From the holdings of the Department of Special Collections , Princeton University Library, Princeton, NJ

These documents are either in the public domain, or can only be used for educational and research purposes (Fair use) as per U.S. Copyright law (text below). By accessing this file, all users agree that their use falls in the public domain or within fair use as defined by the copyrightlaw. We do not charge any permission or usage fees for the publication of images of material inour collections, including those provided by Princeton University Library, via our website, catalog, or directly from staff.For more information regarding copyright, credit, and citation please review the information onthe Copyright, Credit and Citation Guidelines page of our website.
https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/policies/copyright-credit-and-citation-guidelines. If you have any questions, including how to order higher-quality images from the collection, contact Special Collections Public Services via our Ask Us! Form. https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/ask-us

---

Doctoral Dissertations, 2011-2026 Classics

2012

Horace and the Greek Language: Aspects of Literary Bilingualism

Gitner, Adam

Princeton, NJ : Princeton University

---

http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/dsp01v118rd57m

U.S. Copyright law: The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, §108, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of fair use that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve a violation of copyright law. https://www.copyright.gov/title17/title17.pdf

HORACE AND THE GREEK LANGUAGE:

ASPECTS OF LITERARY BILINGUALISM

Adam Gitner

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY

OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

RECOMMENDED FOR ACCEPTANCE

BY THE DEPARTMENT OF

CLASSICS

[Adviser: Joshua Katz]

June 2012

© Copyright by Adam Gitner, 2012. All rights reserved.

ABSTRACT

While classicists are better informed than ever about the significance of bilingualism in the ancient world, its contribution to Latin literature has not fully benefited from these new linguistic and historical perspectives. Making use of a multidisciplinary body of research on multilingualism, this dissertation investigates Horace's many-sided relationship with Greek and the Greeks. By placing him more fully in the context of the cultural and linguistic diversity of the Late Republic, it reassesses the range of bilingual interaction in Horace's poetry and its contribution to his style and achievement.

Each chapter addresses a distinct form of bilingual interaction that has left its mark on Horace's poetry. Chapter 1 ("*Splendida Verba*: Elevated Borrowings") examines high-style borrowings, including loanwords, calques, and loanshifts. These foreign elements not only extend Horace's semantic range but create oppositions that are central to Latin lyric, such as between proximity and distance, native and foreign, Roman and Greek. Chapter 2 ("*Sordida Verba*: Ordinary and Colloquial Borrowings") studies borrowings at the lower end of the stylistic spectrum that are valuable for creating sudden shifts in register (*tapinosis*), describing everyday life, and personifying low-class speakers. Chapter 3 ("*Verbis Felicissime Audax:* Syntactic Grecisms") studies Greek syntax ("Grecisms") as a form of interference, showing how Horace puts it to use to allude to a foreign presence, elevate his register of speech, and create densely patterned word-images. Finally, Chapter 4 ("*Puris Verbis:* Purism and the Absence of Greek") studies the suppression of Greek in Horace's poetry, especially his avoidance of code-switching, as a manifestation of linguistic purism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract iii

Table of Contents iv

Acknowledgements vi

Abbreviations viii

Introduction: Bilingualism in Latin Poetry 1

Chapter 1 *Splendida Verba*: Elevated Borrowings 16
1. Introduction: Roman Critics on Greek Poeticisms 16
2. Poetic Borrowings: Typology and Definitions 22
3. Lexical Distance 35
    3.1 Poetic Distance 35
    3.2 Cultural Distance 40
    3.3 Sacred Distance 46
    3.4 Temporal Distance 50
4. Intensification 60

Chapter 2 *Sordida Verba*: Ordinary and Colloquial Borrowings 69
1. Introduction 69
    1.1 Tillius's *sordes Graecae* 69
    1.2 Chapter Overview 75
2. Preliminary Definitions 78
    2.1 Non-literary Language 78
    2.2 *Sordida verba* 82
    2.3 Axelson's *unpoetische Wörter* 83
    2.4 Non-literary Language in the *Odes* 87
3. Lexical Contrast: Low Words in High Places 89
    3.1 *Tapinosis*: Achilles's Fierce *stomachus* 89
    3.2 Illusion versus Reality: Love, polyps, and a derrière 95
    3.3 Past versus present: Ulysses's wine-cellar 99
4. Denotative Specificity 102
    4.1 Technical Language and Specificity 102
    4.2 Realism: The Trip to Brindisi 104
    4.3 Autobiographical Detail 106
    4.4 Technical Loanwords in the *Odes* and *Epodes* 108
5. Loanwords and Identity 115

Chapter 3 ***Verbis Felicissime Audax*: Syntactic Grecisms** **123**
1. Overview 123
2. Varieties of Grecism 129
2.1 Literary Interference: Problems and Principles 129
2.2 Varieties of Grecism: Direct, Parallel, Apparent 135
3. Grecisms in Horace 142
3.1 Survey of Horace's Grecisms 142
3.2 Grecisms at Work 147
3.3 Foreignizing Grecisms 150
3.4 Grecisms as Elevation and Innovation 159
3.5 Grecisms as Syntactic Expressionism 169

Chapter 4 ***Puris Verbis*: Purism and the Absence of Greek** **177**
1. Linguistic Purism 177
1.1 Chapter Overview 177
1.2 Introduction to Linguistic Purism 179
1.3 Purism and Code-Switching 186
2. Horace's Purism 195
2.1 Horace's Concept of Purity 195
2.2 Technique 1: Translation of Greek Tags 204
2.3 Technique 2: Calques 212
2.4 Technique 3: Periphrasis 222
2.5 Technique 4: Lexical Assimilation 225
3. The Pathology of Bilingualism: *Satires* 1.10 227
3.1 The Argument 228
3.2 Bilingualism and Class: The Trouble with Late-Learners 231
3.3 Bilingualism and Identity: *Canusini more bilinguis* 236

Appendix **Syntactic Grecisms: An Annotated Survey** **243**

Bibliography 267

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank the many people whose support has made this dissertation possible. Foremost thanks go to my adviser, Joshua Katz, whose seminar on Greco-Latin bilingualism in 2008 set the dissertation on its way. An incomparable committee, Denis Feeney, Kenneth Haynes, and Robert Kaster, has guided and improved this work at every step, and I am deeply grateful for their encouragement, deep learning, and patience.

It takes a department to write a dissertation, and this has been no exception. I am grateful to all the faculty and graduate students from whom I have learned and whose company has been an encouragement over the years. I would especially like to thank Andrew Feldherr as Director of Graduate Studies for his Horatian good humor; Yelena Baraz, who has always been ready to offer advice; and Andrew Ford, a model teacher and rhetorician. Working for Heinrich von Staden has opened new perspectives on antiquity and provided practical and intellectual support. Special thanks are also owed to all the members of my cohort: especially, Brigitte Libby, friend and most forbearing of roommates; Andrew Siebengartner, the partner in teaching I could not do without; and Anna Uhlig, motivator and gardener extraordinaire. Stephanie Lewandowski, Jill Arbeiter, and Nancy Barthelemy have made everything inside and outside the office run more smoothly. I also want to thank the Trustees of Princeton University for their generous support over the years and for standing by the values that have made the University an ideal place for classical scholarship.

Among the many friends and colleagues have left their mark on this work, I am especially grateful to several readers who have improved particular drafts and whose advice has been crucial: Hans Aarsleff, Jeffrey Edelstein, David Kaufman, John Logan,

Hester Schadee, Petra Schierl, Andrew Siebengartner, and Anna Uhlig. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Ted Mason and the entire Classics Department at Saint Ann's School, who have made a difficult year joyful and rewarding. To my parents, David and Debbie, *sine quibus non*, I owe more than I can say.

ABBREVIATIONS

Citations of Latin authors and works follows the *OLD*, where available, and the *TLL* otherwise; Greek authors and works are generally cited according to the conventions of the *LSJ*. Journals have been abbreviated to the short forms of *L'Année Philologique*.

Brink	C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry*: Vol. 1 *Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles* (Oxford, 1963); Vol. 2 *The 'Ars Poetica'* (Oxford, 1971); Vol. 3 *Epistles Book II: The Letters to Augustus and Florus* (Oxford, 1982)
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (Berlin, 1863–)
DK	H. Diels and W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (Berlin, 1951–1952)
Enc. oraz.	*Enciclopedia oraziana* (Rome, 1996–1998)
Enc. virg.	*Enciclopedia virgiliana* (Rome, 1984–1991)
FRP	A. S. Hollis, *Fragments of Roman Poetry c.60 bc–ad 20* (Oxford, 2007)
G–L	B. Gildersleeve and G. Lodge, *Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar* (Wauconda, IL, 1997)
K–G	R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* (Hanover, 1890–1904)
K–H	A. Kießling and R. Heinze, *Q. Horatius Flaccus:* Vol. 1 *Oden und Epoden* (repr. 1964); Vol. 2 *Satiren* (Berlin, 1968); Vol. 3 *Briefe* (Berlin, 1970)

H–Sz	J. B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich, 1965)
K–St	R. Kühner and C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, 4th edn (rev. A. Thierfelder), 2 vols. (Darmstadt, 1962)
LSJ	H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (rev. and augmented by H. S. Jones, with a revised supplement) (Oxford, 1996)
N–H	R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book I* (Oxford, 1970); eid., *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book II* (Oxford,1978)
N–R	R. G. M. Nisbet and N. Rudd, *Odes III* (Oxford, 2004)
Neue–Wagener	F. Neue and C. Wagener, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* (Berlin, 1892–1905)
OLD	*Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1982)
RE	*Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Stuttgart, 1893–1980)
TLL	*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (Leipzig, 1900–)
SB	D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Opera*, 4th edn (Munich, 2001)
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (Amsterdam, 1923–)

SH	H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, (Berlin, 1983)
SVF	J. von Arnim, *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta* (Stuttgart, 1978–1979)
Walde–Hofmann	A. Walde and J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3rd edn (Heidelberg, 1954)

Introduction

Bilingualism in Latin Poetry

This study assesses the significance of Greek to Horace's style—understood not only in the narrow sense of style, according to which it is merely the clothing that content puts on, but also in the deeper sense, according to which, as Bernard Williams puts it, "to discover the right style is to discover what you are really trying to do."[1] Accordingly, it attempts to bring language choice and bilingualism to the center of discussions about Latin literary meaning from the peripheral position they sometimes occupy, for instance, in commentaries whose bilingual interest may be confined to Greek puns and poeticisms. Bilingual phenomena were an integral presence not only in the Latin high style, but in ordinary and technical registers of speech that matter to literary expression; moreover, the absence of Greek might itself be a significant communicative choice to which readers should respond. While linguists and historians, especially in response to the pioneering work of J. N. Adams, have grown more sensitive to the importance of multilingualism in the ancient Mediterranean, literary scholars have yet to incorporate these insights fully into their research. Nevertheless, as Adams shows, language choice powerfully relates to the expression of identity, the maintenance of power, and the creation of social solidarity or exclusion, all matters of interest to readers of ancient literature. Integrating these matters with the essential concerns of literary criticism, such as tone, genre, and allusion, can shed new light on Horace's poetry and on Augustan literature in general.

Although Horace wrote his poetry in Latin, Greek was a universal presence in the society of the late Republic in a way that may recall the cultural dominance of French,

[1] Williams (1993: xviii).

say, throughout much of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Europe.[2] Unlike the case of French, however, which was mostly spoken by the middle and upper classes, in the late Republic Greek was simultaneously the language of the cultured Roman elite and the lowest members of the social hierarchy—slaves, freedmen, and professionals, all of whom brought their native language to Rome from one place or another throughout the Mediterranean. Both push and pull factors encouraged the spread of Greek: on the one hand, the allure of an advanced civilization and the economic opportunities available throughout the Greek world encouraged Romans to adopt Greek as a second language; on the other, Rome's political position as well as her economic and demographic needs necessarily impelled numerous Greek speakers to the banks of the Tiber.

One consequence was widespread Greco-Latin bilingualism, which is well attested in Rome's literary and archaeological record. "Bilingualism" in this sense covers a wide range of dual language competencies, equally appropriate for describing the speaker of one language who can effectively deploy a few words of a second language and the "ideal" bilingual with equal fluency in both languages.[3] The earliest record of Greco-Latin contact, as Calvert Watkins has discussed, may well be an archaic inscription from Lavinium (*CIL* I^2 2833), dated to approximately 500 BC, which contains

[2] Some of the most useful introductions to Greco-Latin bilingualism are: Kaimio (1979), Adams, Janse, and Swain (2002), Adams (2003), Rochette (2010), and Mullen (2011). Fögen (2003) contains a lengthy bibliography on ancient bilingualism. Some of the most important studies of Roman bilingualism from the point of view of the present work include: Farrington (1927), Horsfall (1979), Dubuisson (1981), Baldwin (1989), Biville (1990, 1995), Holford-Strevens (1993), Leiwo (1995), Rochette (1997), Wenskus (1998), Jocelyn (1999), and Dunkel (2000). On the cultural dominance of French in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Europe, see, for instance, Fumaroli's (2011) dossier of French texts written by non-native speakers.

[3] This flexible notion of bilingualism corresponds to Adams's (2003) notion. For a wider orientation to the study of bilingualism, see Weinreich (1974), Romaine (1995), Thomason (2001), Winford (2003), and Myers-Scotton (2008).

the Greek loanword *qurois* (*Castorei Podlouqueique qurois*).[4] The discovery on Italian soil of the oldest examples of Greek alphabetic writing suggests that contact between Greek and Italic languages considerably antedates the sixth century: estimates go as far back as the late ninth century.[5] The linguistic evidence amply supports Denis Feeney's insistence that there was never a period of Roman culture that antedated Greek contact.[6] While communication between the western and eastern Mediterranean intensified over the course of the Republic and Empire, the conditions that made Greek ubiquitous in Rome during the late Republic did not outlast the High Empire. As the supply of Greek-speaking slaves diminished and the children of former slaves exclusively adopted Latin, Greek ceased to be spoken on the streets of Rome and increasingly became confined to the most educated circles. By the third century, there is evidence that Roman emperors had difficulty finding bilingual administrators.[7]

The socially ambivalent position of Greek in the late Republic—its association with both high and low status—was amplified by a second, related ambivalence that characterized the Roman response to Greek culture in general.[8] Genuine admiration for the Greek cultural achievement—especially in the arts and sciences but also in more

[4] Watkins (1995).

[5] The Osteria dell' Osa object (*SEG* 42.899), the oldest Greek alphabetic inscription, belongs to a late Latial IIB burial. Although early Latian chronology remains hotly contested, Jean Turfan's (2006) review of recent work suggests that, "even if we select the lowest date, we must admit that Latial period III began *before* the end of the 9th century BC." The Nestor's Cup inscription (*SEG* 14.604) from Ischia furnishes strong reason to suppose that contact between Greek colonists and Italic natives was taking place in the eighth century. For a discussion of the prehistory of Roman historiography in light of their bilingual culture, see Wiseman (2007).

[6] Feeney (1998: 25–28; 2005).

[7] Kaimio (1979: 22–24) discusses the loss of Greek among the Roman slave population; on the importance of slavery as a linguistic vector for Greek, see Adams (2003: 761–62). On the place of Latin and Greek in imperial administration, see Rochette (2011).

[8] On cultural interaction between Rome and Greece, particularly in the late Republic, see: Bowersock (1965), Petrochilos (1974), Wardman (1976), Jocelyn (1977, 1983), Crawford (1978), Ferrary (1988), Wallace-Hadrill (1988, 1998, 2008), Balsdon (1989: 31–38), Rawson (1989), MacMullen (1991), Henrichs (1995), Gruen (1990, 1992, 2006), Christes (1997), Erskine (2001), Williams (2010: 73–78), and Spawforth (2012).

mundane areas, such as sports and pastry-making—was mingled with nativist mistrust and outright hostility towards foreign influence. In particular, Greeks were associated with a variety of negative qualities: sexual indecency (*stuprum*), luxury (*luxuria, luxus*), deceit (*fallacitas*), levity (*levitas*), and folly (*ineptia*).[9] Partly this reflected a familiar cultural process by which Romans defined their own identity in opposition to characteristics that were projected on to foreign groups.[10] It also resulted from the genuine competitive threat that Greek immigration must have posed to the native Roman *plebs*. As Juvenal's fiercely anti-Hellenic sixth satires attests, many Romans would have found themselves competing for work, patronage, and urban space against Greek-speaking immigrants. Reconciling these opposed views of Greece was not always easy or possible. Cicero's views provide a representative example: by projecting his admiration backwards in time on to historical, mainland Greece (*Graecia pura*), he was able to maintain ample scorn for contemporary, Asiatic Greece.[11]

Classicists have studied the interaction between Rome and Greece from a few productive points of view. On the one hand, it is possible to consider the relationship between these languages as a form of linguistic interaction. This approach takes its cue above all from linguistics and attempts to document, for instance, the transformation of Latin syntax, morphology, and vocabulary as a response to foreign pressure. The pioneers of this approach include Jacob Wackernagel (2009; orig. publ. 1928), Dag Norberg (1944), and Einar Löfstedt (1956, 1959), and their findings are reflected in recent scholarship, such as Frédérique Biville's two-volume study of lexical borrowing (1990,

[9] Petrochilos (1974: 35–53) provides a useful resume of primary sources relating to these qualities.
[10] Burke (2009) discusses the dynamics of cultural hybridity from a sociologist's point of view.
[11] On Cicero's many-sided attitude to Greece, see Gaertner (2000), Krostenko (2001), Zetzel (2003), and Gildenhard (2007).

1995) and Clackson and Horrocks's history of Latin (2007). While much of this work has been diachronic in outlook, one of Adams's most valuable contributions has been to adapt the resources of synchronic linguistics to the description of ancient bilingualism. Drawing on recent studies of bilingualism and such concepts as code-switching, Adams recovers the meaning and significance of bilingualism for the participants in these exchanges and in the process sheds light on a vast range of ancient literary and non-literary evidence.

On the other hand, classicists have also studied the relationship between Rome and Greece in terms of the dynamics of literary interaction. The Hellenized foreigners, such as Livius Andronicus and Cn. Naevius, who helped create Latin literature in the third century BC initiated a long-standing relationship between Latin and Greek literary culture that has left its mark on all Rome's literary achievements.[12] Literary scholars and critics have concentrated on the dense and reciprocally illuminating network of allusion and imitation that resulted, especially in Augustan literature.[13] In the case of Horace's poetry, both types of interaction have received fruitful attention. For instance, linguists have documented Horace's lexical borrowings, calques, and compounds.[14] The complex relationship between Horace's poetry and Greek literature has also been well explored: especially the interaction between the *Odes* and earlier Greek lyric, between the *Epodes* and Archilochus and Callimachus, and between the *Satires* and Old Comedy.[15]

[12] On the creation of Latin literature in relation to Greek literary culture, see Fränkel (1932), Traina (1974), Mariotti (1986, 2000), and Feeney (2005).

[13] Among the many valuable studies of interaction between Latin and Greek literature, see the representative works of Williams (1968: esp. 250–357), Hinds (1998), Hunter (2006), and Morgan (2010).

[14] Important linguistic work on bilingual phenomena in Horace's poetry includes: Keirns (1930), Zacchilli (1988–1989), Muecke (1997), and Ricottilli (2003).

[15] For representative studies and guides to earlier scholarship on Horace's relationship to Greek literature, see Arnold (1891), Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1913: 305–23), Pasquali (1964), MacLeod (1979,

This dissertation instead takes a third approach, which remains highly indebted to the other two perspectives. It investigates Horace's relationship with the Greek language as a phenomenon distinct from his relationship with Greek literature and also from the purely linguistic interaction that occurs between Latin and Greek. It thus studies a class of relationships described by Kenneth Haynes (2004) in his study, *English Literature and Ancient Languages* (2004). When a borrowing, such as *aethera*, occurs in Horace's *Odes*, it is simultaneously a linguistic and a literary fact: it reflects both the dynamics of lexical borrowing and the poetic history that gives the word its meaning and significance (e.g., its relation to Homer and Ennius). The dissertation aims to do justice to both these dimensions of Greek as it appears in Horace's poetry. By surveying a representative range of bilingual phenomena, it aspires to produce a general account of the significance of Greek for Horace.

The interaction between Latin literature and the Greek language was not an inevitable result of linguistic contact or literary imitation. In many cases of widespread contact, bilingualism leaves little trace on literature. For instance, though Spanish is an important language in many areas of the United States, its presence in popular American literature remains peripheral. Similarly, in the case of Greek literature from the Second Sophistic, despite the great influence of Latin on spoken forms of Greek, writers and grammarians fiercely resisted its presence in formal writing.[16] Viewed from this perspective, the example of Latin literature appears all the more remarkable. Unlike many ancient and modern examples of bilingual contact, Rome provides an instance of a

1982), Jocelyn (1993, 1995), Lowrie (1995), Barchiesi (2000, 2001b), Paschalis and Putnam (2002), Hutchinson (2007), Katz (2007), Thomas (2007), Feeney (2009), and Race (2010).

[16] Kim (2010).

literary tradition that remained largely open and welcoming to a foreign language and its expressive potential.

BILINGUAL PHENOMENA IN LITERATURE

A source language may be present within a target literature in several ways. Since these forms of interaction are relevant to Horace's poetry, it will be helpful to introduce them briefly at the outset. The first kind of presence occurs when one language is actively incorporated, or borrowed, into the speech of another language.[17] A wide range of linguistic elements can be borrowed into another language: whole words (lexical borrowing), parts of words (morphological borrowing), and the meanings of words (semantic borrowing). Because language works as a system, borrowings are not inert additions to the Latin word-stock but have the power to reconfigure the relationships among existing vocabulary and morphemes. Four kinds of Greek borrowings will figure prominently in the discussion of Horace: loanwords, such as *amphora* (< ἀμφορεύς; e.g., *C.* 1.36.11 *modus amphorae*); morphological borrowings, such as the accusative singular *-a* in *aethera* (< -α; e.g., *C.* 2.20.2 *per liquidum aethera*); morphological calques, where the lexical items in a Latin compound reproduce the items in a Greek compound (e.g., *biformis*, *C.* 2.20.2 < δίμορφος); and loan-shifts, where a native Latin word acquires new semantic content from a Greek synonym (e.g., *iunctura*, *AP* 48 < σύνθεσις ὀνομάτων). For more on these types of borrowings, see Chapter 1.2 ("Poetic Borrowings: Typology and Definitions").

[17] On borrowing in Latin, see Adams (2003: 431–526). Biville (1990, 1995) authoritatively studies Greek loanwords in Latin, supplanting earlier studies (e.g., Weise 1882).

Distinct from borrowing, code-switching occurs when a speaker actively changes from one language into another, whether to express a proverb, find the *mot juste*, establish intimacy with an interlocutor, or for any other reason.[18] Code-switching can take place between sentences ("inter-sentential switching") or, more commonly, within the scope of a single sentence ("intra-sentential switching"). For instance, an English speaker might engage in code-switching by pretentiously describing a painting as "a compositional *tour de force*." As the example shows, code-switching does not necessarily depend on a high degree of bilingual competence: in the case of some close bilingual relationships, such as English and French or Latin and Greek, foreign tags may be familiar to many speakers who could not easily produce a full sentence in the foreign source. While code-switching between Latin and Greek is amply attested in both literary and non-literary sources, it figures prominently in Horace's poetry chiefly by its absence, as discussed in Chapter 4; further observations on the definition of code-switching are to be found in Chapter 4.1.3 ("Purism and Code-Switching").

Given the constraints of working within a corpus language such as Latin, where everything we have comes from writing and there are no native informants to interview, it may sometimes be difficult in practice to distinguish between full-blown code-switching and borrowing.[19] A switch from Latin to Greek was ordinarily indicated by a change of alphabet, especially in literary texts. However, some obvious switches were written in Latin transliteration and, conversely, sometimes Greek script was used to write

[18] For code-switching in general, see Myers-Scotton (2008) and Gardner-Chloros (2009); for code-switching in antiquity, see Adams (2003: 19–26, 297–416), who draws on important, earlier studies by Wenskus (1993, 1995, 1996, 1998), Dunkel (2000), and Swain (2002).

[19] On Latin as a corpus language, see Langslow (2002).

Latin.[20] Moreover, in certain ancient bookhands, especially in the early second century AD, the graphic difference between the two alphabets was minimal, and, in any case, later copyists were not faithful to the choice of script in their exemplar.[21] Nevertheless, as a general rule of thumb, where a trace of Greek script survives in the manuscript tradition of a Latin author, it almost always indicates a full code-switch.[22] Varro's description of the inflection of Greek proper names in Latin suggests that the Roman ear was alive to gradations of foreignness that the stark distinction between a code-switch and a borrowing may sometimes fail to capture.[23]

A third phenomenon of interest involves what linguists call "interference", which occurs when the acquisition of a second language (L^2) affects the speaker's linguistic performance in the use of the first language (L^1), or vice versa.[24] Its most obvious manifestation in Latin literature involves syntax, specifically the feature sometimes called a "syntactic Grecism" or simply a "Grecism" for short: for instance, the extension of the

[20] Adams (2003: 298–99) discusses the relationship between script and code-switching in antiquity. For instance, the greeting *chaere* often appears in Latin transliteration even where it is certainly a code-switch (e.g., Lucil. 93 M.; Pers. *pr.* 8; conversely, it appears in Greek characters at Var. *R.* 2.5.1). By contrast, Adams (2003: 90–91) cites an example where a doctor has used Greek script to write Latin as an expression of his professional identity.

[21] On the similarity and differences between Greek and Latin script, see Winsbury (2009), especially Chapter 3 ("Aesthetics"). The bilingual papyri suggest that Romans and Greeks were generally aware of each other's differing graphic traditions regarding word separation. In the second century AD under Hadrian, Latin increasingly appears in *scriptio continua* in a way that deliberately imitates the aesthetics of Greek writing.

[22] Where code-switching occurs in a literary text, such as Cicero's correspondence and Seneca's philosophical letters, some principles behind script alternation can often be deduced: see Nieschmidt (1913) and Vottero (1974). It is important to note, though, that some untrained scribes did attempt to restore Greek characters to Latin manuscripts where none originally belonged: for instance, Seneca's *architectos* (*Ep.* 90.9.2) was transliterated to ΑΡΧΙΤΕΚΤΟΣ as if the word were a second-declension Greek noun; similarly, a manuscript of Plautus presents the accusative plural loanword *moros* (*Trin.* 669) as ΜΩΡΩΣ (see Nieschmidt 1913: 19).

[23] Varro (*L.* 10.69–71) distinguishes among the use of native Latin inflection on a Greek word, the practice of archaic poetry (e.g., acc. pl. *Bacchidēs*), the use of a purely foreign inflection, which he calls *adventicium* (e.g., acc. pl. *Bacchidĕs*), and the use of a hybrid form (*nothum ex peregrino hic natum*; e.g,. acc. pl. *Bacchidăs)*. Varro recommends using the hybrid form, which was neither excessively Greek nor insufficiently Latin.

[24] On interference in Latin, see Adams (2003: 424–25, 432–41, 496–520).

Latin accusative case to perform the same function as a Greek accusative of respect (e.g., *os umerosque deo similis*, Verg. *A.* 1.590). While linguists commonly view interference as performance errors that tend to diminish as a speaker gains greater bilingual fluency, interference in literature is rarely the result of linguistic incompetence or inattention. Very occasionally, Latin writers may use such devices to imitate the speech of an imperfect language learner, such as the freedman Hermeros in the *Satyrica*.[25] Usually, however, syntactic interference is a feature of elevated, poetic language that imparts stylistic distinction. Grecisms not only expanded the stylistic range of Latin literature but also provided one means to establish or interrogate the relationship between Roman and Greek, between what is perceived as native and foreign, and other categories with which these dichotomies were at different times associated.

CHAPTER SUMMARIES

Each chapter of this study considers a different manifestation of bilingualism in Horace's poetry: while the first two chapters address borrowing at high and low registers of speech, the third considers syntactic interference, and the final chapter addresses language purism. Though the treatment is not exhaustive—for instance, morphological borrowings, calques, and puns are given short shrift, and loanwords are not systematically collected—my aim is to offer a representative survey of Horace's many-sided relationship with Greek. In doing so, I give greater prominence to broad continuities of style and function than to generic differences. Greater attention to these

[25] On Hermeros's "Greeks' Latin", see, for instance, Boyce (1991: 57–60).

differences as well as to the numerous instances of interaction in Horace's *Epodes* and *Epistles* would add greater depth to this picture.

