Grecism

R. G. MAYER

Summary. The purpose of this review is first, to establish so far as is possible, by collecting for the first time all the evidence, how the reader of Latin poetry in antiquity understood the varied oddities of syntax borrowed more or less directly from the Greek language. These usages were classified under the term *figura Graeca*. The second purpose is to show how modern scholars, when reluctant to follow antiquity in this issue, treat syntactical grecisms, and then to compare their approach with that of the Romans themselves. From time to time modern philologists either ignore or seek an alternative to the ancient explanations. They have created evolutionary models which rely heavily on the modern concept of grammatical analogy (which gives rise to the term 'partial grecism') and on the bilingualism of Romans. I will urge that we should up to a point try to respect ancient opinion, because at bottom it was developed out of the Romans' own feel for propriety in their language. A sense was instilled in Roman readers by their teachers of the difference between poetic syntax and what was in normal use, either spoken or written. One of the means of differentiation was the use of the term *figura Graeca*. Modern attempts to find analogies for unusual syntax within Latin rather than pure grecisms in effect dilute the exoticism which the Romans found in the syntax they believed to be entirely borrowed.

LUCRETIUS NOTORIOUSLY COMPLAINED of dearth in his native language, (1.832, 3.260 *patrii sermonis egestas*).[1] What as a philosopher he probably missed most was an established technical terminology. But perhaps as a poet too, with his eye upon his Greek models, he will have regretted the

[1] He did so, however, in the first passage in a way that rather drew attention to the richness of the Latin vocabulary, at least in words denoting everyday activities like speaking.

sheer ductility of the Greek language, its more flexible word order, its delight in compound words and coinages, its varied syntax. The Latin he used was altogether less malleable, and one of the tasks which the Roman poets of his and later generations clearly set themselves was the improvement of the language in point of suppleness. One device they employed now goes by the generic name of grecism (spelling of the word varies). There are several distinct species of grecism; I will briefly mention a few which will not detain us, though they have a bearing on the issue of borrowing as a whole. We shall focus upon the most complex of the manifestations of the usage, the syntactical borrowings.

First come the lexical grecisms, borrowed Greek words. In some cases, the reason for the loan is clear: Lucretius called the famous wooden horse of Troy *durateus* at 1.476, because that was the word Homer had used at *Od.* 8.493, 512, and so he evoked the epic tradition with a word that the native *ligneus*, used at 4.1153 and 6.1059, could not have done (Bailey (1949: ad loc.) says the use is gratuitous, a failure of imagination (cf. Sedley p. 239)). It would be interesting to know why Virgil chose but once at *E.* 10.52 to use *spelaea*; Servius, who notes many such lexical grecisms in Virgil, remarks: *Graece ait pro speluncis.* As a verbal experiment it failed to catch on, though it was picked up by that industrious magpie, the author of the *Ciris* at 467. Some borrowed words can prove to be well worth remark; *gyros*, for instance, which is rare enough in Greek, was adopted by Romans, because *circu(m)itio* and many of the oblique cases of *circulus* were unsuitable to the dactylic hexameter. What is remarkable is that the Romans, especially the poets, worked this loan-word very hard and gave it a range of meanings apparently unknown to Greek (we may compare the articles on the word in the *OLD* and in LSJ). But verbal grecisms had to be deployed with discretion; Dr Sedley discusses in this collection Lucretius' scruples on this point. Horace, it may also be noted, did not approve of the mixture of Greek words in the Latin context of the satires of Lucilius (*S.* 1.10.20–30), evidence of the growth of purism, *Latinitas*, among some writers. This has a bearing upon syntactical borrowings.

The next type of grecism to be noticed is the morphological. Greek inflections of proper names deserve careful attention, because poets had varying practices in their use of Greek terminations. Horace, as Bentley pointed out in his note on *Epode* 17.17, affected a transmarine elegance in his lyrics, but prefered native terminations as stylistically appropriate in his iambic and hexameter poems. In the post-Augustan poets there was a tendency to favour Greek inflections for proper names over the Latin (though here we have to reckon with problems of transmission). Statius provides abundant evidence of this fashion.

A third type, less usually recognized in discussions, deserves to be

included in this brief overview, namely grecisms of word order. Greek poets departed from the spoken norm in the placement of conjunctions and prepositions, and the Romans most under their influence introduced the practice into their poems. The postponement of co-ordinating conjunctions is always recognized as a borrowed practice, e.g. by Kroll (1922) on Catull. 51.9 *lingua sed torpet* and 64.93 *funditus atque imis exarsit tota medullis* (cf. Pfeiffer on Callim. 260.55), by Norden in his commentary on *Aen.* VI, p. 402 and by Harrison on *A.* 10.372–3 *fidite ne pedibus*.[2] But there are refinements upon this practice, seen for instance in the anastrophe of the comparative particles *ut* and *ceu*. Greek allows this with ὥς but we do not find it in Latin before Horace, and then remarkably in a satire, a genre often reckoned to be closer in style to spoken Latin: *S.* 1.3.89 *captiuus ut*. When it occurs in Virgil, as at *A.* 2.355 *lupi ceu*, Servius sorts out the unusual word order for his readers. Wackernagel (1926: i.11) reckoned that Virgil imitated Greek, λύκοι ὥς. Perhaps the most characteristically Greek word order to have been adopted was the anastrophe of a monosyllabic prepostition, which was followed by a genitive dependent on the transposed noun; this artificial word order is even found in the *Annals* of Tacitus, a point to bear in mind, for as we shall see, historical prose was felt to be entitled to the sort of grecism which this essay will chiefly be concerned with.[3] Euripides is fond of this word order, and the first to use it in Latin is that great experimenter Cicero (*Arat.* 201 *parte ex Aquilonis*).[4] The usage is extended by Lucretius at 3.49 *conspectu ex hominum*, 1088 *tempore de mortis*[5] and 6.1265 *silanos ad aquarum* (there is even *viam per* in the previous line[6]). Virgil is apparently rather restrained in his use of the licence: *E.* 8.59 *aerii specula de montis*, *G.* 4.333 *thalamo sub fluminis alti* (we are in the narrative portion of the book, the Aristaeus epyllion), *A.* 7.234 *fata per Aeneae*. So much then for some features of Latin poetic style that are reckoned to be owed to imitation of the Greeks.

We will from now on focus upon the more difficult avenue of grecizing, syntactical borrowing; this type from time to time entails lexical loan-shifts (called calques) as well. (But the syntactical grecisms that appear to be

---

[2] See K–G ii.179 note 1.

[3] See Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 216), where Greek influence is acknowledged, and Nipperdey–Andresen on Tac. *Ann.* 3.72. There is a still useful list of Tacitean grecisms in Boetticher (1830: C-CII). Cf. p. 266 below.

[4] See Platnauer on *IT* 1460 and add Bond on *HF* 527; for *ex* see *TLL* v.2.1130.56. For another of his verbal experiments see footnote 36.

[5] This collocation is unnoticed by Gudeman in *TLL* v.1.42.75–6, but cf. ibid. 52.17.

[6] For that see Bailey (1949: i.107), but he does not specifically note the kind to which attention has just been drawn, and anyway regards the practice as due chiefly to metrical convenience. This is important, for Bailey was inclined to minimize the poet's debt to Greek style. It is odd that Catullus appears not to have adopted the practice.

due to direct translation of a Greek model, such as we find at *G.* 3.232
irasci in cornua, derived from Eur. *Ba.* 742, will not here concern us.) The
origin of the Roman notion of syntactical grecism cannot now be recov-
ered. We may speculate that it developed in the line-by-line exposition
(*praelectio*) of contemporary poetic texts by *grammatici* like Q. Caecilius
Epirota, who first expounded Virgil and the 'new poets' in the early
principate, according to Suetonius (*Gram.* 16.3, with Kaster's
commentary). However that may be, a form of doctrine appears at its
earliest in Quintilian, who drew attention to syntactical grecism in his
general discussion of *figurae* (*Inst.* 9.3.17). We notice at once a character-
istic approach to the phenomenon: the Romans dealt with it as a part of
rhetoric, and so a feature of style. This should not surprise. Latin gram-
marians leaned heavily upon the Greeks for their categories, and obviously
Greek grammar had no concept of 'grecism', i.e. borrowing of syntactical
practice from a different language, to pass on to them. Moreover, gram-
marians before Apollonius Dyscolus spent most of their time describing
and accounting for accidence; their analysis of syntax was, compared to
ours, limited, and they largely handed it over to the rhetoricians, who
described it as grammatical figures or as virtues and vices of style.[7] It was
therefore the rhetoricians who accommodated these imported syntactical
practices within their own category of grammatical *figurae*. The poet whose
works provide the most examples is Virgil, not only because of his range,
but because we have an invaluable (though often neglected) guide to his
practice in the commentary of Servius. We cannot know just how extensive
or independent Servius' own knowledge, and that above all of his suc-
cessors, was in this department. Much of their information was traditional,
and presumably went back to the earliest commentaries, composed when
a knowledge of Greek literature was more secure. Even very late gram-
marians and rhetoricians who refer to grecism are clearly trotting out
standard examples; they may themselves have been comparatively ignorant
of Greek and its influence, but their snippets of traditional learning seem
well founded. My approach in this essay will be historical, starting with
the Romans themselves and concentrating on Servius above all. I want
first to present the ways in which they came to terms with the apparent
irregularities they noticed in poetic usage and how they described and
drew attention to them.

---

[7] There is a brief discussion by A. Gudeman, art. 'Grammatik', *RE* vii.1806.18–51; for a fuller
account see Baratin (1989) and Atherton (1996: 256–7).

ROMANS ON *FIGURA GRAECA*

We start with Quintilian. It is striking that when he introduced the vast topic of figures of speech he first exemplified their historical development by the use of the cases, for instance with verbs like *incumbere* or with adjectives like *plenus* (*Inst.* 9.3.1). This indicates the keen sense the élite Romans had of what was correct or at least permissible where two words were to be joined together. There was a flexible norm, which might alter over time, but a serious departure from it could only be justified as a figurative usage (otherwise it was condemned as a solecism). The usage of the cases provided the clearest examples, so far as Quintilian was concerned. He then proceeded to what we now call grecism (*Inst.* 9.3.17): *ex Graeco uero tralata uel Sallusti plurima, quale est: [uulgus] 'amat fieri', uel Horati, nam id maxime probat: 'nec ciceris nec longae inuidit auenae', uel Vergili: 'Tyrrhenum nauigat aequor', et iam uulgatam actis quoque: 'saucius pectus'.*[8] Three writers, Sallust, Horace and Virgil, provide his examples. All are classics (they of course reappear in the tenth book in his list of authors whose style is to be studied for imitation) but none, it is significant to observe, was an orator. At once Quintilian's reader, who was studying to be an orator, ought to have been on his guard, for the usage of historians and poets might not always be available to those who meant to follow what Horace had called the *norma loquendi*. For, as the later grammarian Fortunatianus said, in answer to his own question *'aliena uerba quae sunt?'*: *'quae non sunt oratori accommodata, sed historico aut poetae'.*[9] Among the Romans themselves grecism was seen as a feature of style in the more highly wrought literary forms, history and poetry, which were implicitly ranged together against the norm established for formal oratorical Latin.

Let us now look at Quintilian's examples of grecism. First and very briefly, the Sallustian usage: *amat fieri* is as much a lexical as a syntactical grecism, since the sense of *amat* here ('is accustomed') is not native, but a loan-shift from Greek;[10] it was that new sense which facilitated the novel syntax.

Now for Horace. Quintilian, who was later to describe him as *uarius figuris et uerbis felicissime audax* (*Inst.* 10.1.96), assured us that Horace

---

[8] The passage referred to in Sallust may be from a now lost part of the *Histories*, though it is sometimes regarded as a mis-recollection of *Iug.* 34.1 (*uulgus* was deleted by Radermacher; others emend it); the others are *S.* 2.6.83–4, *A.* 1.67 and 12.5 (though the phrase also occurs in Tibull. 1.6.49).

[9] *Ars rhetorica* iii.4–5 in Halm (1863: 123). For *aliena uerba* see *TLL* i.1578.63ff., esp. 79–80.

[10] Coleman (1977: 106); *TLL* i.1956.35–59.

was specially keen on syntactical grecisms, yet he contented himself with only the one example. It is remarkably from the *Sermones*, which, generically considered, might have been thought to stick close to spoken Latin norms.[11] To Quintilian however the syntax of *nec ciceris nec longae inuidit auenae* was totally strange, unidiomatic, and yet it could be accounted for straightforwardly as a borrowing from Greek. Nowhere else in classical Latin is *inuideo* used with the genitive and so it has every appearance here of an experiment on Horace's part, one which failed to take even in poetry. That is why Quintilian chose so striking an example: he had begun his section on *figurae* with the observation that in older Latin Romans said *hanc rem inuidere*, whereas in his own day everybody said *hac re inuidere*. So Horace's genitive with this verb stuck in his mind as a freak. We might have expected, in the light of what he said of Horace's fondness for grecisms, to find numerous references to them in what remains of the Horatian scholia, but it is only Porfyrio who has two explicit statements on the figure, in his notes on *C.* 2.6.15–16 *uiridique certat | baca Venafro*, where he observes: *Graeca figura dictum est 'illi certat' pro 'cum illo certat'* (a usage to be discussed in more detail below, pp. 167–8) and 2.9.17 *desine querelarum*: *Graeca elocutione figuratum est. alioquin nos 'desine queri' dicimus*. The dearth in these scholia is probably due to their scrappy transmission. But sometimes Horace's scholiast does not specify that the 'figured' syntax is owed to the Greek. All that Porfyrio said about *C.* 3.30.11–12 *agrestium | regnauit populorum* was: *adnotanda elocutio per genetiuum figurata*. A figure to be sure, but not to him precisely a grecism (if his full note has come down to us). Servius, however, discussing *A.* 11.126, is more explicit: *figura Graeca 'miror illius rei' et 'regno illius rei', ut Τενέδοιό τε ἶφι ἀνάσσεις* [*Il.* 1.38]: *inde Horatius ait 'et qua pauper aquae Daunus agrestium | regnauit populorum' pro agrestibus populis* (his quotation of a snippet of Homer which illustrates Greek usage, and the MS transmission of this text will both be discussed below, pp. 166–7 and 170). So the grecism was explicitly acknowledged, at least by some.

