

The Word Order of Horace's *Odes*

R. G. M. NISBET

Summary. The intricate word order of Horace's *Odes* is brought about by the repeated separation of adjectives from their nouns. Sometimes adjectives and nouns are interlaced in a pattern attested in Hellenistic poets and developed by their Roman imitators. As a result the force of the adjective comes over more sharply, and the structure of the sentence is more tightly integrated. The word order of the *Odes* conveys subtle shades of meaning, especially when a word's place in the line is also considered: possessive adjectives and personal pronouns sometimes have more emphasis than is recognized. A few points are added about Horace's colometry: his Graecizing use of participial and similar clauses to extend a period, his partiality for prosaic ablative absolutes even at the end of a sentence, his transposition of words to a colon where they do not properly belong. But even his abnormalities follow a system, and though the mosaic is so artificial, he follows his own rules rigorously without showing any constraint.

Quis multa gracilis te puer in rosa
 perfusus liquidis urget odoribus
 grato, Pyrrha, sub antro?
 cui flavam religas comam,
 simplex munditiis? heu quotiens fidem 5
 mutatosque deos flebit, et aspera
 nigris aequora ventis
 emirabitur insolens,
 qui nunc te fruitur credulus aurea,
 qui semper vacuum, semper amabilem 10
 sperat, nescius aurae
 fallacis. miseri quibus
 intemptata nites. me tabula sacer
 votiva paries indicat uvida
 suspendisse potenti 15
 vestimenta maris deo.

(Horace, *Odes* 1.5)

THE FAMILIARITY OF this poem disguises its oddity. The vocabulary is normal enough, sometimes even a little prosaic (*gracilis*, *emirabitur*, *vacuum* in a semi-legal sense, *vestimenta*); the constructions are straightforward; there is ambiguity indeed in the words that refer both to the girl and the sea, but none of the off-centre use of language that makes Virgil so elusive. Yet though the components are simple, the composition is intricate: we can say with more reason than Lucilius ever could 'quam lepide lexis compostae ut tesserulae omnes / arte pavimento atque emblemate vermiculato' (84-5 M.). A scrutiny of Horace's word order may explain something about the character of his lyrics; it also reveals shades of emphasis that have received regular attention only in H. D. Naylor's neglected commentary (1922). As situations recur, any study must deal with the *Odes* as a whole, but I shall revert from time to time to the ode to Pyrrha; when the composition of the individual poems is so carefully integrated, it is desirable as often as possible to look at the total context.

The distinctive word order of the *Odes* depends above all on the placing of adjectives, which Horace, like the other Roman poets of his time, uses far more freely than prose writers. Though his lines tend to be short, he averages about an attribute a line ('attributes' include not just adjectives but participles); and as a rule the nouns with attributes considerably outnumber those without. Of course particular circumstances may distort the statistics: when a noun has a dependent genitive, it is less likely to have an attribute as well; and when three parallel nouns are joined by connectives, one at most is likely to have an attribute (as at 2.4.21 'bracchia et voltum teretisque suras'). When an ode is elaborate and picturesque, the incidence goes up (with 22 attributes in the 16 lines of the ode to

Pyrrha), but it declines in an austere poem like 4.7 ('diffugere nives') or a boring poem like 4.8 ('donarem pateras'). All in all, Horace uses far more attributes than Greek poets even of the Hellenistic age, and it is not till we come to Nonnus that we find a comparable profusion (Wifstrand (1933: 80)).

A poet's adjectives, for the most part, are not simply objective (as in *ius civile*); so, though various factors may operate, they are usually placed before their nouns (Marouzeau (1922); Hofmann-Szantyr (1965: 406-7); Adams (1976: 89)). What is more, 40 per cent of Horace's adjectives are separated from their nouns (Stevens (1953: 202)); in the ode to Pyrrha this is always the case except for 12 *fallacis*, and even that is in a different line from 11 *aurae*. Hyperbaton was a familiar feature of literary prose that becomes more abundant in the imperial period (Hofmann-Szantyr (1965: 690-1); Adams (1971)); but the Roman poets of the first century BC use it much more freely than contemporary prose writers. To some extent they are following the patterns of their Hellenistic predecessors (Van Sickle (1968)), but they go much further. Part of the reason lies in their greater number of adjectives: that helps to explain why the *Aeneid* has less hyperbaton than the *Eclogues* or for that matter than Lucan (Caspari (1908: 80-93)). Other factors were the avoidance of homoeoteleuton (for which see now Shackleton Bailey (1994)) and the attraction of rhyme; for Greek poets were less averse to homoeoteleuton and less attracted by rhyme.

Horace in the *Odes* often interlaces adjectives and nouns in a double hyperbaton: thus in the poem to Pyrrha we find 1 'quis multa gracilis te puer in rosa', 6f. 'aspera / nigris aequora ventis', 9 'qui nunc te fruitur credulus aurea', 13f. 'tabula sacer / votiva paries indicat'. Various sorts of interlacing are attested in Plato (Denniston (1952: 54-5)) and in late Greek prose, but Latin prose is much more restrained. Norden collected some examples in the notable third appendix to his commentary on *Aeneid* VI (1957: 393-6), and others have been added (Goodyear on Tac. *Ann.* 1.10.1, Woodman on Vell. 2.100.1, Winterbottom (1977a and 1977b)); but prose parallels to the verse pattern are rare in the central period, at least when special cases are excluded (as when one of the attributes is a genuine participle). There is a striking early instance at *Rhet. Her.* 4.63 'aut (ut) aliquod fragile falsae choragium gloriae comparetur'; but as that comes from a quotation it may be the rendering of a Greek orator. At Cic. *Phil.* 2.66 we find 'maximus vini numerus fuit, permagnum optimi pondus argenti'; but here *permagnum* picks up *maximus*, and *optimi pondus argenti* can be regarded as a single unit (cf. Caes. *Gall.* 5.40.6 'multae praeustae sudes, magnus muralium pilorum numerus'). There is a more unusual instance at Plin. *N.H.* 10.3 'caeruleam roseis caudam pinnis distinguen-

tibus'; but here the metrical *caeruleam roseis* may suggest the imitation of a poet or at least the manner of poetry.

For though so rare in classical Latin prose, this sort of interlacing is superabundant in the Roman poets of the first century BC and later. Norden attributed their predilection to the influence of rhetorical prose (cf. *Rhet. Her.* cited above); but in that case it is strange that the arrangement is not significantly attested in Cicero's speeches or the declamations in the elder Seneca (though note *Suas.* 3.1 'miseri cremata agricolae lugent semina'). It is better to look for poetical origins for a poetical phenomenon (Boldt (1884: 90-6); Caspari (1908: 86-90)). The interlacing of adjectives is attested in Greek poetry as early as Theognis 250 ἀγλαὰ Μουσάων δῶρα ἰοστεφάνων, and Pindar provides lyric examples, but they usually lack the symmetry characteristic of Roman poetry. Such symmetry appears occasionally in Hellenistic poetry (e.g. Call. *H.* 4.14 Ἰκαρίου πολλὴν ἀπομάσσειται ὕδατος ἄχνην, 6.9), and particularly in pentameters (ibid. 5.12 πάντα χαλινοφάγων ἀφρὸν ἀπὸ στομάτων, 5.34); but among extant poets it is not common till Nonnus (Wifstrand (1933: 139-40)), who is likely to have been influenced by Hellenistic rather than Roman prototypes. On the other hand interlacing appears abundantly in Catullus 62-68 (so also Cinna, *FLP* fr. 11), occasionally in Lucretius, more often in an innovating earlier poet, namely Cicero (Pearce (1966: 164-6 and 299-301)). As both hexameters and pentameters naturally fall into two sections, this favoured a balanced distribution of adjectives and nouns (Patzer (1955: 87-9); Conrad (1965)); and as Latin hexameters usually have their main caesura after the first syllable of the third foot (rather than after the trochee as in Greek), this made it easier to deploy adjectives before this caesura. As the interlaced pattern was already established in Horace's day, and was used by him both in the iambs and hexameters of the *Epodes* (2.15, 43, 47; 16.7, 33, 55), it is not surprising that he extended it to lyrics.

What then is the function of hyperbaton in the *Odes*? It is often pointed out that it adds 'emphasis' to the adjective (cf. Marouzeau (1922: 112-18); Fraenkel (1928: 162-8)), but some qualifications are desirable (Stevens (1953); Dover (1960: 32-4)). In the first place 'emphasis' in this context need not imply a raising or other modification of the voice: that might be superfluous in a language with a more flexible word order than English. In a complex sentence other factors may play a part, for instance rhythm in a prose writer (Quint. 8.6.62-7), metre in a poet. Sometimes there is a wish not so much to add emphasis to the adjective as to stow away less important words between the adjective and the noun. Hyperbaton also helps to bind the sentence into an integrated unit; this aspect is particularly important for Horace.

It should also be recognized that the Roman poets developed their own

conventions about word order and took a delight in their own symmetrical patterns. Sometimes an adjective is brought forward not because its semantic significance is great by prosaic standards but to set it against some parallel or contrasting expression: for one of many instances see 1.3.10f. 'qui fragilem truci | commisit pelago ratem', where by a typical chiasmus the fragility of the boat is set against the savagery of the sea. Even when there is no parallelism or antithesis a poet may highlight an adjective in a way that would seem excessive in prose: to cite again the ode to Pyrrha, 2 'liquidis . . . odoribus' underlines the paradox that smells can be liquid, 4 'flavam . . . comam' plays on the name 'Pyrrha', which suggests auburn hair, 14ff. 'uvida . . . vestimenta' underlines in a vivid way that Horace has suffered shipwreck himself. Even adjectives that are described as 'conventional' may have more life in them than emerges from the English translations: thus at 1.38.1 'Persicos odi puer apparatus' the adjective evokes a picture and expresses an emotion. So instead of denying any emphasis to such adjectives in Horace, we can sometimes say that he gives his adjectives more prominence than would be natural in prose.

We may go further. When an adjective is detached from its noun, 'the temporary isolation of each word makes its own peculiar imagery the more vivid' (T. F. Higham, cited by Leishman (1956: 85)). The ear is kept waiting for the corresponding noun, which often rhymes; this is a persistent feature of classical Roman poetry, notably in the 'golden lines' of Catullus and the pentameters of Ovid. Sometimes the noun may surprise the reader; thus at 1.5.6f. 'aspera | nigris aequora ventis' it is a paradox that flat *aequora* should be rough, and *ventis* is also more arresting than the expected word for water. But it is the hardest thing for moderns to take the words in the order that they come: Milton is thought to force the English language when he translates 1.5.9 'qui nunc te fruitur credulus aurea' by 'Who now enjoys thee credulous all gold', but he is representing precisely what he found in the Latin.

The complexity of the *Odes* is not uniform throughout but is influenced by the context. Erotic and sympotic odes may be particularly intricate to suit the sensuous subject-matter; see the first line and last stanza of the ode to Pyrrha (1.5), the last stanza of the ode to Thaliarchus (1.9.21ff.) 'nunc et latentis proditor intimo | gratus puellae risus ab angulo' (with triple interlacing), the closing couplet of the ode to Quinctius (2.11.23f.) 'maturet incomptum Lacaenae | more comae religata nodum' (where the intricacy of the word order makes a piquant contrast with the simplicity of the girl's hair). On the other hand the great political poems are often written more directly, in what Horace would have called a more 'masculine' style (cf. *Serm.* 1.10.16, 91; *Pers.* 6.4); there is nothing involuted about the end of the ode to Lollius (4.9.45ff.): 'non possidentem multa vocaveris |

recte beatum; rectius occupat | nomen beati qui deorum | muneribus sapienter uti, | duramque callet pauperiem pati, | peiusque leto flagitium timet . . .'. Metre also plays a part: Sapphics give relatively little scope for complexity, and the *Carmen Saeculare*, which was meant to be sung, has a notably simple texture.

The word order of classical poetry is sometimes said to correspond to the situation described (Wilkinson (1963: 65–6)); thus at 1.5.1 'quis multa gracilis te puer in rosa' the girl and the boy are in the middle of the line surrounded by *multa rosa*, and in 3 'grato, Pyrrha, sub antro' *Pyrrha* is indeed enclosed by *grato antro*. This aspect of Horace's hyperbata is subsidiary at most, for it affects a very small proportion of the material; see for instance 1.3.21ff. 'nequiquam deus abscidit | prudens Oceano dissociabili | terras', where the artificial placing of *terras* suits a special explanation (I owe this suggestion to Dr S. J. Harrison), 4.3.14f. 'dignatur suboles inter amabilis | vatum ponere me choros'. By a more general phenomenon a vocative is enclosed by words appropriate to the person addressed: thus at 1.5.3 (cited above) the cave is welcome to *Pyrrha*, at 1.17.10 'utcumque dulci, Tyndari, fistula' *Tyndaris* may enjoy the pipe because she is herself a musician (Fraenkel), at 2.1.14 'et consulenti Pollio curiae' the republican *Pollio* is associated with the senate-house (it is pointless to add that he is inside it), at 3.29.3 'cum flore, Maecenas, rosarum', the roses suit the notorious sybarite.

It has been calculated that in 85 per cent of the hyperbata in the *Odes* there is an interval of only one or two words (Stevens (1953: 202)); just as in hexameters and pentameters, the incidence of two-word intervals is greater than in prose. Longer hyperbata in prose tend to be reserved for special cases, as with interrogatives, or adjectives of size or quantity, or where there is a particular degree of emphasis or floridity (Adams (1971: 13)). In poetry longer hyperbata are used more freely: see for instance 1.17.1f. 'velox amoenum saepe Lucretilem | mutat Lycaeo Faunus', where the postponement of the subject makes us wonder who is bounding in, while the chiasmic order sets *Lucretilem* against *Lycaeo*. In other places a special point may be recognized, or missed: thus at 1.4.7f. 'alternò terram quatium pede, dum gravis Cyclopum | Volcanus ardens visit officinas' *gravis* underlines a contrast with the nimble feet of the Graces. At 2.14.5ff. 'non si trecenis, quotquot eunt dies, | amice, places inlacrimabilem | Plutona tauris . . .' the hyperbole justifies the unusual emphasis on *trecenis* (though numerals are sometimes separated even in comedy and prose). At 3.10.19f. 'non hoc semper erit liminis aut aquae | caelestis patiens latus' the emphatic *hoc* suggests 'whatever other people might put up with'. Occasionally a long hyperbaton recalls the grand style of Pindar: see 3.4.9ff. 'me fabulosae Vulture in Apulo | nutricis extra limina †Pulliae |

ludo fatigatumque somno | fronde nova puerum palumbes | texere', 4.4.7ff. 'vernique iam nimbis remotis | insolitos docuere nisus | venti paventem'.