Chapter 1 ("*Splendida Verba*: Elevated Borrowings") studies high-register borrowings in Horace's poetry, including poetic loanwords, Greek inflections, calques, and loan-shifts. While there is nothing inherently elevated about these types of borrowing, they are most familiar to readers from passages that aim for a certain stylistic grandeur, such as Horace's *sphragis* to *Odes* 2 (*C.* 2.20) and the Roman Odes. Both ancient and modern critics have tended to treat such bilingual phenomena as if they were superficial adornments, without a deeper connection to the content and argument of a poem. After an introduction that discusses the response of Roman critics to elevated Greek borrowings (especially Cicero and Quintilian), I argue that such borrowings serve two related functions. First, lexical distance can help to establish or reinforce a range of contrasts of central importance to Horace's poetry: for instance, the contrast between literature and life, between Greece and Rome, between religious and secular experience, and between the heroic past and the mundane present. Secondly, in addition to these contrastive functions, I also argue that Horace uses elevated borrowings to heighten and transfigure ordinary experience. For instance, when Horace describes the *lymphae loquaces* tumbling from his *fons Bandusiae* (*C.* 3.13.13–16), his use of two borrowings (*lympha* < νύμφα; *loquaces* < λαλὸν ὕδωρ, *Anacreont*. 11.7 W.) invests the familiar spring with dignity and literary significance.

By contrast, Chapter 2 ("*Sordida Verba*: Ordinary and Colloquial Borrowings") investigates borrowings at the opposite end of the stylistic spectrum: in colloquial, technical, vulgar, and other non-literary registers of speech that figure in Horace's poetry.

While Greek was often associated with high culture, it was simultaneously the language of slaves, freedmen, and professionals. The sordid associations of these Greek speakers provided Latin writers with a rich stylistic resource to explore. After defining "non-literary" language and relating it to the ancient concept of *sordida verba* and Bertil Axelson's modern notion of *unpoetische Wörter* (1945), the chapter investigates three different functions of non-literary borrowings. First, Horace sometimes exploits their low register to provide an unexpected drop in tone, something ancient critics called *tapinosis*. Striking contrasts in register can emphasize important thematic concerns, such as the indecency of Achilles's anger (*Pelidae stomachum*, *C.* 1.6.6), the delusion that lovers suffer (e.g., *depugis*, *S.* 1.2.93), and the contrast between heroic and contemporary practices (e.g., Ulysses's *apotheca*, *S.* 2.5.7). Secondly, since many non-literary borrowings were technical in origin, they offer a valuable resource for describing objects in realistic detail. I argue that such denotative specificity helps Horace to convey the experience of being present at Actium (*Epodes* 9), provide a sense of autobiographical detail in *Satires* 1.6, and reinforce his lyric reminders to pay attention to the present (e.g., *C.* 1.9). Finally, Horace uses non-literary borrowings to characterize a range of low-class speakers in his poems: slaves (e.g., Davus in *S.* 2.7), doctors (e.g., the anonymous doctor in *S.* 2.3), and witches (e.g., Canidia in *Epod.* 5 and *S.* 1.8).

Chapter 3 ("*Verbis Felicissime Audax:* Syntactic Grecisms") studies Greek syntax as a form of linguistic interference. While the presence of syntactic Grecisms in Latin poetry has been recognized since antiquity, such constructions have proven a challenge for linguists to classify and critics to describe. For instance, Greek syntax often resembles native but non-standard (i.e. archaic, colloquial) constructions, with the result that

without close attention to the context it is difficult to determine the tone or register of a Grecism. Responding to these difficulties, I provide a novel, three-way classification of such constructions, distinguishing among direct (unambiguous instances of syntactic interference), parallel (constructions that may be either Greek or native), and apparent Grecisms (constructions that are not Greek in origin but may appear so in a given context). By surveying the variety of Grecisms in his poetry (see Appendix 1), I show that Horace was no more syntactically innovative than Virgil, his contemporary. The chapter then examines three ways Horace in which put such Grecisms to expressive use: to allude to a foreign presence, particularly in his translations from Greek; to elevate the register of speech; and to create densely patterned word-images. By interacting with the Greek poetic tradition and creating an innovative lyric idiom in Latin, syntactic interference helped Horace acquire his reputation as *verbis felicissime audax*.

Chapter 4 ("*Puris Verbis:* Purism and the Absence of Greek") investigates the avoidance and elimination of Greek as, paradoxically, a response to the spread of bilingualism. One particularly striking manifestation of purism is Horace's refusal to speak or quote Greek—in other words, to engage in code-switching—in contexts where educated Romans usually alternated between the languages. Given the overwhelming absence of code-switching in Horace's work, the final chapter addresses two related questions: Which devices did Horace use to limit or replace the presence of Greek? and What significance did these purist strategies contribute to their context? By comparing Horace's text with the Greek of earlier writers, in particular Lucilius, Varro, and Cicero, it is possible to identify passages where Horace's Latin suppresses and assimilates a code-switch. For instance, Horace translates a Homeric citation (*sic me servavit Apollo*,

S. 1.9.77) that Lucilius had quoted in the original (τὸν δ’ ἐξήρπαξεν Ἀπόλλων, Lucil. 303-4 M.). Altogether I examine four strategies that Horace uses to replace or suppress the use of Greek, most of which can be paralleled from Cicero’s contemporary philosophical treatises: the translation of tags, the use of calquing (both calques proper and loan-shifts), periphrasis, and lexical assimilation. While the significance of these devices varies greatly according to their context, I argue that the choice of Latin is sometimes marked and significant in relation to the Greek form.

After studying Horace’s avoidance of Greek, I explore Horace’s own accounting of his strategy through a reading of *Satires* 1.10, in which Horace brings to the fore two issues that are central to ancient bilingualism and Latin purism: class and identity. The inappropriate intrusion of Greek might be a sign of a sub-elite education (ὀψιμαθία) or a symptom of an ethical failure to manage one’s own identity (to be *bilinguis more Canusini*). Horace explores each of these failings through the figure of the interlocutor whom he addresses and through particular instances of the avoidance of code-switching: *seri studiorum* (*S.* 1.10.21), as a substitute for ὀψιμαθεῖς (“late-learners”), and the proverb *in silvam non ligna feras* (*S.* 1.10.34) as a creative translation of the proverb γλαῦκα εἰς Ἀθήνας (“owls to Athens”; cf. “coals to Newcastle”). As Horace describes it, a purist aversion to Greek involves a double allegiance: it is simultaneously an affirmation of Roman identity (*S.* 1.10.20–35) and a commitment to Greek literary values, such as *munditiae*, which he views as a beneficial import to Latium (cf. *E.* 2.1.156–67). The paradox is familiar from the attitude to Latin of Cicero, who justifies his purism on the grounds that it is an essential feature of his identity (e.g., *sermone eo debemus uti, qui* †*notus*† *est nobis*, Cic. *Off.* 1.111) and also a way of imitating Greek

standards of decorum (e.g., *scis enim me Graece loqui in Latino sermone non plus solere quam in Graeco Latine*, Cic. *Tusc.* 1.15).

Chapter 1

Splendida Verba: Elevated Borrowings

1. Introduction: Roman Critics on Greek Poeticisms

The presence of elevated Greek vocabulary in Latin poetic diction is a familiar topic in both ancient and modern criticism. For instance, Cicero associated Greek borrowings with the grandeur of Latin tragedy, citing an unattributed *senarius* in his *Orator* (Cic. *Orat*. 163–4):

> verba, ut supra diximus, legenda sunt potissimum bene sonantia, sed ea non ut poetae exquisita ad sonum sed sumpta de medio: "Qua pontus Helles, †supera† Tmolum ac Tauricos." locorum splendidis nominibus illuminatus est versus, sed proximus inquinatus insuavissima littera: "Finis, frugifera et efferta arva Asiae tenet." quare bonitate potius nostrorum verborum utamur quam splendore Graecorum . . .
>
> As we have said above, one should select the most euphonious words, but they must not be selected with particular attention to euphony as the poets do, but taken from ordinary language: "Where Helle's sea beyond Tmolus and Taurica." The verse is embellished by magnificent geographical names; but the following verse is spoiled by the repetition of the unpleasant letter: "possesses the fruitful and rich fields of Asia." Therefore let us use good old Latin words rather than the magnificent Greek ones . . . (transl. Hendrickson)

The *senarius* (*inc. trag.* 163–4 Ribb.[3]) contains a sequence of borrowings from Greek, which are mainly geographical in origin: *pontus Helles*, *Tmolum*, and *Tauricos*.[1] Though Cicero did not object to these *splendida nomina* as such, he used them to illustrate the kind of Greek poetic diction unsuitable for the Roman forum. In this respect, Cicero's

[1] The same tmesis (*pontus Helles* for *Hellespontus*), which imitates Greek usage (e.g., εἰς Ἕλλης πόντον, *SH adesp*. 1132), appears in a fragment from an unknown tragedy, possibly the opening to Varius's *Thyestes* (*FRP* fr. 245 *adesp*.): *qua ponto ab Helles*.

rhetorical practice conformed with his precept.[2] Though such words were suitable for poetry, whose diction was chosen for the sake of its sound (*exquisita ad sonum*), orators must rely instead on vocabulary in common usage (*sumpta de medio*).[3] Hence, Cicero concluded, an orator should prefer the moral solidity (*bonitas*) of the Latin lexicon to the luster of Greek vocabulary (*splendor Graecorum*). The term Cicero used here, *splendor*, had been picked up by Latin rhetorical theorists to refer to the "brightness" of elevated diction in contrast to hackneyed (*obsoleta*) or ordinary words (*usitata*).[4] Because of its common use as an epithet for Roman *equites*, the term also suggested the "illustriousness" of high birth. Cicero turned both these senses to negative effect by contrasting *splendor* with native *bonitas*: instead of actual moral worth and high standing, the term *splendor* stands for the misleading impression of these qualities, as it does when Horace speaks of the deceptiveness of money (*capit argenti splendor; stupet Albius aere*, *S.* 1.4.28). Cicero seems to have considered the over-use of Greek borrowings one of the faults of "neoteric" style, as his parody of a neoteric style demonstrates (*Att*. 7.2.1): *ita belle nobis flavit ab Epiro lenissimus Onchesmites*.

Elaborating on this theme in the *Institutio Oratoria* (c. AD 96), which drew extensively on Cicero's rhetorical treatises, Quintilian also claimed that the sound of Greek was crucial to its presence in Latin poetry (*Inst.* 12.10.27–34):

---

[2] Cicero rarely used unfamiliar loanwords in his speeches except to suggest mockery (Laurand 1936–1938: 72–75). Oksala (1953: 78), who collects Cicero's loanwords, notes that the speeches *ad senatum* contain a higher percentage of loanwords than his speeches *ad populum*.

[3] Cicero deprecated the poets' preference for sound over sense (*Orat*. 68): *vocibus magis quam rebus inserviunt*. Asmis (2004) treats antecedents to Cicero's attitude in Philodemus and Hellenistic poetic theory.

[4] On *splendor* in literary criticism (e.g., Cic. *de Orat.* 3.125), see Brink on Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.111. Philodemus also treats λαμπρότης as a feature of poetic diction (cf. Phld. *Po*. 1.18.26 Janko).

> Namque est [sc. lingua Latina] ipsis statim sonis durior, quando et iucundissimas ex Graecis litteras non habemus (vocalem alteram, alteram consonantem, quibus nulla apud eos dulcius spirant: quas mutuari solemus quotiens illorum nominibus utimur; quod cum contingit, nescio quo modo velut hilarior protinus renidet oratio, ut in "zephyris" et "zopyris" . . . itaque tanto est sermo Graecus Latino iucundior, ut nostri poetae quotiens dulce carmen esse voluerunt illorum id nominibus exornent.
>
> For one thing, [Latin] is harsher in its actual sounds, because we lack the two most pleasing of the Greek letters [υ and ζ], one vowel and one consonant, the sweetest sounds in their language. We borrow these when we use Greek words, and when this happens, the language at once seems to brighten up and smile, as in words like *zephyrus* and *zopyrus* . . . Greek is therefore so much more agreeable than Latin that our poets adorn their verse with Greek words whenever they have wanted to achieve a dulcet effect. (transl. Russell)

Like Cicero, Quintilian admired Greek phonology, particularly the alien sounds [z] and [ü], which he characterized in aesthetic terms as *iucundus*, *dulcis*, and *hilaris*.[5] Consequently Greek borrowings were especially suitable for poetic speech, which aimed to produce aesthetic pleasure. Similarly, Macrobius's discussion of poetic loanwords used by Virgil emphasizes their beauty as well as their learned relationship to earlier Greek poetry and scholarship.[6] In addition to their sensual qualities, ancient commentators also referred to the greater dignity of Greek borrowings, as Servius does, for instance, when addressing Virgil's use of *lychnus* (*graeco sermone usus est, ne vile aliquid introferret*, Serv. *A.* 1.726).

These ancient critics touch on several important points about the language of Latin poetry and its relationship to Greek. As their emphasis on the formal linguistic properties of poetry shows, Latin possessed what a modern linguist would call a poetic

---

[5] For Quintilian's comparison between Latin and Greek, see Coleman (1963) and Fögen (2000: 167–79).

[6] Macrobius (*Sat.* 5.17.15–21; 6.4.17) discusses Virgil's lexical borrowings from Greek. Donatus's *vita* also refers in passing to Virgil's acquaintance "with names and objects in Greek and Latin" (*nominibus ac rebus Graecis Latinisque*, *VSD* 21).

register, a distinct variety of language, partly characterized by its lexicon.[7] While the boundaries between poetic and unpoetic speech varied considerably by context and genre, there were some highly marked "lexical aristocrats", words that were distinctly elevated and rarely occured outside verse, such as *aequor* (for *mare*), *ensis* (for *gladius*), and *ratis* (for *navis*).[8] Within this poetic lexicon, borrowings from Greek played a significant role. In addition to Greek proper names of mythological or geographic origin, such as *Zephyrus* and *Tmolus*, Greek common nouns also contributed to the Latin poetic lexicon, such as *gyrus*, *heros*, and *pelagus*. Finally these passages emphasize the strong sensuous impression that Greek phonetics made on the Roman ear, which it is easy for the modern reader to overlook.

Nevertheless, these descriptions also shortchange the contribution of Greek to the Latin poetic register. For Cicero and Quintilian, Greek vocabulary appears to serve mainly as a superficial adornment to Latin verse, in much the same way that a Greek sculpture or painting might beautify a Roman garden. Its contribution is construed as aesthetic in the most narrow and peripheral sense: a kind of lustrous gleam or pleasant sound, which enhances the beauty or raises the dignity of verse without entering into any meaningful relation with its content. In portraying Greek as a superficial adornment, these descriptions of poetic loanwords resemble the ways Romans spoke about Greek culture more generally. According to this perspective, being Greek was a simple choice

---

[7] Treatments of the Latin *sermo poeticus* include: Lunelli (1988), Maurach (1995), Coleman (1999), and Ferri (2011). The relevant sections of L–Sz on style (685–842) have been translated and augmented with recent bibliography in Traina (2002).

[8] Lyne (1989: 13–17) provides a helpful starting point for examining "poetical words" and "poetic diction" in Latin literature. Watson (1985) surveys the distribution of particular poeticisms (*aequor*, *ensis*, *ratis*), showing that neither genre nor content is always decisive in determining the presence of poeticisms.

like deciding to wear a *pallium* or adding a *palaestra* to your villa.[9] By portraying Greek culture and language as something to put on or take off at will, Romans obscured deeper and more long-term forms of cultural interaction and preserved the impression that Roman identity remained independent of Mediterranean influence.

Modern scholarship on Greek words in Latin poetry has tended to rely unreflectively on this ancient paradigm. For instance, L. P. Wilkinson's perceptive discussion of Greek words in Latin poetry nevertheless emphasizes their sensuous beauty in passages such as Ovid's description of Persephone gathering flowers (Ov. *Fast*. 4.439–40): *has, hyachinthe, tenes, illas, amaranthe, moraris: | pars thyma, pars casiam, pars meliloton amat*.[10] While Wilkinson's emphasis on the beauty of these borrowings is appropriate, he overlooks the relationship of Greek to Ovid's *doctrina*, the presentation of a mythological narrative, and not least the sense of the deceptiveness and imminent threat that will be realized with Persephone's abduction. More recently Landfester's introduction to Greek and Latin stylistics mentions the "aesthetic function" of loanwords as one of their three main uses in Latin literature—the other two being "language mixture" and their use in technical jargon.[11] At a loss to describe their effect, modern commentators sometimes treat Greek borrowings as if they were exclusively "poetic" or "exotic" without making finer distinctions in terms of their origin, register, and function. In a groundbreaking study of code-switching in Latin literature, H. D. Jocelyn reports that

---

[9] See Wallace-Hadrill (1998), who compares the alternation between Greek and Latin cultural modes to linguistic code-switching. On Greek as a matter of clothing and architecture, see further Wallace-Hadrill (2008: 38–70).

[10] Wilkinson (1963: 11–13).

[11] Landfester (1997: 85–97).

(1999: 181), "the Greek language as such remained an object of wonderment." Imagine this comment applied to the Victorian attitude towards French, and one can see why it only begins to scratch the surface.

By concentrating on the superficial appeal of Greek vocabulary, the *splendor Graecorum verborum*, ancient writers neglected deeper layers to its function and significance. In this respect, as in many others, ancient literary criticism ran behind contemporary poetic practice.[12] As recent research on bilingualism has emphasized, a speaker may use the choice of a foreign word to project an identity or negotiate a relationship with the audience, for instance by inviting solidarity or exclusion. As a result, borrowings formed an expressive resource a Latin poet might use to adopt an attitude towards his content and to create or dispel intimacy. Greek borrowings stood in many potentially significant relationships with the content or genre of a Latin poem, and its presence might be intimately linked with a work's argument and communicative strategy. For instance, David Sedley has shown how Lucretius's deployment of poetic loanwords forms part of the *De rerum natura*'s didactic strategy: emphasizing the gulf between Greek and Latin culture enables Epicurean philosophy, whose language Lucretius has carefully domesticated, to appear universal by contrast.[13]

By investigating the presence and function of poetic Greek borrowings in Horace's lyric poetry, this chapter aims to redress some of the shortcomings of ancient and modern criticism. It confines itself chiefly to Horace's *Odes* and examines

[12] See Feeney (2006).
[13] Sedley (2003: 35–61).

manifestations of Greek that are traditionally regarded as poeticisms: loanwords, such as *aether* and *pelagus*, and other lexical phenomena, including morphological borrowings and loan-shifts, that are generally confined to elevated poetry. After introducing a typology for describing the variety of lexical borrowings in Latin poetry in Section 2, it explores two complementary functions that they perform. Section 3 treats "distancing": Horace's use of Greek to evoke various kinds of contrastive distance, whether between poetry and prose, between Greek and Roman culture, between sacred and secular, and between the past and the present. For instance, Horace's description of himself flying as a bird *per liquidum aethera* (*C.* 2.20.2) emphasizes the contrast between his literary persona and his corporeal existence. Section 4 examines instances of "intensification" in which Greek borrowings, rather than create distance, portray an object in the most positive or generous possible light. By such means Horace moves from reflections on a specific moment to something more general. In addition to throwing light on Horace's poetry, examining both these functions will help to move past some familiar critical clichés about Greek borrowings: that they are simply "poetic" or "exotic" without any deeper significance.

2. Poetic Borrowings: Typology and Definitions

Several forms of lexical contact with Greek—not just elevated borrowings—contributed to the Latin poetic register. To illustrate their range and importance in Horace's poetry, it will be helpful to use a passage from the *Odes*. In the concluding poem of Book 2, Horace lays claim to literary immortality by announcing his transformation into an

undying swan. The poem begins at the highest register in language whose poetic character reflects the nature of Horace's transformation into literature (*C.* 2.20.1–4):

> Non usitata nec tenui ferar
> penna biformis per liquidum aethera
> vates, neque in terris morabor
> longius invidiaque maior . . .
>
> On no common or flimsy wing shall I be borne aloft through the clear air, a poet of double shape. I shall remain no longer on earth, but shall leave the cities of men, superior to envy. (transl. Rudd)

Several elements of its rhetoric and content contribute to the stanza's poetic elevation, such as litotes (e.g. *non usitata*), the poetic singular (*penna* for *pennis*), and the allusion to Callimachus (κρέσσονα βασκανίης *Ep.* 21.4).[14] But of greatest relevance to this chapter are the four distinct manifestations of lexical interaction with Greek that the passage displays in close succession. Since they are all familiar and constitutive features of poetic style and will figure throughout this chapter, it will be valuable to introduce each in turn.

In the first place, the loanword *aethera* (*aether* < αἴθηρ) presents an instance of a lexical borrowing that has been incorporated into Latin poetic diction.[15] While most Greek loanwords belong to conversational or technical registers of speech (e.g., *nauta* < ναύτης, *amphora* < ἀμφορεύς), the word *aether* and its derivatives (e.g., *aetherius*, *aetheralis*, *aethrius*) appear almost exclusively in elevated poetry from their earliest occurrences (Enn. *Ann*. 545 Sk.; Hostius fr. 6 Courtney). Aside from a single instance of

[14] On the poetic figure of "singular for plural", see Bell (1923: 67–71).

[15] On loanwords in Latin in general, see Adams (2003: 441–59). Biville (1990, 1995) surveys borrowings from Greek. On the semantics and register of *aether*, see Lunelli (*Enc. virg.* s.v. *aer*) and Cavalca (2001: 27–28).

the adjectival derivative (*aetheria domo*, *C.* 1.3.29), this is its only occurrence in Horace's poetry.[16] Its grandeur derives partly from its association with Homeric epic, where it occurs frequently. Through it strictly denotes the upper atmosphere in contrast to the sub-lunar atmosphere (ἀήρ), poets in both languages use the word with greater semantic freedom. Yet it is more than simply a synonym for *caelum*: in portraying the sky in an epic light, the word transports the audience to a heroic world where the celestial machinery works differently than in mundane reality. As Nisbet and Hubbard remark (324), *aether* and its derivative are especially appropriate when immortality is contrasted with the mortal body. Like the use of "heaven" for "sky" or "ichor" for "blood" in English, the borrowing brings with it a certain attitude or set of beliefs, which conditions our response to the rest of the poem and, in this case, imaginatively prepares us for Horace's metamorphosis. Its pairing with the adjective *liquidum*, which recalls ὑγρόν αἰθέρα in Horace's Pindaric model (Pi. *N.* 8.41–42), provides further poetic charge.

Loanwords tend to become more fully integrated within the receiving language over time, with the result that their original status as loanwords may no longer be ordinarily perceptible. While this was true for many Greek loanwords, especially the oldest stratum of borrowings (e.g., *ancora*, *gubernator*, *poena*), poetic loanwords, partly as a result of their limited distribution, often retained their exotic association. To further emphasize their foreign status, however, several additional forms of bilingual interaction might come into play. A borrowing may take a form that has been less fully integrated

[16] Meineke conjectured a second occurrence of *aetherius* at *C.* 1.28.5 to replace *aerias*; see N–H *ad loc.*

into Latin phonology, for instance, by preserving the length of a vowel in hiatus (e.g., *chorēas*, *C.* 1.9.16, for *chorĕas*) or presenting Greek syllabification (e.g., *cycni*, *C.* 4.3.20, scanned as an iamb with *n* counting as a liquid). Doubtless these variations served the demands of meter, but aesthetically they also increased the perceptibility and exotic character of a borrowing. To describe this quality, it may helpful to import the German distinction between a *Lehnwort*, an integrated loanword, and a *Fremdwort*, a borrowing still perceived as foreign. It is important, however, to keep in mind that the same word may be a striking *Fremdwort* in one context and an innocuous *Lehnwort* in another. For instance, Horace breathes new life into familiar loanwords by varying their gender (e.g., *obsessam Ilion*, *Epod.* 14.14; *timidos . . . lyncas*, *C.* 2.13.40) or importing an unfamiliar sense from their Greek original (e.g., *hora*, *C.* 1.12.16 "season, division of the year" < ὥρα).[17] Etymological play or even partial sound-sense equivalence may also make a familiar term seem an exotic *Fremdwort* in the right circumstances. For instance, as Alex Hardie observes, since the opening of *Odes* 1.12 is so closely modeled on Pindar (*Ol.* 2), it is hard not to hear *celebrare* as an echo of Pindar's κελαδήσομεν and *unda recumbit* as an echo of κῦμα.[18]

The loanword *aethera* also exhibits a second type of lexical—or, more precisely, morphological—interaction between Latin and Greek. Further emphasizing its poetic quality and distance from the quotidian *caelum*, the word appears with an accusative

[17] Bo (1960: 364–68) surveys Horace's treatment of nominal gender.
[18] Hardie (2003: 402–3).

singular ending, *-a* (< -α) that has also been borrowed from Greek.[19] Though not as widespread as lexical borrowing, morphological borrowing from Greek occurred in many registers of Latin. For instance, Greek lent several productive nominal suffixes, such as -ικος and -αριος, which became *-icus* and *-ărius*. By the mid-second-century BC, Latin tragedians in pursuit of both poetic elevation and metrical convenience began introducing Greek case endings into their work, especially the accusative singular *-a* in names such as *Hectora*. As Varro's account of these developments makes clear (*L.* 10.69–71), words of this kind were often felt to be hybrid constructions rather than direct quotations of Greek. Within Augustan poetry, these morphological borrowings appear to have been regularized to such an extent that it is possible to identify several hybrid "Greek declensions", which combined Latin and Greek case endings.[20] Compared to both earlier and later Latin poets, Horace's tolerance for morphological borrowing was rather restrained: in addition to the accusative singular *-a*, his repertoire included the nominative singulars *-ē*, *-os*, and *-ēs*, the accusative singulars *-ēn*, *-on*, *-in*, *-ō*, and *-ē*, the nominative plural *-ĕs*, the accusative plural *-ăs*, and the vocatives *-ē*, *-eu*, and *-ī*.[21] Their stylistic elevation is evident from their distribution in Horace's corpus: as Bentley remarked, they occur more commonly in the *Odes* and *Epodes* than in his hexametric verse and generate

[19] On morphological borrowings in Latin in general, see Adams (2003: 473–96, 371–72). Jocelyn (1999: 179–84) surveys literary instances of morphological borrowing before Augustan poetry. In the accusative singular, the word *aether* regularly appears with a Greek inflection until Tertullian, who uses *aetherem* (cf. *TLL* s.v. *aether* I.1149.27–30).

[20] On the declension of Greek nouns in Latin see especially Frei (1958), who treats borrowings from the first-declension, and Housman (1972: II.817–39), who treats borrowings from the first- and third-declension.

[21] Bo (1960 s.v. *ablativus*, *accusativus*, *dativus*, *genitivus*, *nominativus*, *vocativus*) collects all Greek inflections in Horace. Significantly absent from this list are several endings that appeared in both earlier and later Latin poetry (e.g. *-ou*, *-ēs*, *-ōn*; cf. Neue–Wagener). Post-Augustan poets, such as Statius, also experimented with borrowing the Greek dative singular *-ĭ* (e.g., *Doridi*, Stat. *Silv.* 4.2.28).

what he termed *transmarina elegantia*.[22] Thus Horace's *aethera* in fact presents two independent manifestations of lexical exchange: lexical borrowing (*aethēr/aither*-) and morphological borrowing (-*a*). Both contribute to the impression of this word's otherworldliness and literary character.

In addition to the lexical and morphological borrowings, the stanza also presents two less overt forms of interaction in which the borrowing is partly semantic. The compound *biformis* ("two-shaped") is an instance of a morphological calque, a coinage whose lexical components reproduce a compound in the source language (e.g., *gratte-ciel* is a calque on "skyscraper").[23] The term "calque" is sometimes used by linguists in a broader sense to refer to any kind of structural equivalence that results from language contact (e.g., morphemic calques, syntactic calques).[24] Following the practice of Adams, however, I will use "calque" to refer only to morphological calques such as *biformis*.[25] Calques occur in several registers of Latin, including the technical discourse of medicine and philosophy, but are especially common in poetry as a way of enlarging the native stock of vocabulary.[26] For Horace, one important use was to reproduce Greek poetic

---

[22] Bentley, commenting on *Epod*. 17.17, wrote (1728: 338): *Sane observavi in Iambis, Sermonibus, et Epistolis Latinas declinationes libentius adhibere Nostrum; in Carminibus Graecos. In illis Cretam, Helenae, Penelopam habes; in his Creten, Helenes, Penelopen. Quippe in illis puram et nativam orationem sectatus est; in his plus exotici nitoris et transmarinae elegantiae affectavit.*

[23] Adams (2003: 459–61) discusses morphological calques in Latin. Earlier classical scholarship (e.g., N–R) often does not distinguish calques from loan-shifts, a phenomenon to be discussed below.