We turn now to Quintilian's citations from Virgil. His first, *A.* 1.67, is more remarkable than it may appear to us at first sight, and it therefore requires some discussion. Quintilian perhaps chose *nauigat aequor* designedly, because in his first book (1.5.38) when he came to illustrate solecisms he used as one of his examples the phrase *ambulo uiam*, his point there being that normal Latin usage required a preposition before the noun indicating 'ground covered' with a verb of movement (internal objects are

---

[11] But cf. the observation on p. 159 above about borrowed word order.

of course related but different).[12] According to that doctrine then Virgil's use of *nauigo* without a preposition before *aequor* ought to have seemed a solecism. A defence was needed for the poet's usage, and the one that Quintilian chose was that of a grammatical figure borrowed from the Greek; he might also have chosen to regard it as an ellipse, an explanation often found in the Virgilian scholia on other passages.[13] But here, Servius concurs with him, noting: *figura Graeca est; nos enim dicimus 'per aequor nauigat'*. With this he compares the use of *iuro* at A. 12.197.[14] It may also be noted that 'Julius Rufinianus' also lists this usage of *nauigo* and of *iuro* (though he has in mind A. 6.351 *maria aspera iuro*) among his few instances of grecism.[15] But the intricacies of the explanation of *inauigat aequor* have not been exhausted.

One of the MS of Servius, called by Thilo D, regularly adds further explanatory matter, and on A. 1.67 it appends a Greek phrase: τὴν θάλασσαν πλέει (a practice of which more notice will be taken later). This obviously confirms the reader's conviction that the Latin syntax is borrowed. But that little Greek phrase crops up again in the Verona scholia on E. 6.2 *habitare casas*, where once more the accusative object was felt to need defence. The full note runs thus: *antiqua consuetudine, sicut: centum urbes habitant magnas* [= A. 3.106], *ut Graeci dicunt* πλέει τὴν θάλασσαν *et alibi Vergilius: caua trabe currimus aequor pro 'super aequor currere'* [= A. 3.191]. The situation with *currere* was felt to be the same as with *nauigare*, and indeed on A. 3.191 the DServius commentary cross-referenced to A. 1.67. In both cases a preposition would have been the norm in prose, but the poet's practice is felt to be borrowed from the Greek. At the same time the Verona scholiast adds as a possible explanation archaism (*antiqua consuetudo*). We shall meet this alternative again.

Now for Quintilian's second Virgilian example, *saucius pectus*. Here an adjective, rather than a verb, 'governs' the accusative case of a noun which

---

[12] We should not expect to find many instances of *ambulo* in the poets, since the verb is colloquial, and anyway metrically unwieldy; nonetheless at F. 1.122 Ovid wrote *libera perpetuas ambulat illa uias*.

[13] Virgil frequently omitted a preposition where prose would employ it, e.g. at A. 1.2 *Italiam . . . uenit*. This omission is noted by Servius (*detraxit*) at A. 1.52 *Aeoliam uenit* and at A. 11.683 *agminibus totis*, cf. the note of DServius on A. 9. 598 where he glosses the simple accusative with *ad Italiam*. Mühmelt (1965: 111) drew attention to similar notes in the Homeric scholia which he believed served as Servius' models both for the grammatical issue and its explanation.

[14] Ovid picks up the figure at *Her.* 16.321 *iurabo . . . numina*.

[15] *De schematis lexeos* in Halm (1863: 56.13–14). It is interesting that 'Rufinianus' spoke of these two passages as instances where the preposition had been removed (*praepositione detracta*), perhaps thus echoing an alternative scholiastic explanation such as we find elsewhere in Servius himself, see n. 13 above.

specifies or limits its scope (in this case the adjective may be thought to have verbal sense, 'wounded', not that Quintilian observes this). Servius in his comment on *A.* 12.5 does not mention Greek practice, but glosses the expression with a turn of phrase that he regularly uses in his commentary to explain this sort of accusative: *saucium pectus habens*; he went on to observe: *et bene alia uerba interposuit, quia 'saucius pectus' et sonabat asperrime et imperitis poterat soloecismus uideri.* He thus shows that he was dealing with a grammatical figure, for it is often a short step between a legitimate figure and an unacceptable solecism. The student is warned.

This particular usage and the scholiasts' form of words to expound it deserve more notice. The 'figure' was first introduced by Virgil at *G.* 2.131 *faciem . . . simillima lauro* (where there is no comment from antiquity). It then occurs twice in *A.* 1, where Servius does have notes. On 320 *nuda genu* he is explicit: *nudum genu habens, ut si dicas 'bonus animum'. et est Graeca figura, sed non ea quam diximus fieri per participium praeteriti temporis et casum accusatiuum; haec enim per nomen* ['adjective'] *fit, quamuis ad unam significationem recurrant.* (He cross-references back to this note at 1.328 *uox hominem sonat*, where he also says: *Graeca figura est.*) This phrase, *nuda genu*, became a standard example of the usage;[16] Diomedes (*GLK* i.440.21–2) also used it to illustrate what he calls 'hellen- ismos': *ibi enim nudum genu habens debuit dicere. sed seruiens schemati* (NB = *figurae*) *quod appellatur hellenismos . . .* (a word rarely used in antiquity to refer to the *Graeca figura*).[17] The note Servius composed on *A.* 1.320 *nuda genu* is crucial to our understanding of how this grecism struck a Roman reader. The best way he could think of to demonstrate its outlandishness was to compose a piece of dog-Latin, *bonus animum*, a construction unknown to good usage, which, as Dr Horsfall pointed out in discussion, was precisely the point at issue.[18] The same 'figured' usage of the accusative is found a second time at *A.* 1.589 *os umerosque deo*

---

[16] On the very difficult *A.* 2.273 *traiectus lora* Servius says: *traiecta lora habens; ut nuda genu* adds DServius. This particularly troublesome passage is discussed by Mariner (1963); Pro- fessor José-Luis Perez Vidal kindly brought this article to my notice. *nuda genu* was used as an example of a *figura λέξεως* by 'Fortunatianus' (Halm 1863: 126.25–6), but he did not specify grecism.

[17] For the origins of the term ἑλληνισμός see Lohmann (1915: 1) and Dionisotti (1995: 45–58). It is also found in Donatus' comment on Ter. *And.* 543 *ne me obsecra* for *ne obsecres*; Donatus remarks upon the common usage only here (see McGlynn 1963: 389) s.v. *ne*). Where did he get this notion? Can he mean that Terence is translating Menander? Even if so, the usage cannot have escaped his notice, so common is it (eighty examples in comedy alone according to K–S i.202–3). Prose avoids it however, so perhaps by Donatus' time it seemed a poeticism. Cf. Servius on *A.* 6.95 and 7.202, where he rewords *ne* + imperative to *ne* + subjunctive (he ignores *E.* 2.17); he nowhere calls it a grecism. See Penney, p.253, in this volume.

[18] See *TLL* ii.2097.71–2098.41.

similis, where again Servius says: *est Graeca figura, ut diximus supra* (he simply notes the presence of a figure at *A.* 4.559). Similar notes on this sort of accusative are found on *A.* 5.285 *Cressa genus*, where Servius identifies the syntax as *Graeca figura*, with a cross-reference to 8.114 *qui genus?* Finally, DServius notes on *A.* 12.25 *non genus indecores* that it is an *elocutio figurata de Graeco.*[19] The feeling of antiquity is clear: such an accusative is to be accounted for as foreign idiom.

Let us return now to Quintilian. His examples of grecism were few, and chiefly concerned the use of cases; the phenomenon sheltered under the broad umbrella of *figura*. It is worth looking at some of the other 'figures' he drew attention to, because, though he did not class them as grecisms, some later commentators did. For example, Quintilian noticed Persius 1.9–10 *nostrum istud uiuere triste | aspexi*, but only saw in it a figure: *cum infinito uerbo usus est pro appellatione: nostram enim uitam uult intellegi.*[20] But the scholiast to Persius specifies that it is a *figura Graeca*. This ought to be correct, so far as ancient doctrine was concerned, since the use of the infinitive as a noun that might be in the accusative case was felt by Roman grammarians to be borrowed from Greek; so Servius and Sergius on Donatus call it a *graeca elocutio*.[21]

Another related figure Quintilian found in Virgil, *A.* 5.248 *magnum dat ferre talentum*, of which he said: *utimur et uerbo pro participio: 'magnum dat ferre talentum', tamquam ferendum* (*Inst.* 9.3.9).[22] Whether or not he defined more precisely the sort of figure is not clear, thanks to a lacuna in the transmission; he clearly did not include it among grecisms. It is, however, plain what sense he attached to the construction: the infinitive is epexegetic, and replaces another form of the verb, e.g. gerundive.

[19] When the usage is encountered in Horace, however, Porfyrio merely notes it as a figure. On *C.* 1.21.12 *Apollinem umerum insignem* he says: *per figuram haec eloquutio intelligenda … hoc est umerum insignem habentem ut laeta comam* (probably = *A.* 7.60 *sacra comam*) *dicitur a Vergilio et multa similia*. The failure to call it specifically a grecism may be due either to accident or to the commentator's refusal to go into detail about origins.

[20] *Inst.* 9.3.9; but if his text is here correctly transmitted his memory betrayed him since the infinitive phrase is *not* the object of the verb *aspexi* but of a preceding *ad*. This does not alter his argument.

[21] See *GLK* iv.411.24–5 and 502.32; the issue is discussed by Wölfflin (1886). Persius is especially fond of this use of the infinitive as a noun, but 1.9–10 is the sole example of its use after a preposition. 'Julius Rufinianus' (Halm 1863: 58.10) drew attention to 1.122 *hoc ridere meum* as a *figura per eclogam uerborum* in a section which groups together a number of non-native usages of the infinitive.

[22] It is, however, odd that Quintilian says *utimur* since this is not true of usage in general, as Servius pointed out; the infinitive with *dare* is only found in prose in Vitr. 7.10.4 (cf. *TLL* v.1.1688.59–1690.29) and remained poetic syntax (albeit widespread there: first in Lucr. 6.1227). See now for a general discussion Domínguez Domínguez and Martín Rodríguez (1993).

Other students of the language defined this usage as a grecism, for instance the grammarian Pompeius, who in explaining that the verb had no case in Latin noted none the less that it appeared to be in the accusative when it followed *do*. He insisted that this usage was not Latin but an *elocutio Graeca*; under this head he included the common expression *da bibere*, and compared Ter. *And.* 484 (*GLK* v.213.12–15). Now this little expression came to be usual in accounts of the 'abnormal' syntax of *do*. All such syntax, Pompeius assures us, is acceptable in poets, but quite foreign to everyday usage.

For Servius too the infinitive with *do* was borrowed from Greek; he said in his own note on *A*. 5.248: *Graecum est duo uerba coniungere, ut paulo post* (= 262 *donat habere uiro*), *sed hoc datur poetis*. The construction he clearly felt to be exceptional, and earlier in his commentary he had set out the doctrine a bit more fully, on *A*. 1.318: *unde 'da bibere' usus inuenit, quod facere non debemus, ne duo uerba iungamus nisi in poemate*. He thus made a point of offering a considerable number of notes on it as it occurred throughout the *Aeneid*.[23]

After Quintilian there is a single notice in Aulus Gellius, who drew attention to a use of the passive of *exigo* in a speech of Metellus Numidicus and in a play of Caecilius which he felt was a *Graeca figura* (*Noctes Atticae* 15.14).[24] This is most curious since an oration and a comedy are not, given the opinion of Quintilian, the genres in which we would expect to find abnormalities. None the less it shows that the strategy of tracing some abnormalities in Latin syntax to a deliberate (because 'figured') borrowing from Greek is part of the exegetic tradition well before we reach our extant scholiasts. To them we may now turn in earnest.

Servius provides our most abundant information for Virgilian grecisms, and some of his notes have already been referred to. (Others, which do not call for detailed comment, are gathered into an appendix.) Here let us consider some of the devices he had for drawing attention to grecisms, especially to their 'Greekness'. As we have already seen above, he (or at any rate some of his MSS) sometimes offered a similar Greek expression, either as pure illustration, or as a sort of paraphrase of the Latin. Among the illustrations are these: on *E*. 5.1 *boni inflare: Graecum est ἱκανός λέγειν* (DServius);[25] on *A*. 8.127 *cui . . . precari* the Servian scholia offered three

---

[23] E.g. at 1.319 *dederatque comam diffundere uentis* where he glosses: *ut diffunderetur: Graeca autem figura est. sic alibi* (5.248) *et* (1.79); there are similar notes on 10.235, 701, 12.97 and 211.

[24] For Gellius' use of Greek syntactical practice to justify some constructions in Latin see Holford-Strevens (1988: 137).

[25] See Page ad loc. and cf. *TLL* ii.2098.33–41 (where Servius is quoted quite differently from Thilo's ed.)

explanations, one archaism, another hyperbaton and yet a third runs: *est Graecum, ut* εὔχεο Ἀπόλλωνι (= *Il.* 4.101). Similar is the note on *A.* 10.698 *Latagum occupat os: est Graeca figura, in Homero frequens*, which went on to explain: *ut si dicas* ἔκρουσεν Ἀχιλλέα τὸν πόδα, *id est Achillem percussit pedem pro percussit Achillis pedem*[26] (he made up his Greek phrase, for κρούω is not found in epic). On *A.* 11.383-4 *timoris argue* Servius said: *est de Graeco: nam ita dicunt* κατηγορῶ σε φόνου, and at *A.* 12.649 *indignus auorum* he noted the use of the genitive as a *Graeca figura* and explained: *nam nos 'indignus illa re' dicimus, contra Graeci* ἀνάξιος στεφάνου, *id est indignus coronae.*[27]

Translations (more or less) of the Virgilian original into Greek are found in the Servian scholia on *A.* 1.440 *cernitur ulli: et est Graecum* οὐδενὶ ὁρώμενος, *A.* 1.465 *multa gemens: Graecum est* πολλὰ στενάζων (DServius).[28] At *A.* 3.426 *prima hominis facies* Servius took *prima* as neuter plural: *est Graeca figura* τὰ πρῶτα ἄνθρωπος; his opinion is not shared by modern commentators but that does not affect his observation. We find more translations at *A.* 6.341 *quis deorum: 'quis deus' debuit dicere sed graece dixit* τίς θεῶν (= *Il.* 1.8, 18.182),[29] *A.* 8.217 *una boum: Graeca figura*, μία τῶν βοῶν,[30] and at *A.* 8.676 *cernere erat* Servius after again specifying *Graeca figura*, translates: ὁρᾶν ἔνεστι.[31] A few more examples of paraphrase into Greek or citation of Greek syntactical practice will be mentioned below, but it is time now to consider how the scholiasts handled a general topic in Latin syntax which they often faced in their poets.

