (123) and (124), the enclosing order of (124) is clearly related to the tendency which we have discussed for *ego* to link itself to demonstratives. The question arises whether cases such as (124) represent a poetic development of an old pattern.

I repeat that in Catullus, with the exception of (123), the pronoun is the only word which separates the deictic from the noun. In this respect there is again a close similarity between Catullan and prose usage. I offer some statistics from Cicero. In the Verrine orations (including *diu. Caec.*) there are 24 cases of relative/demonstrative + *ego* followed by a noun. In 22 of the 24 cases the noun is located immediately after *ego*. The two exceptions show an adverb (*maxime*) and a subordinator (*si*) as additional separating constituents:

> (125)   a   *Verr.* 2.183 **quod** ego *maxime* **genus** . . .
>   b   *Verr.* 5.130 **hunc** ego *si* **metum** . . . deiecero.

But while such limited separations are the norm in Ciceronian prose, the

---

[30] See Pearce (1966).

host of *ego* (i.e. the demonstrative or relative) from time to time is at a much greater remove from the associated noun. Consider first (126a):

(126) a Cic. *Tusc.* 5.64 **cuius** *ego* quaestor ignoratum ab
          Syracusanis, cum esse omnino negarent, saeptum
          undique et uestitum uepribus et dumetis *indagaui*
          sepulchrum
       b *Sest.* 13 **cuius** *ego* nuper in Macedonia *uidi* **uestigia**
       c *Flacc.* 106 eam **quam** *ego* patri suo quondam pro salute
          patriae *spoponderim* **dignitatem**
       d *Att.* 8.4.1 **cuius** *ego* cum satis *cognossem* **mores**
       e *Att.* 13.33a.1 **horum** *ego* uix *attigi* **paenulam**
       f *De orat.* 2.174 sic **has** *ego* argumentorum *notaui* **notas**
       g Livy 2.2.7 **hunc** *tu* . . . tua uolunate, L. Tarquini, *remoue*
          metum.

Of note here (126a), apart from the length of the disjunction of *cuius* and *sepulchrum*, is the fact that *sepulchrum* is immediately after the verb, and that a second disjunction is embedded within the structure *cuius ego . . . sepulchrum*. I refer to the fact that the participial expression *saeptum . . . dumetis* is itself separated by the verb from *sepulchrum*. (126f) combines the same two features: *notaui* is in the penultimate position, and *argumentorum* is separated from *notas* by the verb. All of the examples in (126) have a verb in penultimate position. It is as if the verb announces the arrival of the noun which is to close the construction. That noun is usually focal.[31]

This is by no means the full extent of longer separations in Cicero. I have concentrated on a particular type. In Augustan poets when compared with Catullus there is a change in the balance between short and long separations. When *ego* takes part in a disjunction, it is more often hosted in poetry by *hic* than by *qui* (a reversal of the norm for prose), and the disjunction is long more often than short. Short disjunctions do of course occur, but I have noted only about 13 in Virgil, Horace and elegy.[32] To what extent are longer separations in poetry artificial or distinctively 'poetic'? Can they be related to prose usage?

I return to (124). It may be true that *hunc dolorem* frames the line, but in fact there is no great difference between this line and some of the

---

[31] A participant at the Symposium suggested that in (126a) there is a correspondence between structure and meaning, in that the sentence describes the discovery of the tomb of Archimedes, and *sepulchrum* comes right at the end of the sentence. That may be so, but Cicero was able to achieve this correspondence because the appropriate structure existed already, to be exploited in this way.

[32] Prop. 2.10.19, 3.8.17, Ovid, *Am.* 1.4.32, *AA* 3.178, *Her.* 17.91, 17.136, *Trist.* 4.4.21, 4.7.19, 5.5.28, *Pont.* 2.1.12, *Fast.* 3.486, *Met.* 9.475, Virg. *Aen.* 9.323.

separations which we have seen in Cicero. Note first that *dolorem* is object of a verb which immediately precedes it, as is the case in every one of the prose examples quoted in (126). Moreover the line opening *hunc ego si*, where *hunc* and *ego* syntactically belong *within* the *si*-clause, can be found in Cicero at (125b).