[24] For instance, see Haugen and Mithun (2003) for this general use of "calque".

[25] On this restricted sense of "calque" see Hock and Joseph (1996: 264–65) and Adams (2003: 459–64).

[26] General studies of calques in Latin include: Steiner (1921), Traina (1974, index s.v. *calco*), Coleman (1989), Kroll (1988: 13–15), Rosén (1999: 68–70), and Langslow (2000: 140–205).

epithets, which could be coined much more freely in Greek than in classical Latin.[27] In accordance with his precept in the *Ars poetica* of employing *licentia sumpta pudenter* (*AP* 51), Horace showed greater restraint in his use and creation of compounds, especially contrasted with his predecessors in lyric and other elevated genres (e.g., Laevius's *subductisupercilicarptores*, fr. 7 Courtney).[28] Especially rare are compounds composed of two nominal elements, such as the epithet *tauriformis* (*C.* 4.14.25), which imitates Pindar's dithyrambic style. In the case of *biformis*, the calque reproduces the Greek δίμορφος or δίφυος, epithets found in earlier Greek poetry and prose, and which may well have been translated into Latin by an early tragedian.[29] Because they evoke the language of old Latin tragedy, calques such as *biformis* may be perceived as simultaneously archaizing and Grecizing.

A calque, such as *biformis*, differs from a related type of lexical transfer called a loan-shift, which is evident in the word *vates* ("poet"). In the case of a loan-shift, an existing word in the target language acquires a new meaning as the result of a pre-existing semantic overlap.[30] Unlike calques, loan-shifts (in German, *Lehnübersetzungen*) do not involve the coinage of a new word, nor do they constitute a morpheme-by-

---

[27] Latin writers commented on the greater restrictions of nominal compounding in Latin than in Greek: Quint. *Inst.* 1.5.70; 8.3.30; Liv. 27.11.5.

[28] On poetic compounds as a feature of Latin style, see Traina (2010). Lindner (2002: 289) lists nominal compunds that appear in Horace. Traina (*Enc. oraz.* s.v. *composti nominali*) and Di Giovine (*Enc. oraz.* s.v. *epiteti*) discuss this feature of Horace's style in greater detail. Bo (1960: 352–53) provides a general list of calques, including verbal coinages (e.g., *renodo* < ἀναδέω), though it is not complete. Calboli (2005) investigates compounds in Horace whose first element is the privative *in-*.

[29] Though *biformis* first appears in Augustan poetry here and in Virgil (Verg. *A.* 6.25), Norden (1957: *ad loc.*) speculates that the compound, like many others, originated in the language of earlier Latin tragedy.

[30] Adams (2003: 523). Hock and Joseph (1996: 263). Nicolas (1996) studies this phenomenon under the name *calque semantique*. On loan-shifts in Latin poetry: Löfstedt (1956: II.433-36); Kroll in Lunelli (1988:13–15).

morpheme imitation. For instance, Adams cites the example of the Latin word *casus*, which acquired the technical meaning "case inflection" from πτῶσις. Since both words shared the meaning "fall", it was easy for Latin grammarians to extend the meaning of *casus* to include the technical sense of πτῶσις ("nominal inflection"). While loan-shifts were common in technical jargon, they were also a regular occurrence in the Latin poetic lexicon. In seeking alternatives to everyday words, Latin poets drew on their familiarity with the Greek lexicon to create surprising new semantic extensions, such as Catullus's *nutricum tenus* (Catul. 64.18 "up to her breasts"), in which *nutrix* acquired the meaning "breast" from the Greek equivalent τίτθη. As Catullus's *nutrix* demonstrates, poetic loanshifts tend to make greater interpretive demands than morphological calques, whose meaning often does not depend on knowledge of the source language.

The word *vates* arguably presents a more complex instance of such semantic transfer.[31] While it originally referred to a seer or fortune-teller, Augustan poets, probably misled by Varro's scholarship, began using the word as if it were an archaic term for "poet". The perceived affinity between the roles of seer and poet encouraged Latin writers to extend the semantic range of the word *vates* to cover meanings that ultimately derive from ποιητής or ἀοιδός. Sometimes in Augustan poetry the word appears simply as a convenient substitute for the more familiar loanword *poeta* (e.g. *AP* 299). In other contexts, however, the word is semantically distinguished from *poeta* by its

[31] The literature on this much-discussed word includes: Bickel (1951); Newman (1967); Brink on *Ep*. 2.1.118–38, 2.984, *AP* 400; N–H on *C*. 1.1.35; Skutsch (1985) on Enn. *Ann*. 207 Sk.; Jocelyn (1995). Müller's (1894: 51–55) survey of evidence remains a helpful and authoritative starting point. Dahlmann (1948, 1962), supported now by Korenjak (1999), argued that the change in meaning derived from Varro's scholarship.

emphasis on the writer's divine qualities: a new kind of poet-prophet for Augustus's new political dispensation. Though actually a semantic innovation, this use of the word was presented as if it were a recovery of archaic Latin practice. By calling himself a *vates* in this poem, Horace emphasizes both his poetic and religious authority, which are crucial to his literary metamorphosis. In addition, assuming the mantle of sacred authority allows Horace to prepare the way for the Roman Odes, which immediately follow the end of Book 2 and exemplify Horace's role as *vates*.

The term may possibly be an appropriate choice in this poem for an etymological reason as well. Horace's two-fold nature, half-bird and half-bard, recalls the double application of the word ἀήδων (lit. "singer"), which referred both to birds, specifically the nightingale, and to poets in their role as singers.[32] Since ancient scholars believed many words with word-initial *v-* derived from "Aeolic" Greek, it may have been possible to derive *vates* from ἀήδων ("nightingale") or ἀοιδός. Supposing ἀήδων was etymologized with an intervocalic digamma (ἀϝήδων), which Romans recognized in words like *Avernus* (< ἄϝορνος "birdless"), the subsequent loss of the initial vowel and the devoicing of the *-d-* could both be readily explained to yield the form *vates*. In addition, the existence of dialectical variants, such as the Laconian ἀβηδών (Hesych.

[32] Greek writers frequently exploited the etymological conection between the nightingale (ἀήδων) and singing (ἀείδειν). For instance, poets are described as nightingales: e.g., Bacchyl. 3.98; E. fr. 598; Ion, *AP* 7.44; Hermesian. 7.49. Unknown to the *LSJ*, the same usage also occurs in an epigram on a Roman tomb (Merkelbach 1972): τὴν Μουσέων χαρίεσσαν ἀηδόνα τὴν μελίγηρυν. Worth noting in this connection also is the use of ἀήδων to refer to poems in contradistinction to the poet, as in Callimachus's epigram on the death of Heraclitus (αἱ δὲ τεαὶ ζώουσιν ἀηδόνες, *Ep*. 2.5), which explores a similar theme—Heraclitus's "birds" live on despite his corporeal death. As Barchiesi (2001: 126 with n47) shows, Catullus (65.12ff.) also exploits the etymological connection by characterizing himself as a nightingale in mourning. For more on avian poetics in Hesiod, Pindar, and Callimachus, see Steiner (2007).

α.110) and the contracted form ἀδών (Moschus *Ep. Bionis* 9, 46), which appear closer in phonology to *vates*, might have supported such a derivation. Though neither of the two existing etymologies (*vates appellabant a versibus viendis*, Var. *L.* 7.36; *vates a vi mentis appellatos Varro auctor est*, Isid. *Orig.* 8.7.3) preserves any overt connection with ἀήδων, they are clearly drawn from Greek sources and imitate ancient etymologies of μάντις (< μανία) and ῥαψωδός (< ῥάπτειν τὰς ᾠδάς).[33] If a fuller account of the origin of *vates* survived from antiquity, it may well have touched on the comparable word ἀηδών. In any case, Varro's etymology contains a bird by another means, since the phrase *a vi mentis* can be re-divided to produce *avi mentis*. It may be that Horace's description of himself as a *canorus ales* (*C.* 2.20.15–16) glances at these two senses of ἀηδών.

These four varieties of lexical interaction—loanwords (*aethera*), morphological borrowings (*-a*), calques (*biformis*), and loan-shifts (*vates*)—are especially characteristic of the Latin *sermo poeticus* and tend to occur in Horace's poetry at moments of stylistic elevation. For the sake of convenience I will refer to them as "poetic borrowings" or "elevated borrowings" to distinguish them from borrowings that are neutral in register (e.g., *nauta*, *astrum*) or characteristic of non-literary speech (e.g., the loanword *periscelis* "anklet" or the calque *imminere* "persist (with treatment)" < ἐπιμένειν in medical jargon). It is important to emphasize that "poetic" simply refers to a statistical fact about the borrowing's distribution in the existing Latin corpus: that it occurs overwhelmingly in

[33] See Maltby (1991: s.v. *vates*).

poetry, especially epic, which was usually regarded as the "highest" genre.[34] This definition corresponds to what Lyne in his study of Virgil's diction calls "poetical words".[35] Much harder to measure and evaluate, but essential to the task of criticism, is determining the semantic, aesthetic, and historical features that make a particular borrowing valuable for literary use. As Williams emphasized, many factors come into play, such as a word's connotative power, the degree of emotional involvement it conveys, and its allusive force.[36] While it is relatively easy to determine whether a particular loanword, such as *pelagus*, is statistically poetical, it is harder to evaluate calques and loan-shifts in this way, since many are one-off occurrences (e.g., *tauriformis*, *C.* 4.14.25). In practice, however, a judgment informed by the context, one's own Latin *Sprachgefühl*, and the remarks of Horace's contemporaries about poetic language is straightforward. For instance, it is easy to perceive that the calque *ulcerosus* (< ἑλκώδης) in Horace's *iecur ulcerosum* (*C.* 1.25.15), though this is its first occurrence, is a technical compound from medical jargon, whereas the hapax *tauriformis* (< ταυρόμορφος) in one of Horace's most Pindaric odes aims toward the high style.

To describe the effect of these poetic borrowings in the most general way, it may be helpful to use the term "defamiliarization", which was popularized by Russian formalists.[37] Viktor Shklovsky coined the word to identify one distinguishing

---

[34] Williams (1968: 746–50) challenged the assumption that there was a hierarchy of genres in antiquity. While recognizing that generic categories are more flexible than Axelson supposed, scholars such as Watson (1985) and Lyne (1989: 14–15) have argued in favor of its existence.

[35] Lyne (1989: 13–17).

[36] See Williams (1968: 743–50), Watson (1985), and Lyne (1989: 13–17).

[37] Shklovsky (1965: 13–22). The views of the Russian formalists influenced Roman Jakobson's (1987) work on poetic language.

characteristic of poetic language: the presence of strange and unfamiliar language that elicits greater cognitive involvement. By departing from everyday usage, whether lexically, morphologically, or semantically, Greek borrowings stood out with greater salience and demanded greater attention from the audience. Latin poets sought to distinguish elevated poetry from ordinary expression. Drawing on bilingual interaction was one means of achieving such a formal distinctiveness, of creating a Latin *Dichtersprache*. In this respect, Shklovsky's discussion was indebted to Aristotle, as he was aware, who identified "foreignness" or "strangeness" as an important feature of some poetic diction (διὸ δεῖ ποιεῖν ξένην τὴν διάλεκτον, *Rhet.* 1404b).[38]

In addition to increasing the salience of an expression and distancing poetry from prose, the use of Greek lexical interaction connected Latin poetry to a literary tradition of high cultural status. Naturally the significance of this connection varied over time and according to context. For instance, it appears that Ennius and other second-century tragedians, such as Accius, used daring high-style borrowings to differentiate themselves from their predecessors and to lay claim to greater literary authority.[39] Poetic borrowings may assert a privileged fidelity in relation to a Greek original, such as when Catullus uses the borrowing *comae* as the equivalent to Callimachus's κόμαι in the numerically

---

[38] See also Demetrius (*De interp*. 77): τὴν δὲ λέξιν ἐν τῷ χαρακτῆρι τούτ| περιττὴν εἶναι δεῖ καὶ ἐξηλλαγμένην καὶ ἀσυνήθη μᾶλλον οὕτ γὰρ ἕξει τὸν ὄγκον, ἡ δὲ κυρία καὶ συνήθης σαφὴς μὲν, λειτὴ δὲ καὶ εὐκαταφρόνητος. ("The diction used in this style should be grandiose, elaborate, and distinctly out of the ordinary. It will thus possess the needed gravity, whereas usual and current words, though clear, are unimpressive and liable to be held cheap." transl. Roberts)

[39] Among the most audacious of these experiments may be Ennius's shortenings *endo suam do* (*Ann.* 587 Sk.), *altisonum cael* (*Ann.* 586 Sk.) and *laetificum gau* (*Ann.* 585 Sk.). Compare also the importation of the Homeric Greek genitive singular -οιο (*Mettoeo . . . Fufetioeo, Ann.* 120 Sk.), which may have simultaneously been a native Latin archaism (Adams 2003: 28, 371).

equivalent verse of the *Coma Berenices* (66.51), or when Lucretius imports the Homeric adjective *durateus* to describe the Trojan horse.[40] There are several participants in these linguistic interactions: the poet, whose identity and learning (*doctrina*) are at stake; Greek literature, whose cultural and poetic authority is drawn upon; and the audience, which may be invited to experience solidarity or exclusion by displays of bilingual knowledge.

While "defamiliarization" is a useful concept for discussing these poetic interactions in general, it hardly exhausts the full range of their significance in Horace's poetry. Among its many functions, this chapter draws attention to two complementary uses: distancing and heightening. On the one hand, lexical defamiliarization may evoke an exotic atmosphere, transporting the audience to a foreign place.[41] We have seen such a function already in *C*. 2.20, which takes Horace, so to speak, outside his own skin; I will return to this poem in greater detail below. As the discussion will show, various kinds of distance may be implicated within these bilingual effects: cultural distance (i.e. the distance between Greece and Italy), religious distance (i.e. the distance between the sacred and the profane), and temporal distance (i.e. the difference between the heroic past and the present). On the other hand, sometimes exotic distance is not at stake; instead, these effects aim to achieve elevation without leaving behind the here-and-now or the particularity of the moment being described. For instance, when Horace describes the

---

[40] Callimachus's first line (Callim. *Aet.* 4 fr. 110.51 Pf.): ἄρτι [ν]εότμητόν με κόμαι ποθέεσκον ἀδε[λφεαί. For these "verbatim" translations in Catullus, see Oksala (1982). Similarly striking is Catullus's *Arsinoes Locridos* (66.54), which reproduces Λοκρίδος Ἀρσινόης with the same inflections. Sometimes a different Greek borrowing may stand in allusively for a differing original, as in Valerius Flaccus's *namque virum trahit ipse chalybs* (6.540), which evokes a Homeric formula (ἄνδρα σίδηρος, *Od*. 16.294).

[41] Adams (2003: 403–5) describes the "evocation of the exotic" as one function of both code-switching and the use of integrated borrowings.

leaping waters of the *fons Bandusiae* (*unde loquaces | lymphae desiliunt tuae, C.* 3.13.15–16), the elevation of the poetic borrowing *lympha* transfigures the descriptive detail without entailing any loss of specificity. At these moments, the Greek interaction presents an object at greater elevation or invests it with increased generality. By means of these effects, Horace invests the everyday world in which many of the lyric poems move with greater luminosity and interest. The dialectic between these two functions, distance and intensity, reflects a basic tension that characterizes Horace's relationship to Greek culture in general: Greek is both far and near, exalted and ordinary.

3. Lexical Distance

3.1 POETIC DISTANCE: LITERATURE VS. LIFE

The four examples of poetic borrowings that have been examined occur in the epilogue to *Odes 2*, which serves a function similar to the self-identifying σφραγίς that Greek poets often appended to their work. In language that is strikingly elevated, Horace describes his humble origins and predicts his undying poetic fame, which he will enjoy in the form of a brilliant, tuneful bird, usually identified as a swan, which will fly to all corners of the empire. By elevating the stylistic register and raising themes, such as the nature of literary commemoration and the relationship between poetry and empire, the poem also functions as a bridge to the Roman Odes, which initiate *Odes* 3. In addition to the bilingual effects already touched upon in the first stanza, Greek lexical interaction occurs with striking frequency throughout the rest of the ode, with several Greek proper names,

such as *Stygia unda* (8), *Daedaleo . . . Icaro* (13), *Bosphori* (14), and *Hyperboreos campos* (16). Two of these are adjectival forms that stand in place of a possessive genitive (e.g., *Stygia unda* for *unda Stygis*), an archaizing construction that evoked Greek epic language (e.g., *Aeneia nutrix*, Verg. *A.* 7.1), while one preserves Greek phonology (*Daedalēo*). The sense of bilingual play is reinforced by the pun between *dilecte* and *Stygia*, whose root (στυγέω) means "hateful". There are also several phrasal calques, similar to the morphological calques discussed above, in which a Greek compound is rendered by means of several Latin words, including *Rhodanique potor* (20), which imitates Greek compounds in -ποτης, and *inani funere* (21), which recalls κενοτάφιον.

These elevated poeticisms help to explore one of the poem's principal themes, the otherworldliness of poetry and its relation to physical embodiment. As often in classical literature and criticism, the ode figures poetry through the metaphorical domain of "height". This metaphor is reflected in common evaluative terms such as *sublimis* and ὕψος to characterize markedly poetic or elevated language.[42] Through the image of his transformation into a bird and his flight to the ends of the earth, Horace has reinvigorated cliché of ancient criticism. This vision of poetry emphasizes the otherworldliness of poetry in relation to everyday experience, while downplaying other functions of literature, such as its ability to serve as a mirror for life.[43] In the concluding stanza of the poem, the contrast between poetic transcendence and corporeal existence sharpens even

[42] Discussions of the *genus sublime dicendi* include: *Rhet. Ad Her*. 4.11–12; Cic. *Orat.* 20, 97–99; Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.58. Russell (1964: xxx–xlii) treats the development of the concept of "height of speech" in classical criticism.

[43] On the theme of literature as a reflection of life in classical literature, see Bramble's excursus (1974: 23–25).

further: Horace's transformation into song becomes an alternative to bodily annihilation. Such a vision of poetry as physical transcendence stands in contrast to a different view of poetic immortality offered by Horace in the epilogue to Book 3, where poetic achievement is represented as being paradoxically more substantial than physical reality.

Lexical elevation provides a linguistic analogue for the theme of poetic sublimity. From a stylistic point of view, such effects forcefully insist on the ode's status as a poetic utterance. By distancing his language from everyday expression, Greek stands thematically for the otherworldliness of poetry in contrast to corporeal reality. Horace introduces another model for understanding poetic distance by mentioning the exotic people he will visit in his flight: Greeks, Africans, Colchians, Dacians, Spaniards, Geloni, and Germans. The list of ethnicities in effect circumscribes the boundaries of Augustus's empire. To clarify the nature of poetic sublimity, Horace draws on the new experience of imperial distance, displayed in monuments such as Agrippa's Map and the *porticus ad nationes*, which contained *simulacra omnium nationum* (Serv. *A.* 8.721).[44] In this way Greek borrowings, geographic distance, and poetic flight are all set in a reciprocally illuminating relationship.

With characteristic humor, Horace's exploration of the image of poetic flight exposes both its strengths and its weaknesses as a way of conceptualizing poetry. As Eduard Fraenkel notes (1957: 301–2), the physical description of Horace's transformation is jarring in its detail and low register (e.g., *residunt cruribus asperae* |

[44] On Agrippa's Map and the *porticus ad nationes* as manifestations of Augustus's claims to world conquest (Aug. *Anc.* 1 *quibus orbem terrarium imperio populi Romani subiecit*), see Cooley (2009: 103–4).

pelles, 9–10).[45] The interpellation of these physical details poses problems for a view of poetry in which corporeal details are left behind. It is tempting to read this stanza as a *reductio ad absurdum*, which develops an acceptable image to the point of comic exaggeration and reveals its shortcomings in the process. Horace's anticipation of being read in the provinces may not have filled him with great pleasure, as David West notes (1995: 145–46), considering how he portrayed his own school experience with Orbilius (*Ep.* 2.1.71).

Lexical elevation in this ode poses these same questions about the nature of poetic distance in an especially concentrated form. In this context it is hard not to feel that the density of elevated Greek poeticisms verges on self-parody. In particular, Horace's comparison between himself and "Daedalean Icarus" (*Daedaleo . . . Icaro*) discloses the risk that in stylistic terms he may be flying too close to the sun. The ordinary metaphor in ancient literary criticism for this kind of stylistic fault is the image of swelling (*turgeo, turgidus*), which is succinctly described in the *Ars Poetica* (*AP* 27): *professus grandia turget.* Horace, especially in the *Sermones*, uses "turgid" poeticisms of this sort parodically in order to poke fun at generic conventions and mock fellow writers for their literary pretensions.[46] For instance, Horace sends up M. Furius Bibaculus and his epic *Annales Belli Gallici* by imitating its over-the-top diction (*S.* 1.10.36–37): *turgidus Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona dumque | defingit Rheni luteum caput*. By a common turn of speech, Horace speaks of the poet performing an action described in his work—the

[45] Feeney (2009: 219–20) notes the physical fascination and connects it with Plato's description of avian metamorphosis in the *Phaedrus* (251b), where there is a similar concentration on physical detail.

[46] On Horace's satirical allusions to epic, see Connors (2005).

killing of Memnon, which probably occurred in an epic simile—and so wittily suggests that Bibaculus has effectively murdered his content. It has also been suggested that *caput*, in addition to referring to the personified "head" of the river god, may suggest a calque on κεφαλή in the sense "mouth of a river", which appears in Polybius and Callimachus (fr. 43.46 Pf.).[47] By comparing himself to Icarus in a heavily Grecizing line, Horace has turned this form of poetic parody on himself.

Horace's ambivalent relation towards poetic elevation was long-standing. In the *Satires* he had insisted that his own versification differed from more elevated forms of poetry. According to his satiric definition of a *poeta*, which he claimed ironically not to be, a true poet possessed three distinguishing features (*S.* 1.4.43–44): *ingenium*, *mens divinior*, and *os magna sonaturum*. In fitting imitation of the poetic style, this last expression presents two manifestations of lexical contact of the sort we have already considered: it is both a phrasal calque on the Greek (μεγαλόφωνος) and deploys the accusative plural adverbially (*magna* < πολλά), in a way more characteristic of Greek than Latin syntax.[48]

The epilogue to *Odes* 2 attempts to demonstrate Horace's *os magna sonaturum*. By instantiating poetic elevation, Greek borrowings dramatize the dangers of high style: that high flying might collapse into stylistic frigidity, that poetic immortality might require becoming school fodder, and that the empire might mean being surrounded by barbarians. Critics' sharp disagreements about Horace's attitude towards poetry in here

---

[47] On this passage and its relation to Furius, see Courtney (2003: 97–98). Ogilvie (1957) discusses the calque *caput* ("mouth of a river") in Livy.

[48] For more on the neuter accusative plural as adverb, see Chapter 3 on syntactic Grecisms.

suggest that the ode does not propose a single-minded view of poetic elevation but rather engages with the theme polyphonically. With its emphasis on the otherworldliness of poetry, the poem contrasts with the epilogue of *Odes* 3, which explores the substantiality of poetry. Where *C.* 2.20 dramatizes poetry's presence throughout the empire, *C.* 3.30, by contrast, localizes its immortality in Italy and specifically Roman institutions.

3.2 CULTURAL DISTANCE: GREECE VS. ROME

Odes 2.20 illustrates in an especially dramatic way the distance of poetic sublimity, instantiating it by means of foreign borrowings and aligning it with the geographic expanse of empire. Readings of additional poems will help to explore several kinds of distance that matter to the *Odes*. One form of distance that sits at the heart of Horace's lyric project is the contrast between Italy and Greece, which is simultaneously cultural and geographic. As Horace repeatedly emphasizes, the *Odes* are a blending of Greek and Roman elements, well represented by Horace's term for himself, *lyricus vates* (*C.* 1.1.35). Through the contrasting etymological origins of these words, the expression effectively fuses Greek and Roman elements in the same way as the *Odes*.[49] Horace uses several bilingual oxymorons of this sort to describe the hybrid nature of his poetry, such as *Latinum, barbite, carmen* (*C.* 1.32.3), *Graiae Camenae* (*C.* 2.16.38), *Romanae fidicen lyrae* (*C.* 4.3.23), and *Calabrae Pierides* (*C.* 4.8.20).[50] The Greek lexical elements, which in these expressions are generally elevated (e.g., *Graius* for *Graecus*), convey a sense of

[49] Compare Horace's description of himself as *princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos | deduxisse modos* (*C.* 3.30.13–14). Feeney (2009) describes Horace's relationship to his Greek lyric predecessors.

[50] Ross (1975: 145–50) provides a sensitive account of Horace's relationship to the *Graiae Camenae*. See also McDermott (1981), who discusses such bilingual "oxymora".

cultural distance between Greek and Roman identity even as the expressions as a whole attempt to elide that distance.

Horace puts this contrast to powerful use in *Odes* 1.7, one of the so-called Parade Odes, which lay out the coordinates of Horace's poetic project and establish his relationship to Greek lyric. Thematically the Plancus Ode explores the contrast between the familiar Italian countryside and the exotic East. In an elaborate priamel, a rhetorical structure that recalls the manner of Greek lyric, Horace counterposes a series of Greek cities to Plancus's beloved Tivoli (*C.* 1.7.1–14):[51]

> Laudabunt alii claram Rhodon aut Mytilenen
> aut Epheson bimarisve Corinthi
> moenia vel Baccho Thebas vel Apolline Delphos
> insignis aut Thessala Tempe:
>
> sunt quibus unum opus est intactae Palladis urbem
> carmine perpetuo celebrare et
> undique decerptam fronti praeponere olivam:
> plurimus in Iunonis honorem
>
> aptum dicet equis Argos ditisque Mycenas:
> me nec tam patiens Lacedaemon
> nec tam Larisae percussit campus opimae,
> quam domus Albuneae resonantis
>
> et praeceps Anio ac Tiburni lucus et uda
> mobilibus pomaria rivis.
>
> Others will praise the brilliance of Rhodes, or Mytilene, or Ephesus, or the walls of Corinth with its two seas, or Thebes that is famous for Bacchus, or Delphi or Thessalian Tempe, both renowned for Apollo. There are some whose one mission is to celebrate the virgin Pallas's city in a long continuous poem, and to display on their brow the olive plucked from every source. Very many, in Juno's honor, will tell of Argos, a good place for horses, and rich Mycenae. As for me, neither tough Lacedaemon nor the fertile plain of Larisa has so struck my imagination as the home of the echoing Albunea and the plunging Anio and the grove of Tiburnus and the orchards watered by hurrying rivulets. (transl. Rudd)

[51] On Horace's adaptation of the priamel, among other devices, from Pindar, see Race (2010).

The most striking linguistic feature of these lines is its density of morphological borrowing. In a show of bilingual virtuosity, nearly every Greek place-name ends with a Greek inflection (*Rhodon*, *Mytilenen*, *Epheson*, *Tempe*, *Argos*, *Lacedaemon*). In only two cases are the endings unambiguously Latin (*Delphos*, *Corinthi*), and both involve inflections whose Greek version (-ους, -ου) Horace consistently refuses to domesticate. In addition to these morphological borrowings, Horace has also provided calques on familiar epithets, such as *bimaris Corinthi* (e.g., δίπορον κορυφὰν | Ἴσθμιον, Eur. *Tr*. 1097–98) and *aptum equis Argos* (< ἱππόβοτον, Hom. *Il.* 2.287). These elevated lexical borrowings set the foreignness of the Greek East in contrast to the Italian locales that Horace praises. This juxtaposition relates to the personal history of the poem's addressee, L. Munatius Plancus, whose political career kept him frequently away from his hometown of Tivoli, first as a governor of *Gallia transalpina*, then as one of Antony's lieutenants in the East until he joined Octavian shortly before Actium.[52]

While the difference between native and foreign, between near and far, is perhaps the most explicit point of comparison here, several additional contrasts are implicated in the comparison between Greece and Italy. One of the most prominent of these is the juxtaposition between the urbanism of the Hellenic world and the rural quality of the Italian countryside. Aside from the Thessalian plain (*campus Larisae*), all the Greek places Horace names are prominent cities. By contrast, in praising Tivoli Horace lingers over details of the Italian countryside: the rivers Albunea and Anio, the grove of Tiburnus, and the nearby apple orchards. When he finally names Tibur directly in line 21,

[52] Nisbet and Hubbard (N–H 90–94) provide a full historical introduction to the poem.