Most verbs of fighting or contending took the dative in Greek, and in Latin usually a prepositional construction (K-S i.319). One of the first to depart from the native usage was Catullus at 62.64 *noli pugnare duobus*. We have no scholia on Catullus, but when we find the same construction in Virgil, at *A.* 4.38 *pugnabis amori*, we can turn to Servius, who says: *est Graecum 'pugno tibi', nam nos 'pugno tecum' dicimus.*[32] The same view is

---

[26] See Landgraf (1898: 215) and Müller (1908: 131). There is a similar construction at *A.* 12.273-6 *unum ... transadigit costas*, but Servius only noted on 273: *figurate dixit pro unius*.

[27] The usage is picked up by Val. Flac. 8.38 and Silius 8.383; cf. *TLL* vii.1.1190.32-9.

[28] So far as the adverbial use of the plural neuter adjective is concerned we may compare Servius on *A.* 11.471 *multaque se incusat: multa pro multum, Graeca figura* (cf. DServius on 12.402). See Löfstedt (1933: 412), Wölfflin (1885: 98), *TLL* viii.1617.41-50 (Virgilian examples omitted!). Cf. Hor. *Ep.* 5.74 *o multa fleturum caput*.

[29] *OLD* 1 only cites this example, then Apul. *Met.* 1.25. Commentators and grammars are strangely silent.

[30] The usage is also classed as *figura Graeca* by 'Julius Rufinianus' (Halm 1863: 56.12). See Clausen on *E.* 6.65 *una sororum*.

[31] He missed both *G.* 4.447, on which Bourgeois (1940: 85) astutely noted that it is a Greek who is speaking, and *A.* 6.596.

[32] Cf. *A.* 11.600-1 *sonipes ... pugnat habenis*, and Hor. *S.* 1.2.73 *pugnantia ... istis* (again in the satires, where we might not have expected abnormality).

found in 'Julius Rufinianus'; this passage from the *Aeneid* is the second in his brief list of instances of *figura Graeca*.[33] Such syntax is frequently adopted for other verbs of fighting as well, e.g. *certo*, by Horace and Virgil, but when their ancient commentators come to describe the usage they are not always consistent in their terminology. By various means they none the less drew attention to the oddity of the syntax; Servius on *A.* 1.493 *uiris concurrere* says that it is a *Graeca figura*, but no specific detail is given (see Thilo's note), nor does he always say that the dative so used is a loan from the Greeks.[34] What needs to be stressed here is that sometimes we can only get the full picture of the ancient opinion by combining scraps of information from various sources. Thus in his note to Horace, *S.* 2.5.19 Pseudo-Acro says: *certans datiuo casui iungitur* with an appeal to the same usage in Virgil at *E.* 8.55 *certent et cycnis ululae* (where there is no Servian note) and 5.8 *tibi certat* (where Servius says unspecifically *usurpatum est; nam hodie 'certo tecum' dicimus*). This latter line is of the first importance, because it provides Porfyrio with a reference point; on Horace, *Ep.* 11.18 he says: *imparibus autem certare per datiuum casum figuratum est* and cross-references to Virgil, *E.* 5.8 *tibi certat*. This is surprising since he might have been expected to refer to his own note on *C.* 2.6.15–16 (quoted above on p. 162), one of only two explicit references to the *Graeca figura* in the whole of the Horatian scholiastic tradition. In fact, only one writer explicitly places *E.* 5.8 among examples of *figura Graeca*, the late (but not for that reason untrustworthy) 'Julius Rufinianus' (see n. 33). We must then be alert to the unspecific use of terms like *figura*, *figuratum*, *figurate* or *usurpatum*, as well as to paraphrases into Greek and to cross-references to a standard example of a particular usage.

When for instance we turn to Priscian's grammar, we find him remark on Virg. *G.* 3.53 *crurum tenus: (praepositio) apud nos duobus solis praeponitur, id est accusatiuo et ablatiuo, nisi* ἑλληνισμῶι *utatur auctoritas, ut Vergilius in III Georgicon genetiuo est usus secundum Graecos pro ablatiuo*.[35] This view is endorsed by Servius on *A.* 3.427 *pube tenus*, but without specific note of Greek usage, and by DServius on *A.* 10.210 *laterum tenus*,[36]

---

[33] *De schematis lexeos*, in Halm (1863: 56.9–14).

[34] He has, for instance, no note on *G.* 2.99 *cui non certauerit ulla*, but on *G.* 2.138 *laudibus Italiae certent* he says: *figurate: nam 'certo tecum' dicimus*. See also *G.* 2.96 *cellis contende Falernis*, to which there is a false reference in *TLL* iv.667.55–61; the correct reference appears ibid. 670.20–6. The syntax is not found in prose until Plin. *Ep.* 8.8.4.

[35] 14.14 = *GLK* iii.32.11; cf. 18.262, 279 = *GLK* iii.343.13–18 *secundum Graecos dixit*. For 'hellenismos' see n. 17. It is telling that Mynors has no note on the usage, Thomas notes it without attempting to account for Virgil's practice.

[36] Harrison ad loc. does not mention the possibility of grecism in the usage, nor does Austin on Virg. *A.* 1.737 or 2.553 (where he does suggest metrical convenience). The usage is first found in poetry in Cic. *Arat.* 324 (83), in prose in a letter of Caelius (*Fam.* 8.1.2).

where there is a cross reference to the *Georgics* passage and, more signifi-
cantly, a translation into Greek, ἄχρι τῶν πλευρῶν, one of the scholiasts'
ways of indicating grecism.

  Another grammarian who draws attention to Virgilian grecism is Dio-
medes (*GLK* i.312.20). In discussing the cases used with *diues* he says that
the genitive is Greek, for πλούσιος or ἀφνειός are so used with genitive or
dative (e.g. *Od.* 1.165); from Virgil he cites *A.* 9.26 *diues equum, diues
pictai uestis et auri*. Servius there simply notes that it is used figuratively
with the genitive (Virgil in fact has the genitive often, not that he spurns
the normal Latin ablative).

  Let us conclude this trawl through the scholiasts and grammarians of
antiquity with a remaining notice of our figure that calls for special dis-
cussion. The author of the *Adnotationes super Lucanum* regarded *felix
esse mori* at 4.520 as *secundum Graecam elocutionem*. This passage,
however, clearly gave other ancient students pause. For Priscian regarded
it as the normal Latin use of the infinitive as an accusative object.[37] If we
had more and fuller scholia on poets other than Virgil we would surely
find a wider range of observations upon the usage than have survived.

  To close this account of the attitude to syntactical grecism in antiquity
we may notice a different sort of evidence which reinforces the conclusion
that grecisms were felt to be exotics: in our MSS they are sometimes
normalized out of existence. Scholiasts too betray the practice. This is
found for instance at Virg. *A.* 9.789 *excedere pugnae* and 10.441 *tempus
desistere pugnae*. In the former case the Medicean MS and in the latter
the codex Romanus offer the uariant *pugna*, as well they might since the
construction with the genitive is unnecessary metrically, and the normal
ablative was found at *A.* 1.37. At *A.* 10.154 *libera fati* Servius knew the
reading *fatis*; again the syntax was not metrically generated, and the normal
ablative was to be found at *G.* 3.194.[38] A yet more taxing use of the
genitive is found at *A.* 11.126 *iustitiaene prius mirer, belline laborum*. Here
the MSS give variant readings, and Donatus appears to have read *iustitiam*
and *laborem*, which metrically and syntactically are unexceptionable: Virgil
could have written them. But Servius saved the syntax and the text, not
only here but in the passage of Horace referred to above (p. 162): *figura
Graeca 'miror illius rei'*; he derived the construction from θαυμάζειν, and
was supported by Priscian, who said: *illi* [Attici] εὐδαιμονίζω σοῦ τόδε καὶ
εὐδαιμονίζω σε τοῦδε. *nostri quoque auctores hanc saepissime* [!] *imitati sunt*

---

[37] The reference in the *Adnotationes super Lucanum* will be found between 4.536 and 4.537
in Endt's edition. For Priscian see 18.260 (= *GLK* iii.342.8–10) and cf. *TLL* iii.767.77–80.
[38] This < ἐλεύθερος, and is picked up by Horace at *AP* 212 (see Brink ad loc. and *TLL* vii
2.1288.29–35, but also Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 78)).

figuram, and went on to refer to this very line from the *Aeneid*.[39] Horace's MS tradition also provides an example of normalization at *C.* 3.30.13, the passage referred to by Servius in the note just quoted (and on p. 162 above). *agrestium regnauit populorum* appears as *agrestium regnator populorum* in our oldest MSS. This reading used to be found even in early printed editions, but though it produces locally normal syntax, it ruins the run of the sentence. These more or less clumsy attempts to foist a normal expression upon the transmitted text suggest dismay in the face of the unusual.

We may now take stock. The Romans themselves created a more or less homogeneous category by treating certain syntactical abnormalities as 'figures of speech'. This indicates that they regarded the phenomenon as fundamentally ornamental, but it had also to be deliberate. For whilst ordinary speakers of a language use *figurae*, they do so unconsciously. Those who speak and write formally, on the other hand, are expected to choose every detail, especially when using figures, for a figure used unawares is a solecism (so Quintilian reiterates, *Inst.* 1.5.53 and 9.3.2, and cf. Sen. *Ep.* 95.9). This *figura* Quintilian classed among the 'grammatical' ones because it changed normal syntactical practice (*loquendi rationem nouat, Inst.* 9.3.2). It differed somewhat from the others in this group in that Quintilian appears to have felt that it belonged especially to historical prose and to poetry generally; it was less suitable to oratory. That would indicate a sense that this particular figure was exotic. Now figures need some justification, and, leaving authority, antiquity and usage to one side, that justification may be found in giving a reason (*Inst.* 9.3.3). The simplest reason for *this* figure is provided by the epithet *Graeca*. All sorts of deviations from the syntactical norm were thus swept into the single basket called *Graeca figura*, and no further attempt was made to account for the usage. So much was already owed, especially by the poets, to Greek literary practice that it sufficed to point to a model in the foreign idiom. Later commentators sometimes underscored this exoticism by reference to what the Romans actually said (*dicimus*), or by a fullish grammatical account of normal Latin syntax, or by translation into or quotation from Greek, or even, once, by the formation of a bit of dog-Latin (*bonus animum*) to warn the reader of the 'foreignness' of the expression. The ancient reader, trained in rhetorical doctrine and the poetical exegesis of the *grammatici*, was ready to pigeon-hole certain abnormalities of syntax as *figurae* modelled upon the Greek. We may now turn to the much more sophisticated views of modern philologists.

---

[39] 18.219 = (*GLK* iii.316.13–15); cf. 17.102 = *GLK* iii.163.1–5.

THE MODERN POSITION

Nowadays when we want to know about grecism, we turn to grammars and to special studies, particularly those of Brenous (1895), Löfstedt (1933) and, for Virgil, the special studies of Lohmann (1915) and of Görler (1985). We now also have a critical survey of the whole topic by Coleman (1977). Despite differences over details, we encounter in them a measure of unanimity about the approaches to be taken. There lies behind all of them a considerable amount of theorizing about the genesis of the phenomenon and a desire to categorize the manifold instances. At the end of his essay on the Greek influence on Latin syntax Coleman (1977: 147), for instance, concluded that 'grecism must be recognized not as a sharply differentiated monolithic category but as a spectrum comprising greater or lesser degrees of abnormality'. (The contemporary model reflects at some remove the first work dedicated to grecism, Vechner (1610). Vechner's approach too was largely theoretical, and he relied only occasionally on ancient comment.) The modern taxonomists have carefully laid out the systematic beds in which our exotics bloom. Some are seen as direct transplants, full-scale grecisms, for instance the 'accusativus Graecus' (or some of its manifestations at any rate). Others are treated as hybrids, created either by developing a peculiar, but still native growth, or by a foreign graft upon a Latin stock; these latter are called 'partial grecisms' (a concept owed to Löfstedt (1933: 410) and (1959: 93)). In either case it is apparently assumed that the process works by analogy. It is with this concept of analogy that I want to deal first.

ANALOGY

Many modern philologists explain the origin of unusual syntactical usages by a process of analogy to some related feature of the language. This approach looks at first sight plausible, but its applicability to grecism is less clear cut. Of course, within the Latin language we can detect analogy at work on syntax. But even then we expect a measure of difference between what ordinary Romans said, and what the poets chose to write. For example, Professor Adams draws attention to *adiuto* used exceptionally with the dative in the speech of a freedwoman in Petronius (62.11) and in a letter of Claudius Terentianus. Latin-speakers of little sophistication obviously borrowed the syntax from intransitive verbs of helping for one which was normally transitive. Such a practice was no doubt common, but also largely unconscious. We would, however, not assume that Ovid was as unaware of what he was doing when he wrote at *Met.* 8.215 *damnosasque*

erudit artis ('Daedalus *taught* Icarus the devilish skills'). He could have used the metrically equivalent *edocet*, and produced normal syntax, but preferred something unusual. It must be stressed that the poet's analogical procedure was deliberate and that the newly minted syntax of *edoceo* never became current (in the way that *adiuto* with the dative appears to have been colloquial); it remained purely artificial and cropped up again only in later poets, who of course imitated Ovid as a master of the language (Val. Flac. 2.50 and Stat. *Theb.* 10.507). Let us now look at some of the grecisms attributed in modern studies to analogical development within Latin. We will begin with the passages referred to by Quintilian, and then notice some others.