If there is a difference between (124) and the Ciceronian examples, it may lie in the place of the focus. In the examples in (126) the final noun often seems to be emphatic, whereas in (124) the focus seems rather to be on *sperare*. But there can be no doubt that the pattern represented in (124) had its origin in the spoken language, rather than in a contrived form of poetic diction.

In (124), as we saw, *hunc ego si* is followed by a verb. For this structure in verse, cf.:

> (127)   Hor. *Epist.* 1.7.34 **hac** *ego* si *compellar* **imagine**.

I quote in (128) further examples from verse which have the opening *hic ego si*:

> (128)   a   Ovid *Her.* 18.27 **his ego si** uidi . . . / noctibus
>   b   *Pont.* 4.12.15 **his ego si** uitiis ausim corrumpere nomen.

I return to the structure showing a verb in penultimate position. In the examples cited in (126) the enclosing expression is object of the penultimate verb. In (127) it is an instrumental. In the poetic examples quoted in (129) an accusative is to be seen in f, but poets seem to have been prepared to exploit a wider range of cases in this position:

> (129)   a   Prop. 1.6.11 **his** *ego* non horam possum *durare* **querelis**
>   b   Ovid *Pont.* 3.6.9 **huic** *ego*, quam patior, nìl possem *demere* **poenae**
>   c   Hor. *Epist.* 1.1.27 restat ut **his** *ego* me ipse regam solerque **elementis**
>   d   Ovid *Her.* 19.128 **hac** *ego laedor* **aqua**
>   e   Prop. 4.8.33 **his** *ego* constitui noctem lenire **uocatis**
>   f   Lucr. 3.316 **quorum** *ego* nunc nequeo caecas *exponere* **causas**.

I would draw particular attention to (129f). Here the initial constituent is a relative, as often in prose. It is in the genitive, as again is typical of prose (see e.g. (126b)). And within the wider disjunction *quorum . . . causas* there is a secondary disjunction *caecas . . . causas*, as in the Ciceronian example (126a).

The type of disjunction which we have been considering was clearly domiciled in both verse and prose, though poets may have extended the range of cases in which the enclosing noun phrase might stand. The verb

seems to have had a role in indicating that the construction was about to end. For this type of clause-ending in clauses which do not have *ego* in second position, see (130):

(130) a Cic. *Brut.* 6 **hunc** autem ... *sustineret* **dolorem**
        b *Phil.* 12.9 **omnis** aequo animo belli *patitur* **iniurias.**

(130b) recalls Lucretius (129g) and Cicero (126f), in that there is a secondary disjunction of *belli* from *iniurias.*

Long disjunctions, or 'enclosing' word orders, have been the subject of some discussion. In this section I have dealt with just one type, that in which a demonstrative or relative attracts *ego* and is detached from an associated noun. In its simplest form, which is the predominating type in Cicero, *ego* alone is the disjoining element. This simple structure is represented a number of times in Catullus in examples which have structural parallels in Cicero, and which, we have suggested, are grounded in the patterns of real speech. The simple type in Augustan poetry is outnumbered by more complex disjunctions. But despite the greater *frequency* of these longer disjunctions in Augustan poetry as compared with Cicero or Catullus, the poetic examples can constantly be paralleled in structure in Cicero. I conclude that, even if poets may have developed complicated patterns of their own, a topic to which I will return in the next section, the basic structure rel./*hic* + *ego* + disjoined noun had its origin in real speech, at least of a formal kind. It should not be seen as an artificial invention of poetry, or as something inspired from outside Latin, but rather as a native Latin phenomenon.

XII. POETIC DEVELOPMENTS

I turn now to the exploitation of the structure *hic* + *ego* ... noun by Augustan poets. I take in turns various developments discernible particularly in Ovid.
(i) Usually the pair *hic ego* belongs syntactically in the same clause: that is, *ego* is subject of a verb with which the deictic is also associated, as its object for example or instrumental satellite. But it is not unusual, even in prose, for *hic* and *ego* to belong in different clauses. Thus in (131) *ego* belongs in the main clause as subject of *confiteor*, whereas *hisce* belongs in the dependent clause, as object of *uti*:

(131) Cic. *Planc.* 87 **hisce** ego **auxiliis** studentibus atque incitatis
       uti me ... potuisse confiteor (= (*ego confiteor*) (*me hisce
       auxiliis uti potuisse*)).