Horace emphasizes its thick shade (*seu densa tenebit | Tiburis umbra tui*), a quality more characteristic of a rural grove than a city. The contrast between city and countryside runs throughout Horace's poetry, both overlaid with a range of positive and negative associations. While *urbanitas* was associated with civilization and sophistication, *rusticas* stood for purity and simplicity. Characteristically, Rome and Italy stood for rusticity: *agresti Latio* (*Ep*. 2.1.157) and Daunus's rule over the rural peoples (*agrestium . . . populorum, C.* 3.30.11–12). For instance, Horace famously described the development of Latin poetry as the conquest of Greek urbanity over rural Latium (*Ep.* 2.1.157): *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis | intulit agresti Latio*.

The contrast between Greece and Italy also possesses a religious dimension. As David West (1995: 34) has noted, Horace emphasizes the association of these Greek cities with Olympian deities: Apollo, Bacchus, Pallas Athena, and Artemis. In contrast to these far-off Olympian deities, Horace depicts the local shrines of Tivoli: the Sibyl Albunea lived near the falls of the Anio, and Tiburnus, the founder of Tivoli, had a sacred grove. It was in the domain of religion with its contrast between *ritus Graecus* and *ritus Romanus* where the distinction between Greek and Roman was formulated and maintained most rigorously.[53] Through the lens of Homeric epic, Horace's calqued epithets evoke Greek forms of religious life.

Finally the comparison between Greek and Rome also occurs along an ethical axis. The splendor of the Greek place names at the opening of the poem both represents

[53] On the categories of "Greek" and "Roman" in Roman religion, see Feeney (1998: 25–28) and Scheid (2003: 36–38).

and excites the sort of *admiratio* (θαυμάζειν) that Horace finds philosophically suspect. The external charm of foreign places is juxtaposed to the genuine repose available closer to home at Tivoli. This philosophical dimension becomes even more explicit in Horace's epistle to Bullatius (*Ep.* 1.11), where Horace reworks the same theme in the didactic persona characteristic of that epistolary genre. Distance here becomes philosophically significant, as in Lucretius's well-known comparison of tranquility (ἀταραξία) to a man on shore viewing a shipwreck at sea. Indeed Horace's wording in the epistle to Bullatius (*procul e terra spectare furentem*, *Ep*. 1.11.10) explicitly echoes Lucretius's passage (*suave, mari magno turbantibus aequore ventis | e terra magnum alterius spectare laborem*, Lucr. 2.1–2). Equanimity is thus associated with the native and familiar, as the concluding lines of the epistle state: *quod petis, hic est, | est Ulubris, animus si te non deficit aequus*. Tivoli thus becomes, as Feeney (2009: 227) puts it, "a self-sufficient metaphor for a frame of mind and a mode of poetry."

As we have seen, the Greek lexical elevation in the Plancus Ode stands for several forms of distance: not only the cultural distance of Greece in comparison with Italy, but the distance between town and country, the difference between Greek and Roman religious practice, and the yearning of *admiratio* in contrast to Epicurean tranquility. While the Plancus Ode exploits the contrast of Greek and Roman culture, elsewhere Horace also draws on Greek lexical resources to insist on the parity between Greek and Roman culture.[54] For the sake of brevity, one example will suffice. Several times Horace sets Greek athletic contests side by side with comparable Roman practices, such as the

[54] See further Fraenkel (1957: 265–66).

election and triumph. His aim appears to be not to set these institutions at odds but to reveal the parallels between them. An example occurs in *Odes* 4 (*C.* 4.3.3–9):

> illum non labor Isthmius
>
> clarabit pugilem, non equus impiger
> curru ducet Achaico
> victorem, neque res bellica Deliis
> ornatum foliis ducem,
> quod regum tumidas contuderit minas,
>
> ostendet Capitolio.
>
> [that man] will not win glory as a boxer through his exertions at the Isthmus; no spirited horse will carry him to victory in an Achaean chariot; nor will a military career parade him before the Capitol, a general decorated with Delian bays, for crushing the swelling threats of princes. (transl. Rudd)

In this passage, the dignity and lexical splendor of Horace's description of the Isthmian games favorably illuminates the Roman triumph: note the emphatically parallel placement of *Achaico* and *Capitolio*.[55] The comparison recalls Horace's first ode, whose priamel establishes the parity of both Greek and Roman pursuits and which in its conclusion insists on the equality of Greek and Latin lyric.

3.3 SACRED DISTANCE: SACRED VS. PROFANE

In the Plancus ode, Greek lexical elevation helps to juxtapose two different forms of religious experience: worship of the Olympian deities in contrast to the local cults of the Italian countryside. Horace also uses similar effects to mark a contrast even more fundamental to ancient religion between the categories of sacred and profane. In these

[55] Virgil (*G.* 3.17–20) establishes a parallel between the Roman triumph and Greek athletic festivals.

instances the elevation of Greek lexical interaction represents the experience of holiness—divine inspiration, contact with a god, and so on—as something apart from or raised above everyday life. One of the most striking examples occurs in Horace's Ode to Bacchus (*C.* 2.19). In the opening two stanzas, Horace describes an epiphanic encounter with Dionsyus functioning as a chorus-trainer (*C.* 2.19.1–8):

> Bacchum in remotis carmina rupibus
> vidi docentem—credite posteri—
> Nymphasque discentes et auris
> capripedum Satyrorum acutas.
>
> euhoe! recenti mens trepidat metu
> plenoque Bacchi pectore turbidum
> laetatur: euhoe! parce Liber,
> parce gravi metuende thyrso!
>
> I have seen Bacchus teaching songs on a distant crag (believe me, my future readers!), and the Nymphs learning them and goat-footed Satyrs with their pointed ears pricked. Euhoe! My mind is in a confused ecstasy, still trembling with the fear that just now came over me; my soul is possessed by Bacchus. Euhoe! Have mercy on me, o God of Freedom! Have mercy, dread Lord of the fearsome ivy rod! (transl. Rudd)

In these stanzas, the elevation of Greek borrowings emphasizes the distance (*in* <u>*remotis*</u> *rupibus*) of divine inspiration from everyday experience. In addition to the lexical borrowings (*Bacchus*, *Nymphas*, *Satyrorum*, and *thyrso*), there are other forms of lexical contact, such as the morphological calque *capripedum* (< αἰγιπόδης or τραγόπους). In this context the verb *parce* serves as what Nisbet and Rudd call a "ritual word": not precisely a loan-shift, since the meaning "spare" is already native, it nevertheless recalls the regular

use in Greek of the imperative φείδεο to introduce prayers.[56] Rather than a semantic loan-shift, it is better to describe it as "pragmatic" loan-shift, which borrows its discursive function from the language of Greek prayer. The Grecizing extends to the syntax as well: the use of a participle as the argument of a verb of perception (*Bacchum . . . vidi docentem*) and the adverbial accusative (*turbidum laetatur*). The exclamation *euhoe* (< εὐοῖ) is more challenging to describe, since it exists in the grey area between a lexical borrowing and an outright code-switch. Though it already occurs in Latin literature in Plautus's comedy, it does not appear to have been phonologically integrated into Latin.[57] It seems to be the kind of foreign expression that Latin speakers adopted for use within a monolingual frame of reference (e.g. *ohe, papae, phy*), which linguists sometimes call tag-switching to distinguish it from outright code-switching (Adams 2003: 21).

These foreign effects together evoke the kind of religious experience we still call by the Greek term "epiphany".[58] Horace had available a range of literary antecedents in both Greek and Latin literature, including epiphanies in Hesiod, Archilochus, Pindar, Callimachus, and Ennius. In addition to evoking the distance of a divine encounter, the Greek borrowings also reorient the audience's expectations. One function of magical language across many cultures is to exempt an utterance from the kinds of interpretation

---

[56] On this religious usage of *parce* (e.g., Hor. *C.* 3.1.2; Juv. 6.172), see: N–R *ad loc.*; Fraenkel (1957: 411n1); Norden (1957) on *Aen*. 6.63. For some additional occurrences in prayer, see TLL (s.v. *parco* X.1.339.14–25).

[57] While Latin possessed native forms of both diphthongs (e.g., *coepit, foedus, seu*), they remained very rare. The digraph *oe* appears to be the usual Latin orthographic convention to represent Greek diphthong [oi]. Occurrences of *euhoe* include: Pl. *Men*. 835, Catul. 64.255, Verg. *A.* 7.389, Ov. *Ars* 1.563, Juv. 7.62. Conjectured to replace *euhan* at Enn. *scen*. 122 Joc. On the phonological integration of Greek [oi], see Biville (1990: 93; 1995: 38).

[58] On literary epiphanies, see further N–H (315), Feeney (1998: 104–7).

applied to ordinary statements; instead linguistic remoteness may call for specialized hermeneutic practices, such as allegoresis, or even sidestep interpretation entirely. Greek borrowings might thus have a protective function, encouraging Horace's audience not to seek the literal truth in his revelation and effectively bracketing off the poem from everyday inquiry. This is not the same as writing literary fiction or religious burlesque, as Nisbet and Hubbard and David West have it; rather "literary" language can insist that Horace's account is fictive without being fictional. Plato seems to have used the dithyrambic style, well known for its linguistic extravagance, in an analogous way: narrating his myths in this fashion urged his readers to seek beyond the literal meaning.[59]

Horace's elevated Grecisms also serve an additional function: they provide a level of stylistic grandeur that is appropriate for addressing a god of Bacchus's majesty. In rhetorical terms, elevated Greek borrowings furnish a level of decorum that is suitable (*aptum*) for the occasion. The Bacchic shouts of *euhoe* go beyond representing an epiphany and suggest that the speaker is actively experiencing divine possession. The intrusion of a foreign interjection—as close to speaking Greek as Horace ever comes—stands for the irruption of a divine presence. The Bacchic cry has a mysterious, talismanic quality, which Latin writers sometimes respected by retaining such ritual shouts in their original language.[60] Later philosophers acknowledged the magical power that inhered in ritual language by insisting that divine names of foreign origin were untranslatable.[61]

---

[59] On Greek dithyrambic style, especially in Plato, see Thesleff (1967: 77–80).

[60] For instance, the Greek ritual exclamation of the cult of Isis (εὑρήκαμεν, συγχαίρομεν) is preserved in Greek characters by Seneca (*Apoc*. 13) and Firmicius Maternus (*Err. prof. rel*. 2.9).

[61] On the untranslatability of ὀνόματα βαρβαρικά, see Iamblichus (*Myst. Egypt*. 7.5) and Psellus (*Oracles chaldaïques* fr. 150 Des Places). Pliny (*Nat.* 28.20) also mentions *externa verba atque ineffabilia*.

Horace's portrayal of divinity touches on one of the poem's themes, the nature of poetic inspiration.[62] When Horace sees Bacchus, he is acting the role of a chorus-trainer (χοροδιδάσκαλος) preparing nymphs and satyrs for a dramatic performance. The reference to tragic performance is appropriate, since Horace models his third stanza on Euripides's *Bacchae*. Just as in the following ode, the epilogue to Book 2, poetic elevation characterizes and comments on Horace's sources of inspiration, in this case Greek tragedy. Describing his relationship to Bacchus is one way of speaking about his relationship to Greek literature in general, which Horace has put on display through his Euripidean appropriation. While many Roman depictions of the encounter with Greek poetry, such as one finds in Aulus Gellius, for instance, emphasize the scholarly virtues of diligence and accuracy, Horace's ode provides an alternative model, which emphasizes the revelatory and ecstatic nature of the encounter.

In odes such as this one, Horace draws on a long-standing association in Rome between Greek and religious cult.[63] As early as the sixth century BC, Latin religious language appears to be full of Greek borrowings, as the Diosocuri dedication from Lavinium shows: *Castorei Podlouqueique qurois* "to the youths Castor and Pollux" (*CIL* 1^2 2833).[64] Though probably conceived as a Latin inscription, only the suffix *-que* and the inflections have not been borrowed from Greek. Arguably the *Carmen arvale* also contains Greek loanwords, such as the Dionysian *triumpe* (< θρίαμβος) and *sins* (<

[62] Schiesaro (2009) discusses Horace's "Bacchic" poetics.
[63] Kaimio (1979: 162–67) surveys Greek in relation to Roman religion.
[64] See Watkins (1995), Baldi (1999: 196–97). For some comments on this inscription in relation to ancient bilingualism, see Mullen (2011: 533) and Biville (2008: 43).

σίνος).[65] Romans also borrowed heavily on the forms and conventions of Greek prayer, which in some ways represented a pan-Mediterranean religious koine. In the Late Republic, Greek appears to have remained the primary language for several imported cults that were managed by Greek priests, such as the cults of the *Magna Mater* and *Ceres*. It is also likely that the primary ritual language for several cults without official recognition, such as the mysteries of Isis and Mithras, was Greek, as it was for the early Christian church.

3.4. TEMPORAL DISTANCE: PAST VS. PRESENT

A final form of distance that the presence of Greek can evoke is the remoteness of the idealized past in relation to the present. Greek thus becomes a resource for demarcating boundaries between different points in time, for instance between the dissolute present and the heyday of the Republic, and even different kinds of temporality, for instance between the age of men and the age of heroes. A representative keyword is the borrowing *heros*, usually found with a Greek inflection, which simultaneously conjures up the foreignness of the past and its ethical superiority to the present. Horace's poetry portrays many periods from the Greco-Roman past, including the recent triumviral period, the Middle Republic, Archaic Greece, and the Trojan Wars. Denis Feeney (2007: 83–84) has recently shown that the fall of Troy furnished a crucial demarcation point for Horace. My aim here is not to survey Horace's presentation of time throughout the *Odes* but merely to observe how Greek can place temporality under pressure.

---

[65] On *sins*, see Pisani (1981).

A poem that makes much of time is Horace's *recusatio* to Agrippa (*C.* 1.6), in which he declines the invitation to compose an epic on the soldier's recent martial exploits. While the ode has attracted attention for many reasons, of greatest relevance here is the contrast Horace stages between two moments in time: the heroic past characterized by Homeric exploits, on the one hand, and Horace's convivial present in which he sings at leisure (*cantamus vacui*). To underscore his refusal to compose epic, Horace elaborates in mock-epic style on the heroic themes about which he does not wish to write (*C.* 1.6.5–16):

> nos, Agrippa, neque haec dicere nec gravem
> Pelidae stomachum cedere nescii
> nec cursus duplicis per mare Ulixei
> nec saevam Pelopis domum
>
> conamur . . .
>
> quis Martem tunica tectum adamantina
> digne scripserit aut pulvere Troico
> nigrum Merionen aut ope Palladis
> Tydiden superis parem?
>
> I do not attempt to recount such things, Agrippa, any more than the deadly pique of Peleus's son who was incapable of giving way, or the wily Ulysses and his journeys over the sea, or the inhuman house of Pelops; . . . who could write worthily of Mars clad in his adamantine breastplate, or Meriones black with the dust of Troy, or the son of Tydeus who, with Pallas's aid, was the equal of the gods? (transl. Rudd)

To portray these heroes in their heroic glory, Horace has recourse to a range of elevated Grecisms. Especially striking are the calques and loan-translations that recall Homeric epithets, such as *duplicis* (< πολύτροπος), *imbellis* (< ἀπόλεμος), *tunica tectum adamantina* (< χαλκοθώραξ), and *superis parem* (< δαίμονι ἶσος). There are also two instances of morphological borrowing, in the names *Merionen* and *Tydiden*. The trisyllabic genitive *Ulixei* is a special case, for Horace appears to have invented this form

as a convenient way of concluding an iambic line.[66] The loanword *adamas*, like *aether*, is a noteworthy example of a poetic borrowing from Greek that refers to an entity that appears not to exist outside epic poetry. By describing Agrippa and Augustus Caesar with similarly heroic language, Horace assimilates their exploits to this idealized Homeric past and holds himself largely aloof from it. As Denis Feeney notes, Horace allows a glimpse of the contemporary realities of warfare to peek through the Homeric veneer: in line 3 it looks as if Agrippa himself is performing feats on land and sea, but in line 4 it turns out to be the soldier under Agrippa's command in a more modern, top-down style of combat.

In contrast, the poem's final stanza describes Horace's own preference for partying and lyric poetry in language that is decidedly more down-to-earth. Despite some poetic flourishes, such as the word order of the ablative absolute *virginum sectis in iuvenes unguibus acrium* (17–18), its diction firmly inhabits the realm of the ordinary and the familiar. Its differing linguistic register in relation to the previous stanzas corresponds to a different sense of time and its passage. In contrast to the fullness of epic and mythological time, packed with heroic action, Horace's own convivial temporality is empty and leisured (19–20): *cantamus, vacui sive quid urimur, | non praeter solitum leves*. Cultivated indifference, well expressed by the off-hand qualification (*vacui sive quid urimur*), is juxtaposed to the grand intentions of heroes and the poets who write about them.[67] The heroic world presents what linguists would call punctual or simple

[66] For Greek names ending in *-es* (*Ulysses, Achilles*), Horace employed two forms of the genitive singular: the bisyllabic *-ĕī* in the *Odes and Epodes* (*Epod*. 16.60; 17.16; *C*. 1.6.7) and the monosyllabic *-ei* which appears in the *Epistles* (*Ep*. 1.6.63; 1.7.40). See N–H on *C.* 1.15.34.

[67] Punctuation somewhat artificially forces editors to decide whether *vacui* qualifies *cantamus* (*cantamus vacui, sive quid urimur*), as most editors print (e.g. Klingner), or *urimur*, as Shackleton Bailey

aspect: it is full of unique, non-recurrent events, such as Diomedes's attack on Aphrodite. In Horace's convivial present, by contrast, similar events recur habitually and without much consequence. In accordance with the argument of Horace's *recusatio*, the presence of Greek helps to insist on the apartness of the heroic past from Horace's own day-to-day present.

While Greek in the Agrippa ode portrays heroic time, foreign borrowings could also be used to present a similarly exalted view of Roman history. Drawing on Greek resources, however, entailed the risk that Horace's distinctively Roman authority might be compromised in the process. Horace faced this stylistic challenge in an acute way in composing the Roman Odes. To articulate a moral vision for the new Principate, he needed to find the right style for showing the interrelationship between the past and the present without either surrendering his Roman identity or lapsing into historical fantasy. One solution Horace found was to adapt the linguistic dignity of Greek lyric style in such a way that it coincided with or even enhanced native Roman idiom. In particular, Horace drew on both the rhetorical and the stylistic resources of Pindaric epinician, a genre well-suited to relating the past to the present. At the same time, Horace counterbalanced stylistic elevation with prosaic diction in an attempt to ground these odes in present-day concerns.

---

proposes (*cantamus, vacui sive quid urimur*). Shackleton Bailey has an Ovidian passage on his side for the conjunction of *vacuus* and *uror* (*uror et in vacuo pectore regnat amor*, Ov. *Am.* 1.1.26; see N–R *ad loc.* for *vacuus* and κενεός in Latin and Greek erotic poetry). Nevertheless, the force of this adjective seems to apply to both verbs. Perhaps the best solution is Keller and Holder's *cantamus, vacui, sive quid urimur*, which additionally calls attention to the thematic importance of the adjective.

We can see how Horace addressed these difficulties by examining the Regulus Ode (*C.* 3.5), the poem in the sequence most explicitly engaged with history.[68] In it Horace relates the legendary story of M. Atilius Regulus, a Roman general captured during the First Carthaginian War who was sent to Rome to plead for a prisoner exchange. After persuading the senate not to accept the deal, he kept his promise to return to Carthage, where torture and death awaited him. By Horace's day, the story had become a traditional *exemplum* used to illustrate the Roman values of *fides* and *fortitudo* (e.g., V. Max. 1.1.14; 2.9.8; Cic. *Parad.* 2.16; *Fin.* 2.65; *Off.* 1.39; 3.97–115; Sen. *Dial.* 1.3.9). Though Mommsen argued that the poem was a political intervention supporting Augustus's policy of renouncing the invasion of Parthia, most interpreters have followed Fraenkel in backing away from such an explicitly political reading of the poem. Without offering any precise policy proposals, however, the ode is still deeply engaged with contemporary political morality: through Regulus's set-piece oration and the enfolding narrative Horace develops a complex view of Roman martial *virtus* and the obligations it entailed to government, family, and *clientela*.

The ode's fourth stanza, in which Horace pivots from the prologue to the narrative proper, shows how Horace put Pindaric resources into effect (*C.* 3.5.13–16):

> hoc caverat mens provida Reguli
> dissentientis condicionibus
> foedis et exempli trahentis
> perniciem veniens in aevum,
>
> It was this that the far-seeing mind of Regulus had sought to prevent when he rejected the

[68] On the background to this poem, historical and legendary, see N–R (80–81). Recent discussions include Luther (2003) and Morgan (2005).

> humiliating terms and cited it as a precedent involving disaster for future generations . . . (transl. Rudd; adapted to Shackleton Bailey's text)

The first line contains two noteworthy Pindaric borrowings, neglected by most commentators. The seemingly innocuous pronoun *hoc* provides an essential hinge that connects this stanza, which begins the Regulus narrative, to the preceding one, which describes Crassus's captured soldiers. It is in fact a striking departure from Latin poetic usage, which generally avoided monosyllabic demonstrative pronouns; in this case, a connective relative pronoun might have been expected.[69] In its daring it recalls a typical construction in Pindar: the use of the definite article to introduce mythical narrative.[70] We might regard *hoc* as another example of a pragmatic loan-shift, in which a Latin word has acquired the rhetorical function of its Greek equivalent, in this case Pindar's demonstrative use of the article.

The second manifestation of Greek contact occurs in the use of the abstract *mens provida Reguli* as the subject of the verb *caverat* in place of the more prosaic personal construction (*Regulus providae mentis caverat*, *vel sim.*). Commentators have sometimes described this as if it were straightforwardly equivalent to a familiar Greek poeticism, sometimes called the βία Ἡρακλεία construction, in which a personified abstract (e.g., ἶς,

[69] On the avoidance of pronouns, see Axelson (1945: 71–74), Butterfield (2008), and Ferri (2011: 359–61).

[70] For instance: τοῦ μεγασθενὴς ἐράσσατο Γαιάοχος | Ποσειδάν (Pi. *O*.1.25–26 "with whom the mighty Earthholder Poseidon fell in love"); τὰν ὁ χαιτάεις ἀνεμοσφαράγων | ἐκ Παλίου κόλπων ποτὲ Λατοίδας | ἅρπασ' (Pi. *P*. 9.5–7 "whom the long-haired son of Leto once seized from the wind-echoing folds of Pelion").

μένος, σθένος) stands in place of the ordinary personal construction.[71] Yet the relationship is much subtler. In the typical form of the construction the abstract noun cannot normally fulfill the function of an agent: for instance, in Virgil's *ruunt equites et odora canum vis* (*A.* 4.132), the power comes from the oddity of imagining "force" (*vis*) as "rushing forth" (*ruunt*). By contrast, since *mens* is usually conceived as the site of rational agency, it is less strange for it to be performing an action.[72] In fact the closest parallel comes from Pindar, who uses φρήν in a similar construction (Pi. *P.* 6.34–35): Μεσσανίου δὲ γέροντος | δοναθεῖσα φρήν βόασα παῖδα ὅν ("the mind of the old man of Messene, reeling, shouted to his son"). Unlike in Pindar's construction, though, which represents the mind as performing a physical act (βόασα "shouted"), Horace's verb (*caverat*) describes a typical mental action. Though the construction recalls a Greek lyric poeticism, Horace has effectively blanched much of its semantic oddity.

He has also assimilated it to its Roman setting in another respect. From a Roman point of view, it was not unusual to speak abouts *Mens* in personal terms. In 217 BC in response to the Roman defeat at Lake Trasimene, the Sibylline books decreed the introduction of the cult of *Mens* to Rome, possibly modeled on Greek worship of Εὐβουλία or Γνωμή, and in 215 BC her temple was dedicated on the Capitol.[73] It was also possible to address in personal terms the *mens* of an exceptional individual, especially the

---

[71] See Austin (1955) on Verg. *A.* 4.132 (*odora canum vis*) with K–S 1.242–34. Examples in Horace are sometimes epic-parodic (e.g., *Proscripti regis Rupili pus atque venenum*, *S.* 1.7.1; *virtus Scipiadae et mitis sapientia Laeli*, *S.* 2.1.73).

[72] In addition to the Vitruvius passage (Vitr. 1 praef. 1), cited below, the *TLL* provides two other parallels in which *mens* serves as a subject, though the list might not be exhaustive: Verg. *A.* 8.205 (*furiis Caci mens effera . . . tauros avertit*) and Ps.-Damas. E*pigr*. 104.5 (*devota Severi nec non Cassiae mens dedit ista d(e)o*).

[73] On the goddess *Mens*, see: TLL (s.v. *mens*, VIII.736.77ff); *RE* (XV.936ff.); *NP* (s.v. *Mens*).

emperor, as if it were a divine component similar to a personal *genius*. Writing not long after the publication of Horace's *Odes* 3, Vitruvius began the preface to his *De architectura* by invoking Augustus's divine *mens* (*cum divina tua mens et numen, imperator Caesar, imperio potiretur orbis terrarum*, Vitr. 1 *praef.* 1), and later imperial panegyricists imitated the praise (e.g., *Paneg*. 3.15.1; 7.7.1; 9.6.4). In a striking grammatical and conceptual parallel, Vitruvius has personified Augustus's divine *mens* as the agent of the verb *potiretur*. By applying the terms of imperial panegyric to a historical personage, Horace establishes a parallel between Regulus, the Republican hero, and the new *princeps* while also historicizing such panegyrical language to make it seem traditional rather than a recent innovation. The reference to Regulus's *mens provida* thus invests the description with a characteristically Roman sense of piety, one that interacts with the language of imperial panegyric. In a way that is typical of Horace's most effective poetic borrowings, the construction resonates powerfully with both a Greek lyric model and with Latin usage.

Both these manifestations of Greek show how Horace drew on epinician language to depict Regulus's story in almost mythic terms. Other points of contact with Greek provide additional stylistic elevation, such as the calque *immiserabilis* (< ἀνηλέητος), which is heightened by the characteristically Greek scansion of the Alcaic verse.[74] In this context, it is hard not to hear Pindaric resonance in the use of the verb *miscuit* (*pacem*

[74] Though a short syllable at this metrical position (*si non perirĕt immiserabilis*) is unattested in Horace, it was an option for Alcaeus. For a comparable Greek metrical freedom in the Roman Odes, see *ĭnauspicatos* (*C.* 3.6.10); cf. also the scansion of *ignis (ϝ)iliacas domos* (*C.* 1.15.36). Alternatively, as N–R suggest, Horace has preserved the archaic length of the ending (*perirēt*), as he did with *timēt* (*C.* 2.13.16 with N–H).

duello miscuit) which recalls a verb (μείγνυμι) that Pindar subjected to great semantic pressure. Though translators have generally preferred tame renditions of *miscuit* (e.g., David West's "he has confused war with peace"), Pindaric parallels suggest that the verb here has a more primal, conjugal sense ("he has married war to peace")—a vivid and appropriate image for the depravity of Crassus's veterans, whose marriage to Parthian brides has betrayed their country's declaration of war.[75]

Almost as if to counterbalance the poetic elevation, however, the ode also includes some strikingly prosaic expressions. In the stanza under consideration, the elevation of Horace's *mens provida Reguli* is immediately followed by the typically prosaic word *condicio* (*dissentientis condicionibus*, 14), which is more reminiscent of the courtroom than historical epic. Axelson (1945: 103) has characterized other lexical choices in this ode as similarly *unpoetisch*, including *atqui* (49; Axelson 1945: 103–4) and *negotia* (53; Axelson 1945: 110). Along the same lines, the ablative absolute in the opening stanza (*adiectis Britannis* | *imperio gravibusque Persis*, 3–4) has been said to evoke "officialese" (N–R) or perhaps more accurately the epigraphic style familiar, for instance, from the inscriptions Augustus composed for the imperial *Forum Augusti*.[76] It would be a mistake to claim that these "unpoetic" features lowered the register of the poem or were at odds with the poeticisms we have discussed. Instead it appears that

[75] Not an instance of semantic borrowing: see *OLD* s.v. *misceo* 5b "to unite by marriage or kinship". Compare Pindar's (Pi. *O*. 1.22) κράτει δὲ προσέμειξε δεσπόταν ("and wedded his master to strength"). Gildersleeve (1890) comments: "the concrete, personal μείγνυμι is common in Pindar, and must have its right of contact. Here, 'brought to victory's embrace,' 'wedded,' 'clasped,' 'embraced,' 'encircled,' will answer for many cases."