One type of hyperbaton is too common to be noticed: when a genitive depends on a noun that is qualified by an adjective, it is usually sandwiched between them. When this word order is upset, the effect is often to emphasize the genitive; Horace is particularly precise in his regard for such nuances (Naylor (1922: xxiii and xxvi)). See 1.10.6 'Mercuri, facunde nepos Atlantis': the balancing proper names frame the line (cf. 1.19.1 'mater saeva Cupidinum'). 1.13.1ff. 'cum tu, Lydia, Telephi | cervicem roseam, cerea Telephi | laudas bracchia . . .': in this position the first *Telephi* underlines Lydia's infatuation. 2.1.17 'iam nunc minaci murmure cornuum': *cornuum* balances *litui* in the next line. 2.1.23f. 'et cuncta terrarum subacta | praeter atrocem animum Catonis': the proper name marks the climax. 3.5.53f. 'quam si clientum longa negotia | diiudicata lite relinqueret': *clientum* emphasizes the mundane business that usually concerned Regulus. 3.28.1f. 'quid festo potius die | Neptuni faciam?': Naylor explains 'What better can I do on a *feast-day*, and that the *feast-day* of Neptune?' 4.7.19f. 'cuncta manus avidas fugient heredis, amico | quae dederis animo': the alien heir is contrasted with Torquatus' own dear heart (with appropriate stress on *amico*). The same principle operates with the ablative at 3.4.37ff. 'vos Caesarem altum, militia simul | fessas cohortes abdidit oppidis, | finire quaerentem labores | Pierio recreatis antro': here *militia* is not sandwiched between *fessas* and *cohortes*, but stressed to produce a balance with *labores* and a contrast with *Pierio*.

Little need be said about the position of genitives where no adjective is present. Here classical Latin uses both possible orders, with a tendency for the earlier position to add emphasis (Adams (1976: 73–82)). Horace sometimes highlights such genitives in the same way that he highlights adjectives: see for instance 1.2.9f. 'piscium et summa genus haesit ulmo | nota quae sedes fuerat columbis' (where by a characteristic chiasmus the fish are contrasted with the birds). There is an illuminating case at 1.1.6 'terrarum dominos evehit ad deos'; as Naylor points out, the emphasis on *terrarum* confirms that the first two words refer to the victors rather than the gods.

In classical Latin, adjectives derived from proper names regularly follow their noun, as *forum Romanum*, *horti Sallustiani*. In the *Odes* these adjectives often come first, sometimes with hyperbaton: thus in the opening poem we find 10 'Libycis . . . areis', 12 'Attalicy condicionibus', 15 'Icariis fluctibus', 28 'Marsus aper'. Horace prefers the livelier order because he tends to treat such adjectives as ornamental and emotive rather than factually descriptive (Marouzeau (1922: 28–32)). On the other hand when an adjective describes a particular place, he often gives it its standard

position immediately after the noun: cf. 1.2.14 'litore Etrusco', 1.3.6 'finibus Atticis', 1.11.5f. 'mare | Tyrrenum', 1.31.14 'aequor Atlanticum', 3.4.15 'saltusque Bantinos', 3.7.26 'gramine Martio'. Sometimes he reverses this tendency for particular reasons: cf. 1.1.13f. 'ut trabe Cypria | Myrtoum pavidus nauta secet mare' (another chiasmus), 3.5.56 'aut Lacedaemonium Tarentum' (at the end of the *Regulus Ode Lacedaemonium* is evocative rather than merely factual), 3.14.3f. 'Caesar Hispana repetit Penatis | victor ab ora' (*Hispana* underlines the analogy with Hercules). Of course other exceptions to the general tendency can be noted: thus the adjective is ornamental at 1.31.6 'non aurum aut ebur Indicum', 2.13.8 'venena Colcha', 2.18.3 'trabes Hymettiae' and particular at 2.1.16 'Delmatico . . . triumpho' (yet emphasis is appropriate), 3.12.7 'Tiberinis . . . undis'. When people are given a geographical epithet this often comes immediately before the name (1.15.22 'Pylum Nestora', 2.5.20 'Cnidiusve Gyges'); but this order is attested in Ciceronian prose (*Amic.* 88 'a Tarentino Archyta' with Seyffert-Müller's note).

I turn now to possessive adjectives, where Latin normally puts the possessive after the noun (*pater meus*); when this order is reversed the effect is to emphasize the possessive, especially when the two words are separated by hyperbaton (Marouzeau (1922: 137-44)). There are many instances in Horace of this kind of point, though the nuance is sometimes ignored. See 1.13.3f. 'vae meum | fervens difficili bile tumet iecur' (a contrast with 1 'tu, Lydia'), 1.15.7f. 'coniurata tuas rumpere nuptias | et regnum Priami vetus' (Paris is set against Priam, as Naylor says), 1.22.9f. 'namque me silva lupus in Sabina | dum meam canto Lalagen . . .' (*meam* is not predicative, as Naylor suggests, but 'my very own Lalage', picking up the emphatic *me*), 1.26.9f. 'nil sine te mei | possunt honores (*mei* is set against *te* as at 4.9.30), 2.6.6 'sit meae sedes utinam senectae' ('I' and 'you' are often contrasted in the ode to Septimius, as in the following ode to Pompeius), 2.8.21 'te suis matres metuunt iuvenis' (underlining the possessiveness of the mothers), 3.29.54f. 'et mea | virtute me involvo' (a man's own *virtus* is contrasted with external possessions), 4.1.33f. 'sed cur heu, Ligurine, cur | manat rara meas lacrima per genas?' (correcting 29 'me nec femina nec puer'), 4.6.35f. 'Lesbium servate pedem meique | pollicis ictum' (Horace's thumb balances Sappho's metre), 4.10.2 'insperata tuae cum veniet poena superbiae' (the penalty is least expected by Ligurinus). There is a more difficult case at 3.4.69f. 'testis mearum centimanus Gyges | sententiarum', where the emphasis on the trisyllabic *mearum* has seemed excessive to some editors; but the transmitted text is protected by Pindar, fr. 169.3f., where after saying that the violent are punished he adds *τεκμαίρομαι | ἔργοισιν Ἡρακλέος*. Perhaps Horace is saying with the self-assertion of a *vates* 'That's what I think, and Gyges proves it.'

Possessive adjectives that follow their nouns and are separated by hyperbaton sometimes have more emphasis than is realized, particularly when they occur at the end of a line; in the same way at the end of an elegiac pentameter the characteristic *meo*, *tuo*, etc. often have point. The situation is fairly clear at 1.16.15f. 'desectam et insani leonis | vim stomacho adposuisse *nostro*' (where the emphatic *nostro* is contrasted with *leonis*), 2.1.34ff. 'quod mare Daunia | non decoloravere caedes? | quae caret ora cruore *nostro*? (where *nostro* balances *Daunia*). Sometimes there is a contrast between the first and second personal pronouns: 2.13.10f. 'agro qui statuit *meo* | te, triste lignum', 2.17.1 'cur *me* querelis exanimas *tuis*? (followed by 2ff. 'nec dis amicum est nec *mihi te* prius | obire, Maecenas, *meorum* | grande decus columenque rerum. | a, *te meae* si partem animae rapit, | maturior vis, quid moror alteram?', 3.13.13ff. 'fies nobilium *tu* quoque fontium, | *me* dicente cavis impositam ilicem | saxis, unde loquaces | lymphae desiliunt *tuae*' (*tuae*, the last word of the poem, continues the 'Du-Stil' of this hymnal address, and is also contrasted with *me* at the beginning of line 14). In view of Horace's liking for point, I also see emphasis in passages where some would deny it: 1.3.8 'et serves animae dimidium *meae*' ('I have entrusted *you*, the ship, with half of *my* life'), 1.7.20f. 'seu densa tenebit | Tiburis umbra *tui*' (Plancus came from Tibur), 3.4.65 'vis consili expers mole ruit *sua*' ('collapses from its own bulk'), 3.19.28 '*me* lentus Glycerae torret amor *meae*'. There is a puzzle at 2.7.18ff. 'longaque fessum militia latus | depone sub lauru mea, nec | parce cadis tibi destinatis'; here *mea* seems to make a contrast with *tibi*, for though it follows immediately on *lauru* it comes at the end of its clause and at a very unusual position in the line.

After possessive adjectives I come to personal pronouns, where the distinction is familiar between emphatic *me*, the equivalent of Greek ἐμέ, and weak *me*, the equivalent of enclitic με; on the same principle Milton spelt 'mee' when the pronoun was emphatic and 'me' when it was weak. In his famous article Wackernagel (1892) discussed the tendency of weak pronouns to occupy the second place in the colon, but the case should not be overstated; J. N. Adams (1994a) has shown that a weak pronoun sometimes nestles in the lee of a significant word, what he calls the 'focused host', even when this is not the first word in the colon. In the more informal registers the pronoun may come even at the end of the colon; thus Adams (1994a: 108) cites Varro, *Rust.* 1.2.2 'nos uti expectaremus se, reliquit qui rogaret', 1.2.7 'simul aspicit me, . . .'. When we turn to Horace as to the other Roman poets, it is not always obvious whether a pronoun is weak or emphatic; but I believe that we should be readier to recognize emphasis than editors sometimes are, particularly when the pronoun comes at the end of the line.

Thus at 3.9.1 'donec gratus eram tibi', I regard *tibi* as emphatic: the amoebaeon ode to Lydia repeatedly underlines personal pronouns. 3.13.6f. 'nam gelidos inficiet tibi | rubro sanguine rivos'; an emphatic *tibi* suits the hymnal aspect of the ode to Bandusia (cf. 9f. 'te... tu'). 3.16.33ff. 'quamquam nec Calabriae mella ferunt apes, | nec Laestrygonia Bacchus in amphora | languescit mihi, nec pinguia Gallicis | crescunt vellera pascuis'; here weak *mihi* at the very end of the second colon seems too inert for the *Odes* (contrast Varro cited above), and I should rather place it in the emphatic position at the beginning of the following colon (positing an influence by the ἀπὸ κοινοῦ principle on its two predecessors); for the same emphasis cf. line 27 'occultare meis dicerer horreis' and in a similar context 2.18.1f. 'non ebur neque aureum | mea renidet in domo lacunar', probably also 2.18.7f. 'nec Laconicas mihi | trahunt honestae purpuras clientae'. 3.29.1 'Tyrrhena regum progenies, tibi...'; the pronoun is emphatic after the long vocative, which forms an independent colon (cf. 4 'pressa tuis balanus capillis'). 4.3.13ff. 'Romae principis urbium | dignatur suboles inter amabilis | vatum ponere me choros'; here *ponere* does not seem significant enough to act as 'focused host', so I regard *me* as emphatic, balancing *vatum*. Contrast 4.15.1f. 'Phoebus volentem proelia me loqui | victas et urbis increpuit lyra'; here Naylor again regards the delayed pronoun as emphatic, but this time *proelia* is important enough to be regarded as the 'focused host'.

When *mihi*, *tibi*, *sibi* come after the main caesura in a Sapphic hendecasyllable, they may be either weak or emphatic according to circumstances. For weak instances (following a 'focused host') see 2.2.13 'crescit indulgens sibi dirus hydrops', 2.4.1 'ne sit ancillae tibi amor pudori', 3.11.38f. 'surge, ne longus tibi somnus unde | non times detur', 3.14.13f. 'hic dies vere mihi festus atras | exiget curas', 3.27.45f. 'si quis infamem mihi nunc iuvenum | dedat iratae'. But at other times I regard the pronoun as emphatic, sometimes against the general opinion. See 1.20.5ff. 'ut paterni | fluminis ripae simul et iocosa | redderet laudes tibi Vaticani | montis imago' (the emphatic pronoun is natural in a panegyric, as also above at 2ff. 'Graeca quod ego ipse testa | conditum levi, datus in theatro | cum tibi plausus'), 2.6.13f. 'ille terrarum mihi praeter omnis | angulus ridet' (cf. 6 'sit meae sedes utinam senectae'), 2.8.17 'adde quod pubes tibi crescit omnis' (cf. 21 'te suis matres metuunt iuvenis'), 3.8.19 'Medus infestus sibi luctuosis | dissidet armis' (*sibi* is to be taken with *luctuosis* and *dissidet*, but not with *infestus*), 3.11.15f. 'cessit immanis tibi blandienti | ianitor aulae' (following the hymnal *tu potes* at the beginning of the stanza), 3.18.14 'spargit agrestis tibi silva frondes' (again hymnal, like 10 above 'cum tibi Nonae redeunt Decembres'), 4.11.17f. 'iure sollempnis mihi sanctiorque | paene natali

proprio' (*mihi* like *proprio* underlines Horace's respect for Maecenas' birthday).