An extension of structures of this type can be seen in the Ovidian example (132):

> (132)   Ovid *AA* 3.178 crediderim nymphas **hac** ego **ueste** tegi (= (*ego crediderim*) (*nymphas hac ueste tegi*)).

But here the main verb *crediderim precedes* the dependent clause. *Ego* comes after the verb of which it is subject, and is in the wrong clause. It has tracked *hac* away from the start of the sentence well into the dependent clause. The position of *ego* is determined by that of its favoured host. A striking analogy for this placement of *ego* can be found later in the same book:

> (133)   Ovid *AA* 3.522 credere uix uideor, cum cogar credere partu, / **uos** ego cum uestris concubuisse uiris.

Here again the verb phrase *credere... uideor* precedes the dependent clause in the second line. *Ego* is even more clearly detached from the main verb and embedded in the dependent clause, because an intervening *cum*-clause separates the main verb from its dependent clause. *Ego* is not in this case attached to *hic*, but it has a preferential term before it, namely an instance of *uos* which is emphatic in the context. In a way (133) is less remarkable than (132). The dependent clause occupies the whole of the second line. If that whole line could be placed before *credere*, then we would have much the same structure as that of (131). The whole dependent clause, with *ego* in its characteristic second position behind a preferential term, has been postponed. In (132), on the other hand, *ego* is not second word in the dependent clause, but is well within that clause.

(ii) The examples (134)–(136) differ from (132)–(133) in that *ego* and *hic* are syntactically in the same clause.

> (134)   Ovid *Met.* 8.771 nympha **sub hoc** *ego* sum Cereri gratissima **ligno**
>
> (135)   Ovid *Trist.* 5.5.28 fieri quis posse putaret, / ut facerem in mediis **haec** ego **sacra** Getis
>
> (136)   Prop. 2.34.58 ut regnem mixtas inter conuiua puellas / **hoc** *ego*, quo tibi nunc eleuor, **ingenio**.

They resemble (e.g.) (132) in that *hic ego* is not at the start of the clause but well within it. What these examples show is the intimate connection between *hic* and the nominative pronoun, and Ovid's readiness to displace the pair. If one is postponed, so too is the other. (136) resembles (133) because the whole second line could in theory be moved *en bloc* to the initial position (after *ut*) and a normal position for *hoc ego* restored.

(iii) In (136) a relative clause stands between *hoc ego* and *ingenio*. For this pattern, which is characteristic of Ovid, see (137)–(138):

(137)   Ovid *Pont.* 3.6.9 **huic ego**, *quam patior*, nihil possem demere
        poenae

(138)   Ovid *Pont.* 4.10.19 **hos ego**, *qui patriae faciant obliuia*, **sucos**.

(iv) Finally, in (139) we see as usual *hac ego* separated from a noun (*nocte*):

(139)   Ovid *AA* 2.138 **hac** ego sum *captis* **nocte** reuectus *equis*.

But within this disjunction there stands *captis*, which is itself disjoined
from *equis*. A double disjunction of this type is more complex than a prose
example such as (126a).

XIII. CONCLUSION

Any attempt to account for the use of the nominative pronouns *ego* and
tu exclusively in terms of an opposition 'emphatic' vs. 'unemphatic', with
the 'unemphatic' use perhaps 'colloquial', is misguided. There is undoubt-
edly an emphatic use of both pronouns, which is most readily detectable
when they are contrastive. But there are many cases of *ego* and *tu* in high
literature which cannot be described as emphatic in this sense. I have
suggested that certain structural conditions are among the determinants
which may generate the use of a nominative pronoun, regardless of
whether that pronoun in the context is emphatic or not. *Ego* and *tu* have
a tendency to attach themselves to certain preferential terms, that is terms
which habitually are placed at the head of a colon.