[76] On epigraphic language in Virgil, see Horsfall (2008: xx; and esp. on *A.* 2.554–8).

Horace aims to produce an inclusive, open lyric style, one that welcomes and ennobles ordinary language and experience.

The contrast in the Regulus Ode between lyric Greek elevation and prosaic detail helps to establish a basic contrast between the past and the present. Yet the mythological distance created by such constructions as the Pindaric *hoc* and *mens provida Reguli* does not remove the poem from quotidian concerns. In fact Horace's diction continually shows the present working through the past and vice versa. Its characteristic tense is not the historic perfect but rather the present perfect, which views the past as active or consequential in the present: *credidimus* (*Caelo tonantem credidimus Iovem* | *regnare*, 1–2, "we have believed" . . . and still do) *vixit* (5), *consenuit* (8), and with particular force, the anaphoric *vidi* at the beginning of Regulus's speech (21).[77] The presence of Greek borrowings thus helps both to establish the contrast between two points in time and to resolve it.

4. Intensification

The combination of elevation and prosaic detail in the Regulus Ode leads naturally to the second function of poetic Greek borrowings that this chapter will treat. As Section 3

[77] N–R describe the tense of *credidimus* as a present perfect that comes to be used as a present tense on analogy with *novi*: "we have come to believe" and so "we believe" (see H–Sz 318). If so, this may be another irruption of conversational speech into the Roman Odes, since the use of the perfect tense of this verb for the present is first attested in Seneca's *Epistles* (e.g., *mors contemni debet magis quam solet; multa enim de illa credidimus*, *Ep.* 82.16; *sequitur itaque ut ideo mutari nolimus quia nos optimos esse credidimus*, *Ep.* 59.11); see Axelson (1939: 70–71). Alternatively, Hutchinson (2002) interprets it as a historic perfect, specifically referring back to Horace's "conversion" experience.

showed, the presence of Greek often imparts a sense of distance, whether poetic, religious, or temporal in nature. All these manifestations of distance are fundamentally contrastive: in other words, they draw a line, implicitly or explicitly, between two domains, such as between poetry and reality, between Greek and Roman, between sacred and secular, between past and present, and so on. Even when Horace works to undermine that distinction, as in the epilogue to Book 2, which exploits the comic potential of poetic elevation, the presence of Greek helps to establish the basic terms of the comparison.

By contrast, this final section will examine several examples from Horace's *Odes* where the Greek is not mainly or exclusively contrastive in function. In describing these cases, the metaphors of "elevation" and "distance" become rather unhelpful. Though the presence of Greek may impart greater stylistic weight and dignity, its aim in these instances is not primarily to create a sense of distance or separation from immediate experience or to establish a contrast between it and some implied term of comparison. Instead, without any loss of specificity, the Greek intensifies the content by setting it in relation to an ideal and presenting it with a greater sense of generality and significance. For instance, when Horace mentions his birth near the river Ofanto, he describes the river by means of an epic epithet (*C.* 4.9.2): *longe sonantem natus ad Aufidum*. The phrasal calque, which reproduces the compound τηλέθροος (Hesych. τ762 "far-resounding"), effectively conveys the sound of the river, which was famous for its springtime flooding. At the same time, the Greek poetic diction helps to dignify the Ofanto by setting it in relation to an epic ideal. Its aim is not to imbue the river with some exotic or otherworldly quality, but rather to reveal it in all its particularity as a noble object worthy

of serious attention. The construction also serves to establish a relationship between Horace and the river, demonstrating his affection for a familiar landmark.

Readers of modern poetry may find it paradoxical to encounter a poetic expression that adds intensity and weight without diminishing its sense of particularity. In the wake of Wordsworth's *Lyrical Ballads* (1798), English-speaking writers have tended to mistrust poetical language *tout court* as if it were incapable of giving adequate expression to things of this world and led inevitably to fantasy. For similar reasons classicists have sometimes disregarded Horace's poeticisms as if they were incapable of serious intent or were a necessary evil, dictated by the demands of the genre, rather than a feature of expressive power. Fortunately, Homeric literary criticism has provided more sophisticated ways of coming to terms with the depth and flexibility of poetic epithets. Due attention to Horace's elevated Greek borrowings may help provide a more mature appreciation for this aspect of his style.

Horace's ode to the *fons Bandusiae* (*C.* 3.13) can illustrate this function of Greek in more detail. Much has been written about the forces of meaning at play beneath the deceptively simple surface of the ode. This reading addresses only one narrow dimension, the axis between "realistic" and "literary", though it will offer larger lessons for reading many of Horace's odes.[78] The Bandusian spring may or may not have existed, though Nisbet and Rudd have given reasons for thinking that neither the name nor the sacrificial event was entirely fictional (N–R 172–73). They suggest that Horace has named a local

[78] Gordon Williams's (1969: 87–90) interpretation of this poem brings out this interweaving of real and ideal.

Sabine spring after a Calabrian landmark from his youth, which would explain the name *Bandusia* as a typical south Italian corruption of the Greek place name Πάνδοσια. Llewelyn Morgan has recently revived the argument, originally advanced by De Chaupy in the eighteenth century, for locating the spring near Horace's hometown in Venusia.[79] Regardless of whether the *fons Bandusiae* can be firmly placed, Horace describes the spring with a level of detail that invites us to imagine an actual Italian spring, especially in its final stanza (*C.* 3.13.13–16):

> fies nobilium tu quoque fontium,
> me dicente cavis impositam ilicem
> saxis, unde loquaces
> lymphae desiliunt tuae.
>
> You too will be numbered among the illustrious springs, thanks to my singing of the holm oak that stands above the rocky cave from which your chattering watters come leaping down. (transl. Rudd)

It is essential to the success of the poem that the audience be brought to believe in the central lyric relationship established by the poem and dramatized in the final stanza by the juxtaposition of *tu* (13) and *me* (14). Several details help contribute to this effect of actuality, such as the presence of the solitary *ilex,* a characteristic feature of the Italian landscape (as Nisbet and Rudd remark), and the picturesque location of the spring above the grotto.

Nevertheless, as several commentators have emphasized, these details are also consistent with an idealized conception of a spring. The solitary tree featured in many "literary" springs, including Plato's spring in the *Phaedrus* (Plat. *Phaedr*. 230b), springs

[79] See Morgan (2009).

in Greek epigram (Leonidas *AP* 6.334.2; *AP* 6.230.4ff), and the bucolic spring in Theocritus's first idyll (Theocr. 1.1–2). Likewise the combination of rock and water was also conventional (e.g., Hom. *Il*. 9.14–15; Leonidas, *AP* 9.326.1; Theocr. 1.8.7; Ap. Rhod. 3.227; Ov. *Fast*. 3.295). Trees, rocks, trees, water, and goats are all, as Nisbet and Rudd claim (N–R 179), "conventional features of the so-called 'sacral-idyllic landscape.'" Horace, however, does not force us to choose between the "actual" *fons Bandusiae* and the "literary" *fons Bandusiae*, but rather attempts to equate the two. The poem aims to give equal weight to both impressions, to present the spring as simultaneously actual and ideal, without diminishing either. As a result, Horace's description attends to precisely those details that seem most universal. These literary echoes present the spring from the widest possible angle and place it in the largest number of illuminating relationships: all the springs that have come before in literature from Homer onwards and all that will come after.

The interaction between real and ideal is especially evident in the final two verses, which describe the sound of the water as it leaps from the rocks (15–16): *unde loquaces* | *lymphae desiliunt tuae*. Though Horace might have used the neutral and metrically equivalent *aquae*, he has preferred a Greek loanword that brings with it strong poetic and religious associations. Ancient etymologists such as Varro (*lympha a Nympha, L.* 7.87; see Maltby 1991 s.v.) derived the word from the Greek νύμφα, and it often occurs in the singular to refer to a particular water nymph in texts and inscriptions (e.g., Hor. *S.* 1.5.97; Var. *R.* 1.1.6; *CIL* 5.3106; see *OLD* s.v. 1). Though the borrowing lends dignity to Horace's spring, it does not thereby remove it from ordinary experience or transform it into something merely literary or fictional. At issue is not primarily the distance of the

spring from experience. On the contrary: the alliterative liquids are sensually evocative of the sound of water. Rather, by activating these associations, the term *lympha* shows the eternal and sacred appearing within the actual and the familiar. A similar dynamic is at work within the descriptive epithet *loquaces*. The metaphor of the "talking" spring adds descriptive detail but also recalls an epithet from Greek lyric (λαλὸν πιόντες ὕδωρ, *Anacreont*. 11.7 W.). In neither case is "distance" primarily at issue; instead the presence of Greek intensifies the ordinary details by placing them within a much wider range of literary and religious relationships. They thus help to follow through on Horace's claim to transform the spring into one of the famous fountains: *fies nobilium tu quoque fontium*.

Another poem that shows how Greek serves to intensify rather than to distance is Horace's Soracte Ode (*C*. 1.9). The well-known poem begins with a description of Mount Soratte in the winter, which naturally leads Horace to reflect on the powerlessness of man in relation to nature. He concludes with a familiar pseudo-philosophical refrain, urging his audience to enjoy the pleasures of youth while they are young. Characteristically Nisbet and Hubbard in their introduction to the poem rely on the dichotomy of "real observation" versus "literature" as if the categories were mutually exclusive. For instance, they claim that (N–H 117) "the second stanza is likewise based on literature rather than observation." While the contrast between literature and life is one that Horace sometimes employed, as we saw in the epilogue to Book 2, it is not a relevant distinction for this ode. Instead Alcaeus's ode (fr. 338 V.), on which the first two stanzas are modeled, provides a lens through which to perceive more sharply the Italian scene and its universal significance.

Partly Horace accomplishes this turn towards the universal through the ode's Greek vocabulary. Recommending that young men enjoy love and dancing while they are able, Horace writes (*C*. 1.9.14–17):

> . . . nec dulcis amores
> sperne puer neque tu choreas,
>
> donec virenti canities abest
> morosa.
>
> And do not say no to sweet love and dancing, while you are still a lad and your green age is free from peevish whiteness. (transl. Rudd)

The reference to young Romans dancing has struck critics as having "less to do with Roman life than with the Greek poetic convention." (N–H 123).[80] Yet there is sufficient evidence to be sure that Romans danced, especially in religious contexts and at dinner parties; furthermore, some well-born youth, most famously Sempronia (Sal. *Cat*. 25), became quite skilled at it.[81] It seems willful to doubt that Horace's advice has some relation to actual practice when the next stanza goes on to describe erotic happenings in the Campus Martius (*nunc et campus at areae* . . .).

The literary quality of the borrowing *choreas*, which occurs almost exclusively in poetry (e.g., Lucr. 2.635, Catul. 64.287, Verg. *A*. 6.644), has encouraged commentators to suppose that Horace has here moved away from reality into lyric fantasy. As if to further emphasize its foreignness, the poem has also preserved the Greek prosody of the original (*chorēas* < χορεῖος) in contrast to the more phonologically integrated form *chorĕas*

[80] See also Williams (1962: 37–38).

[81] Tiberius Gracchus's reference to noble youths dancing confirms that the practice was long established, though poorly regarded by the authorities (Macr. 3.14.4–8).

(Verg. *A*. 6.644, Tib. 1.3.59, Prop. 2.19.15). Nevertheless, if it is accepted that dancing was a familiar practice in Rome, the loanword does not open up a gap between literature and life. Instead, its literary pedigree serves two related functions. The first is to insist in the face of fierce Roman opposition that dancing is a worthwhile activity. The word's literary associations lend it grandeur and remind the audience of the higher status that dancing enjoyed among Greeks. Secondly, the borrowing transcends the local manifestations of dance in Rome and enables Horace to speak about it in the most general possible terms. By implicating literary history in his diction, Horace speaks simultaneously as a Roman writer to a contemporary audience and as a lyric poet articulating a universal commonplace. Horace's awareness of this second layer of experience—Horace's "thematization of genre", as Barchiesi puts it—is one of the features that distinguishes his poetry from archaic lyric.[82] As these examples have shown, however, Horace's literary self-awareness does not entail any corresponding turn away from reality.

These observations could be applied to many Greek features of Horace's diction and style that are typically regarded as literary rather than descriptive. For instance, in *Diffugere nives* (*C*. 4.7), Horace describes the passage of the seasons with several Grecizing touches (*C*. 4.7.9–12):

> frigora mitescunt Zephyris, ver proterit aestas
> interitura simul
> pomifer Autumnus fruges effuderit, et mox
> bruma recurrit iners.

[82] Barchiesi (2000).

> The cold grows mild under the zephyrs; spring is trodden under foot by summer, which is doomed to die as soon as apple-bearing autumn pours forth its crops, and soon lifeless winter comes hurrying back. (transl. Rudd)

The reference to the west wind as the *Zephyri*, instead of the native *Favonius*, and the epithet *pomifer* applied to the personification of Autumn are both manifestations of Greek lexical influence. Yet these touches enhance the descriptive force of the passage by emphasizing the universal and recurrent aspect of the seasons. They intensify the experience of familiar events by placing them in the fullest possible context, which includes literary antecedents. This perspective also bears on Horace's choice of Greek pseudonyms, such as *Licymnia*, *Asterie* (*C*. 3.7), and so on, even when they are clearly referring to Roman characters.

Horace is especially fond of applying Greek epithets to ennoble features of the Italian landscape. Some examples of this have already occurred, such as Horace's description of the Ofanto as *longe sonantem* (*C*. 4.9.2) and the leaping waters of the *fons Bandusiae*. In addition to the Ofanto (cf. *C*. 3.30.10), Horace describes several Italian rivers in a similar way: the Liris (*quae Liris quieta mordet aqua taciturnus amnis*, *C*. 1.31.7–8) and the Anio (*praeceps Anio*, *C*. 1.7.13). Horace also uses Grecizing epithets to portray the landscape of his birth in *C.* 3.4: for instance, *celsae Acherontiae* (*C*. 3.4.14) and *humilis Forenti* (*C*. 3.4.16).

As these examples have shown, elevated borrowings from Greek provided Horace with a rich stylistic palette. However, they are more than just a source of aesthetic *splendor*. By creating lexical distance, such vocabulary can emphasize important thematic contrasts, such as the difference between poetry and reality or between Greece and Rome.

Moreover, by presenting a familiar object, such as Horace's *fons Bandusiae*, in the light of classical literature, elevated borrowings can intensify one's experience of the ordinary. Ordinary experience is indeed an important preoccupation of Horace, as the next chapter shows, which examines borrowings from a different spectrum of registers.

Chapter 2

Sordida Verba: Greek Words and Everyday Life

1. Introduction

1.1 TILLIUS'S *SORDES GRAECAE*

While elevated Greek borrowing contributed significantly to the *splendor* of Latin poetry, it was not only in the highest registers of poetic speech that bilingual exchange operated. The poeticisms considered in the previous chapter represent only a small fraction of the borrowings that entered Latin—not only technical registers, such as medical and legal Latin, but also informal varieties ranging from the highest to the lowest sociolects. By turning to a random page in Friedrich Weise's comprehensive lexicon of Greek loanwords in Latin (*Die griechischen Wörter im Latein*, 1882), one gains a measure, albeit impressionistic, of the relative proportions. For instance, between pages 464 and 465 (*murritis – mysteriarches*), only one borrowing from the 61 listed, or approximately 1.6% of the total, qualifies as "statistically poetic" as defined in the previous chapter. The single exception, *musaeus* (e.g., Lucr. 1.934, Germ. *Arat*. 220), appropriately enough means "poetical". The remaining 60 borrowings, which occur in both prose and verse indifferently, mainly constitute plant or animal names (e.g., *mygale* "a small species of mouse"; *myophonos* "a plant defined as having a sinewy stem"), technical terms relating to the spice trade (e.g., *myrobrecharius* "a perfumer"; *myropolium* "a perfume shop"), and compounds pertaining to religion (e.g., *mystes* "an initiate"; *mystagogus* "a priest who initiates people in sacred mysteries"). This range of borrowings, many of them

rather technical and confined to specific registers of speech, is broadly representative of the Greek contribution to the Latin word-stock.

Despite their numerical preponderance, these non-literary borrowings have received less sustained attention from critics of Latin literature, both ancient and modern, than their patrician counterparts. Nevertheless, they constituted a valuable expressive resource that Latin poets regularly drew upon to connect their verse with the contemporary world around them, to shock their audience out of moral complacency, and to characterize the speakers in their poems. Horace provides a powerful example in his attack on the senator Tillius and his sordid retinue in *Satires* 1.6. Contrasting his own modest life as a *scriba quaestorius* with that of a politically ambitious man, Horace mordantly addresses Tillius, who has risen to high public office despite being an *ignotus* of unknown origins (*S.* 1.6.107–11):

> obiciet nemo sordis mihi, quas tibi, Tilli,
> cum Tiburte via praetorem quinque sequuntur
> te pueri lasanum portantes oenophorumque.
> hoc ego commodius quam tu, praeclare senator,
> milibus atque aliis vivo.
>
> No one will accuse me, Tillius, of meanness, as they do you, when on the road to Tibur, though praetor, you have as your retinue five slaves carrying your chamber-pot and your wine-jar. In this, my life is more comfortable than yours, great senator, and in countless other ways too. (transl. Brown)

The passage, which begins in an elevated tone (e.g., the poetic *Tiburte via* in place of the ordinary *via Tibertina*), quickly becomes a savage parody of the high style. The cadence of the third line, which contains a polysyllabic word (four or more syllables) in the final position (*oenophorumque*) is a type with strong literary associations. Such polysyllabic

clausulae are relatively common in Greek hexameters and in Catullus's most elevated and Hellenized works, the epyllion on the marriage of Peleus and Thetis (*c*. 64) and his rendering of Callimachus's *Coma Berenices* (*c*. 66), where they often appear in conjunction with resonant Greek proper names.[1] Virgil, perhaps wishing to avoid a "neoteric" affectation, employed polysyllabic cadences only with Greek words or with special significance (e.g., Verg. *A.* 4.99 *pactosque hymenaeos*). Though the movement of Horace's hexameter recalls the stateliness of Catullus's "neoteric" style, its content sharply undercuts any impression of grace or polish. Instead of a resonant, mythological name, one finds two Greek borrowings with rather mundane, if not disreputable, associations: *lasanum* (< λάσανον), an ordinary word for "chamber-pot", and *oenophorum* (< οἰνοφόρον), a variety of large wine-jar. In contrast to the more common native word for "chamber-pot", *matella*, which occurs in neutral contexts, such as medical treatises, the loanword *lasanum* appears to be markedly less formal and at times indecent.[2] Though *oenophorum* lacks the indecent associations of *lasanum*, its use is exclusively confined to prose and verse satire (Lucil. 139, Pers. 5.140, Juv. 6.426, Mart.

[1] For discussions of abnormal line-endings in the hexameter include, see Winbolt (1903: 127–28) and Raven (1965: 101). Cairns (2006: 150–53) discusses polysyllabic words at the end of Catullus's hexameters and pentameters, arguing that such placement results from Greek metrical influence. On polysyllabic endings in Virgil, see Austin (1955) on *A.* 4.99.

[2] See Cavalca (2001: 103–4) on the borrowing *lasanum* and Blümner (1911: 147) on Roman chamber-pots in general. The three other occurrences of the borrowing illustrate its informal and possibly indecent character. Besides its presence here in Horace's *Satires*, the word occurs twice in the *Satyrica*, once spoken by the narrator Encolpius (*Trimalchio ad lasanum surrexit*, Petr. 41.9) and once spoken by Trimalchio during a passage which emphasizes his ἀηδία (*si quid plus quam crepitus centris venit, omnia foras parata sunt: aqua, lasani, et cetera minutalia*, Petr. 47.5). The final instance appears in the *Anthologia Latina* (205.13), where it serves as a direct insult: *lasanus es plenus* ("you're a full piss-pot").

6.89.6).[3] The loanword never occurs in the highest genres of Latin poetry, perhaps because over-sized wine jars are not the sort of thing one ordinarily encounters in epic, or because the associations of the word seemed too mercantile or mundane for serious verse. Both loanwords, therefore, belong to the class of words Axelson calls *unpoetische Wörter*, words characteristically excluded from elevated poetry. Their mundane register provides a humorous counterpoint to the elevation of Horace's hexameters and the diction of the proceeding lines.

One effect of this abrupt shift in register is to emphasize the satirist's scorn for Tillius's unseemly *équipage*. The Greek origin of these words emphasizes Tillius's meanness by activating a familiar nexus of associations between Greekness and "lowness" (*vilitas*) of a social, moral, and aesthetic kind. Livy gives concise expression to this view when he has the consul M.' Acilius Glabro (*cos*. 191 BC) revile Syrian and Asiatic Greeks as (Liv. 36.17.5) *vilissima genera hominum et servituti nata*.[4] The scornful use of Greek loanwords, usually from low or non-literary registers of speech, was a familiar technique from Roman oratory. For instance, Cicero expressed his contempt for Sextus Roscius's way of life by speaking indignantly about his Greek "samovar" (*authepsa illa*, Cic. *S. Rosc.* 133.5). The indignant use of Greek occurred already in the second century BC in the speeches of Scipio Aemilianus, a noted Hellenophile. His attack on P. Sulpicius Galus, delivered in 142 BC, contained a

[3] Hilgers (1969: 232–33) provides full citations and a technical description: *Trinkgefäß, eigentlich für Wein; im Reisegepäck; wird nach dem Leeren umgedreht.* According to Varro an *oenophorum* stood in the Temple of Liber (the *Aedes Cereris, Liberi, Liberaeque*?) as a symbol of wine (Var. *Ant.*. XVI fr. 225 Car.): *Liberi aede oenophorum sisteretur, quod significaret vinum*.

[4] On the association between Greeks and moral degeneracy, especially sexual indecency, see Petrochilos (1974: 48–51), Balsdon (1989: 31–38), and Williams (2010: 73–78).

crescendo of increasingly loathsome Greek loanwords (frg. 17 Malc.): *qui in conviviis adulescentulus cum amatore cum chirodyta tunica inferior accubuerit, qui non modo vinosus, sed virosus quoque sit, eumne quisquam dubitet, quin idem fecerit, quod cinaedi facere solent?* Latin satirists, including Lucilius, Horace, and Juvenal, made this technique their own.[5]

Furthermore, the relationship in Horace's satire between the polished form of these lines and their sordid content mirrors the contrast between Tillius's high political status (*praeclare senator*) and the meanness (*sordes*) of his lifestyle and origin. Both objects in effect become perversions of the emblems of power that typically accompanied a Roman magistrate. Tillius's chamber pot, on which he might sit in state, parodies the *sella curulis*, the folding chair used by curule magistrates and carried by his *servi publici*. Likewise, the *oenophorum*, associated with the worship of Bacchus, may be a satirical perversion of the sorting urn (*sitella* or *urna versatilis*), a symbol of the collegial ethos of the Roman Republic, which was used to settle a variety of political issues.[6] Whether Tillius is portrayed as a genuine Roman praetor or simply a provincial official with high airs—the word *praetor* is ambiguous—his behavior parodies that of a Roman magistrate.[7] Horace's shift from high to low register serves both to criticize and unmask

---

[5] On Greek and Greeks in Roman satire, see Rudd (1986: 162–92). Juvenal provides a particularly noteworthy sneer at Greek athletic practices (3.67–68): *rusticus ille tuus sumit trechedipna, Quirine, | et ceromatico fert niceteria collo* (3.67–68). On Juvenal's use of low language, see Urech (1999).

[6] Sortition and the *urna versatilis*, in which it was performed, were highly visible elements within the Republican political process; see Rosenstein (1995). Horace uses the image of an *urna versatilis* to portray the randomness of death (*C.* 2.3.25–27): *omnium versatur urna serius ocius*.

[7] Mark Toher's (2005) recent arguments for identifying Tillius with L. Tillius Cimber, one of Caesar's assassins, do not entirely resolve the historical difficulties this passage presents. It is worth emphasizing that the word *praetor* does not only refer to the Roman praetorship but to various non-Roman municipal offices and sometimes serves as a general synonym for *dux.* Of the seven occurrences of the

Tillius's behavior for what it is—mean and undignified. As we shall see, unmasking is a characteristic strategy in Horace's *Satires*, and it is one for which Greek vocabulary is well suited. The beauty of Greek, which was so important for the elevated vocabulary discussed in the previous chapter, could simultaneously be an object of moral suspicion.

Lasanum and *oenophorum* exemplify the kind of Greek borrowing of interest in this chapter: non-literary loanwords that belong to colloquial, technical, prosaic, obscene, or otherwise nonstandard registers of Latin. It is fitting that Horace blames Tillius for his *sordes*, since the same word provided ancient literary critics with one common term for describing undignified language: *sordida verba*. Borrowings of this sort remind us that from a Roman point of view Greek was not only the language of high culture—philosophical discourse, epic poetry, and Eastern monarchs—but simultaneously the language of commerce, the urban poor, and various professions, such as doctors and rhetoricians. A similar lexical contrast exists among Latin borrowings in English between words that are almost exclusively literary, such as "reboantic" and "irriguous", and ordinary or technical borrowings, such as "street" (< *strāta*) and "renal" (< *rēnālis*).[8] The contrast was far more potent for Latin speakers in the late Republic, who encountered both high and low manifestations of Greek culture on a daily basis. Examining sordid borrowings thus confronts the ambivalent position of Greek in Roman life and the ambivalent attitudes Romans adopted towards their Mediterranean neighbors. Some

---

word in Horace, three are used in this much wider sense (*S.* 1.5.34 of Aufidius Luscus, the *duumvir* of Fundi; *S.* 1.7.18 of Brutus, technically a propraetor; *Ep.* 2.2.34 as a synonym of *dux*). Horace may be playing on the literal meaning of the word: Tillius turns out to be someone who "goes before" (*prae* + *ire*) only in the limited, parodic sense that he precedes a retinue.

[8] On the use of "irriguous" in English literature, see Haynes (2004: 45–46).

loanwords, which possessed divergent "high" and "low" meanings, exhibit this ambivalence in an especially forceful way: for instance, *stomachus* (< στόμαχος), which will be discussed in greater detail below, ordinarily means "stomach" or "indignation" but in Latin epic (e.g., Verg. *A.* 9.699) refers strictly to the "esophagus", recalling its original Greek meaning.

1.2 CHAPTER OVERVIEW

After defining some essential terminology (e.g., "non-literary" and *sordida verba*), this chapter will identify three related aspects of non-literary borrowings that are highly significant for Horace's poetry: their low register, specificity of denotation, and relationship to particular forms of social identity. My aim is not to describe non-literary loanwords exhaustively, but to single out a few particular qualities—present in some of this vocabulary but not all of it—that Horace exploits for their expressive value. Each of these features arises from and is conditioned by the particular circumstances of Greco-Latin linguistic contact: the domains of language brought into in contact with each other, as well as the social relations of the participants in these exchanges.

One of the most prominent features of non-literary vocabulary is its low register. This characteristic allows Horace to produce striking and meaningful contrasts by juxtaposing high- and low-register vocabulary. The significance of these "low Greek words in high places" varies greatly according to context. For instance, a sudden drop in tone may imply a strong attitude on the part of the speaker, as when Horace sneers at Tillius' chamber pot (*lasanum*) and wine-jug (*oenophorum*). Or the non-literary word

may be an ironic understatement, as when Horace cuts Achilles's "wrath" (μῆνις) down to mere "irritation" (*C.* 1.6.6 *stomachus*). A disparity in register also has parodic potential, as when Horace turns Ulysses into the owner of a modern Roman villa with its own wine cellar (*apotheca*). Ancient critics called this technique *tapinosis* (< ταπείνωσις), by which elevated material is described with low vocabulary. Insightful juxtapositions between high and low registers of speech help Horace to expose, sometimes shockingly and sometimes humorously, contrasts between Greek and Roman, image and substance, poetry and reality.