When the pronoun follows the central diaeresis in the Asclepiad line, I suggest that it is usually emphatic and perhaps always so. At 1.15.23ff. 'urgent impavidi te Salaminius | Teucer, te Sthenelus sciens | pugnae' the first *te* is emphatic (as the second clearly is) to underline the concentration of the Greeks on Paris. At 1.23.1 'vitas inuleo me similis, Chloe' it is generally assumed that *me* is weak, stowed away as it is between *inuleo* and *similis*, but the meaning is perhaps rather 'you avoid *me*' or even 'do you avoid *me*?'; in the last stanza (1.23.9f.) Horace proceeds 'atqui non ego te tigris ut aspera | Gaetulusve leo frangere persequor' ('after all, I'm not pursuing you like a tiger . . .'). At 4.1.7f. Horace says to Venus 'abi | quo blandae iuvenum te revocant preces'; here *te* may be the emphatic pronoun familiar from hymns. The case is clearer at 4.13.9ff. 'importunus enim transvolat aridas | quercus, et refugit te quia luridi | dentes, te quia rugae | turpant et capitis nives'; here the position of 11 *te* at the beginning of its clause shows that 10 *te* in the middle of the Asclepiad line is also emphatic. There is a more problematic instance at 1.19.1f. 'mater saeva Cupidinum | Thebanaeque iubet me Semelae puer | et lasciva Licentia | finitis animum reddere amoribus'; here most readers will regard *me* as weak (as at 5 'urit me Glycerae nitor'), but at 9 'in me tota ruens Venus' *me* is undoubtedly emphatic. To return to the ode to Pyrrha, a similar situation arises in the first line (1.5.1) 'quis multa gracilis te puer in rosa . . .'; here *te* seems usually to be regarded as weak, but perhaps the meaning is 'What mere boy presses a voluptuous person like *you*?' (with a contrast first between *multa* and *gracilis* and then between *te* and *puer*).

When the pronoun is first word in the line it cannot be enclitic, any more than $\mu\epsilon$ can begin a line of Greek verse. Consider the ode to Postumus, 2.14.21ff. 'linquenda tellus et domus et placens | uxor, neque harum quas colis arborum | te praeter invisas cupressos | ulla brevem dominum sequetur'; here *te* must be emphatic, perhaps balancing *uxor*, which also derives point from its place in the line. 4.1.38ff. 'iam volucrem sequor | te per gramina Martii | Campi, te per aquas, dure, volubilis'; the position of *te* at the beginning of one line and another clause underlines Horace's obsession. 4.5.31f. 'hinc ad vina redit laetus et alteris | te mensis adhibet deum'; here *te*, in spite of its position between *alteris* and *mensis*, has the emphasis common in panegyrics as in prayers (note also the following line 'te multa prece, te prosequitur mero'). There is a striking instance at 1.8.1ff., where the commentaries offer no comment: 'Lydia, dic per omnis | te deos oro, Sybarin cur properes amando | perdere'. If this had been prose we should all have assumed that *te* was weak, hidden away between *omnis* and *deos*; but that leaves us with weak *te* at the beginning of the

line, where $\mu\epsilon$ would be intolerable in Greek. It seems that *te* is more insistent than is sometimes realized; *te oro* is a common word order.

It is already clear that metre has an effect on Horace's word order, not because it imposes abnormalities (as is too often implied), but because certain positions in the line tend to suit particular elements. The word at the beginning of a self-contained line often agrees with the word at the end; this can sometimes produce an epigrammatic effect, as at 2.16.30 'longa Tithonum minuit senectus'. Such lines are attested in Greek and are familiar in Latin from the time of Cicero and Catullus (Norden (1957: 391); Conrad (1965: 225-9); Pearce (1966: 162-6); Van Sickle (1968: 500)); they are notably common in the *Odes*, where it has been calculated that 247 lines (one in fourteen) are thus bound into a single colon (Stevens (1953: 203)). The word before the caesura often agrees with the word at the end of the line, and the word after the caesura often agrees with the word at the beginning (cf. 3.3.5 'dux inquieti turbidus Hadriae'); for other standard distributions see Drexler (1967: 126-34). A word in one line is sometimes picked up by a corresponding word at the same place in a following line (for such 'vertical responson' cf. Boldt (1884: 82-3); Stevens (1953: 203-4); Conrad (1965: 252-3)). See for example 1.1.9f. 'illum si proprio condidit horreo | quidquid de Libycis verritur areis', and for longer intervals 2.14.5ff., 4.4.7ff.; for a less obvious instance one may cite the balancing adjectives at 1.22.5ff. 'sive per Syrtis iter aestuosas, | sive facturus per inhospitalem | Caucasum, vel quae loca fabulosus | lambit Hydaspes'.

The last word in the line may or may not be significant. One in three of the hyperbata in the *Odes* crosses verse boundaries (Stevens (1953: 203)), compared with one in seven in the *Aeneid*; when an adjective in such circumstances comes at the end of the line, its position may reinforce the emphasis imposed by the hyperbaton itself (as at 2.10.6ff. 'tutus caret obsoleti | sordibus tecti, caret invidenda | sobrius aula'). On the other hand the last word may be a mere connective like *et* or *neque*; for an extreme instance of the former cf. 2.6.1ff. 'Septimi, Gadis aditure mecum et | Cantabrum indoctum iuga ferre nostra et | barbaras Syrtes', where the repeated enjambment may be meant to suggest persistent scurrying. For other weak line-endings cf. such passages as 1.5.12f. 'miseri quibus | in-temptata nites' (so 4.4.18), 3.7.14f. 'nimis | casto Bellerophontae'.

When the first word in the line is followed by a pause (not always marked by punctuation in modern texts), it often has particular significance (just as in hexameters); thus we find in the ode to Pyrrha 1.5.10ff. 'qui semper vacuum, semper amabilem | sperat, nescius aurae | fallacis', where *sperat* and *fallacis* are given an extra edge by their position. The slight emphasis may easily be missed: cf. 1.9.17f. 'donec virenti canities abest | morosa', 2.2.19ff. 'populumque falsis | dedocet uti | vocibus' ('empty

words', as Naylor suggests), 2.11.21f. 'quis devium scortum eliciet domo | Lyden?' (the climax, with *devium scortum* in apposition, cf. 3.7.4f.), 2.16.9ff. 'non enim gazae neque consularis | summovet lictor miseros tumultus | mentis' (the tumult of the mind is contrasted with the tumult of the streets, and *mentis* derives emphasis from its place in the line as well as its place outside *miseros tumultus*; cf. 2.13.7f. 'nocturno cruore | hospitis'), 2.16.21f. 'scandit aeratas vitiosa navis | cura' (the climax comes at the end of the clause and the beginning of the line), 3.2.5f. 'vitamque sub divo et trepidis agat | in rebus' ('in action', as Naylor says), 3.10.16f. 'supplicibus tuis | parcas' (the key word of the supplication), 3.17.6f. 'qui Formiarum moenia dicitur | princeps...' (the founder was particularly important, cf. 1.3.12 'primus' in the same position). When a first word followed by a pause seems over-emphasized, it may prove to be contrasted with another word in the context: see 1.3.21ff. 'nequiquam deus abscedit | prudens Oceano dissociabili | terras, si tamen impiae | non tangenda rates transiliunt vada', 2.1.1ff. 'motum ex Metello consule civicum | ... (7) tractas, et incedis per ignes' (handling is balanced by walking), 2.3.9ff. 'quo pinus ingens albaque populus | umbram hospitem consociare amant | ramis? quid obliquo laborat | lympha fugax trepidare rivo?' (the pause after *ramis* need not be strong, a fact obscured by the modern question-mark), 3.10.5ff. 'audis quo strepitu ianua, quo nemus | inter pulchra satum tecta remugiat | ventis, et positas ut glaciet nives | puro numine Iuppiter?', 4.1.38ff. 'iam volucrum sequor | te per gramina Martii | Campi, te per aquas, dure, volubilis'. But not every word in this prominent position has point; see for instance 2.9.1ff. 'at non ter aevo functus amabilem | ploravit omnis Antiochum senex | annos, nec...' (where Naylor notes the oddity), 2.10.13ff. 'sperat infestis, metuit secundis | alteram sortem bene praeparatum | pectus', 4.13.9f. 'importunus enim transvolat aridas | quercus' (for further material see Drexler (1967: 128)).

Sometimes a different effect may be recognized. Consider 1.11.7f. 'dum loquimur, fugerit invida | aetas: carpe diem, quam minimum credula postero': not only does the emphatic *aetas* balance *diem*, but the enjambment seems to underline the speed of time (note also 5f. 'mare | Tyrrhenum'). There are a number of similar enjambments in the poem to the ship (1.14), perhaps suggesting that things are out of control: see 2f. 'fortiter occupa | portum', 6ff. 'ac sine funibus | vix durare carinae | possint imperiosius | aequor', perhaps 14f. 'nil pictis timidus navita puppibus | fidit' (though there the contrast between *pictis* and *fidit* may be more significant). In 3.19 (on the celebration for Murena) the combination of enjambments and short sentences may suit a party that is livening up: see 10f. 'da, puer, auguris | Murenas' (with emphasis on the proper name),

14f. 'ternos ter cyathos attonitus petet | vates', 21f. 'parcentis ego dexteras | odi: sparge rosas'.

Sometimes the enjambment is so strange that the text has been doubted. Such a case arises at 2.18.29ff. 'nulla certior tamen | rapacis Orci fine destinata | aula divitem manet | erum. quid ultra tendis?'; here the position of *erum* before the pause seems intolerable, and I have proposed joining the word to the following sentence ('why do you strain proprietorship farther?'). Or consider 3.6.9ff. 'iam bis Monaeses et Pacori manus | non auspicatos contudit impetus | nostros, et adiecisse praedam | torquibus exiguis renidet'. Here *nostros* before the pause seems too emphatic, seeing that *impetus* is already qualified by *non auspicatos*; Bentley proposed *nostrorum* with *impetus* (it would be better with *praedam*), Shackleton Bailey considered *nostratem* or *Romanam*, I have tried *praeclaram*, which if it was corrupted to *praedam* would have caused rewriting. Some editors have felt difficulty at 4.11.4f. 'est hederæ vis | multa, qua crines religata fulges': *multa* seems very emphatic in its isolated position at the beginning of the stanza. But here the adjective may be pointed, balancing 2 'plenus Albani cadus'; for other instances of an isolated *multus* at the beginning of a line cf. 2.16.17f. 'quid brevi fortes iaculamur aevo | multa' (a contrast), 3.17.10, 4.9.26.

This leads to the controversy about 3.6.25ff. 'motus doceri gaudet Ionicos | matura virgo et fingitur artibus | iam nunc et incestos amores | de tenero meditatur ungui'. Here editors disagree about whether to take *iam nunc* with the preceding or the following clause; this is linked to the problem about *de tenero ungui*, which is explained as either 'from earliest infancy' or 'with every fibre of her being'. I take it that the former is correct; this alone suits *meditatur* ('practises' or 'rehearses'), which itself balances *doceri* and *fingitur*. If that is so, *iam nunc* must be taken with *fingitur artibus* and followed by a comma; now each clause includes an indication of time (*matura*, *iam nunc*, and finally the hyperbole of *de tenero ungui*). This is not the only place where Horace emphasizes an adverb by placing it at the beginning of a line and end of a colon: see 1.34.5ff. 'namque Diespiter | igni corusco nubila dividens | plerumque . . .', 2.9.4 'usque', 2.20.9ff. 'iam iam residunt *cruribus* asperæ | pelles, et album mutor in alitem | *superne* . . .'. But though an adverb may come at the end of a colon, it is less natural at the end of a sentence; here the movement of formal Latin differs from Greek.

This leads one to ask what part of speech most often ends a sentence in the *Odes*. In prose of the first century BC there is still a considerable tendency to end with the verb: thus in a sample of Caesar 84 per cent of verbs come at the end of the main clause, and though the proportion declines in the imperial period, even in a sample of Seneca the figure is

58 per cent (Linde (1923: 154–5)). In Horace, on the other hand, the last word is most often a noun, and a verb ends only a quarter of the sentences (Stevens (1953: 202)). This is partly a consequence of the greater use of adjectives than in prose and the higher incidence of hyperbaton; by an increasingly common word order a verb is often interposed between the adjective and noun (Adams (1971)). In rhetorical Latin there is some reluctance to let an isolated noun dangle at the end; but when the noun is supported by an adjective and the verb interposed, the sentence is clearly incomplete till the noun falls into place.

Horace sometimes places an adjective at the end of a sentence, usually with hyperbaton; this reversal of the normal tendency gives it particular point (see also above on possessives). Such adjectives may be contrasted with earlier words, sometimes with chiasmus: see 2.1.5ff. '*nondum expiatis unctā cruoribus, | periculosae plenum opus aleae | tractas, et incedis per ignes | suppositos cineri doloso*', 2.8.15f. '*semper ardentis acuens sagittas | cote cruenta*', 3.3.72 '*magna modis tenuare parvis*', 3.6.35f. '*ingentem cecidit | Antiochum Hannibalemque dirum*', 3.15.6 '*et stellis nebulam spargere candidis*'. Or the adjective may be important even where there is no antithesis: cf. 1.9.24 '*aut digito male pertinaci*' (where the last word has the force of *resistenti*), 2.3.15f. '*dum res et aetas et sororum | fila trium patiuntur atra*' (but there may be a contrast with 14 *rosae*), 3.2.31f. '*raro antecedentem scelestum | deseruit pede Poena claudio*', 3.6.7f. '*di multa neglecti dederunt | Hesperiae mala luctuosae*', 3.24.44 '*virtutisque viam deserit arduae*'. There is an unusual case at 4.4.3f. '*expertus fidelem | Iuppiter in Ganymede flavo*', where an ornamental adjective with no particular emphasis immediately follows its noun at the end of the sentence and the stanza. Here the word order seems to give a conventionally 'poetical' effect, like the relaxed closure of Catullus 64 '*nec se contingi patiuntur lumine claro*' or the mock-neoteric cadence of Juvenal's ninth satire, '*quae Siculos cantus effugit remige surdo*'.

In considering word order, questions about colometry are sometimes relevant, though in the case of poets they seldom attract attention (Quint. 11.3.36–8, Serv. *Aen.* 1.1, (Norden (1957: 376–90)). A descriptive clause may be separated from the vocative to which it belongs (as sometimes in Pindar); cf. 3.29.1ff. '*Tyrrhena regum progenies, . . . | . . . 3 Maecenas*', and in a hymnal context 3.21.1ff. '*o nata mecum consule Manlio, | . . . 4 pia testa*'. There is a controversial passage at 1.12.19ff. '*proximos illi tamen occupabit | Pallas honores. | proeliis audax, neque te silebo | Liber*'; here in another hymnal context I am now inclined to take '*proeliis audax*' not with *Pallas* but with *Liber* (note the weapons associated with Diana and Phoebus later in the same stanza). A different question arises at 3.14.1ff. '*Herculis ritu, modo dictus, o plebs, | morte venalem petiisse laurum, |*

Caesar Hispana repetit Penatis | victor ab ora'. Against the commentators I take *Herculis ritu* not with *petiisse* but with *repetit*; Augustus was recently thought to have sought the bay-wreath at the cost of his life, but the resemblance to Hercules lies not in this but in his triumphant return from Spain. A short clause like *Herculis ritu* can be an independent colon, and need not cohere closely with what immediately follows.