When a use of *ego* is independently motivated, as for example by its
contrastive emphasis, it will seek out the head of its clause. But if there is
a relative, an emphatic demonstrative, an interrogative, an antithetical
term or a negative present in the clause, *ego* may be excluded by these
preferential terms from the first position. It therefore goes to the second
place, in attachment to the preferential term. The types of terms which
most often precede *ego* are thus preferential terms. A relationship is
accordingly formed between preferential terms and *ego/tu*, such that the
pronoun may sometimes be generated merely by the presence of its prefer-
ential host. It is also possible that this attachment of *ego* (or *tu*) to
preferential terms was influenced by or related to a larger phenomenon,
whereby enclitics in general in Latin (e.g. the copula and oblique case
pronouns) tended to gravitate to preferential or focused terms (see
(34)–(35)).

Our nominative usage is represented in verse as well as prose. Various
nominative pronouns in Catullus which have caused commentators some
puzzlement and have even led to emendation can be explained as typical

manifestations of the phenomenon, and we have seen that Catullan usage is very close in some respects to Ciceronian.

Discussions of poetic language tend to concentrate on the one hand on high-style vocabulary avoided in prose, and on the other on the presence of colloquialisms in lower genres. The phenomena dealt with in this paper cannot be classified in these terms. Fraenkel demonstrated in his work on colon structure that verse often falls into the types of cola found in prose. We have seen that certain quite intricate forms of disjunction in poetry, whereby *hic* in particular, with *ego* attached, is separated from a noun in agreement, are not the inventions of poets but are based in the spoken, or rather, formal spoken language. This aspect of poetic discourse reflects the fact that verse was intended to be read aloud, and it could therefore not reject entirely the communicative processes of formal speech. The collocation *hic ego* readily triggers the expectation that a disjunction may follow, and a later verb in its turn creates the expectation that that disjunction is about to end. Some poets, notably Ovid of those considered here, were able to develop the complexity of such disjunctions beyond that normally found in prose, whereas Catullus adhered to the types of patterns which would readily have been heard in speech.

Bibliography

Adamietz, J. (ed.) (1986), *Die römische Satire* (Grundriß der Literaturgeschichten nach Gattungen) (Darmstadt).

Adams, J. N. (1971), 'A type of hyperbaton in Latin prose', *PCPhS* 17: 1–16.

———— (1976), 'A typological approach to Latin word-order', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 81: 70–99.

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

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

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

———— (1982b), 'Anatomical terms transferred from animals to humans in Latin', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 87: 90–109.

———— (1983), 'Words for "prostitute" in Latin', *RhM* 126: 321–58.

———— (1992), 'Iteration of compound verb with simplex in Latin prose', *Eikasmos* 3: 295–8.

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

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

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

———— (1995b), *Pelagonius and Latin Veterinary Terminology in the Roman Empire* (Studies in Ancient Medicine, 11) (Leiden).

Allen, W. S. (1973), *Accent and Rhythm. Prosodic Features of Latin and Greek: a Study in Theory and Reconstruction* (Cambridge).

———— (1978, 2nd ed.), *Vox Latina. A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Latin* (Cambridge).

Alfonso, S., Cipriani, G., Fedeli, P., Mazzini, I., Tedeschi, A. (1990), *Il poeta elegiaco e il viaggio d'amore* (Scrinia, 3) (Bari).

Anderson, R. D., Parsons, P. J. and Nisbet, R. G. M. (1979), 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qasr 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 (= 1957b: 66–86).

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

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

———— (1957b), *Philologica II* (Paris).

Ernout, A. and Meillet, A. (1959; 4th ed.), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*, augmenté d'additions et de corrections nouvelles par J. André (Paris).

Ernout, A. and Thomas, F. (1953), *Syntaxe latine* (Paris).

Evans, W. J. (1921), *Allitteratio Latina* (London).

Évrard-Gillis, J. (1976), *La récurrence lexicale dans l'oeuvre de Catulle: étude stylistique* (Paris).

Fantham, E. (1972), *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery* (Toronto).

Farrell, J. (1991), *Virgil's 'Georgics' and the Traditions of Ancient Epic* (New York and Oxford).

Fedeli, P. (ed.) (1965), *Properzio, Elegie libro IV: Testo critico e commento* (Bari).

——— (ed.) (1980), *Sesto Properzio, Il primo libro delle Elegie: Introduzione, testo critico e commento* (Florence).