ANALOGY WITHIN LATIN

1(i)   On the Horatian example in Quintilian (cf. p. 161): Coleman (1977: 137), noting the low genre, urged that the homely context — the fable of the mice — suggested that the genitive with *inuideo* could be seen as an extension of the native use of *dare* or *sumere* + genitive, which is especially characteristic of colloquial Latin. He was aware of Quintilian's view, but he did not comment upon it, either to accept it or reject it. This evenhandedness leaves us to follow the ancient or the modern account *ad libitum*. But we surely end up with a different view of Horace's verbal mastery if we decide either that he wrenched the language into an unexampled direction, or gently nudged it along a line which it was anyway pursuing.

Horace's great modern commentator Paul Lejay, however, was more decisive. Albeit in his note ad loc. he quoted Quintilian, yet he denied that the genitive with *inuideo* was a grecism; he saw in it rather a recovery of an older usage of the genitive with words meaning fullness or privation. This approach somewhat mitigates the freakishness of the syntax, its experimental quality, by an appeal to allegedly similar, but normal usages, particularly in the older language. What the modern philologist failed to reckon with, however, was the difficulty that any Roman had in recovering older practice reliably. One example will suffice to illustrate their help-lessness.

As was noted at the outset, Quintilian exemplified the concept of *figura* by drawing attention to the use of cases with *plenus* (*Inst.* 9.3.1), and he clearly believed that the genitive was alone found in older authors, down to Cicero, and that the use of the ablative had developed in his own day. We, however, can check in a moment a comprehensive grammar (e.g. K–S i.386) or dictionary or authoritative commentary to learn that the ablative is certainly found, albeit rarely, in late republican prose writers, Cicero

and Caesar included. Ancient discussions of usage were bedevilled by the lack of comprehensive information retrieval systems. We need to bear this in mind when we detect archaism at work; we must ask what chance the Roman had of securing the information we command so readily. We have seen (p. 167 above) that the Servian scholia offered archaism as an alternative explanation of *precor* governing the dative, so the strategy adopted by modern philology was up to a point available to an ancient commentator, but his difficulties in deploying it were considerable (that particular defence was misconceived: old Latin *precor* + dative meant 'pray for').

   1(ii)   Horace's use of *regno* (cf. p. 162) has prompted debate among philologists, adjudicated by Löfstedt (1933: 416). He was disinclined to follow those who looked for motivation for the usage in analogy, e.g. with *potior*. He followed most others in the view that this is a pure grecism, < βασιλεύω. Neither he nor more recently Coleman (1977: 141–2) cited the opinion of Servius, but they might well have started with him.

   2   On one Virgilian example in Quintilian (cf. p. 161) everyone agrees that *saucius pectus* is a pure grecism. Brenous (1895) failed to draw attention to Quintilian or Servius in discussing *nauigat aequor* (Lohmann, however, did (1915: 22)). When we turn to an eminent contemporary student of Virgil's syntax, Woldemar Görler (1982: 71), we find a different approach. He began his valuable discussion of 'displacements' in Virgilian syntax with this very line, but chose not to notice Quintilian's use of it to illustrate grecism[40] and, albeit admitting that *Od.* 3.71 πλεῖθ' ὑγρὰ κέλευθα was perhaps a model, he was at one time disinclined to agree with Servius that this is a 'real' grecism. It may be urged, however, that we are not here trying to establish a matter of fact. We cannot know by what mental process a poet came to choose an abnormal form of expression or how he would have defended his practice, but we can establish how his readers did so on his behalf. Servius and Quintilian knew that Virgil's usage was strange because it is not what 'we [Romans] say'; to account for this (since solecism in a classic writer was unthinkable) they explained it as a figurative form of writing, and they looked to Greek for a model. Görler, on the other hand, sees it as another instance of the transitivization of intransitive verbs (which is indeed a phenomenon of Augustan verse). But this leaves explanation at half-cock. We still wonder why the poets should have taken it upon themselves to treat the native verbs in this way.

   3   *do* + infinitive (cf. pp. 165–6). Some philologists look for a native Latin idiom that might prepare the ground for the extended usage of the

---

[40] Later (1985: 267) he did so, though it is not clear if this in any way altered his earlier argument.

poets, and our grammars find it in *da bibere*, which is claimed to be purely Latin and is seen as providing the springboard (so, e.g. Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 345)). On the other hand, Heraeus (1937: 195–6 n. 3.) reckoned that the view of the Roman grammarians themselves that *da bibere* was a grecism was not without merit, and he drew attention to what Servius said on *A*. 1.319.[41] Coleman (1977: 135) too refers with approval to his doctrine.

4   Verbs of fighting + dative (cf. pp. 167–8 above): Lohmann (1915: 53), who as usual noted earlier Latin usage that to his mind paved the way to Virgil's own, none the less ignored Porfyrio and Servius. Similarly in his commentary on *E*. 5.8 *tibi certat* Coleman betrayed the modern preference for explanation by analogy, for he drew attention to the syntax of *resisto*, which normally governs the dative. He also fairly acknowledged that *tibi certat* might be a grecism.[42] More reductive and indeed circular is the note of Wendell Clausen, who in his recent commentary on the *Eclogues* (Oxford, 1994) did not draw attention to Greek usage at all, but appealed to analogy with *contendo* at Lucretius 3.5–6 and to *pugno* at Catullus 62.64. Yet these verbs only take the dative in Latin as a grecism! His additional reference to Kühner–Stegmann's grammar goes some way to alerting the industrious reader to the borrowed syntax, but his note showed no interest in the phenomenon, and only put back a generation the basic question why Virgil should have altered the native syntax. The 'analogous' syntax which Clausen cited is itself abnormal and needs an explanation.

Ronconi (1971: 158) sought to diminish the audacity of Catullus 62.64 *noli pugnare duobus* by appealing to vaguely similar uses of the dative in Plautus.[43] His blind spot was *parti pris*. He decided in advance that grecism was inappropriate to a less formal genre like the wedding song, and so he resolved to dilute any apparent examples. But as we have seen, this particular syntax is found in the colloquial satires of Horace at 1.2.73 and the 'humble' pastorals of Virgil.

5   *diues* + genitive (cf. p. 169 above). Görler (1985: 266) refers to Diomedes (without comment) but also looks for analogy in the syntax of *plenus*. We are here given alternative explanations, but it should be noted that the concept of analogy employed here had not been formulated in antiquity; it was not an available account (though paradoxically this does not mean that they did not use it unconsciously). This will be discussed further below.

---

[41] Servius none the less presents his information somewhat glibly; he knew that a number of verbs take a complementary infinitive in prose.
[42] But later Coleman (1977: 138) cited Servian doctrine and revised his statement on the passage in the *Eclogues*.
[43] *Bacch.* 967, *Trin.* 838 (cf. Brenous (1895: 146)).

6 *indignus* + genitive (cf. p. 167 above). Wölfflin (1882: 114), followed by Lohmann (1915: 46), would have none of Servius' explanation, because *dignus* already took the genitive in Latin and so in their opinion this usage must be produced by analogy. They never thought, however, that Servius might have been ignorant of the usage, since it occurs very rarely (K–S i.398–9), and not at all in educated writing.

7 A larger problem with the modern analogical model should be remarked. Any claim that analogy was the agent or catalyst of syntactical borrowing needs scrutinizing. Let us consider for instance the treatment of *A.* 2.10 *sed si tantus amor casus cognoscere nostros*. Of the syntax of *amor* and the infinitive Servius said: *cognoscendorum casuum et Graeca figura est*. The construction first appears here; more instances are listed, but without comment or reference to Servius, in *TLL* ii.1969.83–1970.8.[44] Austin ad loc. fails to notice Servius, and explains: 'the infinitive is used as if a verb of desiring had preceded'. He offers what he regards as similar constructions, e.g. *est lubido* as the equivalent of *libet*, and *pudor est* of *pudet*. He concludes: 'no doubt this helped towards a natural [NB] development of the construction'. He was, however, too astute a Latinist to say that this case was devised as if *amo* itself had preceded. For the construction of *amo* with the infinitive was not native to Latin but borrowed, hence his vague reference to '*a* verb of desiring'. It is of course quite different with *studium* + infinitive at *G.* 1.21 *studium quibus arua tueri*, because *studeo* naturally takes the infinitive in Latin, and the expression is no more than a periphrasis, the equivalet of *qui student* (a form of the verb which cannot appear in hexameters unless the poet is prepared not to lengthen the necessary short vowel before st). This holds for a number of his examples: they are substantival periphrases for common verbal constructions, which is not true of the case at issue, *amor* + infinitive. So the analogical model is here insufficiently cogent. Servius seems correct in identifying this instance as a grecism, for ἔρως was constructed with the infinitive; to him there was nothing 'natural' about it, it was best accounted for as a figure and borrowed from Greek. This example demonstrates the ease with which a modern philologist appeals to analogy, but analysis of the process shows up weak links in the chain of argument.

---

[44] Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 351) do not refer to this example nor to Servius, but classify *amor habet* + infin. at *A.* 12.282 as an instance of not so much the noun, as the whole idea which it represents as governing an infinitive.

PARTIAL GRECISM

Modern philology generally assents to the view that the construction of *nuda genu* (*A.* 1.320) is not native, and the practice is identified as the 'accusativus Graecus'. The assent, however, is sometimes qualified, and refinements of this analysis should now be considered.

Löfstedt (1959: 94) called this phenomenon a 'partial grecism', because he saw it as an extension of native Latin syntax, a view shared by Palmer, who reckoned that here 'Greek stimulated a native Latin usage' (1954: 289). In discussing Horace's use of the genitive with *inuideo* Löfstedt (1933: 416–7) referred to Quintilian's use of the expression as an instance of grecism, but he nevertheless preferred to regard it as only 'partial', since he reckoned that it recovered an older, partitive usage of the case; he is followed by the *Thesaurus*, vii.2.195.16.[45] This may be a fair description of the process that went on in the writer's unconscious (something about which we can only speculate), but the distinction between whole and partial grecisms was clearly unavailable to native readers like Quintilian and Servius (and so presumably to the poets themselves); to them this syntax was unmitigatedly foreign in feel. Servius, to be more precise, drew attention to the formal difference from a more widespread (but still poetic) use of the accusative with the past participle passive,[46] which he still noted on 1.228 *oculos suffusa nitentes* simply as a figure. Löfstedt's attempt to refine analysis betrays the historical approach of the modern philologist and raises the question of the role of such analysis in the assessment of the phenomenon.[47] It also raises a further problem: the philologists who employ the notion of syntactical analogy do not explain how it came into operation across a linguistic divide. Analogy, whether unconscious or deliberate, may operate easily enough *within* a language. But how is it

---

[45] But one of Löfstedt's examples of this old, unusual partitive genitive, Enn. *Ann.* 235 V., was impugned by O. Skutsch in *Studia Enniana* (London, 1968), 95 (and he has maintained his opinion in his n. on *Ann.* 270 Sk.).

[46] His note on *A.* 1.320 concluded: *quamuis ad unam significationem recurrant* 'they come to the same thing'. What this means is shown in his glosses, for he regularly paraphrases both expressions with *habens*, e.g. on 1.228 *nitidos oculos lacrimis perfusos habens*. So one usage is clearly Greek to him, the other simply figurative, and no attempt is made to trace its origins. On the other hand when we reach 12.5 Servius glosses, as we have seen, in the usual way: *saucium pectus habens* but DServius adds: *ut 'nudatosque umeros oleo perfusa nitescit'* [= *A.* 5.135], which rather overrides the distinction set up on 1.228. The blurred distinction is followed by Lactantius on Statius; cf. his notes on *Th.* 2.506 *erecta genas: erectas genas habens* and on 4.365 *ora deformis: deformia ora habens*.

[47] For analysis of aspects of the usage and a general bibliography on the 'accusatiuus graecus' see Harrison on *Aen.* 10, pp. 290–1. It is worth pointing out that Landgraf (1898: 209) is mistaken when he gives as the earliest occurrence Plautus, *Pseud.* 785: *qui* is ablative there and *manus* nominative.

supposed to work *across* languages? It seems to be accounted for by the bilingualism of the Romans, or at any rate some of them. This issue must be briefly — and inexpertly — noticed here.

BILINGUALISM

Both Brenous (1895) and Coleman (1977) provide at the outset of their discussions theoretical expositions of how linguistic borrowings take place in societies. Brenous offered over forty pages of introduction on the progress of linguistic exchange in the European vernaculars before he turned to the application of his theory to Latin (1895: 45). He drew attention to the tendency to bilingualism in Roman education and to the cultural cross-fertilization in much of Italy, which even prompted some Romans to write in Greek. The most important section of his introduction is the last, in which he set out his system for analysing the phenomena, at the same time answering possible objections to his method (1895: 58–81, résumé: 77–81). Coleman's approach is more schematic but at bottom no different; he discusses first the principles of linguistic interaction and then applies them to Latin (1977: 101–4).