Horace sometimes develops a sentence by means of a participial clause, in a manner more characteristic of Greek than of standard Latin; or sometimes the appended clause depends on an adjective where Greek would have supplied the participle of the verb 'to be'. Thus in the ode to Pyrrha we find 2 'perfusus liquidis . . . odoribus' (too compressed for Cicero), 5 'simplex munditiis', 10f. 'nescius aurae | fallacis' (appendages more characteristic of Tacitus than of republican Latin). I add a selection of many other instances; just as in prose, editors do not always use punctuation to indicate colometry, preferring to follow irrelevant modern conventions. 1.29.7ff. 'puer quis ex aula capillis | ad cyathum statuatur unctis, | doctus sagittas tendere Sericas | arcu paterno?' 1.33.14ff. 'grata detinuit compede Myrtale, | libertina fretis acrior Hadriae, | curvantis Calabros sinus' (where many wrongly punctuate after *libertina* rather than *Myrtale*). 1.36.18ff. 'nec Damalis novo | divelletur adultero, | lascivis hederis ambitiosior' (a comparative may link an independent colon as at 1.18.16 'arcanique Fides prodiga, perlucidior vitro', 2.14.28). 1.37.25ff. 'ausa et iacentem visere regiam | vultu sereno, fortis et asperas | tractare serpentis, ut atrum | corpore combiberet venenum, | deliberata morte ferocior, | saevis Liburnis scilicet invidens | privata deduci superbo, | non humilis mulier, triumpho' (the accumulation of appositions is remarkable even for Horace). 3.6.31f. 'seu navis Hispanae magister, | dedecorum pretiosus emptor' (here the sentence is developed by a noun in apposition). 4.9.49ff. 'duramque callet pauperiem pati, | peiusque leto flagitium timet, | non ille pro caris amicis, | aut patria timidus perire'. 4.14.17ff. 'spectandus in certamine Martio, | devota morti pectora liberae | quantis fatigaret ruinis, | indomitas prope qualis undas | exercet Auster, Pleiadum choro | scindente nubes, impiger hostium | vexare turmas, et trementem | mittere equum medios per ignis' (another triumphant period).

Horace in the *Odes* shows a partiality for ablative absolutes that is unusual in a poet: the construction helps his desire for brevity, and if it suggests the language of historians and official discourse, that gives no cause for surprise. Sometimes he separates his ablative with the subject of the sentence or other elements (Naylor (1922: 23)); cf. 1.10.14 'Ilio dives Priamus relicto', 2.7.27f. 'recepto | dulce mihi furere est amico', or with an interlaced word order 1.16.27f. 'fias recantatis amica | opprobriis', 3.16.39f. 'contracto melius parva cupidine | vectigalia porrigam'. In these places the

components are short enough to be accommodated in a single colon; so there is no more difficulty in splitting the ablative than there would be with an ablative of quality. Such hyperbaton is rare in early Latin (cf. Plaut. *Stich.* 602f. 'non me quidem | faciet auctore', with emphasis on *me*), and though Cicero has no difficulty about interposing a connective or an adverb, he does not normally do so with more significant elements (*Sest.* 11 'quibus hic litteris lectis' is an exception, but *hic* slips in very easily). On the other hand the subject is freely interposed in Caesar and particularly Livy (Hofmann-Szantyr (1965: 402)). Here again we find that Horace's practice has more affinities with historiography than with oratory or poetry.

Horace's ablative absolute often comes after the main verb, sometimes at the very end of the sentence, even when it describes an antecedent action. See for instance 2.7.9f. 'tecum Philippos et celerem fugam | sensi, relicta non bene parmula . . .', 3.1.33f. 'contracta pisces aequora sentiunt, | iactis in altum molibus', 3.3.17f. 'gratum elocuta consiliantibus | Iunone divis', 3.3.52, 3.3.65f., 3.5.2ff. 'praesens divus habebitur | Augustus, adiectis Britannis | imperio gravibusque Persis' (such 'officialese' suits the Roman Odes), 3.5.12 'incolumi Iove et urbe Roma', 3.6.27f. 'cui donet impermissa raptim | gaudia luminibus remotis' (an austere description of an erotic situation), 3.14.14ff. 'ego nec tumultum | nec mori per vim metuam, tenente | Caesare terras', 4.5.27 'incolumi Caesare'. Such postponement of the ablative absolute is found occasionally in early Latin (Plaut. *Amph.* 998 'vobis inspectantibus') and Cicero's letters (*Q.F.* 1.4.2 'infidelibus amicis, plurimis invidis'), but is untypical of his speeches, where he is working towards a climax. On the other hand the ablative absolute often follows the main statement both in Livy and Tacitus, though even in the historians it is relatively rare at the very end of the sentence.

I turn now to places where by a procedure common in Greek and Latin poetry the elements of two cola are intertwined. For a simple instance see once again the ode to Pyrrha, 1.5.1f. 'quis multa gracilis te puer in rosa | perfusus liquidis urget odoribus?'; here the main verb is included within the participial clause, as at 1.21.13ff. 'hic bellum lacrimosum, hic miseram famem | . . . vestra motus aget prece'. For a somewhat different trajectory see 3.27.18f. 'ego quid sit ater | Hadriae novi sinus', where *novi* is inserted in the indirect question that depends on it; cf. Soph. *O.T.* 1251 $\chi\acute{\alpha}\pi\omega\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\delta' \omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\tau' \omicron\iota\delta' \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, Theoc. 16.16f. $\acute{\rho}\theta\epsilon\nu \omicron\iota\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\theta\rho\epsilon\iota | \acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\upsilon\rho\nu$, Boldt (1884: 130-59). There is a more unusual case at 1.22.17f. 'pone me pigris ubi nulla campis | arbor aestiva recreatur aura'; here the effect is to throw greater emphasis on *nulla*. See also 3.14.21f. 'dic et argutae properet Neaerae | murreum nodo cohibere crinem'; far from being hidden away, *properet* is emphasized by its unusual position and

underlines the poet's impatience. At first sight we assume that *properet* means 'hurry to come' (cf. 2.11.23 *maturret*), so the infinitive *cohibere* comes as a surprise; there is something to be said for Muretus' *cohibente*, which gives a more straightforward word order.

I come now to other sorts of dislocation, beginning with the ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction, where an element common to two parallel clauses is postponed till the second clause (Leo (1896)); the figure is common in Greek and Latin poetry, and though it may have originated as a metrical convenience, Horace must have felt it as an elegant poeticism that served the interests of balance and economy. To turn first to the ode to Pyrrha, we find 'heu quotiens fidem | mutatosque deos flebit' (1.5.5f.); here some editors interpret *fidem* as *perfidiam*, but it suits Horace better to understand *fidem mutata*m. For other examples of the construction see for instance 2.7.23ff. 'quis udo | deproperare apio coronas | curatve myrto?', 3.1.12 'moribus hic meliorque fama', 3.4.19 'lauraque conlataque myrto', 3.11.6 'divitum mensis et amica templis', perhaps 4.2.41f. 'concines laetosque dies et urbis | publicum ludum' (where Naylor explains the unexpected prominence of *urbis* by taking it with *dies* as well as with *ludum*). For an unusual repetition of the figure see the last three stanzas of the Alcaic ode to Bacchus, 2.19.23f. 'leonis | unguibus horribilisque mala' (where *horribilisque* is Bochart's plausible conjecture for *horribilique*), 28 'pacis eras mediusque belli', 32 'ore pedes tetigitque crura'. Perhaps Horace is using a construction that he regarded as typical of Greek hymns; in similar contexts note 1.30.5f. (to Venus) 'fervidus tecum puer et solutis | Gratiae zonis properentque Nymphae', 3.21.18 (the parodic hymn to the wine-jar) 'viresque et addis cornua pauperi'.

For a common kind of ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction cf. 3.25.2 'quae nemora aut quos agor in specus'; here by a figure common in Greek and Latin poetry a preposition is attached to the second of two nouns to which it applies. For more complex cases see 1.27.11f. 'quo beatus | vulnere, qua pereat sagitta', where by a familiar elegance the common elements (*beatus* and *pereat*) are distributed between the two clauses; so also 2.8.3f. 'dente si nigro fieres vel uno | turpior ungui', 2.15.18ff. 'oppida publico | sumptu iubentes et deorum | templa novo decorare saxo'. There is a controversial passage at 3.12.8f. 'eques ipso melior Bellerophonte neque pugno | neque segni pede victus', where some take *segni* with *pugno* as well as with *pede*; I have suggested elsewhere (1995: 263–4, 434) that the adjective conceals a proper name, say *Cycni*, that again has to be taken with both ablatives.

I turn now to a few places where there is a more unusual dislocation. Consider 1.23.11f. 'tandem desine matrem | tempestiva sequi viro', where *tempestiva viro* is interrupted by the intrusive *sequi*. The metre is not a significant factor (for Horace could have written *tempestiva viro sequi*); in

fact the artificial hyperbaton emphasizes *viro* and sets it against *matrem*. A similar case may be suspected at the end of the ode to Pyrrha, 1.5.14ff. 'uvida suspendisse potenti | vestimenta maris deo'; normally *maris* would come immediately after *potenti*, on which it depends, but its dislocation gives it unusual emphasis. This might support Quinn's idea that there is a pun on Neptune who rules the sea and Venus who rules the male; it is desirable that the ambiguity of the ode should be sustained to the end, and Horace makes a similar pun at *Serm.* 2.8.14f. 'procedit fuscus Hydaspes | Caecuba vina ferens, Alcon Chium maris expers'.

There is a stranger instance of a displaced genitive at 1.35.5ff. (the ode to Fortune): 'te pauper ambit sollicita prece | ruris colonus, te dominam aequoris | quicumque Bithyna lacescit | Carpathium pelagus carina'. Here *ruris* must be taken not with *colonus*, where it is otiose, but with *dominam*, where it is needed to balance *aequoris*. The emphasis on *pauper* might suggest a contrast with the merchant, but it is particularly difficult to give *ruris* the necessary emphasis when it interrupts the sequence of *pauper* and *colonus*. For these reasons I have sometimes been tempted to read 'te ruris ambit sollicita prece | pauper colonus, te dominam aequoris...'. The long hyperbaton would put great weight on *ruris*, which combines with *aequoris* to show the extent of Fortune's power (a kind of polar expression common in hymns); any contrast between the poor man and the rich man is much less significant in this context.

In discussing this last passage Housman said that 'every Roman child felt in the marrow of his bones that *ruris* depended on *dominam*' (*CR* 16 (1902) 445 = Diggle and Goodyear (1972: ii. 581)). That is an implausible assertion, even allowing for characteristic hyperbole: not just in this exceptional case but in general the word order of the *Odes* must have seemed strange to the uninitiated, and it is not surprising that the first reactions were disappointing (*Epist.* 1.19.35ff.). It is often remarked that in late antiquity the literary language was very different from spoken Latin, but the same was true to some extent of the Augustan poets, especially of one so original as Horace in the *Odes*. The formal organization of their verse is indeed remarkable, but it is unprofitable to look for explanations in the national character. Roman poetry was not an indigenous growth, and when it peaked it was very dependent on Hellenistic models, where the divorce from living Greek was greater than in the classical period.

All the same, Horace achieves such regularity in his self-imposed rules that they begin to seem inevitable. Far from cramping his style, they are an inseparable part of it. He achieves his effects not by flowery colouring but by balance and antithesis, precision and intensity, concentration and cohesion. The words interact as in a miniature physical system, the adject-

tives may seem conventional but their placing makes them tell, the interlocking produced by the hyperbata helps to bolt the monument together. Nothing could be more unlike the triteness and triviality of the usual English translations.

Bibliography

- Adamietz, J. (ed.) (1986), *Die römische Satire* (Grundriß der Literaturgeschichten nach Gattungen) (Darmstadt).
- Adams, J. N. (1971), 'A type of hyperbaton in Latin prose', *PCPhS* 17: 1–16.
- (1976), 'A typological approach to Latin word-order', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 81: 70–99.
- (1980a), 'Latin words for woman and wife', *Glotta* 50: 234–55.
- (1980b), 'Anatomical terminology in Latin epic', *BICS* 27: 50–62.
- (1982a), *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London).
- (1982b), 'Anatomical terms transferred from animals to humans in Latin', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 87: 90–109.
- (1983), 'Words for "prostitute" in Latin', *RhM* 126: 321–58.
- (1992), 'Iteration of compound verb with simplex in Latin prose', *Eikasmos* 3: 295–8.
- (1994a), 'Wackernagel's law and the position of unstressed personal pronouns in Classical Latin', *TPhS* 92: 103–78.
- (1994b), *Wackernagel's Law and the Placement of the Copula esse in Classical Latin* (Cambridge Philological Society, Suppl. vol. 18) (Cambridge).
- (1995a), 'The language of the Vindolanda writing tablets: an interim report', *JRS* 85: 86–134.
- (1995b), *Pelagonius and Latin Veterinary Terminology in the Roman Empire* (Studies in Ancient Medicine, 11) (Leiden).
- Allen, W. S. (1973), *Accent and Rhythm. Prosodic Features of Latin and Greek: a Study in Theory and Reconstruction* (Cambridge).
- (1978, 2nd ed.), *Vox Latina. A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Latin* (Cambridge).
- Alfonso, S., Cipriani, G., Fedeli, P., Mazzini, I., Tedeschi, A. (1990), *Il poeta elegiaco e il viaggio d'amore* (Scrinia, 3) (Bari).
- Anderson, R. D., Parsons, P. J. and Nisbet, R. G. M. (1979), 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaşr İbrîm', *JRS* 69: 125–55.
- Anderson, W. S. (1956; 1964; 1970; 1981), 'Recent Work in Roman Satire', *CIW* 50: 33–40; *CIW* 57: 293–301; 343–8; *CIW* 63: 181–94; 199; 217–22; *CIW* 75: 273–99.
- (1961), 'Venusina lucerna: the Horatian model for Juvenal', *TAPA* 52: 1–12. (Reprinted in Anderson (1982) 103–14.)
- (1962), 'The Programs of Juvenal's Later Books', *CPh* 57: 145–60. (Reprinted in Anderson (1982), 277–92.)
- (1982), *Essays on Roman Satire* (Princeton).
- André, J. (1949), *Étude sur les termes de couleur dans la langue latine* (Paris).
- (1967), *Les noms d'oiseaux en latin* (Paris).