Secondly, since many Greek words were borrowed to fill a semantic gap in Latin—often as part of a technical vocabulary—they may exhibit a high degree of technical specificity. For instance, while *libra* usually refers to scales in a general way, the Greek loanwords *trutina* and *statera* typically refer to particular kinds of scales.[9] While there are perfectly good Latin words for speaking about a book in general (e.g., *liber, codex, volumen*), Greek borrowings are necessary for talking in greater detail about specific parts of books (e.g., *collema, cylindrus*), their material (e.g., *charta, papyrus, pergamena*), and their typology (e.g., *palimpseston, macrocollum, charta hieratica*). Even when not part of a technical vocabulary in a strong sense, Greek borrowings often possess a documentary precision that everyday Latin vocabulary sometimes lacks. As a result, Greek loanwords play an important part in depicting the world vividly and relating a poem to the content of human experience. For instance, *Epodes* 9 uses several Greek

[9] On the difference between *libra* and Greek borrowings, such as *trutina*, see Biville (1994: 53). Langslow (2000) examines in greater detail the feature of technical language that I am calling "denotative specificity". According to him, it is a common feature of technical vocabularies, which tend to arrange their content in a hierarchical structure.

loanwords to convey a sense of the immediacy of Octavian's victory at Actium: *conopium*, referring to Egyptian mosquito-nets, and *nausea*, a specific word for sea-sickness. Horace exploits a similar feature of loanwords in the *Odes* to place the audience in the middle of a *convivium*, using relatively precise Greek words to speak about drinking equipment (*cantharus*, *cyathus*, *diota*, etc.). Words of this kind also appear throughout the *Satires*, particularly in passages where Horace speaks modestly about himself and his way of life (e.g., *S.* 1.6). Though he does so differently in different genres, throughout his poetry Horace exploits this feature in order to maintain a connection with ordinary experience.

Finally, non-literary loanwords relate to and express the identity of particular speakers within his poetry, both when Horace speaks *propria persona* and when he personifies separate characters, such as his slave Davus (*S.* 2.7). The capacity of loanwords to serve as a resource for characterization results from the close connection between individual loanwords and particular communities of speakers, such as members of various professions (magicians, grammarians, doctors) as well as people from certain classes (slaves and freedmen). Among the characters whom Horace personifies in this way are doctors (e.g., the medical practitioner at *S.* 2.3.142–57), slaves (e.g., Davus in *S.* 2.7), and witches (e.g., Canidia and her coven in *Epod.* 5). Borrowings that are coded for identity also serve as useful terms of abuse, such as when Horace mocks Hermogenes' professional status by telling him to cry among his pupils' chairs (*S.* 1.10.91 *cathedrae*), using a Greek word associated with the education of women and children. Much of

Horace's Greek sympotic vocabulary (e.g., *barbitos*, *cithara*, *lyra*, etc.) may be understood in a similar light, as a means of constructing a lyric persona.

2. Preliminary Definitions

2.1 NON-LITERARY LANGUAGE

In a letter to his friend L. Papirius Paetus, Cicero defended his habit of using "plebeian language" (*sermo plebeius*) and "everyday vocabulary" (*cottidiana verba*) in his correspondence (*Fam.* 9.21.1):

> Qua re nihil tibi opus est illud a Trabea, sed potius ἀπότευγμα meum. verum tamen quid tibi ego videor in epistulis? nonne plebeio sermone agere tecum? nec enim semper eodem modo. quid enim simile habet epistula aut iudicio aut contioni? quin ipsa iudicia non solemus omnia tractare uno modo. privatas causas et eas tenuis agimus subtilius, capitis aut famae scilicet ornatius. epistulas vero cottidianis verbis texere solemus.
>
> So you don't need that quotation from Trabea. The 'miss' was rather mine. But tell me now, how do you find me as a letter writer? Don't I deal with you in colloquial style? The fact is that one's style has to vary. A letter is one thing, a court of law or a public meeting quite another. Even for the courts we don't have just one style. In pleading civil cases, unimportant ones, we put on no frills, whereas cases involving status or reputation naturally get something more elaborate. As for letters, we weave them out of the language of everyday. (transl. Shackleton Bailey)

While the passage is often cited for the light it throws on ancient epistolary style, it is sometimes forgotten that Cicero's defense of ordinary language was partly prompted by his use of a Greek word for "failure" (ἀπότευγμα). The presence of Greek characters in the manuscript tradition for this passage suggests that ἀπότευγμα is not an integrated borrowing into Latin but rather an instance of code-switching. Nevertheless, it is telling that Cicero here associates Greek with the low and informal end of the stylistic spectrum. The enormous influx of Eastern slaves during the last two centuries of the Republic

meant that Greek was commonly the language of the lowest members in Rome's social hierarchy: slaves, freedmen, and their offspring.[10] At the same time, Rome's political dominance in the Eastern Mediterranean opened new avenues for linguistic and cultural exchange between Rome's urban *plebs* and Hellenistic culture.[11] Roman legionaries who were stationed in Greek-speaking areas, such as the 8,800 soldiers quartered in Tarentum and Sicily in 225 BC (Plb. 2.24.13), may have acquired enough knowledge of the language to have appreciated Plautus's bilingual puns.[12] At a slightly more elevated social level, Italian *negotatiores*, who settled eastern Mediterranean ports (e.g., Delos), served as both commercial and linguistic vectors, facilitating the flow of Greek into the language of business (e.g., *danista* "moneylender", *teloneum* "customs post") and wares sold. Foreign-born Greeks also predominated in many professions that became common in Rome, not always to the censors' approval: for instance, rhetoricians, architects, musicians, jewelers, cooks, pastry chefs, and other *ministeria vitiorum*.[13] All these factors contributed both to the marked Hellenization of varieties of Latin that were regarded as colloquial, technical, or non-standard, and to the moral backlash against Greek culture.

One way of describing such diverse varieties of language is to call them "non-literary", which emphasizes their overall exclusion from the most elevated and formal

---

[10] See Kaimio (1979: 20–25) on Rome's Greek-speaking population and Adams (2003: 761–62) on the linguistic consequences of Roman slavery. Biville (1995: 423–30) contrasts two main channels through which Greek entered Latin, the *tradition savante* and the *langue vulgaire*.

[11] Horsfall (2003: 48–53) surveys the contribution of Hellenization to the "culture of the Roman plebs".

[12] On the Greek knowledge of Plautus's audience, see Fraenkel (2007) and Fontaine (2009).

[13] Kaimio (1979: 189–94) surveys the "everyday" use of Greek in Rome. On foreigners and language in Rome, see Noy (2000: 169–175). De Meo (2005) discusses technical registers of Latin, noting Greek influence throughout; Langslow's study (2000: 76–139) assesses the contribution of Greek to medical Latin.

linguistic contexts. In the case of Latin, "non-literary" means being generally absent from classical epic (Virgil, Lucan, Ovid, Statius, Valerius Flaccus, and Silius Italicus), regarded as the highest and most dignified form of literary composition. This reflects a general feature of literary Latin: that the most elevated registers of poetry and prose were often distinguished by a pronounced aversion to ordinary, technical, and obscene language. A similar tendency is apparent in many languages and poetic traditions. For instance, an eighteenth-century neoclassical poet such as Dryden might avoid using "marjoram" in his translation of the *Aeneid* and a critic such as Johnson might fault Shakespeare for using the word "blanket" in *Macbeth*.[14] It is important to emphasize that the distinction between literary and non-literary vocabulary was not absolute but varied considerably by writer, genre, and period. For instance, Seneca the Elder drew attention to the fashion among some contemporary rhetoricians for shunning vocabulary that was once considered acceptable (e.g., Cicero's description of Verres dressed *cum pallio purpureo tunicaque talari muliercula*, Cic. *Ver*. 2.5.86).[15] Despite these changes in fashion, one of the most effective tests for determining whether a Latin word was non-literary remains the method employed by Bertil Axelson in his study of "un-poetic words" in Latin literature (*Unpoetische Wörter*, 1945). A word or construction absent from classical epic (e.g., *lasanum*, *oenophorum*) is likely to belong to a low, informal, or professional register of Latin. Nevertheless, the Axelson test cannot replace a careful

[14] On English neo-classical diction, see Haynes (2001). Davies (1992) studies purity in English poetic diction more generally.

[15] See Fairweather (1980: 190–97).

examination of context and lexical history for reasons that are considered more fully below.

According to the definition used here, "non-literary" Latin is not a single variety of speech, but a cover term that refers to a diverse and overlapping set of registers and sociolects (e.g., colloquial, prosaic, informal, vulgar, technical, substandard, obscene) that for different reasons were felt to be inappropriate for serious literary expression. "Register" here refers to the stylistic variation one finds within a given text that is determined not by a speaker's identity (sociolectical variation), but by the context of utterance (the content discussed, the social environment, the relationship between speaker and audience, and so on).[16] For instance, to borrow an example from James Clackson, a doctor (who speaks an elite, educated variety of English) uses a technical medical register when speaking to his colleagues and a familiar register when chatting up a nurse. While the varieties and sub-varieties of register might be subdivided, registers are often classified by a basic binary distinction between high and low. High registers are characterized by formality, a tendency towards verbal elaboration and periphrasis, archaic or fossilized forms of speech, and the avoidance of certain kinds of anatomical and sexual content. By contrast, low registers tend to be colloquial, conversational, informal, direct and compendious in expression, and hospitable to slang and obscenity. The perception of low or high register is relative to the context of the utterance: for instance, what is marked as low or slangy in a formal speech may be unexceptional in a casual phone call. While the high–low distinction is often a useful descriptive tool, it is worth noting that

[16] On the notion of register applied to Latin, see Clackson (2010).

powerful writing can sometimes resist classification along binary lines. Agrippa appears to have expressed a stylistic paradox of this kind when he faulted Virgil for his affectation (*cacozelia*), calling him a *novae cacozeliae repertorem, non tumidae nec exilis sed ex communibus verbis atque ideo latentis*.[17] To put it in more positive terms, one might say that Virgil has created an utterly plain version of the sublime.

2.2 SORDIDA VERBA

To describe language that felt unsuitable for literary expression, ancient writers and rhetoricians sometimes employed the expression *sordida verba*.[18] The notion appears most fully developed in the work of Seneca the Elder and later rhetoricians, such as Quintilian, but its roots extend back to Aristotle and Hellenistic rhetorical theory. Writers emphasized three particular qualities that merited a word's exclusion from literature: obscenity, an association with everyday material existence, and excessive technicality. Quintilian puts his finger on just these qualities in his chapter on the stylistic virtue of *perspicuitas* (*Inst.* 8.2.2): *nam et obscena vitabimus et sordida et humilia*. Essential to such a view was the notion of linguistic propriety (*decorum*, τὸ πρέπον), which dictated that one's style must match both the content and the audience. The poetaster Eumolpus in Petronius's *Satyrica* also gives concise expression to this attitude when he declares (Petr. 118.4): *refugiendum est ab omni ut ita dicam vilitate et sumendae voces a plebe*

[17] On Agrippa's criticism of Virgil, see Wilkinson (1959), Jocelyn (1979), and Görler (*Enc. virg.* s.v. *cacozelia*).

[18] Ancient discussions of "low" speech (*sordida verba, verba humilia, vilitas*, εὐτελὴ ὀνόματα) include: Arist. *Rh.* 3.6–7; *Rhet. ad Her*. 4.18, Sen. *Contr.* 1.2.23; Quint. *Inst.* 8.2.1–2, Longin. 43. On ancient concepts of non-literary language, see Lebek (1970: 201–3); Fairweather (1980: 191–97); Russell (1964) on Longin. 43; Kaster (1995) on Suet. *Gramm.* 30.2; Müller (2001: 152) on *humilia verba*; Ferri and Probert (2010); and Maltby (2011).

submotae. Fittingly, Eumolpus proceeds immediately to quote a popular Horation tag to exemplify the dignity of high poetry: (*C.* 3.1.1) *odi profanum vulgus et arceo*. Avoidance of *sordida verba* also extended to formal prose, the perfect instance of which may be Tacitus's refusal literally "to call a spade a spade"; instead of using the word *ligo*, Tacitus terms it "an implement by which earth is dug and turf is cut."[19]

2.3 AXELSON'S *UNPOETISCHE WÖRTER*

The most systematic and controversial study of non-literary language in Latin literature was Bertil Axelson's *Unpoetische Wörter* (1945), which touched off a valuable discussion about the nature of the Latin vocabulary and the hierarchy of ancient genres.[20] Influenced by the Lund school of aesthetics, Axelson sought systematically to identify a class of Latin vocabulary he labeled *unpoetisch*, based entirely on its statistical absence from classical epic. Early responses to Axelson, especially by Ernout (originally published in 1947), criticized his notion of non-literary language as overly schematic and insufficiently attentive to context. Gordon Williams took this criticism further, arguing that Latin poetic diction was determined far more by its actual subject matter than by its position within a putative hierarchy of genres. Patricia Watson has cautiously vindicated Axelson's method, showing that genre clearly influences word choice in the case of some well-documented literary and non-literary word groups.

---

[19] Tacitus writes (*Ann*. 1.65.10): *amissa magna ex parte per quae egeritur humus aut exciditur caespes*. On this passage, see Kaster (1995) on Suet. *Gram.* 30.2 and Griffin (1985: 38). The introduction of this expression into English is apparently owed to Erasmus's *Adagia* (1515), which popularized a mistaken translation of Plutarch's *Apophthegmata Laconica* (178b τὴν σκάφην σκάφην λέγοντας "to call a wash-tub a 'wash-tub'").

[20] Important responses to Axelson (1945) include: Ernout (1957), Williams (1968: 743–50), Wilkinson (1959), Watson (1985), and Lyne (1989: 1–19).

Though Watson has emphasized the statistical accuracy of Axelson's work, Williams's discussion of poetic diction pointed to several important shortcomings in Axelson's method and overall approach. For Axelson, to be *unpoetisch* meant being absent from a given corpus of epic texts. Yet, as Williams rightly observed, the documented absence of a word from epic might result from many different factors that must be taken into consideration. For instance, a rare borrowing such as *ciborium* (< κιβώριον), a word that refers to an Egyptian drinking vessel shaped like a lotus leaf (e.g., Hor. *C.* 2.7.22), may be absent from epic simply because no epic hero had reason to encounter one. By contrast, a loanword such as *lasanum* that may be absent from epic for its positively vulgar connotations. There is, therefore, an important difference between identifying a word as "non-literary" in terms of its observed distribution and showing that it possessed a strong prosaic, colloquial, or technical stamp. At the same time, epic poetry is more receptive to lower registers of speech than Axelson allows: for instance, though *bracchium* is less elevated than its native counterpart *lacerta*, the former occurs more frequently in epic.[21] Similarly, though *gladius* is more "technical" than its high-register counterpart *ensis*, it is the word Lucan ordinarily uses to refer to the military-issue short sword, appropriately enough in a poem on Rome's civil wars.[22] One can put this criticism more succinctly with the aid of a distinction from the philosophy of science: the absence

[21] In the corpus of Latin epic (*Aeneid*, *Metamorphoses*, *Bellum Civile*, *Argonautica*, *Thebaid*, *Achilleid*, and *Punica*), *bracchium* occurs 143 times and *lacertus* 122 times. Strictly *lacertus* refers to the upper arm and *bracchium* (< βραχίων) to the forearm, but epic poets appear to have disregarded the semantic distinction. The lower register of *bracchium* is partly shown by its survival into proto-Romance (Sp. *brazo*, Ital. *braccio*, Rom. *brat*, Fr. *bras*). See Bonfante (1994: 46–47) on the register of *bracchium*.

[22] On the distribution of *gladius*, see Watson (1985: 437–38). Bramble (1982: 541–42) uses *gladius* as an effective example to illustrate the phenomenon of Lucan's avoidance of "poeticism and ornament".

of a word from epic is not the *explanans*, a causal explanation, but rather the *explanandum*, the phenomenon that needs to be explained. Thus, while Axelson's test may help determine the register of a word, it is only the start of an inquiry that must take into account a word's distribution, semantic range, and development over time.

More recently, R. O. A. M. Lyne in his study of Virgil's diction offered a further set of distinctions that may help to describe non-literary language more precisely.[23] Instead of defining non-literary language in binary opposition to poetic diction, Lyne draws a tripartite distinction between colloquialisms, prosaic words, and neutral words. While a colloquialism (e.g., *basium*) was usually limited to everyday conversation, a prosaism (e.g., *gladius*) is also commonly occurred in what Lyne terms "business" prose, such as agricultural treatises or legal documents, to distinguish it from oratory and historiography. By contrast, neutral words, such as *panis*, were equally at home in the highest and lowest ends of the stylistic spectrum. Although the sources for recovering colloquial Latin are quite meager, one gets some sense for the flavor of spoken language from Plautus (especially his *senarii*), the epigrams of Catullus and Martial, Cicero's letters, Petronius's *Satyrica*, and documentary texts.

While Greek is a substantial presence within colloquial, informal, and technical varieties of Latin, its foreign origin is often irrelevant to interpretation. For instance, in a conversational passage from the *Epistles*, Horace addresses Maecenas in ordinary language that recalls Cicero's *sermo plebeius* (*Ep.* 1.1.92–94):

---

[23] See Lyne (1989: 7–13).

ride: mutat cenacula, lectos,
balnea, tonsores; conducto navigio aeque
nauseat ac locuples, quem ducit priva triremis.

> What a laugh! He changes garrets beds, baths, barbers; he's sick in his hired boat as the rich man who has bought the yacht that sails him. (transl. MacLeod)

Both loanwords in this passage are non-literary according to Axelson's test: *balnea* (< βαλινεῖον) and *nauseat* (< ναυσία). Nevertheless, their foreign origin is not an active part of the passage's meaning. By contrast, Horace sometimes draws attention to the Greek origin or a non-literary construction, whether to disparage it as foreign or to emphasize the distinction between Greek and Roman. For example, when Horace criticizes the Roman youth of his day for dicing and playing hoops instead of hunting and horseback-riding, he emphasizes the Greek nature of these activities (*C.* 3.24.57): *seu Graeco iubeas trocho*. Though *trochus*, an exercise hoop, is a non-literary borrowing (< τρόχος) that has been integrated into Latin phonology, the adjective *Graecus* reminds us that the word, no less than the practice it denotes, is a dangerous import. To distinguish between loanwords that are self-consciously Greek in a given context, such as *trochus*, and loanwords that are not, such as *balnea*, we can call the former *Fremdwörter*.

It is important to emphasize, however, that this property depends wholly on the context of use. In the case of *trochus*, Horace draws attention to its foreignness by the argumentative context in which the word is placed, where the contrast between native and foreign is highly relevant. There are, in addition, several other means by which Horace reinvests familiar, integrated borrowings with a sense of their foreignness: for instance, by pointedly juxtaposing native and foreign synonyms (e.g., *amphora* vs. *urceus* at *AP* 21–22; *astra* vs. *sidus* at *Ep.* 17.41), employing its original Greek meaning (e.g., *hora*

"season" < ὥρα at *C.* 1.12.16), attaching foreign or hybridized inflectional morphology (e.g., *heroă* at *C.* 1.12.1), "correcting" its prosody or gender (e.g., *cўcnus* at *C.* 4.2.25; *lyncă̆s* masc. at *C.* 2.13.40), placing it in a Grecizing metrical context (e.g., *oenophorum* in the metrical clausula at *S.* 1.6.109). While some of the non-literary loanwords to be examined below place their Greek origin at issue in this way (e.g., *stomachus, apotheca, diota*), many others do not (e.g., *charta, machina, polypus, laganum*, etc.). Since the aim of this essay is to illuminate how bilingual contact enriched Latin literary expression in general, both types of loanwords will receive attention.

2.4 NON-LITERARY LANGUAGE IN HORACE'S *ODES*

One of Axelson's most interesting findings involved the presence of non-literary vocabulary in Horace's *Odes*, to which he devoted an entire chapter ("Zur Wortwahl des Odendichters Horaz"). Axelson cited the noun *praesidium*, in the second line of Horace's first ode (*o et praesidium et dulce decus meum, C.* 1.1.2), as a representative instance. Though the word occurs three additional times in Horace's *Odes* (*C.* 1.15.13; 2.1.13; 3.29.62), unlike its synonyms (*tutela*, *auxilium*) it is wholly absent from epic aside from a single occurrence in a late book of the *Aeneid* (*ei mihi quantum | praesidium, Ausonia, et quantum tu perdis, Iule*, Verg. *A.* 11.57–68). For Axelson, the occurrence of words of this sort and, indeed, entire stanzas that could be transposed into prose without much change or rearrangement (e.g., *C.* 4.9.45–50), was evidence for a certain failure of taste

(*Schwunglosigkeit*) in Horace's lyrics.[24] The conversational manner, which Horace mastered so well in his *Satires*, seemed to return inappropriately in the *Odes*, bringing them at times uncomfortably close to versified prose.

Though Axelson's judgment may seem surprising, other readers have also expressed disappointment with this feature of the *Odes*. No less accomplished a poet than Goethe faulted Horace for his, ". . . furchtbaren Realität, ohne alle eigentliche Poesie, besonders in den Oden."[25] Wilamowitz's well-known disparagement for Horace's Soracte Ode echoes this sentiment: "hübsche Verse aber noch kein Gedicht." If we look past the disappointment and the Romantic expectations, these remarks disclose an important kernel of perception about Horace's poetry and point to a critical challenge that has not been fully addressed. Non-literary language and the reality it represents sometimes impinge on the *Odes* in ways that may seem deliberately shocking and contrary to the elevation his lyrics aim to maintain. These collisions are characteristic not only of the *Odes*, but of the *Satires*, where it is less surprising to find lower varieties of speech. While this chapter addresses only one aspect to Horace's non-literary language—its interaction with Greek—doing so can throw light on Horace's relationship to non-literary language in general.

Horace's relationship to non-literary Latin has been the subject of much investigation over the last century. Several monographs have been devoted to the topic:

---

[24] For instance, commenting on Hor. *C.* 4.9.45–50, Axelson wrote (1945: 112), "Verse wie die obigen, wo auch einzelne prosaische Wörter wie Meltau über einem an sich nicht eben lyrischen Zusammenhang lagern, sind einigermassen typisch für die ziemlich oft hervortretende Schwunglosigkeit des Odendichters Horaz." Lyne (1989: 4–7) offers a perceptive stylistic reappraisal of this stanza.

[25] Goethe's remark was recorded by the scholar Friedrich Wilhelm Riemer in August/September 1806 (Herwig 1965–1987: 2.130–31). On Goethe's view of Horace, see Dönt (1966) and Schindel (1984).

Friedrich Ruckdeschel's *Archaismen und Vulgarismen in der Sprache des Horaz* (1910), Jean Bourciez's *Le 'sermo cotidianus' dans les Satires d'Horace* (1927), and Giulio Bonfante's *La lingua parlata in Orazio* (1994; orig. publ. 1936–1937). Building on these works, Licinia Ricottilli has expanded her entry in the *Enciclopedia Oraziana* (s.v. *lingua del'uso*) into an appendix that appears in her Italian translation of J. B. Hofmann's *Lateinische Umgangssprache* (2003). Several noteworthy essays have also treated various components of Horace's non-literary usage or its presence in particular poems: Elena Zacchilli's study of colloquial Greek in the *Satires* (1988–1989); Johannes Müller-Lancé's investigation of colloquial language in *Satires* 2.5 (1992); and Richard Thomas's recent discussion of *Satires* 1.5 (2010). The study of colloquial and non-literary Latin in general has received fresh impetus from the recent collection of studies assembled by Eleanor Dickey and Anna Chahoud (2010). Though the contribution of Greek to these registers has rarely been studied on its own, it contributed significantly to many of the non-literary registers on which Horace drew. In what follows, I propose to survey three valuable uses to which Horace put such non-literary Greek.

3. Lexical Contrast: Low Words in High Places

3.1 *TAPINOSIS*: ACHILLES'S FIERCE *STOMACHUS*

As the example of Tillius's *lasanum* showed, the collision between high and low registers of speech was a powerful technique for generating emphasis and meaning. Ancient

grammarians called this effect, or one particular variety of it, *tapinosis* (ταπείνωσις).[26] Charisius, who provides the most succinct explanation, defined it as (Char. 357.19 B.) *rei magnae humilis expositio*. The term was well known already to Quintilian (*Inst.* 8.3.48) and appears frequently in late antique commentaries to Terence, Virgil, and Horace.[27] Strictly speaking, the term only applied to cases that demonstrated a contrast between language and content; however, in practice, the term was often used whenever there was a contrast between language and the prevailing stylistic register. Non-literary Greek, while not the only lexical source of *tapinosis*, provided Horace with one valuable means of creating such juxtapositions. The particular associations of Greek, such as with *vilitas* or *nequitia*, add an additional charge of significance. Because of the ambivalent position of Greek culture, these contrasts sometimes juxtapose two different sense of what it means to be Greek, both a high literary form and a low and undignified view.

The textbook example of *tapinosis*, cited by the grammarians Charisius and Diomedes, comes from Horace's ode to Agrippa (*C.* 1.6), in which the poet declines to write a martial epic in honor of Agrippa and the Augustan regime. The *recusatio* provides Horace an opportunity to demonstrate how weighty Homeric themes appear when adapted to a lyric style. The poem's success depends on achieving two seemingly opposed ends: on the one hand, it needs to showcase Horace's ability to handle epic

[26] On *tapinosis* as a figure of speech, see *Enc. Virg.* (s.v. *tapinosis*), Lausberg (1998: 469) and Schindel (2000). Other ancient definitions include: Quintilian (*qua rei magnitudo vel dignitas minuitur*, *Inst.* 8.3.48), Sacerdos (*GL* 6.454.15), Diomedes (*GL* 1.450.27), Donatus (659.8–12 Holtz), Pompeius (*GL* 6.292.27), and Isidore (*Orig.* 1.34.11). For the commentators' conception of linguistic register, see Norden (1957: 115n1) and Maltby (2011).

[27] For instance, see Donatus (Ter. *Eun.* 274), Servius (*E.* 6.76; *A.* 1.118, 465; 2.20, 46, 482; 3.197, 624; 8.242; 10.763), Porphyrio (*Ep.* 1.17.49), and ps.-Acro (*Ep.* 1.15.28).

content; on the other, it must substantiate Horace's refusal by showing why such a treatment would be unsuitable for Agrippa and the *princeps*. Enumerating the kinds of poetry he is unable to compose, Horace alludes in quick succession to the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and Varius's recent *Thyestes* (*C.* 1.6.5–9):

> nos, Agrippa, neque haec dicere nec gravem
> Pelidae stomachum cedere nescii
> nec cursus duplicis per mare Ulixei,
> nec saevam Pelopis domum
>
> I do not attempt, Agrippa, any more than the deadly pique of Peleus's son who was incapable of giving way, or the deceitful Ulysses and his journeys over the sea, or the inhuman house of Pelops. (transl. adapted from Rudd)

In a show of metrical virtuosity, Horace has translated and adapted the famous proemium of each epic to fit his Asclepiadic verses. Three words from the first line of the *Iliad* (μῆνιν . . . Πηληιάδεω Ἀχιλλῆος) have become *gravem Pelidae stomachum cedere nescii*, while the opening epithet of the *Odyssey* (ἄνδρα . . . πολύτροπον) has been transmuted into *duplicis Ulixei*. Each translation offers a lyric corrective to an idealized view of these heroes: Achilles's "wrath" (μῆνις) has weakened into mere "pique" (*stomachus*); similarly, Ulysses's many-sided cleverness (πολύτροπος) has been reduced to "deceitfulness" (*duplex*). Several epic touches lend this stanza stylistic heft, such as the invocation of Achilles's patronymic (*Pelidae*), the ornamental epithet *cedere nescii*, and the highly involved word order.

In this elevated context, the loanword *stomachus* with its low register feels jarringly out of place, as Charisius and others have recognized. Like many borrowings, the word came to differ semantically in Latin from its foreign source. In Greek the word

στόμαχος appears almost exclusively in an anatomical sense: originally the throat or esophagus, but also the neck of the bladder, the orifice of the stomach, and later the stomach itself.[28] Though the Latin borrowing retains the anatomical sense "esophagus" in some technical contexts (e.g., Celsus, Pliny), in ordinary usage *stomachus* refers either to the stomach or, more commonly, to feelings of displeasure, irritation, and disgust that were associated with digestion. The extended sense "irritation" is especially common in informal discourse; for instance, it is one of Cicero's favorite terms for speaking about political disagreements in his correspondence.[29] The near total absence of it and any of its derivatives (e.g., *stomachor, stomachosus*) from Latin epic is further evidence of its low register.[30] The single Virgilian instance (*aera per tenerum stomachoque infixa sub altum | pectus abit*, *A.* 9.699–700) is the exception that proves the rule: Virgil avoids the word's ordinary sense ("irritation"), perhaps because it seemed insufficiently elevated, and instead recuperates its original meaning ("esophagus"), thereby reproducing with greater fidelity the carnage of a Homeric battle scene.[31] Thus, to a Latin audience the word presented two distinct valences: a learned, Grecizing variant ("esophagus"), sometimes acceptable in high poetry, and an ordinary, colloquial sense ("stomach" or "irritation").