Since Brenous's time there have been many studies of the phenomenon of bilingualism among speakers of modern vernaculars.[48] One conclusion seems to have commanded until recently general assent, and it checks a too ready assumption that syntactical interference whether generated by analogy or otherwise occurs. Susan Romaine (1995: 64) noted that, compared to borrowings of vocabulary, 'syntax has often been thought to be the least easily diffused aspect of language'. If this observation holds good it has a particular bearing upon our study of syntactical, rather than lexical, grecism. But Romaine goes on to draw attention to evidence which might weaken the common view. The work of C. Myers-Scotton (1993) presents an alternative model, which is avowedly speculative.[49] It would be impertinence in me to pronounce upon the success of her hypotheses. But even granting that the view that syntactical interference between languages spoken by bilinguals is more common than has been allowed, the convertibility of the hypothesis to the sort of Latin we are here concerned with is questionable. It is remarkable that studies of bilingualism focus upon speech or conversation, not formal writing. Moreover the speakers whose practice is recorded and analysed are often children or those with little

---

[48] Professor Adams's considerable advice has much improved this discussion.
[49] Myers-Scotton (1993: 208, 228), esp. ch. 7 'Codeswitching and Deep Grammatical Borrowing'.

education (Myers-Scotton studied pidgin and creole, and an East African spoken language, Ma). We should also bear in mind the comparatively straightforward syntax of modern vernaculars. There is on the other hand evidence to confirm the commonly held view referred to by Romaine. P. Gardner-Chloros (1991: 153–4) noted the skill with which bilinguals generally manage to avoid syntactical conflict in conversation and to preserve the syntax appropriate to one language or the other; she also analysed several conversations, and noted that in spite of their frequency 'cases where switching leads to syntactic infelicities', i.e. interference, remained rare. For all these reasons we should be disinclined to attribute syntactical grecism in the Latin poets to the fact that élite Romans were bilinguals. When they came to write their language (as opposed to speaking it) they could easily check interference from Greek; grecisms are not found in the speeches of Cicero, for instance, and Quintilian, as we noted earlier, hints that they will be avoided in oratory. Moreover, if such syntactical interference was common at lower levels of society, the élite would be the more determined to avoid it, especially since they insisted upon purity of Latin (*Latinitas*), and regarded solecisms as stylistic blemishes.

If bilingualism by itself cannot facilitate the use of an analogical model to explain syntactical interference among élite speakers and writers, we are left with a fundamental problem: how does linguistic analogy produce syntactical interference *across* languages? The only answer is that it does not of itself. There must still be in formal, written language the element of deliberation. A Roman poet consciously departed from the norm, and knew that his practice would be scrutinized or even mocked if a reader failed to see any justification; recall Numitorius' parody of a usage in Virgil's *Eclogues* recorded by Suetonius in his life of the poet, section 43: *Dic mihi, Damoeta: 'cuium pecus' anne Latinum?* A writer had to be ready and able to justify his procedure. Now this brings us to a final problem with the modern use of the term analogy.

The Romans too had the term *analogia*, but used it to explain morphological, not syntactical, practice. They had no terms in use (to my knowledge) which would serve to explain our concept of 'syntactical analogy'. It may be that the closest ancient students of Latin came to it was simple comparison. For an example, let us return to the use of *tenus* with a genitive (discussed on pp. 168–9 above). Servius on *G.* 3.53 referred — perhaps in paraphrase — to the view of Modestus:[50] *tenus pro fine ut Sallustius 'fine inguinum ingrediuntur mare'.* Does *pro* here imply something more than simple substitution or comparison? Is it what modern

---

[50] He may have been Iulius Modestus, the freedman of Hyginus, who lived under Tiberius; see *RE* x.1.680–1.

grammars mean by 'analogy'? Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 268) (following the more hesitant Wackernagel (1928: ii.164)) say that the genitive with *tenus* 'folgt dem von *fini*'. This is a matter for further investigation, but my belief is that the Romans lacked the concept altogether. How they explained analogical practice in their own language (for it surely occurred, as we have seen) is a mystery. But if a grammarian or rhetorician, whose business it was to account for the language of the poets and historians, could not expound a principle of grammatical analogy similar to ours, then it is not too much to assume that the poets who generated the syntax were no more likely to think in our terms of what they were doing. Certainly, once the explanation provided by *figura Graeca* was available, it will have sufficed all who needed to explain or justify poetic practice, including the poets themselves.

It is time to draw the threads together and offer a conclusion. The modern approach to grecism is largely historical and grammatical. We appeal to linguistic processes founded on analogy, without establishing how they might operate between the syntaxes of different languages. In effect we also diminish the deliberately artistic effect sought by poets in their use of language. When we turn to antiquity we find a rhetorical description, *Graeca figura*, which falls within the grammatical category (according to Quintilian). *figura* indicates that we are dealing with a departure from the norm of the spoken and written language, one which serves above all as an ornament of style. The usages grouped under this head are comprehensive, the syntax of nouns, verbs and adjectives being all ranged together under it. *Graeca* too pulls its weight and provides an aetiology of the figure; it draws attention, as our grammatical terminology rarely does, to the origin of the ornament, imitation of the Greek. This hints at a satisfactory account of how poets actually work, for it suggests something conscious, which our appeal to analogy or to the partial grecism does not. Latin poets knew and admired the Greek language and literature; some may even have believed with Varro that Latin was a dialect of Greek and that in borrowing from the older language they were recovering their birthright. But even without endorsing that extreme position, it is demonstrable that the Roman poet, bred in the tradition of *imitatio*, kept his eye on Greek for his themes and literary forms; the use of his native language was also influenced by the admired literary culture of Greece. The Romans themselves did not refine upon their understanding of syntactical imitation and look for analogies closer to home. The *Graeca figura* always remained an exotic, so much so that sometimes it was removed by normalization from the text. I would not urge that we reformulate or abandon all that

has been said in accounting for aberrant syntax in the poets. But we ought to resensitize ourselves to the artistry that lies behind the use of grecism. Our grammatical categories somewhat deaden our response; they suggest gradual, even unconscious development, rather than deliberate poetic invention. Analogy cannot account for a poet's mastering of his medium. We need to bear constantly in mind the sense the ancient readers had about those aspects of poetic manipulation of the language which produced a sort of 'Sondersprach'. Grecism was an important element in the process.

Modern analyses fall short in their failure to draw sustained attention to the doctrine of antiquity on grecism. The doctrine is after all Roman in origin and it ought to be our first business to understand what Romans thought constituted the phenomenon. The modern philologist may well decide that the Roman approach is incomplete or even deeply flawed. We might compare the Romans' understanding of etymology. Their bogus etymologies cannot compare with the altogether more securely founded knowledge of the modern day. But, however faulty the etymologies of antiquity may prove to be, it is undeniable that many ancient poets believed them to be true, and indulged themselves in word play founded upon the erroneous doctrine. For example, the second-century BC writer of the epitaph with the famous word-play in its second line, *hic est sepulcrum hau pulcrum pulcrai feminae* (*ILS* 8403, *CIL* i².1211, vi.15346 add. p. 3517, *CE* 52), probably did not know that the 'se' of *sepulcrum* was not a prefix, nor that it could not be derived from the long vowel in *sed*, used in compounds like *segrego*, *secerno*, etc. But if we insist on the true etymology, we will never appreciate his punning *figura etymolgica*. Nor will we grasp why Cicero styled the hare, *lepus*, at *Arat.* 121 *leuipes*, unless we know the (false) etymology.[51] Appreciation of the sometimes misconceived learning of antiquity, and its application to poetic composition does not necessarily entail the overthrow or rejection of what modern research has achieved. We must face the fact that what we know (or believe) was not available to the Roman poet or to his readers. What they thought was true (however false it appears to us) has its own historical validity. We need to bifocalize our knowledge, and create within ourselves a dual sensibility in order to appreciate some aspects of ancient poetry.

---

[51] See Colson on Quint. *Inst.* 1.6.33.

APPENDIX I

In this appendix are collected together the remaining references in the scholiasts to grecism.

(i)   *A.* 1.41 *Aiacis Oilei.* Servius feels this is a grecism (<*Il.* 2.527), *Il.* 2.527), but it seems to be common: K–S i.414.

(ii)   *A.* 1.669 *nota tibi.* Servius calls it a *Graeca figura* and refers to Ter. *Eun.* 288, where Donatus, after observing *mira pro mirum*, repays the compliment by referring to Virgil. See Austin ad loc. and Löfstedt (1942: 63ff.); it is not noticed by Lohmann (1915) or Görler (1985: 270).

(iii)   *A.* 3.594 *cetera Graius.* Servius: *sane . . . Graeca locutio est*, a view approved by Wölfflin (1885: 90; he notes on 93 that this is the first time it is used with a noun). The usage is not uncommon, and appears first in Sallust, then the historians; see Williams ad loc. and Austin on *A.* 4.558.

(iv)   *A.* 4.35, 10.67 *esto.* Servius regards it as a grecism when used as an 'adverbium concedentis'.

(v)   *A.* 6.313 *primi transmittere.* Servius: *ut primi transmitterent, figura Graeca est.*

(vi)   On *iuro* Servius holds two views: the simple accusative at *A.* 6.351 *maria aspera iuro* (cf. 6.324) he regarded as a *Graeca figura* in his note on 1.67, but as an archaism in his note to *A.* 12.197. (Cf. his note on *A.* 8.127 *cui . . . precari* discussed on pp. 166–7 above.) The latter account is plausible, see K–S i.264, and ii.633.

(vii)   *A.* 8.676 *cernere erat.* Servius specifies *Graeca figura*; Görler (1985: 271) is aware of the view of Servius, but denies that the usage is primarily a grecism; Wölfflin (1885: 135–6), however, agrees with the ancient view. Cf. Lohmann (1915: 83), K–S i. 669d, Hofmann–Szantyr (1965: 349), *OLD* 9. This is another instance of a calque generating a new construction, cf. *amare* = φιλεῖν in Sallust (p. 161 above).

(viii)   *A.* 11.416 *fortunatusque laborum.* Servius: *sicut {11.73 laeta laborum} et est Graecum.* The use is picked up by St. *Th.* 1.638.

APPENDIX II

In this appendix are brought together some observations of Servius' which seem to be contradictory or mistaken or confused, but none the less illustrate a readiness to see a poetic usage as an imitation of the Greek.

(i)   Servius says on *A.* 2.247 *non umquam* that a double negative such as is found at Ter. *Hau.* 63 is employed *Graeco more*. He does not call it a *figura*. It appears, however, to be native to both tongues (K–S i.827–8, Roby §2246).

(ii)   On *A.* 3.501 Servius tries to justify the reading *Hesperia* by taking it closely with *Dardanus* as if it = Ἑσπερόθεν: *nam Graece dixit, et est de loco aduerbium.* This destroys the run of the passage entirely and is not to be countenanced. Once again, however, he does not call it a figure; when he uses the adverb *Graece,* he usually means that the poet is borrowing the word directly from the other language.

(iii)   On *A.* 12.680 *furere furorem* Servius says *figura antiqua ut 'serui-tutem seruit', 'dolet dolorem'* (that is to say, he regards it as an archaism) but on *A.* 2.53 *cauae ... cauernae* he notices the *figura etymologica* as a *Graeca figura* and compares *uitam uiuere* or *mortem mori* (the latter an unexpectedly biblical phrase, cf. *TLL* viii.1493.25–32). The etymological figure was perhaps less common in Latin than in Greek, but was hardly borrowed. Servius' note on *A.* 12.680 therefore seems to be more judicious and finds support from Quintilian, *Inst.* 7.3.26. See Lohmann (1915: 25–7), Görler (1985: 276).

(iv)   What is DServius explaining on *A.* 12.568 *ni frenum accipere et uicti parere fatentur: et quidam hunc uersum per figuram Graecam dictum tradunt* ὁμολογοῦσιν μέλλειν λαβεῖν? Is it the meaning of *fateor* 'consent' (*OLD* 3) or the tense of the infinitive (or these combined; see Fordyce on *A.* 7.433 *parere fatetur*)?

Bibliography

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Anderson, R. D., Parsons, P. J. and Nisbet, R. G. M. (1979), 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaṣr Ibrîm', *JRS* 69: 125–55.

Anderson, W. S. (1956; 1964; 1970; 1981), 'Recent Work in Roman Satire', *ClW* 50: 33–40; *ClW* 57: 293–301; 343–8; *ClW* 63: 181–94; 199; 217–22; *ClW* 75: 273–99.

―――― (1961), '*Venusina lucerna*: the Horatian model for Juvenal', *TAPA* 52: 1–12. (Reprinted in Anderson (1982) 103–14.)

―――― (1962), 'The Programs of Juvenal's Later Books', *CPh* 57: 145–60. (Reprinted in Anderson (1982), 277–92.)

―――― (1982), *Essays on Roman Satire* (Princeton).

André, J. (1949), *Étude sur les termes de couleur dans la langue latine* (Paris).

―――― (1967), *Les noms d'oiseaux en latin* (Paris).

_____ (1980), 'Deux remarques sur le volume du mot latin', *RPh* 54: 7–18.

_____ (1987), *Être médecin à Rome* (Realia) (Paris).

_____ (1991), *Le vocabulaire latin de l'anatomie* (Paris).

Arens, J. C. (1950), '-fer and -ger: their extraordinary preponderance among compounds in Roman poetry', *Mnemosyne*[4] 3: 241–62.

Argenio, I. (1963), 'I grecismi in Lucilio', *CRSt* 11: 5–17.

Artymowicz, A. (1909), 'Der Wechsel von *et* und *que* zu Beginn lateinischer daktylischer Verse von Ennius bis Corippus', *Wiener Studien* 31: 38–81.

Atherton, C. (1996), 'What every grammarian knows?', *CQ* NS 46: 239–60.

Austin, R. G. (ed.) (1964), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus* (Oxford).

_____ (ed.) (1971), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus* (Oxford).

_____ (ed.) (1977), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus* (Oxford).

Avotins, I. (1980), 'Alexander of Aphrodisias on vision in the atomists', *CQ* NS 30: 429–54.

Axelson, B. (1945), *Unpoetische Wörter. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache* (Lund).

Bader, F. (1962), *La formation des composés nominaux du latin* (Paris).

Baehrens, E. (ed.) (1885), *Catulli Veronensis liber* (Leipzig).

Baehrens, W. A. (1912), *Beiträge zur lateinischen Syntax*. Philologus, Suppl. 12 (Leipzig).

Bagnall, R. S. (1993), *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton).

Bailey, C. (ed.) (1947, corr. ed. 1949, 3 vols), *Titi Lucreti Cari de rerum natura libri sex* (Oxford).

Baratin, M. (1989), *La naissance de la syntaxe à Rome* (Paris).

Barnes, J., Mignucci, M. (edd.) (1988), *Matter and Metaphysics* (Naples).

Bartalucci, A. (1968), 'La sperimentazione enniana dell'esametro e la tecnica del saturnio', *SCO* 17: 99–122.

Bauer, C. F. (1933), *The Latin Perfect Endings '-ere' and '-erunt'* (Ling. Soc. America, Language Diss. 13) (Philadelphia).