- ____ (1980), 'Deux remarques sur le volume du mot latin', *RPh* 54: 7–18.
- ____ (1987), *Être médecin à Rome* (Realia) (Paris).
- ____ (1991), *Le vocabulaire latin de l'anatomie* (Paris).
- Arens, J. C. (1950), '-fer and -ger: their extraordinary preponderance among compounds in Roman poetry', *Mnemosyne*⁴ 3: 241–62.
- Argenio, I. (1963), 'I grecismi in Lucilio', *CRSt* 11: 5–17.
- Artymowicz, A. (1909), 'Der Wechsel von *et* und *que* zu Beginn lateinischer daktylischer Verse von Ennius bis Corippus', *Wiener Studien* 31: 38–81.
- Atherton, C. (1996), 'What every grammarian knows?', *CQ* NS 46: 239–60.
- Austin, R. G. (ed.) (1964), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus* (Oxford).
- ____ (ed.) (1971), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus* (Oxford).
- ____ (ed.) (1977), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus* (Oxford).
- Avotins, I. (1980), 'Alexander of Aphrodisias on vision in the atomists', *CQ* NS 30: 429–54.
- Axelson, B. (1945), *Unpoetische Wörter. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache* (Lund).
- Bader, F. (1962), *La formation des composés nominaux du latin* (Paris).
- Baehrens, E. (ed.) (1885), *Catulli Veronensis liber* (Leipzig).
- Baehrens, W. A. (1912), *Beiträge zur lateinischen Syntax*. Philologus, Suppl. 12 (Leipzig).
- Bagnall, R. S. (1993), *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton).
- Bailey, C. (ed.) (1947, corr. ed. 1949, 3 vols), *Titi Lucreti Cari de rerum natura libri sex* (Oxford).
- Baratin, M. (1989), *La naissance de la syntaxe à Rome* (Paris).
- Barnes, J., Mignucci, M. (edd.) (1988), *Matter and Metaphysics* (Naples).
- Bartalucci, A. (1968), 'La sperimentazione enniiana dell'esametro e la tecnica del saturnio', *SCO* 17: 99–122.
- Bauer, C. F. (1933), *The Latin Perfect Endings '-ere' and '-erunt'* (Ling. Soc. America, Language Diss. 13) (Philadelphia).
- Beck, M. (1996), *Die Epistulae Heroidum XVIII und XIX des Corpus Ovidianum. Echtheitskritische Untersuchungen* (Paderborn).
- Bell, A. J. (1923), *The Latin Dual and Poetic Diction* (London and Toronto).
- Benediktson, D. T. (1977), 'Vocabulary analysis and the generic classification of literature', *Phoenix* 31: 341–8.
- Bennett, C. E. (1910), *Syntax of Early Latin, Vol. I—The Verb* (Boston).
- Bentley, R. (ed.) (1711), *Q. Horatius Flaccus* (Cambridge).
- Benz, L., Stärk, E., Vogt-Spira, G. (edd.) (1995), *Plautus und die Tradition des Stegreifspiels*. Festgabe für E. Lefèvre zum 60. Geburtstag (Tübingen).
- Berkowitz, L. and Brunner, Th. F. (1968), *Index Lucilianus* (Hildesheim).
- Binder, G. (ed.) (1988), *Saeculum Augustum II* (Wege der Forschung 512) (Darmstadt).
- Biville, F. (1987), *Graphie et prononciation des mots grecs en latin* (Paris).
- ____ (1989), (ed.) 'Grec et latin: contacts linguistiques et création lexicale. Pour une typologie des hellénismes lexicaux du latin', in Lavency and Longrée (1989), 29–40.
- ____ (1990), *Les emprunts du latin au grec: approche phonétique* vol. I (Bibliothèque de l'information grammaticale, 19) (Louvain—Paris).

- Blase, H. (1903), 'Tempora und Modi', in G. Landgraf (ed.), *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. 3. Band *Syntax des einfachen Satzes* (Leipzig).
- Bloch, H. (1940), 'L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus in Samothrace and 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 Elegancia Tibullus' in *XAPITEZ. Friedrich Leo* 371–94 (Berlin).
- Brunér, E. A. (1863), 'De ordine et temporibus carminum Valerii Catulli', *Acta Soc. Scient. Fennicae* 7: 599–657.
- Bülow-Jacobsen, A., Cuvigny, H. and Fournet, J.-L. (1994), 'The identification of Myos Hormos. New papyrological evidence', *BIFAO* 94: 27–42.
- Burnyeat, M. F. (1978), 'The upside-down back-to-front sceptic of Lucretius IV 472', *Philologus* 122: 197–206.
- Cairns, F. (1972), *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh).
- (1979), *Tibullus: a Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge).
- (1983), 'Propertius 1.4 and 1.5 and the 'Gallus' of the Monobiblos', *PLLS* 4: 61–104.
- (1984), 'The etymology of *militia* in Roman elegy' in *Apophoreta philologica Emmanuelli Fernandez-Galiano a sodalibus oblata* 2.211–22 (Madrid).
- (ed.) (1986), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar 5, 1985* (Liverpool).
- (1986), 'Stile e contenuti di Tibullo e di Propertio' in *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi su Albio Tibullo* 49–50. (Rome).
- Callebat, L. (1974), 'Le vocabulaire de l'hydraulique dans le livre VIII du *De architectura* de Vitruve', *RPh* 48: 313–29.
- (1982), 'La prose du *De Architectura* de Vitruve', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* II.30.1: 696–722 (Berlin).
- (ed.) (1995), *Latin vulgaire, latin tardif. IV. Actes du 4^e colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif. Caen, 2–5 septembre 1994* (Hildesheim, Zurich, New York).
- Campanile, E. (1985), art. 'grecismi', in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* ii.805–7 (Rome).
- Casali, S. (ed.) (1995), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroïdum Epistula IX. Deianira Herculi* (Florence).
- Caspari, F. (1908), *De ratione quae inter Vergilium et Lucanum intercedat quaestiones selectae* (Diss. Leipzig).
- Cavenaile, R. (1958), *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum* (Wiesbaden).
- Cèbe, J.-P. (1966), *La caricature et la parodie dans le monde romain*, (Bibl. des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 206) (Paris).
- Charpin, F. (ed.) (1978, 1979, 1991), *Lucilius, Satires. Texte établi, traduit et annoté* (Paris).
- Christ, W. (1879, 2nd ed.), *Metrik der Griechen und Römer* (Leipzig).
- Christes, J. (1971), *Der frühe Lucilius. Rekonstruktion und Interpretation des XXVI. Buches sowie von Teilen des XXX. Buches* (Heidelberg).
- (1972), 'Lucilius. Ein Bericht über die Forschung seit F. Marx (1904/5)', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* I.2. 1182–1239 (Berlin).
- (1986), 'Lucilius', in Adamietz (1986), 57–122.
- Cichorius, C. (1908), *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius* (Berlin).

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

- zens 'De rerum natura'. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 48 (Berlin and New York).
- Diggle, J. (1972), 'Ouidiana', *PCPS* NS 18: 31–41.
- Diggle, J. and Goodyear, F. R. D. (edd.) (1972), *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman* (Cambridge).
- Dingel, J. (1997), *Kommentar zum 9. Buch der Aeneis Vergils* (Heidelberg).
- Dionisotti, A. C. (1995), 'Hellenismus' in O. Weijers (ed.), *Vocabulary of Teaching and Research Between Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Civacima. Études sur le vocabulaire intellectuel du Moyen Age 8) (Turnhout).
- Domínguez Domínguez, J. F. and Martín Rodríguez, A. M. (1993), 'Dare con infinitivo en latín clásico', *Cuadernos de filología clásica*, 4: 9–22.
- Dover, K. J. (1963), 'The Poetry of Archilochus', in *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 10: 183–212 (Geneva).
- (1968, corrected reprint of 1960 ed.), *Greek Word Order* (Cambridge).
- Draeger, A. (1882, 3rd ed.), *Über Syntax und Stil des Tacitus* (Leipzig).
- Drexler, H. (1967), *Einführung in die römische Metrik* (Darmstadt).
- Dubois, J. (1966), 'Les problèmes du vocabulaire technique', *Cahiers de lexicologie* 9: 103–12.
- Dumortier, J. (1935), *Le vocabulaire médical d'Eschyle et les écrits hippocratiques* (Paris).
- Easterling, P. E. (ed.) (1982), *Sophocles, Trachiniae* (Cambridge).
- Eich, M. (1925), *De praepositionum collocatione apud poetas Latinos inde ab Ovidio* (Diss. Bonn).
- Eklund, S. (1970), *The periphrastic, completive and finite use of the present participle in Latin. With special regard to translation of Christian texts in Greek up to 600 A.D.* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Latina Upsaliensia, 5) (Uppsala).
- Elder, J. P. (1962), 'Tibullus: Tersus atque Elegans' in J. P. Sullivan (ed.) *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy and Lyric*, 65–106. (London).
- Eliot, T. S. (1932 [1917]), 'Tradition and the individual talent', in *Selected Essays*, 13–22 (London).
- Ellis, R. (1876; 2nd ed. 1889), *A Commentary on Catullus* (Oxford).
- Erbse, H. (1953), 'Homerscholien und hellenistische Glossare bei Apollonios Rhodios', *Hermes* 81: 163–96.
- Ernout, A. (1946), 'Infinitif grec et gérondif latin', *Philologica* (Paris).
- (1947), 'Le vocabulaire poétique', rev. of Axelson (1945), *RPh* 21: 55–70 (= 1957b: 66–86).
- (1956), 'VENVS, VENIA, CVPIDO', *RPh* 30: 7–27 (= 1957b: 87–111).
- (1957a), 'METVS — TIMOR. Les formes en -us et en -os (-or) du latin', in 1957b: 7–56
- (1957b), *Philologica* II (Paris).
- Ernout, A. and Meillet, A. (1959; 4th ed.), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*, augmenté d'additions et de corrections nouvelles par J. André (Paris).
- Ernout, A. and Thomas, F. (1953), *Syntaxe latine* (Paris).
- Evans, W. J. (1921), *Allitteratio Latina* (London).
- Évrard-Gillis, J. (1976), *La récurrence lexicale dans l'oeuvre de Catulle: étude stylistique* (Paris).

- Fantham, E. (1972), *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery* (Toronto).
- Farrell, J. (1991), *Virgil's 'Georgics' and the Traditions of Ancient Epic* (New York and Oxford).
- Fedeli, P. (ed.) (1965), *Properzio, Elegie libro IV: Testo critico e commento* (Bari).
- (ed.) (1980), *Sesto Properzio, Il primo libro delle Elegie: Introduzione, testo critico e commento* (Florence).
- (ed.) (1985), *Properzio, Il libro terzo delle Elegie: Introduzione, testo e commento* (Bari).
- Ferguson, J. (1987), *A Prosopography to the Poems of Juvenal* (Brussels).
- Fiske, G. C. (1919), 'The plain style in the Scipionic Circle', in *Studies in Honor of Ch. Forster Smith* (Madison).
- (1920), *Lucilius and Horace. A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature 7) (Madison).
- Fitch, J. G. (1981), 'Sense-pauses and relative dating in Seneca, Sophocles and Shakespeare', *AJP* 102: 289–307.
- Flashar, H. (ed.) (1971), *Antike Medizin* (Wege der Forschung 221) (Darmstadt).
- Fluck, H.-R. (1980), *Fachsprachen: Einführung und Bibliographie* (Munich).
- Flury, P. (1968), *Liebe und Liebessprache bei Menander, Plautus und Terenz* (Heidelberg).
- (1990), 'Beiträge aus der Thesaurus-Arbeit, XXV: *occurrere*', *MH* 47: 225–6.
- Fordyce, C. J. (ed.) (1961; repr. with corrections and additional notes 1973), *Catullus: a Commentary* (Oxford).
- (ed.) (1977), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos libri 7–8*, with a commentary ed. by John D. Christie (Oxford).
- Fraenkel, E. (1922), *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Philologische Untersuchungen 28) (Berlin).
- (1928), *Iktus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechvers* (Berlin).
- (1960 = transl. of [1922] with addenda), *Elementi plautini in Plauto* (Florence).
- (1968), *Leseproben aus Reden Ciceros und Catos* (Rome).
- Freudenburg, K. (1993), *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire* (Princeton).
- Friedländer, P. (1941), 'Pattern of sound and atomistic theory in Lucretius', *AJP* 62: 16–34.
- Gaisser, J. H. (1993), *Catullus and his Renaissance Readers* (Oxford).
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (1991), *Language Selection and Switching in Strasbourg* (Oxford).
- Garvie, A. F. (ed.) (1986), *Aeschylus, Choephoroi, with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford).
- Geymonat, M. (ed.) (1973), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Turin).
- Gianfrotta, P. A. (1987), art. 'Navis', in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* iii. 670–4 (Rome).
- Gigante, M. (1981), *Scetticismo e epicureismo* (Naples).
- Gigon, O. (1978), 'Lukrez und Ennius', in *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 24: 167–91 (Geneva).
- Godwin, J. (ed.) (1986), *Lucretius: 'De Rerum Natura' IV* (Warminster).
- (ed.) (1991), *Lucretius: 'De Rerum Natura' VI* (Warminster).
- Gow, A. S. F. (1931), 'Diminutives in Augustan Poetry', *CQ* 26: 150–7.