——— (ed.) (1985), *Properzio, Il libro terzo delle Elegie: Introduzione, testo e commento* (Bari).

Ferguson, J. (1987), *A Prosopography to the Poems of Juvenal* (Brussels).

Fiske, G. C. (1919), 'The plain style in the Scipionic Circle', in *Studies in Honor of Ch. Forster Smith* (Madison).

——— (1920), *Lucilius and Horace. A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature 7) (Madison).

Fitch, J. G. (1981), 'Sense-pauses and relative dating in Seneca, Sophocles and Shakespeare', *AJP* 102: 289–307.

Flashar, H. (ed.) (1971), *Antike Medizin* (Wege der Forschung 221) (Darmstadt).

Fluck, H.-R. (1980), *Fachsprachen: Einführung und Bibliographie* (Munich).

Flury, P. (1968), *Liebe und Liebessprache bei Menander, Plautus und Terenz* (Heidelberg).

——— (1990), 'Beiträge aus der Thesaurus-Arbeit, XXV: *occurrere*', *MH* 47: 225–6.

Fordyce, C. J. (ed.) (1961; repr. with corrections and additional notes 1973), *Catullus: a Commentary* (Oxford).

——— (ed.) (1977), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos libri 7–8*, with a commentary ed. by John D. Christie (Oxford).

Fraenkel, E. (1922), *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Philologische Untersuchungen 28) (Berlin)

——— (1928), *Iktus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechvers* (Berlin).

——— (1960 = transl. of [1922] with addenda), *Elementi plautini in Plauto* (Florence).

——— (1968), *Leseproben aus Reden Ciceros und Catos* (Rome).

Freudenburg, K. (1993), *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire* (Princeton).

Friedländer, P. (1941), 'Pattern of sound and atomistic theory in Lucretius', *AJP* 62: 16–34.

Gaisser, J. H. (1993), *Catullus and his Renaissance Readers* (Oxford).

Gardner-Chloros, P. (1991), *Language Selection and Switching in Strasbourg* (Oxford).

Garvie, A. F. (ed.) (1986), *Aeschylus, 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.

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

—— (1956b), 'Problemi di stile catulliano', *Maia* 8: 141–60.

Lateiner, D. (1977), 'Obscenity in Catullus', *Ramus* 6: 15–32.

Lausberg, M. (1990), 'Epos und Lehrgedicht. Ein Gattungsvergleich am Beispiel von Lucans Schlangenkatalog', *Würzburger Jahrbücher* 16: 173–203.

Lavency, M. and Longrée, D. (edd.) (1989), *Actes du 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 Code-switching* (Oxford).

Mynors, R. A. B. (ed.) (1958), *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina* (Oxford).

_____ (ed.) (1990), *Virgil, Georgics, edited with an introduction and commentary* (Oxford).

Nagle, B. R. (1980), *The Poetics of Exile: Program and Polemic in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto of Ovid.* (Collection Latomus, 170) (Brussels).

Naiditch, P. G. (1988), 'Three notes on "Housman and Ennius"' *Housman Society Journal* 14: 46–9.

Naylor, H. D. (1922), *Horace, Odes and Epodes: A Study in Poetic Word-Order* (Cambridge).

Neue, F. and Wagener, C. (1892–1905; 3rd ed.), *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* (Berlin).

Neumann, G. (1968), 'Sprachnormung im klassischen Latein', *Sprache der Gegenwart* 2: 88–97.

Newman, J. K. (1990), *Roman Catullus and the Modification of the Alexandrian Sensibility* (Hildesheim).

Nilsson, N.-O. (1952), *Metrische Stildifferenzen in den Satiren des Horaz* (Stockholm).

Nisbet, R. G. M. (1978), 'Notes on the text of Catullus', *PCPS* NS 24: 92–115 (=1995: 76–100).

_____ (1995), S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Collected Papers on Latin Literature* (Oxford).

Nisbet, R. G. M. and Hubbard, M. (1970), *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book 1* (Oxford).

_____ (1978), *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book II* (Oxford).

Norden, E. (ed.) (1903; 1957, repr. of 2nd ed., 1915), *P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis Buch VI* (Leipzig and Stuttgart).