---

[28] On the meaning and register of *stomachus*, see Gourevitch (1976, 1977) and Hoffer (2007). A few late attestations contain the metaphorical meaning "anger" (e.g., *POxy* 533.14 ii/iii AD), probably influenced by Latin.

[29] See Hoffer (2007).

[30] Neither *stomachus* nor any derivatives appear in the extant epic poems by Naevius, Ennius, Lucan, Ovid, Statius, and Silius Italicus. Aside from the single occurrence in the *Aeneid* (9.699), Valerius Flaccus uses the word in a combat scene, where it is difficult to determine whether he means "stomach" or "esophagus" (*qua stomachi secreta*, V. Fl. 3.200).

[31] See Adams (1980: 54) and Gourevitch (1976: 87), who agree that Virgil refers to the esophagus.

Of the twelve occurrences of this word in Horace, ten refer anatomically to the stomach and two have the extended sense "irritation" (*C.* 1.6.6; *S.* 2.7.44).

By calling his wrath *stomachus*, Horace brings Achilles abruptly down from his Homeric heights to a realm of experience more ordinary and familiar. The unexpected drop in register serves to belittle two related targets. Most obviously, it depreciates Achilles himself, whose "irritation" appears distinctly ridiculous. Unlike μῆνις, which suits a hero, *stomachus* is an emotion for everyday folks; indeed, Cicero's frequent use of the term may suggest it is especially characteristic of informal political discourse. If this is so, Achilles's behavior begins to look rather more like that of a petty Republican politician from the recent past than an epic hero. The ode brings the heroic and the contemporary into unexpected and unflattering contact in other ways as well: for instance, Horace alludes to the difference between Homeric single combat and the realities of modern top-down warfare (*miles te duce*, 4). By recalling contemporary politics, the word *stomachus* briefly raises the specter of the recent Civil War, placing it and its main actors in the same unfavorable light as Achilles.

In addition to cutting Achilles himself down to size, the loanword *stomachus* also disparages the heroic code of honor on which Achilles's actions were based and which is wellspring for the plot of the *Iliad*. Whether the *Iliad* contains implicit criticism for such heroic conduct, as Adam Parry has claimed, or not, Horace certainly read the epic along such lines.[32] Describing his philosophical reading to Lollius in *Epistles* 1.2, Horace

[32] See Parry (1989).

explains the moral lessons to be drawn from the *Iliad*, specifically the dangers of excessive *ira* and its regrettable consequences for the Greeks (*Ep.* 1.2.11–14):

> Nestor componere litis
> inter Peliden festinat et inter Atriden;
> hunc amor, ira quidem communiter urit utrumque.
> quidquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi.
>
> Nestor tries busily to end the dispute of Peleus's with Atreus's son. Lust burns in the one, and rage in both. When kings rave, the people take the rap. (transl. MacLeod)

As Kießling and Heinze note, Horace's portrayal of the *Iliad* recalls Stoic interpretations of Homer, such as one finds in Maximus of Tyre (Max. Tyr. 25.5). According to this interpretation, Agamemnon and Achilles exemplify the dangers of uncontrolled emotion (εἰκόνες παθῶν), which the Stoics argued was a form of madness. Horace's use of the word *stomachus* thus hints at this moral reading of the poem by belittling anger as an emotion and refusing to grant it epic dignity.

Disparaging Achilles in this way also relates to the issue of genre, as Charles Ahern and others have noted.[33] Distancing himself from epic language not only underscores Horace's refusal to compose an "Agrippaid", it also helps him to refine his own lyric ethos in opposition to it. According to Ahern (1991), the rendering *stomachus* forms part of a pattern within the ode of awkward mistranslations, providing a practical demonstration of Horace's unsuitability to handle higher genres. David West (1995: 29) summarizes this line of reasoning: "This is the sort of mess I'd make of it if I tried to write an epic." Other such "mistakes" include: the rendering of Ulysses' epithet πολύτροπος as *duplex*; the slightly insulting epithet *cedere nescius* applied to Achilles

[33] See Ahern (1991) and West (1995: 29).

(6); the transformation of Mars's bronze into adamantine (13), which echoes Callimachus's version of Homer; and the apparent misidentification of Meriones (16).[34] Collectively these examples convey the *levitas* of Horace's lyrics in contrast to the *gravitas* of epic. Rather than seeing these as performative errors, however, it may be more productive to interpret them as deliberate corrections: attempts not merely to distance lyric from epic, but to subsume the latter within the purview of the former. As I have argued, Horace's *stomachus* lays claim to a deeper and more clear-sighted understanding of anger than is provided by the word μῆνις. Horace establishes this generic contrast in other ways as well: for instance, by contrasting the verb *scriberis*, the first word of the poem, which refers to public commemoration, with the verb *cantamus* (19) in the final stanza, where it evokes the private enjoyment of a lyric banquet.

3.2 ILLUSION VERSUS REALITY: LOVE, POLYPS, AND A DERRIÈRE

As the example of *tapinosis* just discussed shows, the juxtaposition of two different registers of speech helps to sharpen the contrast between several thematic concerns, such as between heroic behavior and contemporary life and between the genres of epic and lyric. In other instances of *tapinosis*, non-literary Greek represents reality in contrast to fantasy and illusion. In these cases, the sudden drop in tone resembles the way Horace uses low vocabulary to unmask Tillius's sordid behavior. Unmasking is a gesture especially characteristic of satire. Horace admiringly describes the way Lucilius dared to peel away people's skin (*S.* 2.1.62–65):

[34] Another error, if this is the right word for it, might be Horace's *imbellis lyrae* (10): as Horace well knew, Alcaeus used the lyre to treat military themes.

> . . . cum est Lucilius ausus
> primus in hunc operis componere carmine morem
> detrahere et pellem, nitidus qua quisque per ora
> cederet, introrsum turpis . . .
>
> When Lucilius dared first to compose poems of this kind, and to strip off the skin, in which each went sleekly groomed in public, while inwardly foul, . . . (transl. Muecke)

In this metaphor, the body and its insides are construed as more genuine, immediate, and morally pertinent than the deceptive surface that covers it. Non-literary Greek vocabulary, often associated with physicality and embodiment, are especially well suited to this endeavor.

The contrast between reality and fantasy is especially pertinent to Horace's treatment of erotic love. A relatively straightforward instance of *tapinosis* that works in this way occurs in *Satires* 1.2. Insisting that is important for a lover to inspect both the attractive features and the blemishes of his beloved with equal care, the satirist declares in the mode of a *praeceptor amoris* (*S.*1.2.90–93):

> . . . ne corporis optima Lyncei
> contemplere oculis, Hypsaea caecior illa
> quae mala sunt spectes: "o crus! o bracchia!" verum
> depugis, nasuta, brevi latere ac pede longo est.
>
> You mustn't scrutinize the best physical features with the eyes of a Lynceus, while turning a blinder eye than Hypsaea's on the blemishes. "What legs! What arms!" But she has no buttocks, a massive nose, a diminutive torso, and enormous feet. (transl. Brown)

In this passage, the lover's besotted exclamation (*o crus! o bracchia!*) and the satirist's sharp retort develop in divergent registers. The lover's language is conventional and idealized, suitable for Latin love elegy, and not particularly descriptive. Indeed, Horace appears to be parodying an epigram by Philodemus (*AP* 5.132), written, fittingly enough, in praise of his Oscan girlfriend. By contrast, Horace's retort is strikingly non-literary and

powerfully descriptive. The shift in tone results, above all, from the adjective *depugis* ("assless"), a hybrid compound of Greek and Latin components (*de* + πυγή) that occurs only here. Given the context, it is unlikely to be Horace's own coinage but rather a colloquial construction that reflects the bilingual nature of low registers.[35] Its frank sexualization of a woman's body also contrasts with the lover's relatively prudish fixation on arms and ankles. In this instance of *tapinosis,* the non-literary adjective represents a realistic, disillusioned view of the world in contrast to the forms of self-deception from which lovers typically suffer. In this respect, a lover's predicament resembles that of many other characters in the *Satires* who fail to see reality as it is.

Two additional instances of Greek *tapinosis* from the same satire further illustrate these dynamics. The first involves a humorous inversion of an epic tag from Ennius (*S.* 1.2.37–38):

> audire est operae pretium, procedere recte
> qui moechis rem voltis, ut omni parte laborent
>
> It's worthwhile to hearken, you who wish adultery to prosper, how they suffer at every turn . . .

Jean Le Clerc's emendation (*rem* for *non* in the MSS), accepted by Shackleton Bailey for his text, brings Horace's allusion more effectively in line with his Ennian source: *audire est operae pretium procedere recte* | *qui rem Romanam Latiumque augescere voltis* (Enn. *Ann.* 494–95 Sk.).[36] Turning its frame of reference inside out, Horace transforms it into

---

[35] On *depugis*, see Adams (2003: 150); on hybrid compounds in general, see Adams (2003: 418–24). Oksala (1953: 20) notes Plautus's use of hybrid coinages for comic effect (e.g., *contechnari, exballistare, pultiphagus, inanilogista*).

[36] On Ennian paradies and reminiscences in Horace's *Satires* (e.g., *S.* 1.2.32; 5.73), see Leich (1910).

an ironic exhortation to people who would like to see adultery prosper. The familiar loanword *moechus* (< μοιχός), which appears five times in Horace's poetry, appears not to have been particularly obscene. Yet, unlike native synonyms (e.g., *adulter*), it was clearly far beneath the decorum of Latin epic, where the word never appears. Horace thus produces a humorous mismatch between a verse of purest epic pedigree and a deeply un-poetic borrowing. As in the previous example, the non-literary Greek word seems to offer more direct contact with the content of ordinary experience than the epic register against which it is contrasted.

A similar type of lowering occurs near the end of the same satire. Advising his audience to avoid adultery with Roman matrons for the sake of their own health and safety, and to flee quickly if caught, Horace suggests this will be the only way for them to preserve their money, ass, and reputation (*S.* 1.2.132–33)

> discincta tunica fugiendum sit, pede nudo,
> ne nummi pereant aut puga aut denique fama.
>
> I have to take my heels barefoot and with my tunic undone, to esape the ruination of my finances, my ass, or at least my good name. (transl. Brown)

The two non-literary borrowings from Greek in this final line (*nummus* < νόμος (?); *puga* < πυγή) offer a frank assessment of the costs of being caught in adultery: money, buggery, and loss of reputation.[37] The register of *nummus* is non-literary, since epics avoid discussing money in the most direct language (*pecunia* or *nummus*). Similarly, the

[37] Valerius Maximus (6.1.13) provides examples of beatings, castration, and sexual assault inflicted on adulterers. The right of a husband to kill his wife *in flagranti delicto* and perhaps the adulterer as well was apparently not much exercised and formally withdrawn by the *Lex Iulia de adulteriis* of 18 BC. See Treggiari (1991: 270–85).

only other appearance of *puga* in Latin occurs in Atellan farce (Novius, *Atell.* 19 Ribb.). Like its Greek etymon, which was excluded from epic and high literature, the term is likely to have been vulgar and colloquial.[38] Nevertheless, since obscenities sometimes shift in tone across languages, it may be difficult to gauge its precise coloring in Latin: euphemistic (e.g., "derrière"), erotic (e.g., "nalgas"), medically precise (e.g., "nates" in English), or obscene (e.g., "ass"). Horace's use of the compound *depugis* (*S.* 1.2.93) in a colloquial context may suggest that the tone is similarly colloquial.

3.3 PAST VERSUS PRESENT: ULYSSES'S WINE-CELLAR

In other instances of *tapinosis*, a drop in tone can help juxtapose two opposed senses of what it means to be Greek: confronting an idealized vision of Hellenic culture with a street-level view of the realities of the *urbs Graeca*. Sometimes this contrast occurs within the scope of a single word, particularly a loanword that combines both a specialized, literary meaning, with a familiar, everyday sense or that has a meaning in Latin significantly different from the original Greek meaning (e.g., ἀποθήκη "storeroom" but *apotheca* "wine cellar"; ὀψώνιον "salary" but *opsonium* "victuals"). Or the contrast may result from an external disjunction between a word's register and some other feature of its linguistic context. The borrowing *oenophorum* exhibits this ambivalence to some degree: on a purely formal level, in terms of its phonology and metrical placement, the word evokes the highest registers of epic; by contrast its semantics bring it into contact with the sordid and the mundane. By bringing these two opposed manifestations of

[38] On the register of πυγή in Greek, see Wackernagel (1916) and Bain (2007: 44 with n17); on *puga* in Latin, see Adams (1982: 229).

Hellenism in touch with each other, the line expresses an abiding Roman discomfort about being Greek: beautiful on the outside but inwardly rotten. In the following examples, a similar productive tension is at work that raises for consideration the relationship between high Greek culture and low Greek culture, as well as the more general relationship between Greek and Roman identity.

Horace's satire on inheritance hunting (*S.* 2.5) powerfully dramatizes the tension between the remote world of Homeric epic and the sordid underside of contemporary Greek culture. On the surface the poem is a continuation of the epic dialogue between Ulysses and Tiresias in *Odyssey* 11. With his reference to *narrata* ("what has been said"), Ulysses's opening line attempts to establish a seamless verbal continuity with its Homeric antecedent. Their conversation in the *Satires*, however, takes a sharply un-heroic turn: Ulysses asks for Tiresias's advice in securing the inheritance of a rich benefactor (*captatio*, a much-maligned Roman practice).[39] Despite its remoteness in time and setting or perhaps because of it, the poem is able to engage critically with many facets of Roman life. The farce resembles a badly staged drama in which the Roman identities of the actors comically undercut their attempts to impersonate characters from Greek mythology. For instance, Ulysses mistakenly addresses Tiresias in Roman religious terms as a *vates* (6) and *augur* (22) rather than as a μάντις. Tiresias's prophecy, which occupies the center of the poem (23–57), mentions the existence of a crafty *scriba* (56), which may hint at Horace's own profession of *scriba quaestorius*. While the poem began by alluding to the *Odyssey*, the final lines portray the Underworld in unmistakably Roman terms (*S.*

[39] On the practice of *captatio*, see Champlin (1989: 87–97).

2.5.109–10): *sed me | imperiosa trahit Proserpina. vive valeque*. Persephone is not only called by her Latin name, *Proserpina*, but described as *imperiosa* in consular terms. In contrast to Tiresias's earlier address to Ulysses, which relied on the Greek patronymic (*Laertiade*, 59), he now bids him farewell with the wholly Latin collocation *vive valeque*.[40] This collision between heroic customs and ordinary Roman reality also plays out on the level of diction: the language of the satire vacillates between elevated, Grecizing locutions (e.g., the Greek vocative *Tiresiā* in line 1) and the mundane language of everyday life.

The *tapinosis* that best captures this ambivalence is the non-literary borrowing *apotheca*, which occurs close to the beginning of the satire. While Ulysses's response to Tiresias began in a suitably epic manner, his complaint becomes progressively lower in register and ends with a colloquial proverb (*S.* 2.5.5–8):

> O nulli quidquam mentite, vides ut
> nudus inopsque domum redeam te vate, neque illic
> aut apotheca procis intacta est aut pecus; atqui
> et genus et virtus nisi cum re vilior alga est.
>
> O you who have spoken false to no one, do you see how I'm returning home destitute and resourceless, according to your prediction, and there neither the wine-cellar nor the flock has been left untouched by the suitors? Yet both lineage and manliness (unless you have money to go with them) are worth less than seaweed. (transl. Muecke)

The absence of the borrowing *apotheca* from Latin epic is a sign of its low register.[41] As in the case of the loanword *stomachus*, the meaning of *apotheca* came to differ from its

[40] On *vive valeque* as a native valediction, see Poccetti (2010).

[41] On the register and meaning of *apotheca*, see Bonfante (1994: 97) and Zacchilli (1988–1989: 115–16). The survival of the word into Romance (It. *bottega*, Sp. *bodega*, Fr. *boutique*) attests its popular currency.

Greek original (ἀποθήκη). While ἀποθήκη had a wide range of meanings (e.g., "magazine", "burial-place", "storehouse"), in Latin the term referred to a specific architectural feature, the above-ground storeroom used for fumigating wine, distinct from the *cella vinaria*.[42] The word seems to transform Ulysses from a Homeric hero into an oenophile with a well-appointed Roman villa. Horace's audience is confronted by an interpretive choice: whether to take the word in its decorous, etymological sense ("storehouse"), or in the more amusing, but entirely un-epic, contemporary sense ("wine cellar"). This semantic disjunction presents the same ambivalence between high and low associations that Greek culture in general possessed. As a result, it neatly captures the tension, which has been charted throughout the satire, between Greek epic and Roman reality, between ethical ideal and actual practice.

4. Denotative Specificity

4.1 TECHNICAL LANGUAGE AND SPECIFICITY

Another prominent characteristic of non-literary loanwords is their capacity for precise and concrete denotation. Borrowings such as *hydrops*, *ciborium*, and *parochus* refer to specific objects: the condition of edema, a cup shaped like a lotus leaf, and public servants who re-supply the *cursus publicus*. In contrast, the available native synonyms to these words are far less precise (e.g., *morbus*, *poculum*, *portator*). In lexicographical terms, such loanwords are "hyponyms", words whose semantic field is included within

[42] The later meaning is eventually attested in a second century AD papyrus (*POxy*. 2729.31), recorded in the *LSJ* supplement (s.v. ἀποθήκη).

another, more general term, a “hypeornym”. Hyponyms are commonly found in technical vocabularies, such as the jargon of doctors and lawyers, where precise distinctions and the hierarchical ordering of objects are important (e.g., “metatarsus” vs. “bone”). Historical circumstances account for the abundance of Greek hyponyms in Latin. Prior to the success of Latin, Greek was the medium of Mediterranean trade and of various technical disciplines (e.g., medicine, architecture, philosophy). When Latin speakers encountered unfamiliar wares or technical concepts that lacked a corresponding *vox propria* in Latin, it was easy to borrow a word from Greek. Loanwords that fill a perceived lexical gap are sometimes called *mots nécessaires* to distinguish them from borrowings *de luxe*, where the semantics of the borrowed word largely overlap with a native equivalent (e.g., *pelagus* as a synonym *mare*). Because technical language was associated with low social standing, it was usually excluded from high literature. As a result, many technical borrowings fall within the class of non-literary vocabulary. While the last section examined non-literary vocabulary in terms of register—its ability to create meaningful stylistic contrasts—this section studies loanwords in terms of their denotative power. Whether because of their position within a technical vocabulary or some other circumstance of their borrowing, many Greek loanwords have a specificity and directness that is valuable for Latin poetry. The denotative force of many of these words enables Horace and other writers to sharpen the focus on a particular object, capture a telling detail, or portray some particularly vivid image.

4.2 REALISM: THE TRIP TO BRINDISI (*S.* 1.5)

By speaking about objects in the most specific terms, technical Greek borrowings connect a poem to the content of ordinary experience and anchor abstract reflection to concrete circumstances. Horace's *Satires* and *Epistles*, which are more welcoming to low registers of speech, provide many instances of this documentary effect. In a travel narrative such as Horace's *iter Brundisinum* (*S.* 1.5), lexical specificity helps to secure the audience's imaginative participation in the events as they unfold. The satire recounts Horace's trip to Brindisi in the spring of 37 BC in the entourage of Maecenas and the young Caesar, and it emphasizes the personal and autobiographical side of the journey at the expense of the public and the political.

Non-literary loanwords often provide a sense of familiarity and observed detail that is contrary to the tendency of high Latin literature to avoid the specific.[43] For instance, in a moment of studied intimacy, Horace depicts himself applying ointment, *collyrium*, to his eyes in order to treat an infection (*lippitudo*).[44] The medical term, a general word for any kind of salve, was originally borrowed from Greek (κολλύριον) and appears in Latin medical treatises (e.g., Cels. 5.28; Scrib. Larg. 19). Its matter-of-factness grounds Horace's condition in concrete reality and by means of its familiar tone closes the distance between speaker and audience. Other loanwords enliven the narrative of the journey with precise, local touches of color, such as the public servants, who equip their caravan with salt and kindling (*parochi*, 46), the fireplace of an local inn (*caminus*, 81),

[43] Kroll (1924) coined the phrase *die Unfähigkeit zur Beobachtung* to describe the tendency of elevated Latin literature to avoid certain kinds of observation.

[44] Horsfall (1995) discusses eye infections and poor vision in the ancient world.

and the kind of mime performed by the local buffoon (a *cyclops*-dance, 63). The relatively low, conversational register of these borrowings fits with the generally informal tone of the satire (e.g. the diminutives *villula*, 45, and *clitella*, 47).

The weight of all this detail counteracts an opposed tendency, also evident in the satire, to avoid the specific and mundane and escape into abstract reflection. One striking manifestation of escapism is the poem's total avoidance of politics, all the more remarkable given the political significance of the meeting at Brindisi between Octavian and Antony. In addition to its evasion of politics, the poem also avoids other unpleasant features of human existence. One example is Horace's humorously aloof description of the unpleasantness of food poisoning (7–8): *hic ego propter aqua, quod erat deterrima, ventri | indico bellum*. Horace's unexpected flight into Epicurean philosophy at the end of the poem provides the most extreme instance of this tendency (101): *namque deos didici securum agere aevum.* By contrast, specific vocabulary calls the reader back from these flights of fancy and idealization to more concrete and more pressing concerns. For instance, just as Horace begins to expound the philosophical virtues of friendship (*o qui complexus et gaudia quanta fuerunt!*, 43), his conjunctivitis intervenes to disrupt the pleasure of company (*namque pila lippis inimicum et ludere crudis*, 49). Similarly, Horace's Epicurean credo at the end of the poem is rudely interrupted by a supervening material circumstance. Horace has run out of writing material (104): *Brundisium longae finis chartaeque viaeque est*. Characteristically, the word that stands for the priority of materiality, *charta*, is an ordinary Greek loanword, borrowed from the Mediterranean book trade.

The documentary power of such loanwords, such as Horace's reference to *collyrium*, contributes to the sense many readers experience of coming into personal contact with the poet.[45] For some, such as Eduard Fraenkel, this this sense of intimacy constituted one of Horace's greatest artistic achievements, particularly in the *Satires*. Horace's own emphasis on autobiography in his readings, or mis-readings, of earlier poets lends some support to such a view. For instance, Horace compares Lucilius's mode of writing to the act of entrusting secrets to reliable friends (*S.* 2.1.30–31): *ille (Lucilius) velut fidis arcana sodalibus olim | credebat libris*. Non-literary borrowings support this self-revelatory element in several ways. Precise, technical vocabulary enables Horace to situate himself within his physical surroundings with a greater sense of fidelity. Medical language is especially valuable in this regard, as it helps to bring the poet's own physical body into his poetry. Low or demotic forms of speech promote a feeling of intimacy and informality, especially when self-description is involved.

Satires 1.6, which has often been read as an autobiographical coming-of-age poem, puts several of these features to use. Horace emphasizes the lowliness of his origins and the modesty of his equestrian lifestyle. Unlike overweening political upstarts, such as Tillius, whose failings have already been examined, Horace is at liberty to spend his days as he pleases and to enjoy a simple but satisfying dinner (*S.* 1.6.111–15):

> Quacumque libido est,
> incedo solus; percontor quanti holus ac far;

[45] See Gowers (2003) on Horatian autobiography.

fallacem Circum vespertinumque pererro
saepe Forum; assisto divinis; inde domum me
ad porri et ciceris refero laganique catinum.

I step out wherever I fancy, on my own; I enquire the price of vegetables and meal; I often wander through the trickster-thronged Circus and the Forum as evening descends; I stand next to the fortune-tellers; then I go back home to a dish of leek and pea minestrone. My meal is served by three slave-boys and a white marble slab has on it two cups with a ladle; next to them stands a cheap cruet and an oil-flask, with its saucer, of Campanian ware.

Several elevated touches maintain the overall dignity of this passage, such as the balanced noun-epithet combinations (*fallacem Circum, vespertinum Forum*). Nevertheless, the diction is rooted in the realities of everyday life. Several of the food items that Horace mentions are of possibly Greek origin and stand at a great distance from literary epic: for instance, *porrum* ("leek" < πράσον ?), *laganum* ("fried dough" < λάγανον), and *catinum* ("earthenware dish" < κοτύλη ?).[46] Ullman has argued that the three items of food that Horace mentions (*porrum, laganum, cicer*) are meant to be taken together as one dish: a form of minestrone, made of leaks, chickpeas, and macaroni.[47] Whatever the concoction, Porphyrio regarded *laganum* as a *vulgaris esca*, and the word survives in some southern Italian dialects and in modern Greek.[48] There are no attestations of the word before Horace, and the later usages show great variability in gender and quantity, suggesting a colloquial register. Other Greek loanwords in the satire produce a similar effect, such as *cyathus* (117), *echinus* (117), and *trigon* (126), which

[46] None of these words occur in Latin epic, as defined for the purposes of this chapter.

[47] On the meaning and register of *laganum*, see Ullman (1912) and Zacchilli (1988–1989: 130–31). Ps.-Acro (*S.* 1.6.115): *lagana sunt de siligine quaedam factae, quasi membranae compositae, quas cum piperi et liquimine cocunt et sic comedunt. Porph. ad loc: hanc escam vulgarem esse nemo est qui nesciat*. Isidore (*Orig.* 20.2.7) also defines the word: *laganum est latus et tenuis panis, qui primum in aqua postea in olio frigitur*.

[48] See Zacchilli (1988–1989: 131) for its presence in Italian dialect; for its use in modern Greek to refer to a kind of pastry, see Ullman (1912: 445).

belong to colloquial and prosaic registers of speech. While it would be misleading to call this a "realistic" or "objective" description of the way Horace spent his evenings, the low register and specificity of his diction gives privileged access to his lifestyle.

4.4 TECHNICAL LOANWORDS IN THE *ODES* AND *EPODES*

Though non-literary loanwords are less common in the *Odes* and *Epodes* than in the *Satires*, they perform a similar function there. Their liveliness and specificity connect the poems to particular contexts of utterance, provides a sense of unfolding action, and offsets abstract reflection by emphasizing the immediate surroundings at hand. For instance, much of Horace's "sympotic" vocabulary—the language of wine and song, such as *barbiton*, *cyathus*, and *diota*, which can be found throughout the *Odes*—is of Greek origin and serves a dual purpose. On the one hand, it connects Horace's lyric poetry to a tradition of Greek convivial poetry. On the other hand, as Jasper Griffin has emphasized, the language reflects the actual paraphernalia of an aristocratic Roman banquet and therefore draws the audience's attention to the performative context of Horace's *Odes*, whether real or imagined.[49] This language also serves an ethical function, reminding the audience to attend to what is immediately at hand and ignore the uncertain future.

These tendencies are already in evidence in *Epodes* 9, a poem whose treatment of Actium has been subject to much debate.[50] Readers have sharply disagreed about its geographical setting—whether it is staged in a Roman villa, on the Greek mainland, or at sea off the coast of Actium—and its timing in relation to the battle—whether it occurs

[49] See Griffin (1986: esp. 1–31).
[50] See Watson (2003: *ad loc.*) for these issues.

before, after, or during the naval engagement. Whatever the answers to these questions, the illusion of direct observation and the connection to an immediate sympotic context are essential to its overall effect. Several striking non-literary borrowings contribute to both these elements. For instance, to emphasize the shameful state of Antony's camp, Horace describes it in the following way (*Epod.* 9.11–16):

> Romanus, eheu (posteri negabitis),
> emancipatus feminae
> fert vallum et arma miles et spadonibus
> servire rugosis potest
> interque signa turpe militaria
> sol aspicit conopium.
>
> The shame of it! A Roman enslaved to a woman (you future generations will refuse to believe it) carries a stake and weapons, and in spite of being a soldier can bear to serve a lot of shrivelled eunuchs, while the sun gazes down on the degenerate mosquito net among the army's standards. (transl. Rudd)

Two non-literary loanwords provide telling details: *spado* (< σπάδων "eunuch") and *conopium* (< κωνωπεῖον, κωνώπιον "mosquito-netting"). Both words, which are absent from classical Latin epic perhaps because they are too technical or prosy, add descriptive force to the battle narrative and convey a sense of urgent disapproval.[51] The epithet *rugosus*, similarly absent from epic, adds an additional touch of visual detail, describing the eunuchs' wrinkled faces. The presence of netting (*conopium*), which Romans considered to be unmanly in a military context, may refer to the canopy protecting Cleopatra's tent or sedan chair or possibly those of her eunuchs. A pun on the name of the Egyptian city of Canopus (*Canōpus* Lat., Κάνωβος, Κάνωπος, Κανώπιον) emphasizes

[51] MacLeod (1982: 373) correctly observes that *spadonibus* and *conopium* are "exotic, but unpoetical" Grecisms.

its foreignness.[52] Watson has also provided another explanation for the presence of mosquito-netting. The area around Actium is marshy and there is evidence among later chroniclers that Antony's soldiers suffered from an outbreak of malaria before Actium.[53] Since the connection between mosquitos and malaria was suspected at in antiquity, it is not outside the realm of possibility that netting was a general protective measure to limit the spread of the illness. If so, Horace's reference to *conopium* provides documentary evidence about the state of Antony's camp that is otherwise unattested.