- Goodyear, F. R. D. (ed.) (1972), *The Annals of Tacitus, I: Annals 1.1–54*, (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 15) (Cambridge).
- (ed.) (1981), *The Annals of Tacitus, II: Annals 1.55–81 and Annals 2*, (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 23) (Cambridge).
- Goold, G. P. (1974), *Interpreting Catullus* (London).
- (1983), *Catullus, edited with introduction, translation and notes* (London).
- (1990), *Propertius* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Görler, W. (1982), 'Beobachtungen zu Vergils Syntax', *Würzburger Jahrbücher* 8: 69–81.
- (1984), 'Zum Virtus-Fragment des Lucilius (1326–1338 Marx) und zur Geschichte der stoischen Güterlehre', *Hermes* 12: 445–68.
- (1985), art. 'Eneide, 6. La lingua', in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* ii. 262–78 (Rome).
- Gransden, K. W. (ed.) (1991) *Virgil Aeneid Book XI* (Cambridge).
- Gratwick, A. S. (1982), 'The Satires of Ennius and Lucilius', in Kenney and Clausen (1982), 156–71.
- Griffin, J. (1985), *Latin Poets and Roman Life* (London) (pp. 1–31 = *JRS* 66 [1976], 87–105).
- Grilli, A. (1978), 'Ennius podager', *RFIC* 106: 34–8.
- Groeber, G. (1884), 'Vulgärlateinische Substrate romanischer Wörter', *ALL* 1: 204–54.
- Guilbert, L. (1965), *La formation du vocabulaire de l'aviation* (Paris).
- Haffter, H. (1934), *Untersuchungen zur allateinischen Dichtersprache* (Problemata, 10) (Berlin).
- (1956), 'Zum Problem der überlangen Wortformen im Lateinischen', *WSI* 69: 363–71.
- Hahn, E. A. (1958), 'Vergil's linguistic treatment of divine beings, part II', *TAPA* 89: 237–53.
- Hakamies, R. (1951), *Étude sur l'origine et l'évolution du diminutive latin et sa survie dans les langues romanes* (Helsinki).
- Halm, C. (ed.) (1863), *Rhetores Latini Minores* (Leipzig).
- Handford, S. A. (1947), *The Latin Subjunctive. Its Usage and Development from Plautus to Terence* (London).
- Hanslik, R. (1969), art. 'Lucilius', in *Der kleine Pauly*, vol. III (Stuttgart).
- Hanssen, J. S. T. (1951), *Latin Diminutives: a Semantic Study* (Bergen).
- Hardie, P. R. (ed.) (1994), *Virgil, Aeneid, Book IX* (Cambridge).
- Harrison, E. L. (1960), 'Neglected hyperbole in Juvenal', *CR NS* 10: 99–101.
- Harrison, S. J. (ed.) (1990), *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford).
- (ed.) (1991), *Vergil, Aeneid 10*, with introduction, translation, and commentary (Oxford).
- Hartung, H. J. (1970), *Ciceros Methode bei der Übersetzung griechischer philosophischer Termini* (Diss. Hamburg).
- Haupt, M. (1841), *Observationes Criticae* (Leipzig) (= 1875: 73–142).
- (1875), *Opuscula I* (Leipzig).
- Heck, B. (1950), *Die Anordnung der Gedichte des C. Valerius Catullus* (Diss. Tübingen).
- Henry, A. (1971), *Métonymie et métaphore* (Paris).

- Herescu, N. I. (1960), *La poésie latine. Étude des structures phoniques* (Paris).
- Heraeus, W. (1937), *Kleine Schriften* (Heidelberg).
- Hermann, G. (1796), *De metris poetarum Graecorum et Romanorum libri III* (Leipzig).
- (1816), *Elementa doctrinae metricae* (Leipzig).
- Hettrich, H. (1988), *Untersuchungen zur Hypotaxe im Vedischen* (Berlin – New York).
- (1990), *Der Agens in passivischen Sätzen altindogermanischer Sprachen* (NAWG, 1. Philologisch-historische Klasse, Nr.2) (Göttingen).
- Heusch, H. (1954), *Das Archaische in der Sprache Catulls* (Diss. Bonn).
- Heurgon, J. (1959), *Lucilius* (Paris).
- Heyne, C. G. and Wagner, G. P. E. (edd.) (1830–33, 4th edn.), *P. Virgili Maronis opera*. (Leipzig).
- Highet, G. (1951), 'Juvenal's Bookcase', *AJP* 72: 369–94.
- (1954), *Juvenal the Satirist. A Study* (Oxford).
- Hillen, M. (1989), *Studien zur Dichtersprache Senecas. Abundanz. Explikativer Ablativ. Hypallage* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 32) (Berlin – New York).
- Hinds, S. E. (1987), 'Language at breaking point: Lucretius 1.452', *CQ* NS 37: 450–3.
- Hofmann, J. B. (1951), *Lateinische Umgangssprache*. 3. Auflage (Heidelberg).
- Hofmann, J. B. and Szantyr, A. (1965), *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II 2.2) (Munich).
- Holford-Strevens, L. (1988), *Aulus Gellius* (London).
- Hollis, A. S. (ed.) (1977), *Ovid, Ars Amatoria Book I, edited with an introduction and commentary* (Oxford).
- Horsfall, N. (1971), 'Numanus Regulus. Ethnography and propaganda in *Aen.* IX.598f.', *Latomus* 30: 1108–16 (= Harrison (1990: 127–44)).
- (1981), 'Some problems of titulature in Roman literary history', *BICS* 28: 103–11.
- Housman, A. E. (1907), 'Luciliana', *CQ* 1: 51–74, 148–59. (= Diggle and Goodyear (1972) ii.662–97.)
- Hunter, R. L. (ed.) (1989), *Apollonius of Rhodes, Argonautica Book III* (Cambridge).
- Hupe, C. (1871), *De genere dicendi C. Valerii Catulli Veronensis. Pars I* (Diss. Münster).
- Hutchinson, G. O. (1988), *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford).
- (1993), *Latin Literature from Seneca to Juvenal. A Critical Study* (Oxford).
- Ilberg, J. (1907), 'A. Cornelius Celsus und die Medizin in Rom', *Neue Jahrbücher* 19: 377–412 (= Flashar (1971), 308–60).
- Jacobson, H. (1974), *Ovid's Heroides* (Princeton, N.J.).
- Jal, A. (1861), *Virgilius nauticus. Études sur la marine antique* (Paris).
- Janni, P. (1967), 'Due note omeriche', *QUCC* 3: 7–30.
- Janni, P. and Mazzini, I. (edd.) (1991), *La traduzione dei classici greci e latini in Italia oggi. Problemi, prospettive, iniziative editoriali* (Atti del Convegno Nazionale, Macerata, 20–22 aprile 1989) (Macerata).
- Janson, T. (1979), *Mechanisms of Language Change in Latin* (Stockholm).

- Janssen, H. H. (1941), *De kenmerken der romeinsche dichtertaal* (Nijmegen – Utrecht).
- Jenkyns, R. (1982), *Three Classical Poets: Sappho, Catullus and Juvenal* (London).
- Jocelyn, H. D. (ed.) (1969a), *The Tragedies of Ennius: the fragments edited with an introduction and commentary* (Cambridge).
- (1969b), 'The fragments of Ennius' Scenic Scripts', *AC* 38: 181–217.
- (1971), 'The Tragedies of Ennius', *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 17: 41–95 (Geneva).
- (1972), 'The Poems of Quintus Ennius', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* I.2.987–1026 (Satires and minor works: 1022–6) (Berlin).
- (1977), 'Ennius, Sat. 6–7 Vahlen', *RFIC* 105: 131–51.
- (1979), 'Catullus 58 and Ausonius, Ep. 71', *LCM* 4: 87–91.
- (1980), 'Marcello Zicàri and the poems of C. Valerius Catullus', *RPL* 3: 55–72.
- (1986), 'The new chapters of the ninth book of Celsus' *Artes*', *PLLS* 5: 299–336 (Liverpool).
- (1995), 'Two Features of the Style of Catullus' Phalaecian Epigrams', *Sileno* 21: 63–82.
- Jouanna, J. (1970), review of Lanata (1968), *REG* 83: 254–7.
- Jouanna, J. and Demont, P. (1981), 'Le sens d' ἰχῶρ chez Homère (*Iliade* V, vv. 340 et 416) et Eschyle (*Agamemnon*, v. 1480) en relation avec les emplois du mot dans la *Collection hippocratique*', *REA* 83: 197–209.
- Kaimio, J. (1979), *The Romans and the Greek Language* (Commentationes Human. Litterarum Soc. Scient. Fenn. 64) (Helsinki–Helsingfors).
- Kaster, R. A. (ed.) (1995), *C. Suetonius Tranquillus, De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus, edited with a translation, introduction and commentary* (Oxford).
- Kenney, E. J. (1958), 'Nequitiae poeta', in N. I. Herescu (ed.), *Ovidiana. Recherches sur Ovide*, 201–9 (Paris).
- (1962), 'The First Satire of Juvenal', *PCPS* NS 8: 29–40.
- (1963), 'Juvenal: Satirist or Rhetorician?', *Latomus* 22: 704–20.
- (ed.) (1971), *Lucretius De Rerum Natura Book III* (Cambridge).
- (1979), 'Two disputed passages in the Heroides', *CQ* NS 29: 394–431.
- (ed.) (1996), *Ovid Heroides XVI–XXI* (Cambridge).
- Kenney, E. J. and Clausen, W. V. (edd.) (1982), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, ii, *Latin Literature* (Cambridge).
- Kingsley, P. (1995), *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery, and Magic: Empedocles and Pythagorean Tradition* (Oxford).
- Knoche, U. (1982; 4th ed.), *Die römische Satire* (Göttingen).
- Knox, P. E. (1986), 'Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and the traditions of Augustan poetry', *PCPS* Suppl. 11 (Cambridge).
- (ed.) (1995) *Ovid Heroides. Select Epistles* (Cambridge).
- Koch, P. (1995), 'Latin vulgaire et traits universels de l'oral', in Callebaut (1995: 125–44).
- Korfmacher, W. Ch. (1935), 'Grecizing in Lucilian Satire', *CJ* 30: 453–62.
- Korzeniewski, D. (ed.) (1970), *Die römische Satire* (Wege der Forschung 238) (Darmstadt).
- Krenkel, W. (ed.) (1970; 2 vols), *Lucilius, Satiren. Lateinisch und Deutsch* (Leiden).

- Krause, H. (1878), *De Vergilii usurpatione infinitivi* (Diss. Halle).
- Kroll, W. (1912), 'Der lateinische Relativsatz', *Glotta* 3: 1-18.
- (1913) (repr. 1958), *M. Tullii Ciceronis Orator*. Als Ersatz der Ausgabe von Otto Jahn. Erklärt von W. K. (Berlin).
- (1924), *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart).
- (1925), 3rd ed., repr. 1969, *Die wissenschaftliche Syntax im lateinischen Unterricht* (Dublin).
- (1929), 2nd ed., 1st ed. 1922, reprinted with addenda, 1968), *C. Valerius Catullus* (Stuttgart).
- Kudlien, F. (1963), *Untersuchungen zu Aretaios von Kappadokien* (Mainz).
- Kühner, R. and Stegmann, C. (edd.) (1955; 3rd ed. by A. Thierfelder, 2 vols), *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* (Darmstadt).
- Labate, M. (1984), *L'arte di farsi amare. Modelli culturali e progetto didascalico nell'elegia ovidiana*. (Biblioteca di 'Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei Testi classici', 2) (Pisa).
- Lachmann, K. (1848), 'De Ovidii epistulis', *Prooemium indicis lectionum aestivarum a. 1848 = Kleinere Schriften zur classischen Philologie*, ed. J. Vahlen, 56-61 (Berlin).
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980), *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago).
- Lakoff, G. and Turner, M. (1989), *More than Cool Reason: a Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor* (Chicago).
- Lanata, G. (1966), 'Sul linguaggio amoroso di Saffo', *QUCC* 2: 63-79.
- (1968), 'Linguaggio scientifico e linguaggio poetico. Note al lessico del *De morbo sacro*', *QUCC* 5: 22-36.
- Landgraf, G. (1898), 'Der Accusativ der Beziehung (determinationis)', *ALL* 10: 209-24.
- (1914, 2nd ed.), *Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino* (Leipzig—Berlin)
- Langslow, D. R. (1989), 'Latin technical language: synonyms and Greek words in Latin medical terminology', *TPhS* 87: 33-53.
- (1991), 'The development of Latin medical terminology: some working hypotheses', *PCPS* NS 37: 106-30.
- La Penna, A. (1951), 'Note sul linguaggio erotico dell'elegia latino', *Maia* 4: 187-209.
- (1956a), review of Heusch (1954), *Gnomon* 28: 291-4.
- (1956b), 'Problemi di stile catulliano', *Maia* 8: 141-60.
- Lateiner, D. (1977), 'Obscenity in Catullus', *Ramus* 6: 15-32.
- Lausberg, M. (1990), 'Epos und Lehrgedicht. Ein Gattungsvergleich am Beispiel von Lucans Schlangenkatalog', *Würzburger Jahrbücher* 16: 173-203.
- Lavency, M. and Longrée, D. (edd.) (1989), *Actes du V^e Colloque de Linguistique latine* (Louvain-la-Neuve / Borzée, 31 March-4 April 1989) (*Cahiers de l'Institut de linguistique de Louvain* 15.1-4) (Louvain-la-Neuve).
- Leavis, F. R. (1948, 2nd ed.), *Education and the University, a sketch for an 'English School'* (London).
- Lebreton, J. (1901), *Études sur le langage et la grammaire de Cicéron* (Paris).
- Lee, A.G. (1975), *Tibullus: Elegies* (Cambridge).