_____ (ed.) (1910), *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* (Berlin).

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).

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

——— (ed.) (1995b), *Cicero the Philosopher* (Oxford).

Puelma Piwonka, M. (1949), *Lucilius und Kallimachos. Zur Geschichte einer Gattung der hellenistisch-römischen Poesie* (Frankfurt am Main).

Pye, D. W. (1963), 'Latin 3rd plural perfect indicative active — Its endings in verse usage', *TPhS*: 1–27

Radermacher, L. (1951), *Artium Scriptores (Reste der voraristotelischen Rhetorik)*. (Österr. Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl., Sitzungsberichte, 227. Bd., 3. Abh.) (Vienna).

Ramage, E. S. (1957), *Urbanitas, rusticitas, peregrinitas: the Roman view of proper Latin* (Cincinnati).

Rand, E. K. (1925), *Ovid and his Influence* (London, Calcutta, Sydney).

Rawson, E. D. (1969), *The Spartan Tradition in European Thought* (Oxford).

——— (1985), *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic* (London).

Reichenkron, G. (1961), 'Zur römischen Kommandosprache bei byzantinischen Schriftstellern', *Byz. Zeitschr.* 54: 18–27

Reitzenstein, R. (1893), *Epigramm und Skolion. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der alexandrinischen Dichtung* (Giessen).

——— (1907), art. 'Epigramm', *RE* 6.1: 71–111.

——— (1912), *Zur Sprache der lateinischen Erotik* (Sitzungsb. d. Heidelberger Ak. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl., 12. Abh.) (Heidelberg).

Renard, M., and Schilling, R. (edd.) (1964), *Hommages à Jean Bayet*, (Collection Latomus 70) (Brussels).

Riemann, O. (1885; 2nd ed.), *Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Tite-Live* (Paris).

Risch, E. (1984), *Gerundivum und Gerundium. Gebrauch im klassischen und älteren Latein. Entstehung und Vorgeschichte* (Berlin–New York).

Risselada, R (1993), *Imperatives and Other Directive Expressions in Latin* (Amsterdam).

Roby, H. J. (1896), *A grammar of the Latin language from Plautus to Suetonius.* Part II *Syntax* (London).

Romaine, S. (1995; ed. 1, 1989), *Bilingualism* (Oxford).

Romano, A. C. (1979), *Irony in Juvenal* (Hildesheim and New York).

Ronconi, A. (1938), 'Stile e lingua di Catullo', *A & R* III 6: 139–56 (= 1950: 23–47).

——— (1939), 'Allitterazione e stile in Catullo', *Stud. Urb.* 13B: 1–77 (= 1953: 9–82 = 1971: 11–86).

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

——— (1940b), 'Atteggiamenti e forme della parodia catulliana', *A & R* III 8: 141–58 (= 1953: 193–212 = 1971: 173–92).

——— (1950), *Da Lucrezio a Tacito* (Messina—Florence).

——— (1971; ed. 1, 1953), *Studi catulliani* (Bari—Brescia).

van Rooy, C. A. (1965), *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory* (Leiden).

Rösler, W. (1989), 'Typenhäuser bei Aischylos?', in Schuller *et al.* (1989), 109–14.

Ross, D. O. (1969), *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, Mass.)

Rothstein, M. (1966; 3rd ed.), *Sextus Propertius: Elegien* (Dublin — Zurich).

Rudd, N. (1960), 'Horace on the origins of satura', *Phoenix* 14: 36–44.

—— (1986), *Themes in Roman Satire* (London).

Ruijgh, C. J. (1957), *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique* (Assen).

Sabbah, G. (ed.) (1982), *Médecins et médecine dans l'antiquité* (Centre Jean Palerne: Mémoires, iii) (Saint-Étienne).

—— (ed.) (1984), *Textes médicaux latins antiques* (Centre Jean Palerne: Mémoires, v) (Saint-Étienne).

—— (ed.) (1991), *Le latin médical. La constitution d'un langage scientifique* (Centre Jean Palerne: Mémoires, x) (Saint-Étienne).

Safarewicz, J. (1965), 'Uwagi o 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).

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)).

_____ (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).