Beck, M. (1996), *Die Epistulae Heroidum XVIII und XIX des Corpus Ovidianum. Echtheitskritische Untersuchungen* (Paderborn).

Bell, A. J. (1923). *The Latin Dual and Poetic Diction* (London and Toronto).

Benediktson, D. T. (1977), 'Vocabulary analysis and the generic classification of literature', *Phoenix* 31: 341–8.

Bennett, C. E. (1910), *Syntax of Early Latin, Vol. I—The Verb* (Boston).

Bentley, R. (ed.) (1711), *Q. Horatius Flaccus* (Cambridge).

Benz, L., Stärk, E., Vogt-Spira, G. (edd.) (1995), *Plautus und die Tradition des Stegreifspiels*. Festgabe für E. Lefèvre zum 60. Geburtstag (Tübingen).

Berkowitz, L. and Brunner, Th. F. (1968), *Index Lucilianus* (Hildesheim).

Binder, G. (ed.) (1988), *Saeculum Augustum II* (Wege der Forschung 512) (Darmstadt).

Biville, F. (1987), *Graphie et prononciation des mots grecs en latin* (Paris).

_____ (1989), (ed.) 'Grec et latin: contacts linguistiques et création lexicale. Pour une typologie des hellénismes lexicaux du latin', in Lavency and Longrée (1989), 29–40.

_____ (1990), *Les emprunts du latin au grec: approche phonétique* vol. I (Bibliothèque de l'information grammaticale, 19) (Louvain—Paris).

Blase, H. (1903), 'Tempora und Modi', in G. Landgraf (ed.), *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. 3. Band *Syntax des einfachen Satzes* (Leipzig).

Bloch, H. (1940), 'L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus in Samothrace and Herculaneum', *AJA* 44: 485–93.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bürger, R. (1911), 'Beiträge zur Elegantia Tibulls' in *XAPITEΣ. Friedrich Leo* 371–94 (Berlin).

Brunér, E. A. (1863), 'De ordine et temporibus carminum Valerii Catulli', *Acta Soc. Scient. Fennicae* 7: 599–657.

Bülow-Jacobsen, A., Cuvigny, H. and Fournet, J.-L. (1994), 'The identification of Myos Hormos. New papyrological evidence', *BIFAO* 94: 27–42.

Burnyeat, M. F. (1978), 'The upside-down back-to-front sceptic of Lucretius IV 472', *Philologus* 122: 197–206.

Cairns, F. (1972), *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh).

—— (1979), *Tibullus: a Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge).

—— (1983), 'Propertius 1.4 and 1.5 and the 'Gallus' of the Monobiblos', *PLLS* 4: 61–104.

—— (1984), 'The etymology of *militia* in Roman elegy' in *Apophoreta philologica Emmanueli Fernandez-Galiano a sodalibus oblata* 2.211–22 (Madrid).

—— (ed.) (1986), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar 5, 1985* (Liverpool).

—— (1986), 'Stile e contenuti di Tibullo e di Properzio' in *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi su Albio Tibullo* 49–50. (Rome).

Callebat, L. (1974), 'Le vocabulaire de l'hydraulique dans le livre VIII du *De architectura* de Vitruve', *RPh* 48: 313–29.

—— (1982), 'La prose du *De Architectura* de Vitruve', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* II.30.1: 696–722 (Berlin).

—— (ed.) (1995), *Latin vulgaire, latin tardif. IV.* Actes du 4e colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif. Caen, 2–5 septembre 1994 (Hildesheim, Zurich, New York).

Campanile, E. (1985), art. 'grecismi', in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* ii.805–7 (Rome).

Casali, S. (ed.) (1995), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistula IX. Deianira Herculi* (Florence).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

De Meo, C. (1983), *Lingue tecniche del latino* (Testi e manuali per l'insegnamento universitario del latino 16) (Bologna).

Denniston, J. D. (1952), *Greek Prose Style* (Oxford).

Deufert, M. (1996), *Pseudo-Lukrezisches im Lukrez. Die unechten Verse in Lukre-*

zens *'De rerum natura'*. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 48 (Berlin and New York).

Diggle, J. (1972), 'Ouidiana', *PCPS* ns 18: 31–41.

Diggle, J. and Goodyear, F. R. D. (edd.) (1972), *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman* (Cambridge).

Dingel, J. (1997), *Kommentar zum 9. Buch der Aeneis Vergils* (Heidelberg).

Dionisotti, A. C. (1995), 'Hellenismus' in O. Weijers (ed.), *Vocabulary of Teaching and Research Between Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Civicima. Études sur le vocabulaire intellectuel du Moyen Age 8) (Turnhout).

Domínguez Domínguez, J. F. and Martín Rodríguez, A. M. (1993), '*Dare* con infinitivo en latín clasico', *Cuadernos de filología clásica*, 4: 9–22.

Dover, K. J. (1963), 'The Poetry of Archilochus', in *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 10: 183–212 (Geneva).

—— (1968, corrected reprint of 1960 ed.), *Greek Word Order* (Cambridge).

Draeger, A. (1882, 3rd ed.), *Über Syntax und Stil des Tacitus* (Leipzig).

Drexler, H. (1967), *Einführung in die römische Metrik* (Darmstadt).

Dubois, J. (1966), 'Les problèmes du vocabulaire technique', *Cahiers de lexicologie* 9: 103–12.

Dumortier, J. (1935), *Le vocabulaire médical d'Eschyle et les écrits hippocratiques* (Paris).

Easterling, P. E. (ed.) (1982), *Sophocles, Trachiniae* (Cambridge).

Eich, M. (1925), *De praepositionum collocatione apud poetas Latinos inde ab Ovidio* (Diss. Bonn).

Eklund, S. (1970), *The periphrastic, completive and finite use of the present participle in Latin. With special regard to translation of Christian texts in Greek up to 600 A.D.* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Latina Upsaliensia, 5) (Uppsala).

Elder, J. P. (1962), 'Tibullus: Tersus atque Elegans' in J. P. Sullivan (ed.) *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy and Lyric*, 65–106. (London).

Eliot, T. S. (1932 [1917]), 'Tradition and the individual talent', in *Selected Essays*, 13–22 (London).

Ellis, R. (1876; 2nd ed. 1889), *A Commentary on Catullus* (Oxford).

Erbse, H. (1953), 'Homerscholien und hellenistische Glossare bei Apollonios Rhodios', *Hermes* 81: 163–96.

Ernout, A. (1946), 'Infinitif grec et gérondif latin', *Philologica* (Paris).

—— (1947), 'Le vocabulaire poétique', rev. of Axelson (1945), *RPh* 21: 55–70 (= 1957b: 66–86).

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

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

—— (1957b), *Philologica II* (Paris).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Garvie, A. F. (ed.) (1986), *Aeschylus, Choephori, with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford).

Geymonat, M. (ed.) (1973), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Turin).

Gianfrotta, P. A. (1987), art. 'Navis', in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* iii. 670–4 (Rome).

Gigante, M. (1981), *Scetticismo e epicureismo* (Naples).

Gigon, O. (1978), 'Lukrez und Ennius', in *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 24: 167–91 (Geneva).

Godwin, J. (ed.) (1986), *Lucretius: 'De Rerum Natura' IV* (Warminster).

—— (ed.) (1991), *Lucretius: 'De Rerum Natura' VI* (Warminster).

Gow, A. S. F. (1931), 'Diminutives in Augustan Poetry', *CQ* 26: 150–7.

Goodyear, F. R. D. (ed.) (1972), *The Annals of Tacitus, I: Annals 1.1–54*, (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 15) (Cambridge).

―――― (ed.) (1981), *The Annals of Tacitus, II: Annals 1.55–81 and Annals 2*, (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 23) (Cambridge).

Goold, G. P. (1974), *Interpreting Catullus* (London).

―――― (1983), *Catullus, edited with introduction, translation and notes* (London)

―――― (1990), *Propertius* (Cambridge, Mass.).

Görler, W. (1982), 'Beobachtungen zu Vergils Syntax', *Würzburger Jahrbücher* 8: 69–81.

―――― (1984), 'Zum Virtus-Fragment des Lucilius (1326–1338 Marx) und zur Geschichte der stoischen Güterlehre', *Hermes* 12: 445–68.

―――― (1985), art. 'Eneide, 6. La lingua', in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* ii. 262–78 (Rome).

Gransden, K. W. (ed.) (1991) *Virgil Aeneid Book XI* (Cambridge).

Gratwick, A. S. (1982), 'The Satires of Ennius and Lucilius', in Kenney and Clausen (1982), 156–71.

Griffin, J. (1985), *Latin Poets and Roman Life* (London) (pp. 1–31 = *JRS* 66 [1976], 87–105).

Grilli, A. (1978), 'Ennius podager', *RFIC* 106: 34–8.

Groeber, G. (1884), 'Vulgärlateinische Substrate romanischer Wörter', *ALL* 1: 204–54.

Guilbert, L. (1965), *La formation du vocabulaire de l'aviation* (Paris).

Haffter, H. (1934), *Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache* (Problemata, 10) (Berlin).

―――― (1956), 'Zum Problem der überlangen Wortformen im Lateinischen', *WSt* 69: 363–71.

Hahn, E. A. (1958), 'Vergil's linguistic treatment of divine beings, part II', *TAPA* 89: 237–53.

Hakamies, R. (1951), *Étude sur l'origine et l'évolution du diminutive latin et sa survie dans les langues romanes* (Helsinki).

Halm, C. (ed.) (1863), *Rhetores Latini Minores* (Leipzig).

Handford, S. A. (1947), *The Latin Subjunctive. Its Usage and Development from Plautus to Terence* (London).

Hanslik, R. (1969), art. 'Lucilius', in *Der kleine Pauly*, vol. III (Stuttgart).

Hanssen, J. S. T. (1951), *Latin Diminutives: a Semantic Study* (Bergen).

Hardie, P. R. (ed.) (1994), *Virgil, Aeneid, Book IX* (Cambridge).

Harrison, E. L. (1960), 'Neglected hyperbole in Juvenal', *CR* ns 10: 99–101.

Harrison, S. J. (ed.) (1990), *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford).

―――― (ed.) (1991), *Vergil, Aeneid 10*, with introduction, translation, and commentary (Oxford).

Hartung, H. J. (1970), *Ciceros Methode bei der Übersetzung griechischer philosophischer Termini* (Diss. Hamburg).

Haupt, M. (1841), *Observationes Criticae* (Leipzig) (= 1875: 73–142).

―――― (1875), *Opuscula* I (Leipzig).

Heck, B. (1950), *Die Anordnung der Gedichte des C. Valerius Catullus* (Diss. Tübingen).

Henry, A. (1971), *Métonymie et métaphore* (Paris).

Herescu, N. I. (1960), *La poésie latine. Étude des structures phoniques* (Paris).

Heraeus, W. (1937), *Kleine Schriften* (Heidelberg).

Hermann, G. (1796), *De metris poetarum Graecorum et Romanorum libri III* (Leipzig).

—— (1816), *Elementa doctrinae metricae* (Leipzig).

Hettrich, H. (1988), *Untersuchungen zur Hypotaxe im Vedischen* (Berlin – New York).

—— (1990), *Der Agens in passivischen Sätzen altindogermanischer Sprachen* (NAWG, 1. Philologisch-historische Klasse, Nr.2) (Göttingen).

Heusch, H. (1954), *Das Archaische in der Sprache Catulls* (Diss. Bonn).

Heurgon, J. (1959), *Lucilius* (Paris).

Heyne, C. G. and Wagner, G. P. E. (edd.) (1830–33, 4th edn.), *P. Virgili Maronis opera.* (Leipzig).

Highet, G. (1951), 'Juvenal's Bookcase', *AJP* 72: 369–94.

—— (1954), *Juvenal the Satirist. A Study* (Oxford).

Hillen, M. (1989), *Studien zur Dichtersprache Senecas. Abundanz. Explikativer Ablativ. Hypallage* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 32) (Berlin – New York).

Hinds, S. E. (1987), 'Language at breaking point: Lucretius 1.452', *CQ* NS 37: 450–3.

Hofmann, J. B. (1951), *Lateinische Umgangssprache.* 3. Auflage (Heidelberg).

Hofmann, J. B. and Szantyr, A. (1965), *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik.* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II 2.2) (Munich).

Holford-Strevens, L. (1988), *Aulus Gellius* (London).

Hollis, A. S. (ed.) (1977), *Ovid, Ars Amatoria Book I, edited with an introduction and commentary* (Oxford).

Horsfall, N. (1971), 'Numanus Regulus. Ethnography and propaganda in *Aen.* IX.598f.', *Latomus* 30: 1108–16 (= Harrison (1990: 127–44)).

—— (1981), 'Some problems of titulature in Roman literary history', *BICS* 28: 103–11.

Housman, A. E. (1907), 'Luciliana', *CQ* 1: 51–74, 148–59. (= Diggle and Goodyear (1972) ii.662–97.)

Hunter, R. L. (ed.) (1989), *Apollonius of Rhodes, Argonautica Book III* (Cambridge).

Hupe, C. (1871), *De genere dicendi C. Valerii Catulli Veronensis. Pars I* (Diss. Münster).

Hutchinson, G. O. (1988), *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford).

—— (1993), *Latin Literature from Seneca to Juvenal. A Critical Study* (Oxford).

Ilberg, J. (1907), 'A. Cornelius Celsus und die Medizin in Rom', *Neue Jahrbücher* 19: 377–412 (= Flashar (1971), 308–60).

Jacobson, H. (1974), *Ovid's Heroides* (Princeton, N.J.).

Jal, A. (1861), *Virgilius nauticus. Études sur la marine antique* (Paris).

Janni, P. (1967), 'Due note omeriche', *QUCC* 3: 7–30.

Janni, P. and Mazzini, I. (edd.) (1991), *La traduzione dei classici greci e latini in Italia oggi. Problemi, prospettive, iniziative editoriali* (Atti del Convegno Nazionale, Macerata, 20–22 aprile 1989) (Macerata).

Janson, T. (1979), *Mechanisms of Language Change in Latin* (Stockholm).

Janssen, H. H. (1941), *De kenmerken der romeinsche dichtertaal* (Nijmegen – Utrecht).