- (ed.) (1990), *The Poems of Catullus, Edited with an Introduction, Translation and Brief Notes* (Oxford).
- Lehmann, C. (1979), 'Der Relativsatz vom Indogermanischen bis zum Italienischen. Eine Etüde in diachroner syntaktischer Typologie', *Die Sprache* 25: 1–25.
- (1984), *Der Relativsatz* (Tübingen).
- Lehmann, Y. (1982), 'Varron et la médecine', in Sabbah (1982), 67–72.
- Leishman, J. B. (1956), *Translating Horace* (Oxford).
- Lelièvre, F. J. (1958), 'Parody in Juvenal and T. S. Eliot', *CPh* 53: 22–6.
- Leo, F. (1896), *Analecta Plautina de figuris sermonis I* (Progr. Göttingen) = Fraenkel, E. [ed.], [1960] *Friedrich Leo. Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Erster Band: *Zur römischen Literatur des Zeitalters der Republik*: 71–122 (Rome).
- (1906), 'review of Lucilii carminum reliquiae ed. Marx, vol. I–II, *GGA*: 837–61 (= Fraenkel, E. [ed.] [1960], *Friedrich Leo. Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Erster Band: *Zur römischen Literatur des Zeitalters der Republik*: 221–247 (Rome)).
- (1967), *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. Erster Band: *Die archaische Literatur*. Im Anhang: 'Die römische Poesie in der Sullanischen Zeit' (Darmstadt) (= Unveränderter Nachdruck der Ausgabe Berlin 1913).
- Leumann, M. (1947), 'Die lateinische Dichtersprache', *MH* 4: 116–39 = *Kleine Schriften* (Zürich-Stuttgart 1959) 131–56 = Lunelli (1980) 131–78.
- (1950), *Homerische Wörter* (Basel).
- (1977, 6th ed.), *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II 2.1) (Munich).
- Levinson, S. C. (1983), *Pragmatics* (Cambridge).
- Lévy, C. (1992), 'Cicéron créateur du vocabulaire latin de la connaissance: essai de synthèse', in *La langue latine, langue de la philosophie* (École française de Rome, 161) (Rome).
- Lewis, N. (1959), *Samothrace, the Ancient Literary Sources* (London).
- Leyhausen, J. (1893), *Helenaë et Herus epistulae Ovidii non sunt* (Diss. Halle).
- Linde, P. (1923), 'Die Stellung des Verbs in der lateinischen Prosa', *Glotta* 12: 153–78.
- Lindsay, W. M. (1893), 'The Saturnian metre', *AJP* 14: 139–70, 305–34.
- (1907), *Syntax of Plautus* (Oxford).
- (ed.) (1913; repr. Hildesheim 1978), *Sexti Pompeii Festi de verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome* (Leipzig).
- (1922), *Early Latin Verse* (Oxford).
- Linse, E. (1891), *De P. Ovidio Nasone vocabulorum inventore* (Progr. Dortmund).
- Löfstedt, B. (1990), 'Notizen zu Sprache und Text von Celsus, *De medicina*', *MH* 47: 60–2.
- Löfstedt, E. (1911), *Philologischer Kommentar zur 'Peregrinatio Aetherae'. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache* (Uppsala).
- (1928 [vol. 1]; 1933 [vol. 2]; 1942 [2nd ed. of vol. 1]), *Syntactica. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins I & II* (Lund).
- (1959), *Late Latin* (Oslo).
- Lohmann, A. (1915), *De Graecismorum Vergiliano usu quaestiones selectae* (Diss. Münster).

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

- (ed.) (1915), *A. Cornelii Celsi quae supersunt* (CML, i; Leipzig–Berlin).
- Mason, H. A. (1963), 'Is Juvenal a Classic?', in Sullivan (1963), 93–176.
- Maurach, G. (1975), 'Ovid, Met. I, 48 und die Figur der "Umkehrung"', *Hermes* 103: 479–86.
- Mayer, R. G. (1983), 'Catullus' divorce', *CQ* 33: 297–8.
- (ed.) (1994), *Horace, Epistles, Book I* (Cambridge).
- Mazzini, I. (1988), 'La medicina nella letteratura latina. I. Osservazioni e proposte interpretative su passi di Lucilio, Lucrezio, Catullo e Orazio', *Aufidus* 4: 45–73.
- (1990), 'Il folle da amore', in Alfonso *et al.* (1990), 39–83.
- (1991a), 'La medicina nella letteratura latina. II. Esegesi e traduzione di Horat. *Epod.* 11, 15–16 e *Od.* I 13, 4–5', in Janni and Mazzini (1991), 99–114.
- (1991b), 'Il lessico medico latino antico: caratteri e strumenti della sua differenziazione', in Sabbah (1991), 175–85.
- (1992a), 'La medicina nella letteratura latina. III. Plauto: conoscenze mediche, situazione e istituzioni sanitarie, proposte esegetiche', in Mazzini (1992b), 67–113.
- (ed.) (1992b), *Civiltà materiale e letteratura nel mondo antico* (Atti del Seminario di Studio, Macerata, 28–29 giugno 1991) (Macerata).
- Meillet, A. (1965; 7th ed.), *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque* (Paris).
- Menière, P. (1858), *Études médicales sur les poètes latins* (Paris).
- Mette, H. J. (1956), rev. of E. V. Marmorale, *L'ultimo Catullo, Gnomon* 28: 34–8 (part repr. in R. Heine (ed.) [1975] *Catull* [Wege der Forschung 308, Darmstadt]: 19–23).
- Meyer, W. (1889), 'Caesur im Hendekasyllabus', *SB Bayr. Ak., philosoph.-philol. und hist. Cl.* 2: 208–27.
- Migliorini, P. (1990), *La terminologia medica come strumento espressivo della satira di Persio* (Quaderni di Anazetesis 2) (Pistoia).
- Mignot, X. (1969), *Les verbes dénominatifs latins* (Paris).
- Miller, H.W. (1944), 'Medical terminology in tragedy', *TAPA* 75: 156–67.
- (1945), 'Aristophanes and medical language', *TAPA* 76: 74–84.
- Mohler, S. L. (1948), 'Sails and Oars in the Aeneid', *TAPA* 79: 46–62.
- Momigliano, A. (1957), 'Perizonius, Niebuhr and the character of the early Roman tradition', *JRS* 47: 104–14.
- Morford, M. P. O. (1972), 'A Note on Juvenal 6.627–61', *CPh* 67: 198.
- Mras, K. (1927/28), 'Randbemerkungen zu Lucilius' Satiren', *WS* 46: 78–84.
- Mudry, Ph. (1982), *La préface du De medicina de Celse: Texte, traduction et commentaire* (Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana 19) (Rome).
- Mühmelt, M. (1965), *Griechische Grammatik in der Vergilerklärung*, (Zetemata 37) (Munich).
- Müller, C. F. W. (1869), *Plautinische Prosodie* (Berlin).
- (1908), *Syntax des Nominativs und Akkusativs im Lateinischen* (Leipzig and Berlin).
- Müller, C.W., Sier, K. and Werner, J. (edd.) (1992), *Zum Umgang mit fremden Sprachen in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Palingenesia 36: Kolloquium der Fachrichtungen Klassische Philologie der Universitäten Leipzig und Saarbrücken am 21. und 22. November 1989 in Saarbrücken) (Stuttgart).

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

- (1993), 'Das medizinische Latein von Celsus bis Cassius Felix', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW II.37: 1*, 227–392 (Berlin).
- Ortony, A. (1979), *Metaphor and Thought* (Cambridge).
- Paganelli, D. (1961), *Properce: Élégies* (Paris).
- Page, D. L. (1936), review of Dumortier (1935), *CR* 50: 17–18.
- Palmer, A. (ed.), (1898) *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides with the Greek translation of Planudes* [Completed by L. C. Purser.] (Oxford).
- Palmer, L. R. (1954), *The Latin Language* (London).
- Paludan, E. (1941), 'The development of the Latin elegy', *CIMed* 4: 204–29.
- Pascucci, G. (1961), 'consens, praesens, absens', *SIFC* 33: 1–61.
- Pasquali, G. (1981), *Preistoria della poesia romana: con un saggio introduttivo di Sebastiano Timpanaro* (Florence).
- Patzer, H. (1955), 'Zum Sprachstil des neoterischen Hexameters', *MH* 12: 77–95.
- Pearce, T. E. V. (1966), 'The enclosing word order in the Latin hexameter' *CQ NS* 16: 140–71; 298–320.
- Peppler, C. W. (1910), 'The termination *-κος*, as used by Aristophanes for comic effect', *AJP* 31: 428–44.
- Peter, H. (1901), *Der Brief in der römischen Literatur* (Leipzig).
- Petersmann, H. (1986), 'Der Begriff *satura* und die Entstehung der Gattung', in Adamietz (1986), 7–24.
- (1989), 'Die Urbanisierung des römischen Reiches im Lichte der lateinischen Sprache', *Glotta* 96: 406–28.
- (1992), 'Vulgärlateinisches aus Byzanz' in Müller, C. W. et al. (1992), 219–31.
- (1995a), 'Soziale und lokale Aspekte in der Vulgärsprache Petrons', in Callebat (1995), 533–47.
- (1995b), 'Zur mündlichen Charakterisierung des Fremden in der Komödie des Plautus', in Benz et al. (1995), 123–36.
- (forthcoming), 'Language and style as means of characterization in the comedies of Plautus', *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*.
- Phillips, J. H. (1984), 'Lucretius and the (Hippocratic) *On Breaths*: Addenda', in Sabbah (1984), 83–5.
- Pigeaud, J. (1980), 'La physiologie de Lucrèce', *REL* 58: 176–200.
- (1982), 'Virgile et la médecine. Quelques réflexions sur l'utilisation de la pensée physiologique dans les Géorgiques', *Helmantica* 33: 539–60.
- (1988), 'Die Medizin in der Lehrdichtung des Lukrez und des Vergil', in Binder (1988), 216–39.
- Pinkster, H. (1987), 'The pragmatic motivation for the use of subject pronouns in Latin: the case of Petronius', in *Études de linguistique générale et de linguistique latine offertes en hommage à Guy Serbat*, 369–79 (Paris).
- Pinotti, P. (ed.) (1988), *Publio Ovidio Nasone, Remedia Amoris* (Edizioni e saggi universitari di filologia classica, 39) (Bologna).
- Platnauer, M. (1951), *Latin Elegiac Verse* (Cambridge).
- Ploen, H. (1882), *De copiae verborum differentiis inter varia poesis Romanae antiquioris genera intercedentibus* (Diss. Strasbourg).
- Poncelet, R. (1957), *Cicéron traducteur de Platon. L'expression de la pensée complexe en latin classique* (Paris).

- Powell, J. G. F. (1987), 'The *farrago* of Juvenal 1.86 reconsidered', in Whitby, Hardie and Whitby (1987).
- (ed.) (1988), *Cicero: Cato Maior De Senectute* (Cambridge).
- (1995a) 'Cicero's translations from Greek', in Powell (1995b), 273–300.
- (ed.) (1995b), *Cicero the Philosopher* (Oxford).
- Puelma Piwonka, M. (1949), *Lucilius und Kallimachos. Zur Geschichte einer Gattung der hellenistisch-römischen Poesie* (Frankfurt am Main).
- Pye, D. W. (1963), 'Latin 3rd plural perfect indicative active — Its endings in verse usage', *TPhS*: 1–27
- Radermacher, L. (1951), *Artium Scriptores (Reste der voraristotelischen Rhetorik)*. (Österr. Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl., Sitzungsberichte, 227. Bd., 3. Abh.) (Vienna).
- Ramage, E. S. (1957), *Urbanitas, rusticitas, peregrinitas: the Roman view of proper Latin* (Cincinnati).
- Rand, E. K. (1925), *Ovid and his Influence* (London, Calcutta, Sydney).
- Rawson, E. D. (1969), *The Spartan Tradition in European Thought* (Oxford).
- (1985), *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic* (London).
- Reichenkron, G. (1961), 'Zur römischen Kommandosprache bei byzantinischen Schriftstellern', *Byz. Zeitschr.* 54: 18–27
- Reitzenstein, R. (1893), *Epigramm und Skolion. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der alexandrinischen Dichtung* (Giessen).
- (1907), art. 'Epigramm', *RE* 6.1: 71–111.
- (1912), *Zur Sprache der lateinischen Erotik* (Sitzungsb. d. Heidelberger Ak. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl., 12. Abh.) (Heidelberg).
- Renard, M., and Schilling, R. (edd.) (1964), *Hommages à Jean Bayet*, (Collection Latomus 70) (Brussels).
- Riemann, O. (1885; 2nd ed.), *Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Tite-Live* (Paris).
- Risch, E. (1984), *Gerundivum und Gerundium. Gebrauch im klassischen und älteren Latein. Entstehung und Vorgeschichte* (Berlin–New York).
- Risselada, R. (1993), *Imperatives and Other Directive Expressions in Latin* (Amsterdam).
- Roby, H. J. (1896), *A grammar of the Latin language from Plautus to Suetonius. Part II Syntax* (London).
- Romaine, S. (1995; ed. 1, 1989), *Bilingualism* (Oxford).
- Romano, A. C. (1979), *Irony in Juvenal* (Hildesheim and New York).
- Ronconi, A. (1938), 'Stile e lingua di Catullo', *A & R* III 6: 139–56 (= 1950: 23–47).
- (1939), 'Allitterazione e stile in Catullo', *Stud. Urb.* 13B: 1–77 (= 1953: 9–82 = 1971: 11–86).
- (1940a), 'Per la storia del diminutivo latino. Studi esegetici e stilistici', *Stud. Urb.* 14B: 1–45 (= 1953: 107–50 = 1971: 87–130).
- (1940b), 'Atteggiamenti e forme della parodia catulliana', *A & R* III 8: 141–58 (= 1953: 193–212 = 1971: 173–92).
- (1950), *Da Lucrezio a Tacito* (Messina–Florence).
- (1971; ed. 1, 1953), *Studi catulliani* (Bari–Brescia).
- van Rooy, C. A. (1965), *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory* (Leiden).