Jenkyns, R. (1982), *Three Classical Poets: Sappho, Catullus and Juvenal* (London).

Jocelyn, H. D. (ed.) (1969a), *The Tragedies of Ennius: the fragments edited with an introduction and commentary* (Cambridge).

—— (1969b), 'The fragments of Ennius' Scenic Scripts', *AC* 38: 181–217.

—— (1971), 'The Tragedies of Ennius', *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 17: 41–95 (Geneva).

—— (1972), 'The Poems of Quintus Ennius', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* I.2.987–1026 (Satires and minor works: 1022–6) (Berlin).

—— (1977), 'Ennius, Sat. 6–7 Vahlen', *RFIC* 105: 131–51.

—— (1979), 'Catullus 58 and Ausonius, *Ep.* 71', *LCM* 4: 87–91.

—— (1980), 'Marcello Zicàri and the poems of C. Valerius Catullus', *RPL* 3: 55–72.

—— (1986), 'The new chapters of the ninth book of Celsus' *Artes*', *PLLS* 5: 299–336 (Liverpool).

—— (1995), 'Two Features of the Style of Catullus' Phalaecian Epigrams', *Sileno* 21: 63–82.

Jouanna, J. (1970), review of Lanata (1968), *REG* 83: 254–7.

Jouanna, J. and Demont, P. (1981), 'Le sens d' ἰχώρ chez Homère (*Iliade* V, vv. 340 et 416) et Eschyle (*Agamemnon*, v. 1480) en relation avec les emplois du mot dans la *Collection hippocratique*', *REA* 83: 197–209.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Lachmann, K. (1848), 'De Ovidii epistulis', *Prooemium indicis lectionum aestivarum a. 1848 = Kleinere Schriften zur classichen Philologie*, ed. J. Vahlen, 56–61 (Berlin).

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980), *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago).

Lakoff, G. and Turner, M. (1989), *More than Cool Reason: a Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor* (Chicago).

Lanata, G. (1966), 'Sul linguaggio amoroso di Saffo', *QUCC* 2: 63–79.

—— (1968), 'Linguaggio scientifico e linguaggio poetico. Note al lessico del *De morbo sacro*', *QUCC* 5: 22–36.

Landgraf, G. (1898), 'Der Accusativ der Beziehung (determinationis)', *ALL* 10: 209–24.

—— (1914, 2nd ed.), *Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino* (Leipzig—Berlin)

Langslow, D. R. (1989), 'Latin technical language: synonyms and Greek words in Latin medical terminology', *TPhS* 87: 33–53.

—— (1991), 'The development of Latin medical terminology: some working hypotheses', *PCPS* ns 37: 106–30.

La Penna, A. (1951), 'Note sul linguaggio erotico dell'elegia latino', *Maia* 4: 187–209.

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

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

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

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

Lavency, M. and Longrée, D. (edd.) (1989), *Actes du Vᵉ Colloque de Linguistique latine* (Louvain-la-Neuve / Borzée, 31 March–4 April 1989) (*Cahiers de l'Institut de linguistique de Louvain* 15.1–4) (Louvain-la-Neuve).

Leavis, F. R. (1948, 2nd ed.), *Education and the University, a sketch for an 'English School'* (London).

Lebreton, J. (1901), *Études sur le langage et la grammaire de Cicéron* (Paris).

Lee, A.G. (1975), *Tibullus: Elegies* (Cambridge).

—— (ed.) (1990), *The Poems of Catullus, Edited with an Introduction, Translation and Brief Notes* (Oxford).

Lehmann, C. (1979), 'Der Relativsatz vom Indogermanischen bis zum Italienischen. Eine Etüde in diachroner syntaktischer Typologie', *Die Sprache* 25: 1–25.

—— (1984), *Der Relativsatz* (Tübingen).

Lehmann, Y. (1982), 'Varron et la médecine', in Sabbah (1982), 67–72.

Leishman, J. B. (1956), *Translating Horace* (Oxford).

Lelièvre, F. J. (1958), 'Parody in Juvenal and T. S. Eliot', *CPh* 53: 22–6.

Leo, F. (1896), *Analecta Plautina de figuris sermonis I* (Progr. Göttingen) = Fraenkel, E. [ed.], [1960] *Friedrich Leo. Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Erster Band: *Zur römischen Literatur des Zeitalters der Republik*: 71–122 (Rome).

—— (1906), 'review of Lucilii carminum reliquiae ed. Marx, vol. I–II, *GGA*: 837–61 (= Fraenkel, E. [ed.] [1960], *Friedrich Leo. Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Erster Band: *Zur römischen Literatur des Zeitalters der Republik*: 221–247 (Rome)).

—— (1967), *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. Erster Band: *Die archaische Literatur*. Im Anhang: 'Die römische Poesie in der Sullanischen Zeit' (Darmstadt) (= Unveränderter Nachdruck der Ausgabe Berlin 1913).

Leumann, M. (1947), 'Die lateinische Dichtersprache', *MH* 4: 116–39 = *Kleine Schriften* (Zürich-Stuttgart 1959) 131–56 = Lunelli (1980) 131–78.

—— (1950), *Homerische Wörter* (Basel).

—— (1977, 6th ed.), *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II 2.1) (Munich).

Levinson, S. C. (1983), *Pragmatics* (Cambridge).

Lévy, C. (1992), 'Cicéron créateur du vocabulaire latin de la connaissance: essai de synthèse', in *La langue latine, langue de la philosophie* (École française de Rome, 161) (Rome).

Lewis, N. (1959), *Samothrace, the Ancient Literary Sources* (London).

Leyhausen, J. (1893), *Helenae et Herus epistulae Ovidii non sunt* (Diss. Halle).

Linde, P. (1923), 'Die Stellung des Verbs in der lateinischen Prosa', *Glotta* 12: 153–78.

Lindsay, W. M. (1893), 'The Saturnian metre', *AJP* 14: 139–70, 305–34.

—— (1907), *Syntax of Plautus* (Oxford).

—— (ed.) (1913; repr. Hildesheim 1978), *Sexti Pompeii Festi de verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome* (Leipzig).

—— (1922), *Early Latin Verse* (Oxford).

Linse, E. (1891), *De P. Ovidio Nasone vocabulorum inventore* (Progr. Dortmund).

Löfstedt, B. (1990), 'Notizen zu Sprache und Text von Celsus, De medicina', *MH* 47: 60–2.

Löfstedt, E. (1911), *Philologischer Kommentar zur 'Peregrinatio Aetheriae'. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache* (Uppsala).

—— (1928 [vol. 1]; 1933 [vol. 2]; 1942 [2nd ed. of vol. 1]), *Syntactica. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins I & II* (Lund).

—— (1959), *Late Latin* (Oslo).

Lohmann, A. (1915), *De Graecismorum Vergiliano usu quaestiones selectae* (Diss. Münster).

Long, A. A., and Sedley, D. N. (1987, 2 vols.), *The Hellenistic Philosophers* (Cambridge).

Lot, F. (1946), 'La langue du commandement dans les armées romaines', in *Mélanges dédiés à la mémoire de F. Grat* (Paris).

Luck-Huyse, K. (1996), *Der Traum vom Fliegen in der Antike* (Palingenesia 62) (Stuttgart).

Lunelli, A. (ed.) (1980, 2nd ed.), *La lingua poetica latina* (contains Italian versions of Janssen (1941) and Leumann (1947) with updated bibliography and annotations) (Bologna).

Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1980), *The Latin Love Poets: from Catullus to Horace* (Oxford).

_____ (1989), *Words and the Poet: Characteristic Techniques of Style in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford).

McGlynn, P. (1963, 2 vols), *Lexicon Terentianum* (Glasgow).

McKeown, J. C. (ed.) (1987), *Ovid: Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary* (Liverpool).

McKie, D. (1984), 'The horrible and ultimate Britons: Catullus, 11.11', *PCPS* NS 30: 74–8.

Madvig, J. N. (ed.) (1869), *M. Tullii Ciceronis De finibus bonorum et malorum*. 2nd ed. (Copenhagen).

Maltby, R. (1991), *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (Leeds).

_____ (1993), 'The Limits of Etymologising', *Aevum Antiquum* 6: 257–75.

Marache, R. (1964), 'Rhétorique et humour chez Juvénal', in Renard and Schilling (1964), 474–8.

Marganne, M.-H. (1993), *L'ophtalmologie dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine d'après les papyrus littéraires grecs* (Studies in Ancient Medicine, 8) (Leiden).

Marichal, R. (1992), *Les ostraca de Bu Njem* (Suppléments de 'Libya Antiqua' 7) (Tripoli).

Mariner, S. (1963), '*Traiectus lora* (Virg. *En.* II 273)', *Estudios Clasicos* 7: 107–19.

Mariotti, I. (1954), 'I grecismi di Lucilio', *Stud. Urb.* 28: 357–86.

_____ (1960), *Studi Luciliani* (Florence).

Mariotti, S. (1991, 2nd ed.), *Lezioni su Ennio* (Urbino).

Marouzeau, J. (1907), *Place du pronom personnel sujet en latin* (Paris).

_____ (1922), *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine, I: Les groupes nominaux* (Paris).

_____ (1949*a*), *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine, III: Les articulations de l'énoncé* (Paris).

_____ (1949*b*), *Quelques aspects de la formation du latin littéraire* (Collection linguistique 53) (Paris).

_____ (1962; 4th ed.), *Traité de stylistique latine* (Paris).

Marshall, P. K. (ed.) (1968, 2 vols), *A. Gellii Noctes Atticae* (Oxford).

Martyn, J. R. C. (1979), 'Juvenal's Wit', *Grazer Beiträge* 8: 219–38.

Marx, F. (1882), *Studia Luciliana*. Diss. Bonn.

_____ (ed.) (1904, 1905), *C. Lucilii carminum reliquiae*. Vol. prius: Prolegomena, testimonia, Fasti Luciliani, carminum reliquiae, indices, Vol. posterius: Commentarius (Leipzig).

_____ (1909), 'Die Beziehungen des Altlateins zum Spätlatein', *NJb. f. d. class. Altertum*: 434–48.

_____ (ed.) (1915), *A. Cornelii Celsi quae supersunt* (*CML*, i; Leipzig–Berlin).

Mason, H. A. (1963), 'Is Juvenal a Classic?', in Sullivan (1963), 93–176.

Maurach, G. (1975), 'Ovid, Met. I, 48 und die Figur der "Umkehrung" ', *Hermes* 103: 479–86.

Mayer, R. G. (1983), 'Catullus' divorce', *CQ* 33: 297–8.

_____ (ed.) (1994), *Horace, Epistles, Book I* (Cambridge).

Mazzini, I. (1988), 'La medicina nella letteratura latina. I. Osservazioni e proposte interpretative su passi di Lucilio, Lucrezio, Catullo e Orazio', *Aufidus* 4: 45–73.

_____ (1990), 'Il folle da amore', in Alfonso *et al.* (1990), 39–83.

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

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

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

_____ (ed.) (1992*b*), *Civiltà materiale e letteratura nel mondo antico* (Atti del Seminario di Studio, Macerata, 28–29 giugno 1991) (Macerata).

Meillet, A. (1965; 7th ed.), *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque* (Paris).

Menière, P. (1858), *Études médicales sur les poètes latins* (Paris).

Mette, H. J. (1956), rev. of E. V. Marmorale, *L'ultimo Catullo*, *Gnomon* 28: 34–8 (part repr. in R. Heine (ed.) [1975] *Catull* [Wege der Forschung 308, Darmstadt]: 19–23).

Meyer, W. (1889), 'Caesur im Hendekasyllabus', *SB Bayr. Ak., philosoph.-philol. und hist. Cl.* 2: 208–27.

Migliorini, P. (1990), *La terminologia medica come strumento espressivo della satira di Persio* (Quaderni di Anazetesis 2) (Pistoia).

Mignot, X. (1969), *Les verbes dénominatifs latins* (Paris).

Miller, H.W. (1944), 'Medical terminology in tragedy', *TAPA* 75: 156–67.

_____ (1945), 'Aristophanes and medical language', *TAPA* 76: 74–84.

Mohler, S. L. (1948), 'Sails and Oars in the Aeneid', *TAPA* 79: 46–62.

Momigliano, A. (1957), 'Perizonius, Niebuhr and the character of the early Roman tradition', *JRS* 47: 104–14.

Morford, M. P. O. (1972), 'A Note on Juvenal 6.627–61', *CPh* 67: 198.

Mras, K. (1927/28), 'Randbemerkungen zu Lucilius' Satiren', *WS* 46: 78–84.

Mudry, Ph. (1982), *La préface du* De medicina *de Celse: Texte, traduction et commentaire* (Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana 19) (Rome).

Mühmelt, M. (1965), *Griechische Grammatik in der Vergilerklärung*, (Zetemata 37) (Munich).

Müller, C. F. W. (1869), *Plautinische Prosodie* (Berlin).

_____ (1908), *Syntax des Nominativs und Akkusativs im Lateinischen* (Leipzig and Berlin).

Müller, C.W., Sier, K. and Werner, J. (edd.) (1992), *Zum Umgang mit fremden Sprachen in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Palingenesia 36: Kolloquium der Fachrichtungen Klassische Philologie der Universitäten Leipzig und Saarbrücken am 21. und 22. November 1989 in Saarbrücken) (Stuttgart).

Müller, H. M. (1980), *Erotische Motive in der griechischen Dichtung bis auf Euripides* (Hamburg).

Müller, K. (ed.) (1975), *T. Lucreti Cari: De rerum natura libri sex* (Zurich).

Münscher, K. (1921), 'Metrische Beiträge II. Erstarrte Formen im Versbau der Aiolier', *Hermes* 56: 66–103.

Munari, F. (1971), 'Textkritisches zu mittellateinischen Dichtern' in Coseriu, E. and Stempel, W.-D. (edd.) *Festschrift für Harri Meier zum 65. Geburtstag* (Munich).

Murgatroyd, P. (1980), *Tibullus I: A Commentary* (Pietermaritzburg).

———— (1994), *Tibullus: Elegies II* (Oxford).

Myers, R. and Ormsby, R. J. (1970), *Catullus. The Complete Poems for Modern Readers* (New York).

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993), *Duelling Languages. Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching* (Oxford).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Nowottny, W. (1962), *The Language Poets Use* (London).

Nutton, V. (1993), 'Roman medicine: tradition, confrontation, assimilation', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW*, II.37: 1, 49–78 (Berlin).

Önnerfors, A. (1963), *In Medicinam Plinii studia philologica* (Lunds Univ. Årsskrift. N.F. Avd. 1. Bd 55, Nr 5) (Lund).

———— (1989), '*Dare* und *Auris/Auricula* im Spätlatein', *Symb. Osl.* 64: 130–57.

—— (1993), 'Das medizinische Latein von Celsus bis Cassius Felix', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* II.37: 1, 227–392 (Berlin).

Ortony, A. (1979), *Metaphor and Thought* (Cambridge).

Paganelli, D. (1961), *Properce: Élégies* (Paris).

Page, D. L. (1936), review of Dumortier (1935), *CR* 50: 17–18.

Palmer, A. (ed.), (1898) *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides with the Greek translation of Planudes* [Completed by L. C. Purser.] (Oxford).

Palmer, L. R. (1954), *The Latin Language* (London).

Paludan, E. (1941), 'The development of the Latin elegy', *ClMed* 4: 204–29.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

—— (1995*b*), 'Zur mündlichen Charakterisierung des Fremden in der Komödie des Plautus', in Benz *et al.* (1995), 123–36.

—— (forthcoming), 'Language and style as means of characterization in the comedies of Plautus', *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar.*

Phillips, J. H. (1984), 'Lucretius and the (Hippocratic) *On Breaths:* Addenda', in Sabbah (1984), 83–5.

Pigeaud, J. (1980), 'La physiologie de Lucrèce', *REL* 58: 176–200.

—— (1982), 'Virgile et la médecine. Quelques réflexions sur l'utilisation de la pensée physiologique dans les Géorgiques', *Helmantica* 33: 539–60.

—— (1988), 'Die Medizin in der Lehrdichtung des Lukrez und des Vergil', in Binder (1988), 216–39.

Pinkster, H. (1987), 'The pragmatic motivation for the use of subject pronouns in Latin: the case of Petronius', in *Études de linguistique générale et de linguistique latine offertes en hommage à Guy Serbat*, 369–79 (Paris).

Pinotti, P. (ed.) (1988), *Publio Ovidio Nasone, Remedia Amoris* (Edizioni e saggi universitari di filologia classica, 39) (Bologna).

Platnauer, M. (1951), *Latin Elegiac Verse* (Cambridge).

Ploen, H. (1882), *De copiae verborum differentiis inter varia poesis Romanae antiquioris genera intercedentibus* (Diss. Strasbourg).

Poncelet, R. (1957), *Cicéron traducteur de Platon. L'expression de la pensée complexe en latin classique* (Paris).

Powell, J. G. F. (1987), 'The *farrago* of Juvenal 1.86 reconsidered', in Whitby, Hardie and Whitby (1987).

⸺ (ed.) (1988), *Cicero: Cato Maior De Senectute* (Cambridge).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Safarewicz, J. (1965), 'Uwagi o jezyku Lucyliusza', *Eos* 55: 96–105.

Sager, J. C., Dungworth, D. and McDonald, P. F. (1980), *English Special Languages: Principles and Practice in Science and Technology* (Wiesbaden).

de Saint-Denis, E. (1935), *Le rôle de la mer dans la poésie latine* (Paris).

―――― (1965), *Essais sur le rire et le sourire des Latins* (Paris).

Schäublin, C. (1988), 'Housman and Ennius', *Housman Society Journal* 14: 42–5.

Schawaller, D. (1987), 'Semantische Wortspiele in Ovids Metamorphosen und Heroides', *Gräzer Beiträge* 14: 199–214.

Scherer, A. (1963), 'Die Sprache des Archilochos', in *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 10: 89–107 (Geneva).

Schmid, P. (1964), 'Juvénal. Essai d'une définition stylistique'. Résumé, in *REL* 42: 57–9.

Schmid, W. and Stählin, O. (1929), *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, I: i (Munich).

Schmidt, B. (ed.) (1887), *C. Valeri Catulli Veronensis carmina* (Leipzig).

―――― (1914), 'Die Lebenszeit Catulls und die Herausgabe seiner Gedichte', *RhM* 69: 267–83.

Schmidt, E.A. (1977), 'Lucilius kritisiert Ennius und andere Dichter. Zu Lucilius fr. 148 Marx', *MH* 34: 122–9.

―――― (1985), *Catull* (Heidelberg).

Schmitt, R. (1967), *Dichtung und Dichtersprache im indogermanischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden).

Scholte, A. (ed.) (1933), *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Ex Ponto Liber Primus commentario exegetico instructus* (Amersfoort).

Scholz, U.W. (1986*a*), 'Der frühe Lucilius und Horaz', *Hermes* 114: 335–65.

―――― (1986*b*), 'Die *satura* des Q. Ennius', in Adamietz (1986), 25–53.

Schreiber, G. (1917), *De Lucili syntaxi* (Diss. Greifswald).

Schünke, E. (1906), *De traiectione coniunctionum et pronominis relativi apud poetas Latinos* (Diss. Kiel).

Schuller, W., Hoepfner, W. and Schwandner, E. L. (edd.) (1989), *Demokratie und Architektur: Der hippodamische Städtebau und die Entstehung der Demokratie* (Konstanzer Symposion vom 17. bis 19. Juli 1987) (Munich).

Schulze, K. P. (1920), 'Bericht über die Literatur zu Catullus für die Jahre 1905–1920', *Bursians Jahresb.* 183: 1–72.

Schuster, M. (1948), art. '(123) C. Valerius Catullus', *RE* II.7.2: 2353–410.

_____ (ed.) (1949), *Catulli Veronensis liber* (Leipzig).

Schweizer, H. J. (1967), *Vergil und Italien* (Aarau).

Sconocchia, S. (ed.) (1983), *Scribonii Largi Compositiones* (Leipzig).

_____ (1993), 'L'opera di Scribonio Largo e la letteratura medica latina del 1. sec. d. C.', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* II.37: 1, 843–922. (Berlin).

Scott (Ryberg), I. G. (1927), *The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal* (Smith College Classical Studies 8) (Northampton, Mass.).

Sebeok, T. A. (ed.) (1960), *Style in Language* (Cambridge, Mass.).

Sedley, D. N. (1988), 'Epicurean anti-reductionism', in Barnes and Mignucci (1988), 295–327.

_____ (1989), 'The proems of Empedocles and Lucretius', *GRBS* 30: 269–96.

_____ (1992) 'Sextus Empiricus and the atomist criteria of truth', *Elenchos* 13: 21–56.

Segal, C. (1990), *Lucretius on Death and Anxiety* (Princeton).

Segebade, J. (1895), *Vergil als Seemann. Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung und Würdigung des Dichters.* Progr.d.Gymn. (Oldenburg).

Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (ed.) (1965), *Cicero's Letters to Atticus.* II *58–54 B.C. 46–93 (Books III and IV)* (Cambridge).

_____ (ed.) (1977), *Cicero: Epistulae ad Familiares.* I *62–47 B.C.* (Cambridge).

_____ (1992), 'Homoeoteleuton in non-dactylic Latin verse', *RFIC* 120: 67–71.

_____ (1994), *Homoeoteleuton in Latin Dactylic Verse* (Stuttgart—Leipzig).

Sharrock, A. R. (1994), *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's Ars Amatoria 2* (Oxford).

Shipley, F. W. (1911), 'The heroic clausula in Cicero and Quintilian', *CPh* 6: 410–18.

Silk, M. S. (1974), *Interaction in Poetic Imagery with Special Reference to Early Greek Poetry* (Cambridge).

Simpson, F. P. (1879), *Select Poems of Catullus* (London).

Skutsch, F. (1892), *Plautinisches und Romanisches. Studien zur plautinischen Prosodie* (Leipzig).

Skutsch, O. (1934), *Prosodische und metrische Gesetze der Iambenkürzung* (Forschungen z. griech. u. latein. Grammatik 10) (Göttingen).

_____ (1964), 'Rhyme in Horace', *BICS* 11: 73–8.

_____ (1969), 'Metrical variations and some textual problems in Catullus, *BICS* 16: 38–43.

_____ (1976), 'Notes on Catullus', *BICS* 23: 18–22.

_____ (1980), 'Catullus 58.4–5', *LCM* 5: 21.

_____ (1985), *The 'Annals' of Quintus Ennius edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford).

Smith, K. F. (1913), *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus* (New York).

Smith, W. S. (ed.) (1989), 'Heroic models for the sordid present: Juvenal's view of tragedy', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* II.33.1: 811–23 (Berlin).

Soubiran, J. (1966), *L'élision dans la poésie latine* (Paris).

Spies, A. (1930), *Militat omnis amans* (Diss. Tübingen).

von Staden, H. (1989), *Herophilus: the Art of Medicine in Early Alexandria* (Cambridge).

Stevens, E. B. (1953), 'Uses of hyperbaton in Latin poetry', *ClW* 46: 200–5.

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

Summers, W. C. (1910), *Select Letters of Seneca edited with introductions and explanatory notes* (London).

Svennung, J. (1935), *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache* (Uppsala).

—— (1945), *Catulls Bildersprache. Vergleichende Stilstudien* I (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 3) (Uppsala—Leipzig).

Swanson, D. C. (1962), *A Formal Analysis of Lucretius' Vocabulary* (Minneapolis).

Syndikus, H. P. (1984), *Catull. Eine Interpretation. Erster Teil. Die kleinen Gedichte (1-60)* (Darmstadt).

Terzaghi, N. (ed.) (1934, 2nd ed.), *Lucilio*, (Turin) (Repr. Hildesheim, New York 1979).

—— (ed.) (1966), *Saturarum Reliquiae* (Florence).

Thierfelder, A. (1955), 'De morbo hepatiario', *RhM* 98: 190–2.

Thill, A. (1979), *Alter ab illo. Recherches sur l'imitation dans la poésie personnelle à l'époque Augustéenne* (Paris).

Thomas, R. F. (ed.) (1988, 2 vols), *Virgil, Georgics* (Cambridge).

Thomson, D. F. S. (ed.) (1978), *Catullus. A Critical Edition. Edited and Introduced* (Chapel Hill).

Tovar, A. (1969), 'Lucilio y el latín de España', in *Studi linguistici in onore de V. Pisani*, ii.1019–32 (Brescia).

Townend, G. B. (1973), 'The literary substrata to Juvenal's satires', *JRS* 63: 148–60.

Tracy, V. A. (1971), 'The authenticity of *Heroides* 16–21', *CJ* 66: 328–30.

Tränkle, H. (1960), *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache* (Hermes Einzelschriften 15) (Wiesbaden).

—— (1967*a*), 'Ausdrucksfülle bei Catull', *Philologus* 111: 198–211.

—— (1967*b*), '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 millenia*, 104–20 (Ann Arbor).

_____ (1989), 'New parameters in historical linguistics, philology and cultural history', *Language* 65: 783–99.

_____ (1995), *How to Kill a Dragon. Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (New York – Oxford).

Watson, P. (1983), '*Puella* and *Virago*', *Glotta* 61: 119–43.

_____ (1985), 'Axelson revisited: the selection of vocabulary in Latin poetry', *CQ* NS 35: 430–48.

Weinreich, O. (1959), 'Catull c. 60', *Hermes* 87: 75–90.

_____ (1960), *Catull. Liebesgedichte und sonstige Dichtungen* (Hamburg).

_____ (1962; 2nd ed.), *Römische Satiren* (Zürich und Stuttgart).

Weis, R. (1992), 'Zur Kenntnis des Griechischen im Rom der republikanischen Zeit', in Müller, C. W. *et al.* (1992), 137–42.

Weise, F. O. (1882), *Die griechishen Wörter in Latein* (repr. 1964 Leipzig).

Wellmann, M. (1931), *Hippokratesglossare* (Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Medizin, 2) (Berlin).

West, D. A. (1969), *Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius* (Edinburgh).

West, M. L. (1982), *Greek Metre* (Oxford).

Westphal, R. (1867), *Catulls Gedichte in ihrem geschichtlichen Zusammenhange* (Breslau).

Whitby, M., Hardie, P., and Whitby, M. (edd.) (1987), *Homo Viator. Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol).

Wiesen, D. S. (1989), 'The verbal basis for Juvenal's satiric vision', in H. Temporini (ed.), *ANRW* II.33.1: 708–33 (Berlin).

Wifstrand, A. (1933), *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos* (Lund).

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1898), 'De uersu Phalaeceo' in *Mélanges Henri Weil* (Paris), 449–61 (revised in 1921: 137–53).

_____ (1921), *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin).

Wilhelm, F. (1925), 'Zu Ovid Ex Ponto I,3', *Philologus* 81: 155–67.

Wilkinson, L. P. (1959), 'The language of Virgil and Homer', *CQ* NS 9: 181–92.

_____ (1963), *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge).

Williams, G. W. (1968), *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford).

Williams, R. D. (ed.) (1960), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quintus* (Oxford).

Wills, J. (1996), *Repetition in Latin Poetry. Figures of Allusion* (Oxford).

Winterbottom, M. (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 adverbielle *cetera, alia, omnia*', *ALL* 2: 90–9.

_____ (1886), 'Der substantivierte Infinitiv', *ALL* 3: 70–91.

Wyke, M. (1989), 'Mistress and metaphor in Augustan elegy', *Helios* 16: 25–47.

Zanker, G. (1987), *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry: a Literature and its Audience* (London–Sydney–Wolfeboro, NH).

Zicàri, M. (1964), 'Some metrical and prosodical features of Catullus' poetry', *Phoenix* 18: 193–205 (= 1978: 203–19).

_____ (1978), *Scritti catulliani* (Urbino).

Zwierlein, O. (1986), *Kritischer Kommentar zu den Tragödien Senecas* (Akad. d. Wiss. u. d. Literatur Mainz, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Einzelveröffentlichung 6) (Wiesbaden).