- Rösler, W. (1989), 'Typenhäuser bei Aischylos?', in Schuller *et al.* (1989), 109–14.
- Ross, D. O. (1969), *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, Mass.)
- Rothstein, M. (1966; 3rd ed.), *Sextus Propertius: Elegien* (Dublin — Zurich).
- Rudd, N. (1960), 'Horace on the origins of *satura*', *Phoenix* 14: 36–44.
- (1986), *Themes in Roman Satire* (London).
- Ruijgh, C. J. (1957), *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique* (Assen).
- Sabbah, G. (ed.) (1982), *Médecins et médecine dans l'antiquité* (Centre Jean Palerne: Mémoires, iii) (Saint-Étienne).
- (ed.) (1984), *Textes médicaux latins antiques* (Centre Jean Palerne: Mémoires, v) (Saint-Étienne).
- (ed.) (1991), *Le latin médical. La constitution d'un langage scientifique* (Centre Jean Palerne: Mémoires, x) (Saint-Étienne).
- Safarewicz, J. (1965), 'Uwagi o języku Lucyliusza', *Eos* 55: 96–105.
- Sager, J. C., Dungworth, D. and McDonald, P. F. (1980), *English Special Languages: Principles and Practice in Science and Technology* (Wiesbaden).
- de Saint-Denis, E. (1935), *Le rôle de la mer dans la poésie latine* (Paris).
- (1965), *Essais sur le rire et le sourire des Latins* (Paris).
- Schäublin, C. (1988), 'Housman and Ennius', *Housman Society Journal* 14: 42–5.
- Schawaller, D. (1987), 'Semantische Wortspiele in Ovids Metamorphosen und Heroides', *Gräzer Beiträge* 14: 199–214.
- Scherer, A. (1963), 'Die Sprache des Archilochos', in *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 10: 89–107 (Geneva).
- Schmid, P. (1964), 'Juvénal. Essai d'une définition stylistique'. Résumé, in *REL* 42: 57–9.
- Schmid, W. and Stählin, O. (1929), *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, I: i (Munich).
- Schmidt, B. (ed.) (1887), *C. Valeri Catulli Veronensis carmina* (Leipzig).
- (1914), 'Die Lebenszeit Catulls und die Herausgabe seiner Gedichte', *RhM* 69: 267–83.
- Schmidt, E.A. (1977), 'Lucilius kritisiert Ennius und andere Dichter. Zu Lucilius fr. 148 Marx', *MH* 34: 122–9.
- (1985), *Catull* (Heidelberg).
- Schmitt, R. (1967), *Dichtung und Dichtersprache im indogermanischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden).
- Scholte, A. (ed.) (1933), *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Ex Ponto Liber Primus commentario exegetico instructus* (Amersfoort).
- Scholz, U.W. (1986a), 'Der frühe Lucilius und Horaz', *Hermes* 114: 335–65.
- (1986b), 'Die *satura* des Q. Ennius', in Adamietz (1986), 25–53.
- Schreiber, G. (1917), *De Lucili syntaxi* (Diss. Greifswald).
- Schünke, E. (1906), *De traiectione coniunctionum et pronominis relativi apud poetas Latinos* (Diss. Kiel).
- Schuller, W., Hoepfner, W. and Schwandner, E. L. (edd.) (1989), *Demokratie und Architektur: Der hippodamische Städtebau und die Entstehung der Demokratie* (Konstanzer Symposium vom 17. bis 19. Juli 1987) (Munich).
- Schulze, K. P. (1920), 'Bericht über die Literatur zu Catullus für die Jahre 1905–1920', *Bursians Jahresb.* 183: 1–72.
- Schuster, M. (1948), art. '(123) C. Valerius Catullus', *RE* II.7.2: 2353–410.

- (ed.) (1949), *Catulli Veronensis liber* (Leipzig).
- Schweizer, H. J. (1967), *Vergil und Italien* (Aarau).
- Sconocchia, S. (ed.) (1983), *Scribonii Largi Compositiones* (Leipzig).
- (1993), 'L'opera di Scribonio Largo e la letteratura medica latina del 1. sec. d. C.', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW II.37: 1*, 843–922. (Berlin).
- Scott (Ryberg), I. G. (1927), *The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal* (Smith College Classical Studies 8) (Northampton, Mass.).
- Sebeok, T. A. (ed.) (1960), *Style in Language* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Sedley, D. N. (1988), 'Epicurean anti-reductionism', in Barnes and Mignucci (1988), 295–327.
- (1989), 'The proems of Empedocles and Lucretius', *GRBS* 30: 269–96.
- (1992) 'Sextus Empiricus and the atomist criteria of truth', *Elenchos* 13: 21–56.
- Segal, C. (1990), *Lucretius on Death and Anxiety* (Princeton).
- Segebade, J. (1895), *Vergil als Seemann. Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung und Würdigung des Dichters*. Progr.d.Gymn. (Oldenburg).
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (ed.) (1965), *Cicero's Letters to Atticus. II 58–54 B.C. 46–93 (Books III and IV)* (Cambridge).
- (ed.) (1977), *Cicero: Epistulae ad Familiares. I 62–47 B.C.* (Cambridge).
- (1992), 'Homoeoteleuton in non-dactylic Latin verse', *RFIC* 120: 67–71.
- (1994), *Homoeoteleuton in Latin Dactylic Verse* (Stuttgart—Leipzig).
- Sharrock, A. R. (1994), *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's Ars Amatoria 2* (Oxford).
- Shipley, F. W. (1911), 'The heroic clausula in Cicero and Quintilian', *CPh* 6: 410–18.
- Silk, M. S. (1974), *Interaction in Poetic Imagery with Special Reference to Early Greek Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Simpson, F. P. (1879), *Select Poems of Catullus* (London).
- Skutsch, F. (1892), *Plautinisches und Romanisches. Studien zur plautinischen Prosodie* (Leipzig).
- Skutsch, O. (1934), *Prosodische und metrische Gesetze der Iambenkürzung* (Forschungen z. griech. u. latein. Grammatik 10) (Göttingen).
- (1964), 'Rhyme in Horace', *BICS* 11: 73–8.
- (1969), 'Metrical variations and some textual problems in Catullus', *BICS* 16: 38–43.
- (1976), 'Notes on Catullus', *BICS* 23: 18–22.
- (1980), 'Catullus 58.4–5', *LCM* 5: 21.
- (1985), *The 'Annals' of Quintus Ennius edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford).
- Smith, K. F. (1913), *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus* (New York).
- Smith, W. S. (ed.) (1989), 'Heroic models for the sordid present: Juvenal's view of tragedy', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW II.33.1*: 811–23 (Berlin).
- Soubiran, J. (1966), *L'élision dans la poésie latine* (Paris).
- Spies, A. (1930), *Militat omnis amans* (Diss. Tübingen).
- von Staden, H. (1989), *Herophilus: the Art of Medicine in Early Alexandria* (Cambridge).
- Stevens, E. B. (1953), 'Uses of hyperbaton in Latin poetry', *CIW* 46: 200–5.
- Sullivan, J. P. (ed.) (1963), *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Satire* (London).

- Summers, W. C. (1910), *Select Letters of Seneca edited with introductions and explanatory notes* (London).
- Svennung, J. (1935), *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache* (Uppsala).
- (1945), *Catulls Bildersprache. Vergleichende Stilstudien I* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 3) (Uppsala—Leipzig).
- Swanson, D. C. (1962), *A Formal Analysis of Lucretius' Vocabulary* (Minneapolis).
- Syndikus, H. P. (1984), *Catull. Eine Interpretation. Erster Teil. Die kleinen Gedichte (1–60)* (Darmstadt).
- Terzaghi, N. (ed.) (1934, 2nd ed.), *Lucilio*, (Turin) (Repr. Hildesheim, New York 1979).
- (ed.) (1966), *Saturarum Reliquiae* (Florence).
- Thierfelder, A. (1955), 'De morbo hepaticario', *RhM* 98: 190–2.
- Thill, A. (1979), *Alter ab illo. Recherches sur l'imitation dans la poésie personnelle à l'époque Augustéenne* (Paris).
- Thomas, R. F. (ed.) (1988, 2 vols), *Virgil, Georgics* (Cambridge).
- Thomson, D. F. S. (ed.) (1978), *Catullus. A Critical Edition. Edited and Introduced* (Chapel Hill).
- Tovar, A. (1969), 'Lucilio y el latín de España', in *Studi linguistici in onore de V. Pisani*, ii.1019–32 (Brescia).
- Townend, G. B. (1973), 'The literary substrata to Juvenal's satires', *JRS* 63: 148–60.
- Tracy, V. A. (1971), 'The authenticity of *Heroides* 16–21', *CJ* 66: 328–30.
- Tränkle, H. (1960), *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache* (Hermes Einzelschriften 15) (Wiesbaden).
- (1967a), 'Ausdrucksfülle bei Catull', *Philologus* 111: 198–211.
- (1967b), 'Neoterische Kleinigkeiten', *MH* 24: 87–103.
- (1981), 'Catullprobleme', *MH* 38: 245–58.
- Traina, A. (1975), 'Orazio e Catullo' in *Poeti latini (e neolatini). Note e saggi filologici*: 253–75 (Bologna).
- Untermann, J. (1971), 'Entwürfe zu einer Enniusgrammatik', *Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt* 17: 209–51 (Geneva).
- (1977), 'Zur semantischen Organisation des lateinischen Wortschatzes', *Gymnasium* 84: 313–39.
- Väänänen, V. (1966, 3rd ed.), *Le Latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes* (Berlin).
- Vairel-Carron, H. (1975), *Exclamation. Ordre et défense* (Paris).
- Van Sickle, J. B. (1968), 'About form and feeling in Catullus 65', *TAPA* 99: 487–508.
- Vechner, D. (1610, ed. 1, Frankfurt; ed. 2 Strasburg 1630; ed. 3 Leipzig 1680; ed. 4 Gotha 1733 (Heusinger)), *Hellenolexia*.
- Vessey, D. W. T. C. (1969), 'Notes on Ovid, *Heroides* 9', *CQ* NS 19: 349–61.
- Vetter, E. (1953), *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*, I. Band: Texte mit Erklärung, Glossen, Wörterverzeichnis (Heidelberg).
- Vollmer, F. (1923), *Römische Metrik*, in A. Gercke and E. Norden (edd.), *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*. I. Band: 8. Heft (Leipzig & Berlin).
- Wackernagel, J. (1892), 'Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1:333–436 (= *Kleine Schriften* (1955) i. 1–104 (Göttingen)).

- (1926 [vol. 1], 1928 [vol. 2]), *Vorlesungen über Syntax* (Basel).
- Walde, A. and Hofmann, J. B. (1930–1956, 2 vols), *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg).
- Waszink, J. H. (1971), 'Problems concerning the Satura of Ennius', *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 17: 97–147. (Geneva).
- Watkins, C. W. (1982), 'Aspects of Indo-European poetics', in E. C. Polomé (ed.), *The Indo-Europeans in the fourth and third millennia*, 104–20 (Ann Arbor).
- (1989), 'New parameters in historical linguistics, philology and cultural history', *Language* 65: 783–99.
- (1995), *How to Kill a Dragon. Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (New York – Oxford).
- Watson, P. (1983), 'Puella and Virago', *Glotta* 61: 119–43.
- (1985), 'Axelson revisited: the selection of vocabulary in Latin poetry', *CQ* NS 35: 430–48.
- Weinreich, O. (1959), 'Catull c. 60', *Hermes* 87: 75–90.
- (1960), *Catull. Liebesgedichte und sonstige Dichtungen* (Hamburg).
- (1962; 2nd ed.), *Römische Satiren* (Zürich und Stuttgart).
- Weis, R. (1992), 'Zur Kenntnis des Griechischen im Rom der republikanischen Zeit', in Müller, C. W. et al. (1992), 137–42.
- Weise, F. O. (1882), *Die griechischen Wörter in Latein* (repr. 1964 Leipzig).
- Wellmann, M. (1931), *Hippokratesglossare* (Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Medizin, 2) (Berlin).
- West, D. A. (1969), *Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius* (Edinburgh).
- West, M. L. (1982), *Greek Metre* (Oxford).
- Westphal, R. (1867), *Catulls Gedichte in ihrem geschichtlichen Zusammenhange* (Breslau).
- Whitby, M., Hardie, P., and Whitby, M. (edd.) (1987), *Homo Viator. Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol).
- Wiesen, D. S. (1989), 'The verbal basis for Juvenal's satiric vision', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* II.33.1: 708–33 (Berlin).
- Wifstrand, A. (1933), *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos* (Lund).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1898), 'De uersu Phalaecei' in *Mélanges Henri Weil* (Paris), 449–61 (revised in 1921: 137–53).
- (1921), *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin).
- Wilhelm, F. (1925), 'Zu Ovid Ex Ponto I,3', *Philologus* 81: 155–67.
- Wilkinson, L. P. (1959), 'The language of Virgil and Homer', *CQ* NS 9: 181–92.
- (1963), *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge).
- Williams, G. W. (1968), *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford).
- Williams, R. D. (ed.) (1960), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quintus* (Oxford).
- Wills, J. (1996), *Repetition in Latin Poetry. Figures of Allusion* (Oxford).
- Winterbottom, M. (1977a), 'A Celtic hyperbaton?', *The Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 27: 207–12.
- (1977b), 'Aldhelm's prose style and its origins', *Anglo-Saxon England* 6: 50–1.
- Wiseman, T. P. (1969), *Catullan Questions* (Leicester).
- (1974), *Cinna the Poet, and Other Roman Essays* (Leicester).

- _____ (1979), 'On what Catullus doesn't say', *Latin Teaching* 35 n. 6: 11–15.
- Wölfflin, E. (1882), 'Über die Aufgaben der lateinischen Lexikographie', *RhM* 37: 83–121.
- _____ (1885), 'Das adverbelle *cetera, alia, omnia*', *ALL* 2: 90–9.
- _____ (1886), 'Der substantivierte Infinitiv', *ALL* 3: 70–91.
- Wyke, M. (1989), 'Mistress and metaphor in Augustan elegy', *Helios* 16: 25–47.
- Zanker, G. (1987), *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry: a Literature and its Audience* (London–Sydney–Wolfeboro, NH).
- Zicàri, M. (1964), 'Some metrical and prosodical features of Catullus' poetry', *Phoenix* 18: 193–205 (= 1978: 203–19).
- _____ (1978), *Scritti catulliani* (Urbino).
- Zwierlein, O. (1986), *Kritischer Kommentar zu den Tragödien Senecas* (Akad. d. Wiss. u. d. Literatur Mainz, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Einzelveröffentlichung 6) (Wiesbaden).