While these two borrowings establish Horace's credentials as an eyewitness to the battle, another loanword, *nausea*, situates the the poem at a sea-born symposium. Horace carefully avoids revealing the poem's setting until the last few verses, when he orders Caecuban wine to brought as a cure for his seasickness (*nausea*). The use of such a detail to fill in the context is a technique of Hellenistic poetry, sometimes called *Ergänzungsspiel*.[54] Although some critics, such as Eduard Fraenkel, have argued that the term might refer to any drinking-induced nausea, the word and its epithet *fluens* (denoting a class of diseases characterized by flux) are clearly drawn from medical jargon and have their their proper force here.[55]

---

[52] Horace has used an assimilated form of the noun (*cōnōpium*), with the original Greek diphthong -ει- shortened to -ĭ-, which gives more scope for the etymological pun than an unassimilated form. Walde–Hofmann (s.v. *conopium*) speculate that the Greek word may have originated from the town Κάνωπος and have been connected with κώνωψ "gnat" via folk etymology. It is typical of Juvenal's greater tolerance for Greek used the unassimilated *cōnōpēum* (6.80).

[53] Watson (2003: *ad loc.*) revisiting arguments from Watson's earlier essay on the epode (1987).

[54] See Bing (1995) on *Ergänzungsspiel* in the poetry of Callimachus; in Horace's work, the Archytas ode (*C.* 1.28) and the surprise ending of the Alfius epode (*Epod.* 2) come to mind.

[55] Despite Fraenkel (1957: 73–74), both Mankin (1995) and Watson (2003) agree that *nausea* puts Horace's symposium unambiguously aboard ship. They disagree, however, about the relationship of the epithet *fluens* to medical terminology. Watson, who generally minimizes the presence of colloquial language in the *Epodes*, argues that the usage is not strictly medical, but a metaphorical extension. Both

Loanwords also provide telling details throughout the *Odes*. For instance, describing the signs that mark the arrival of spring, Horace mentions the melting snow, the arrival of the Zephyr wind, and the use of winches to lower beached boats into the water (*C.* 1.4.1–4):

> Solvitur acris hiems grata vice veris et Favoni,
> trahuntque siccas machinae carinas,
> ac neque iam stabulis gaudet pecus aut arator igni,
> nec prata canis albicant pruinis.
>
> Sharp winter is loosening its grip as spring and the West Wind bring a welcome change; winches drag down the dry hulls; no longer now to the livestock enjoy the stall or the ploughman his fire. (transl. Rudd)

The loanword which Horace uses to name these hauling devices, *māchina* (< μαχανά Dor.), was an early borrowing from a southern Italic dialect of Greek and can be found in all registers of Latin. In epic, the word sometimes refers to siege weapons (e.g., Enn. *Ann.* 620 Sk.), including the Trojan Horse (e.g, Verg. *A.* 2.46), the siege weapon *par excellence*. Given its appearance in epic, the loanword does not count as un-poetic in Axelson's sense; it is closer to what Lyne calls a "neutral word", a word that can appear in any register.[56] However, this fact has not kept readers, such as R. G. G. Coleman, from accurately describing its register here as "workaday".[57] While the other harbingers of

---

views contain some truth: Horace, as often, brings technical language into his poetry, but in a way that enables us to perceive the full semantic range of the adjective *fluens*.

[56] There may be difficulties here with calling *machina* a "neutral word". The loanword is absent from Augustan elegy and rare in contemporary prose. Caesar and the *scriptores Caesariani* prefer derivatives such as *machinatio*. There may be a semantic divergence between its meaning in epic and prose that is difficult for modern readers to detect. As an instance of such a word, we might recall the English "engine". The term is the *vox propria* for a variety of familiar objects, such as a car engine. However, Milton gives the word epic heft by using it in a now obsolete sense, "a plot, a snare" (*Paradise Lost* 1.750 "Nor did he scape | By all his Engins"; see *OED* s.v. "engine" 2).

[57] See N–H on this passage and Coleman (1999: 64).

spring that Horace describes are rather general and not topographically localized, his reference to ship-hauling causes a Roman audience to recall a specific part of the city. Writing perhaps two centuries later, Minucius Felix casually assumes his readers' familiarity with the district in Ostia where ships were beached for winter.[58] Whether Horace has these banks in Ostia in mind or perhaps the Tiber docks closer to the city center, the detail effectively anchors the poem to a specific setting. Yet the detail is not so precisely described that it excludes readers who may be unfamiliar with the Roman cityscape. In this way, Horace attempts to balance a tension in the poem between an idealized, generic vision of spring, compatible with the best Greek poems on the topic (e.g., Alc. fr. 286 V., to which comparison is often made) and therefore universally recognizable, and an image of spring that is specifically Roman in its detail and resonance. This tension runs through the rest of the poem, for instance, in its counterbalancing of Greek and Roman deities (e.g., *Venus* vs. *Faunus*, *Mors* vs. *Pluto*).

Other Greek loanwords connect a particular poem with an immediate performative context in the same way that *nausea* situated *Epodes* 9 at a shipboard symposium. One of Horace's best odes, the Soracte ode (*C.* 1.9) provides an instance of this technique. Urging Thaliarchus not to succumb to anxiety, Horace reminds him of some practical necessities (*C.* 1.9.5–8):

> dissolve frigus ligna super foco
> large reponens atque benignius
> deprome quadrimum Sabina,

[58] Minucius Felix writes in the *Octavius* (Min. Fel. 3.5): *cum ad id loci ventum est ubi subductae naviculae substratis roboribus in terrena labe suspensae quiescebant, pueros videmus certatim gestientes testarum in mare iaculationibus ludere*.

o Thaliarche, merum diota.

> Thaw the cold by piling logs generously on the hearth, Thaliarchus, and serve the four-year-old wine more lavishly than usual from its Sabine jar. (transl. Rudd)

Several linguistic touches elevate the register of the passage, such as the adverbial use of *super* and the Hellenizing exclamation *o*.[59] Nevertheless, the loanword *diota* (< δίωτος "two-eared") points in a different direction. Although the word is virtually a *hapax legomenon* in Latin, occurring only here and in passages commenting on it (e.g., Porph. *ad loc.* and Isid. *Orig.* 6.26.13), it appears not to be a recent lexical arrival. In Greek δίωτος is a two-termination adjective ("two-eared") that describes several different ceramic vessel types (e.g., πίναξ δίωτος "two-eared pinax").[60] By contrast, Horace's *diota* has become a first-declension feminine noun, and the length of the first vowel has been shortened in hiatus (*diōta* < **dīōta* < δῑ̃ωτος). Such adaptations are especially characteristic of spoken, non-literary borrowings. In this case, the familiar register of *diota* offsets the elevation of the surrounding stanza and draws the audience's attention towards the banquet at hand. The immediate, sympotic context matters here, not merely to indicate the work's generic affiliation, but because it is at the center of the poem's ethical focus. The ode turns from large-scale and immutable truths—the burden of time, exemplified by snow-covered Mount Soratte—towards the modest sphere of human action, in which some measure of satisfaction can be found. Horace's intimate and informal *diota* represents this ethical concern for the immediate present in contrast to everything that lies beyond human control.

---

[59] On the high register of the vocative particle *o*, see Dickey (2002: 225–29).
[60] Hilgers (1969: 170) provides a description and bibliography.

For an example of the ways in which colloquial references to drinking vessels work in English poetry, it may be helpful to compare the first stanza of Housman's "The chestnut casts his flambeaux". The poem, published in Housman's *Last Poems* (1922), describes a beautiful spring ruined by May showers:

> The chestnut casts his flambeaux, and the flowers
> Stream from the hawthorn on the wind away,
> The doors clap to, the pane is blind with showers.
> Pass me the can, lad; there's an end of May.

The stanza moves from a generalized and objective description of May showers in the first distich to a depiction of that weather from an individual, focalized viewpoint in the second. This development reaches a crescendo in Housman's "Pass me the can, lad," which recurs as a refrain throughout the poem. Much like Horace's instructions to Thaliarchus, the direct address immediately situates the poem in a recognizable setting, and the colloquial register of "can" attests to the informality of the relationship between speaker and addressee. The effect focuses attention on the immediate context for human action as a response, inadequate though it may be, to loss and uncertainty.

References to Greek drinking vessels often serve a similar purpose throughout Horace's *Odes*, using an immediate, convivial setting to comment on, or even upstage, philosophical reflection. Their denotative power is not at odds with their literary resonance, which simultaneously connects them to a familiar lyric tradition.[61] For instance, when Horace invites Maecenas to a humble dinner, the low register of the

[61] The "literary" significance of drinking paraphernalia is well noted by Athenaeus, who devotes Book 11 of the *Deipnosophistae* to drinking vessels, and Macrobius (*Sat.* 5.21.1), who discusses Virgil's references to Greek vessels.

loanword *cantharus* contributes to the sense of modesty and familiarity (*C.* 1.20.1–2): *vile potabis modicis Sabinum* | *cantharis*. Such borrowings are deictic in a non-technical sense, insofar as they help to situate a poem in a familiar environment, and their specificity makes these passages more ethically compelling. The *Odes* contain a variety of Greek terms for drinking vessels, including *cadus* (*C.* 1.35.26; 2.7.20; 3.14.18; 15.16; 29.2; 4.11.2, 12.17), *cratera* (*C.* 3.18.7), *cyathus* (*C.* 1.29.8; 3.8.13; 19.12, 14), and *patera* (*C.* 1.19.15; 31.2; 4.8.1, 5.34). It is not only drinking vessels that serve this function, but references to other sympotic paraphernalia, most of whose names have naturally been borrowed from Greek. For instance, Horace's references to Greek musical instruments (e.g., *barbiton, cithara, chorda, lyra, plectrum, tympana*) remind the audience of an imagined musical setting.[62] Similarly, Horace mentions Greek unguents (e.g., *balanus*), flowers (e.g., *myrtus, philyra*), and the objects containing them (e.g., *concha*).[63] These "sybaritic details", as Coleman puts it, often provide descriptive and ethical weight to Horace's lyrical musings.[64]

5. Loanwords and Identity

A final category of non-literary loanwords to consider are words that are closely connected with particular forms of identity and, as a result, serve to characterize speakers

[62] On the imagined musical accompaniment to the *Odes*, see Rossi (2009) with references to earlier discussions. Occurrences of these words: *barbiton* (*C.* 1.1.34; 32.4; 3.26.4), *chorda* (*C.* 4.9.4), *cithara* (*C.* 1.15.15; 24.4; 31.20; 2.10.18; 12.4; 3.1.20; 4.4; 9.10; 15.14), *lyra* (*C.* 1.6.10; 10.6; 12.1; 21,12; 28.22; 38.2; 3.3.69; 28.11; 4.1.22; 3.23; 15.2), *plectrum* (*C.* 1.26.11; 2.1.40; 13.27; 4.2.33), and *tympana* (*C.* 1.18.14; 3.15.10).

[63] Occurrences of these words: *balanus* (*C.* 3.29.4), *myrtus* (*C.* 1.4.9; 25.18; 38.5, 7; 2.7.25; 15.6; 3.4.19; 23.16), *philyra* (*C.* 1.38.2), and *concha* (*C.* 2.7.23).

[64] See Coleman's (1999: 66) remarks on *balanus* (*C.* 3.29.4).

in a certain way: as having a certain background, social standing, or professional status. This is most apparent in Roman comedy, where Greek diction and code-switching often identified particular speakers as slaves or freedmen.[65] Though Horace used characterization with much greater restraint than comic playwrights, there are striking instances in his poetry where language helps to reveal a speaker's identity. For instance, Everard Flintoff has shown how Ofellus's (*S.* 2.2) status as a *rusticus* is emphasized by borrowings of language and metrical effects from Virgil's *Eclogues*.[66] Nicholas Horsfall has detected colloquial tinges in the language of Volteius Mena, an urban prole who is recruited to aristocratic service in *Epistles* 1.7.[67] The cry of the boatmen in the Pomptine Marshes (*ōhĕ* | *iam*!, *S.* 1.5.13–14) as they heave Horace's luggage onto the ferry, though a conventional expression, may also relate to their low-class origin.[68]

This final section considers three types of identity revealed by an association with Greek borrowings: doctors, slaves, and witches. Each is typified by the speech of characters in Horace's poetry who speak with their own voice: the language of an anonymous doctor in *Satires* 2.3, the lengthy diatribe of Horace's slave Davus in *Satires* 2.7, and the speech of Canidia in *Epodes* 5. Since Horace's extended impersonations occur most often in his hexametric poetry, the evidence for characterization is mostly drawn from there. As often in Latin literature, these attempts at linguistic characterization

---

[65] On linguistic characterization in Roman comedy, especially through Greek diction, see Adams (1984), Petersmann (1995, 2003), and Jocelyn (1999).

[66] Flintoff (1973) studies Ofellus's linguistic and metrical characterization. Metrical techniques also provide characterization in the Catius satire (*S.* 2.4); see Nilsson (1952: 189–90).

[67] On non-literary elements in *Satires* 2.3, see Horsfall's commentary (1993).

[68] The conventional cry *ohe iam*, deriving from Greek (*ὄhĕ* < ὠή) which Horace uses twice, seems to typify low-class types in Roman comedy and may relate to ancient work songs. The second occurrence is in the mouth of Tiresias (*S.* 2.5.96), whose heroic identity is parodied by the workaday imprecation.

are not transcriptions of live speech, but rather stylized imitations in which a few revealing phrases carry most of the weight.

Practitioners of ancient medicine, who spoke either Greek or a Latin jargon saturated with Greek borrowings, provided a fertile ground for imitation and parody.[69] Horace showed a close acquaintance with the language of ancient medicine, drawing on it for bold metaphors (e.g., *dirus hydrops*, *C.* 2.2.13) and descriptions. He may also have been on familiar terms with Antonius Musa, the personal physician of Augustus, whose care saved the *princeps* during his near-fatal illness in 23 BC.[70] A clear instance of characterization through Greek borrowings occurs in the language of an anonymous doctor in *Satires* 2.3. The anecdote concerns a miser, Opimius, who has taken to his bed with a case of "lethargy" (*lethargus*). Much to the excitement of his heirs, the illness threatens to prove fatal. However, his canny doctors order bags of Opimius's cash to be dumped and counted nearby, which succeeds in resuscitating him. After warning him that death would put his wealth at risk, one of the physicians prescribes a simple and inexpensive course of treatment to restore his health (*S.* 2.3.153–57):

> "deficient inopem venae te, ni cibus atque
> ingens accedit stomachus fultura ruenti.
> tu cessas? agedum, sume hoc tisanarium oryzae."
> "quanti emptae?" "parvo." "quanti ergo?" "octussibus." "eheu!
> quid refert morbo an furtis pereamque rapinis?"
>
> "You are weak and your blood-supply will fail you unless the strong buttressing of food is applied to your stomach, which is collapsing. You hesitate? Come on, down with this rice gruel." "How

[69] On Latin medical language, see Langslow (2000); on medical language in Latin literature, see especially the studies of Mazzini (1988, 1991).

[70] Horace mentions him in the *Epistles* (*Ep.* 1.15.3). On Antonius Musa, see Langslow (2000: 67–68).

much did the rice cost?" "Not much. "How much then?" "Eightpence." "Alas! What difference if I'm destroyed by sickness or theft and pillage?" (transl. Muecke)

The doctor's language involves genuine medical terminology (e.g., *venae, inops, stomachus, fultura*). Perhaps the most telling phrase, though, is *tisanarium oryzae* ("rice porridge"), essentially, a hearty meal to help Opimius recover his strength. Rice, a rare commodity imported from India, was known mainly for its use in medicine as an easily digestible substance.[71] The word, which derives from Iranian via Greek (< ὄρυζα), is rare until later Latin and mainly appears in prose.[72] The doctor's excessively Grecizing and technical language conceals the obviousness and simplicity of the medical advice ("take two aspirin and call me in the morning"). Commentators, disagreeing over the meaning of (*p*)*tisanārium*—whether it refers to a vessel in which barley is prepared (Porphyrio, *TLL*) or functions as a synonym for "barley" or "porridge" (K–H, Lejay)—have perhaps missed the point.[73] The word, which occurs only in this passage and in direct citations of it, appears to be a Horatian coinage based on (*p*)*tisana* (< πτισανή "barley") and either the Latin suffix *-ārium* or a Greek diminutive -ἄριον. The suffix appears to be chosen not because it conveys any precise content, but rather because of its semantic opacity and the hint of technical abstraction.[74]

What brings Opimius back to health, it turns out, is not the treatment itself, but his reaction to the cost of his porridge: eight *asses*, a relative pittance (about half a day-

[71] See Muecke (1993: *ad loc.*).

[72] On the eastern Iranian origin of the Greek ὄρυζα (< Iran. **u̯rinĵi-* and **u̯riĵi-*), see Brust (2005: 494–98).

[73] See Zacchilli (1988–1989:103)

[74] As Muecke (1993: *ad loc.*) notes, the diminutive -αριον is common in medical texts, though the form is not attested in Greek.

laborer's daily wage), but a high price to pay for his "oryzivorous barleyfication", at least from the point of view of a miser. The joke here comes partly at the expense of the stinginess of Opimius, who recovers not through medical treatment but a case of sticker-shock. At the same time, Horace pokes fun at the medical profession and their habitual forms of expression, which enable them to obfuscate an obvious remedy, disguise their ignorance in a show of verbiage, and make a profit from it all. These are also familiar features in later medical satire, exemplified by the Bachelerius in Molière's play *Le Malade imaginaire*, who answers all the questions put to him during his degree examination with the response, "Clysterium donare, Postea seignare, Ensuitta purgare."[75]

Like doctors, slaves were another class of speakers popularly associated with the use of Greek. Especially after the Macedonian Wars in the second century BC, many slaves in Roman households were native speakers of Greek.[76] Even when they learned Latin and gained their freedom, their first language continued to influence their speech. Horace puts this association to use in characterizing his own slave Davus, who, in accordance with the topsy-turvy freedom of the Saturnalia, is granted the right to speak his mind in *Satires* 2.7. While Davus' language is generally elegant and correct, a few unusual turns of phrase reveal his Greek origins. Greek loanwords occur often in his speech, such as *cheragra* (15), *phimus* (17), *drachmus* (43), *stomachus* (44), *moechus* (72), *talenta* (89), and *obsonia* (106). While Horace ordinarily speaks about monetary value in Roman terms (e.g., *sestertia* at *Ep.* 1.7.80; 2.2.33), Davus exclusively uses the

[75] On humor directed at medical Latin in European literature, see Haynes (2003: 26).
[76] See n10 above.

language of Greek currency (*drachmis*, *talenta*). In the most striking of these instances, Davus names his own initial price at auction (*quid si me stultior ipso | quingentis empto drachmis deprenderis?*, 42–43), which suggests that he passed through an Eastern slave market. The references to Greek currency are significant because they relate to a convention in Latin comedy: Greek characters ordinarily speak about value in Greek terms, presumably to indicate their foreign identity and to distance *comoedia palliata* from everyday life.

More amusingly, Davus' origins may also be revealed by means of a pair of sexual malapropisms based on Greek vocabulary. At one point Davus uses the verb *meio* ("piss") as a synonym for *futuo* (*S.* 2.7.51–52): *ne | ditior aut formae melioris meiat eodem*. While verbs of urination occasionally have a sexual sense ("ejaculate") in both Greek and Latin, Davus's *meiat* makes best sense as a calque on the verb ὀμείχω.[77] The verb refers both to urination and to the action of a μοιχός ("adulterer"), an agent-noun derived from it. Davus may have thought he was using an ordinary Latin verb for sexual intercourse, as he would have been doing with Greek ὀμείχω, and instead rather haplessly produced an image that expresses his scorn more effectively. A second instance involves his use of the word *cauda* ("tail") to mean "penis". Though "tail" may seem to be an obvious sexual metaphor for the male genitals, in Latin *cauda* is never used this way beyond this single occurrence. In Davus's case, its meaning appears to be a calque on ordinary Greek sexual terminology (οὐρά and κέρκος).[78] While these calques may be

[77] On the sexual connotations of *meio*, see Adams (1982: 142).
[78] Adams (1982: 36–37).

polite and learned ways of avoiding primary obscenity (ironic in a poem about unrestrained speech), I suspect they were heard as humorous deformations of Latin by a speaker whose native language was Greek.

While characterization often works through direct speech, it can also occur through a kind of focalization. Such focalizing devices occur in Horace's portrayal of the witch Canidia, who appears in the *Epodes* (3, 5) and the *Satires* (1.8). Witches were associated with Greek because of their status on the margins of society and because the terminology of magic and pharmacology was dominated by Greek. In addition, Horace locates the activity of Canidia and her coven in Naples, a city where Greek retained its dominance well into the fourth century AD.[79] Even though Canidia appears to be a Roman matron, her monologue in *Epodes* 5 reveal several Grecizing touches. For instance, she appears to use *adulter* as a calque on μοιχός (57) and she employs *fallo* with a supplementary participle (*fallat . . renati*, 68), a characteristic syntactic Grecism. When the coven returns in *Satires* 1.8, the goddesses to whom these women pray are named with Greek terminations (33): *Hecaten vocat altera | altera Tisiphonen*. Though the names do not occur in direct speech, their Greek morphology indirectly suggests the foreign character of their prayers. Furthermore, the women are given Greek hairstyles in both poems: Sagana's "bristle cut" is compared to a sea urchin (*echinus* < ἐχῖνος, *Epod.* 5.27–28) and later she wears a wig (*caliendrum* < καλίενδρον, *S.* 1.8.48). By describing her hair with non-literary borrowings, Horace associates Sagana unflatteringly with the

[79] On the preservation of Greek in Naples, see Kaimio (1979: 70–72) and Leiwo (1995).

sordid side of Greek culture. The unusual prosody of the name *Săgăna* (< *sāga* "witch" + -ᾰνος?) may itself be a hybrid formation.[80]

In conclusion, non-literary Greek—borrowings not ordinarily found in epic—consists of a diverse family of registers and sociolects. In Horace's poetry this hodgepodge includes the informal language of the *convivium* (e.g., *diota, barbiton*), professional jargon (e.g., *rhetor, tisanarium oryzae*), and sexual obscenities (e.g., *puga*). Though non-literary borrowings are most characteristic of Horace's *Satires*, which come closest to ordinary speech (*S.* 1.4.42 *sermoni propiora*), they are used for striking effect throughout his poetry. Among their various functions, three in particular have been singled out. Juxtaposed with more elevated registers of speech, non-literary Greek can produce meaningful contrasts (*tapinosis*), such as between Achilles's epic pedigree and his ordinary *stomachus*. Non-literary borrowings, especially from technical registers, contribute denotative power to Horace's poems, connecting them to the content of experience and serving as ethical reminders. Finally, such words provide a means of characterizing various speakers, including doctors, slaves, and witches.

[80] The quantities of these vowels are surprising. The second short -*a*- suggests that the suffix was not the native -*ānus* but rather the imported -αvος with a short alpha (Mankin 1995: *ad loc*.).

Chapter 3

Verbis Felicissime Audax: Horace's Syntactic Grecisms

1. Overview

While the previous two chapters examined manifestations of the Greek language within the domain of Horace's lexicon, the present chapter investigates the presence of Greek within Horace's syntax—in other words, its effect on the relationship between words. For instance, when Horace praises Maecenas for his bilingual learning, the use of a retained accusative, more typical of Greek than Latin syntax, mirrors the content of the praise (*C.* 3.8.11): *docte Maecenas sermones utriusque linguae* ("Maecenas, learned at talk in either tongue"). The retained accusative (*sermones*) momentarily reduces the linguistic gap between Latin and Greek and establishes a rapport between speaker and addressee based on the recognition of shared bilingual expertise.[1] Moreover, the foreign turn of speech shifts the meaning of the surrounding words: *doctus* is no longer a conventional epithet ("expert") but, as ancient grammarians observed, regains its participial force ("learned") by governing an accusative.[2] It also opens up additional possibilities of bilingual play: in this Grecizing context the word *sermones* glances at the title of Maecenas' collection of Latin dialogues, the *Dialogi*, and *doceo* resembles a calque on διδάσκω (*OLD* s.v. *doceo*

[1] The construction is an example of a "parallel Grecism", as described below: a native Latin construction, usually avoided in classical prose, whose appearance in poetry was encouraged by a Greek parallel. When made passive, verbs that govern two accusatives (e.g., *doceo, posco, rogo*) occasionally "retain" one of the accusatives as an object. Gellius (15.14) describes two similar instances of retained accusatives after passive verbs as imitations of Greek usage. Citations of Grecisms will be keyed to Appendix 1 (App.) below; on retained accusatives, see App. 1.1.1.

[2] Prisc. (GL 3.217.16): *"doctus grammaticam" participium est, "doceor" enim grammaticam dicimus.*

5 “to produce a play, etc.”), which hints at a secondary interpretation (“Maecenas, you who have produced the *Dialogi*”).

Syntactic interference of this sort, which is a hallmark of Horace’s poetry, occurs in the speech of bilingual speakers when the syntax of their first language (L^1) imposes itself on that of their second language (L^2) or vice versa. For instance, a native French speaker might construct a sentence such as “I am in Princeton since three weeks,” in which the English (L^2) present tense erroneously follows French (L^1) usage (*je suis à Princeton depuis trois semaines*). The sentence also contains an example of *lexical* interference, which may help illustrate the sometimes elusive difference between syntax and lexicon: “since” is serving as an equivalent to the French *depuis*. While the most arresting forms of interference are often the transitory result of imperfect language learning, as the example shows, subtler forms of interference persist in the speech of more accomplished bilinguals. For reasons that are often not well understood, sustained interference between two languages may lead ultimately to syntactic integration and long-term transformations in the syntax and typology of a language, as happened to Middle English with changes in word order and tense usage under French influence.[3]

While linguists typically study interference in the everyday speech of bilinguals and language-learners in order to shed light on deep syntactic constraints that underlie each language, the phenomenon also occurs in highly wrought literary artifacts, where its motivation and significance can differ considerably. In English literature, for instance, the

[3] See, for instance, Fischer (1992: 242–45) on the adoption of the historical present in Middle English under French influence. Thomason (2001: 86–87) offers examples of contact-induced syntactic change, such as the addition of new cases to Lithuanian under Uralic influence, new mood categories (presuppositional, inferential) in northern Tajik dialects under Uzbek influence, and so on. Appel and Muysken (1987: 153–63) survey the factors affecting contact-induced syntactic change.

language of Milton's *Paradise Lost* and Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* represent two different extremes of interference put to literary ends.[4] Milton's "Babylonish dialect", which combines Hebraisms, Latinisms, and Grecisms, has been a stumbling block for many of its readers, including the poet Samuel Butler and F. R. Leavis, who faulted creations such as the following (*PL* 9.791–92):

> Greedily she ingorg'd without restraint,
> And knew not eating Death.

The participial construction is modeled on the Greek use of participles with verbs of knowing and perceiving (ἤσθετο ἐμπεσών), in which the participle provides the content of the perception ("knew not *that* she was eating death"). Though Milton's use of Greek is an extreme example of interference, other Latinisms have become familiar features of English poetic diction, such as the "there are whom . . ." construction, in which the antecedent of the relative pronoun is dropped in imitation of classical practice (*sunt qui* . . ., εἰσὶν οἳ . . .). As Kenneth Haynes has documented, the Latinism was first rendered into English in George Turberville's translations of Mantuan's *Eclogues* (1567) and was subsequently popularized in the eighteenth century, especially in imitation of Horace.[5] Examples are found in Alexander Pope's *Essay on Criticism* ("There are whom heav'n has blessed with store of wit. . .", 80) and Kipling's "translation" of *Odes* 5.1 ("There are whose study is of smells, | and to attentive schools rehearse | How something mixed with something else | Makes something worse.").[6]

---

[4] Haynes (2004: 78–82) discusses the role of linguistic interference in Milton and Joyce.
[5] Haynes (2004: 90–103).
[6] Godley (1922: 3).

The aim of this chapter is to show how similar linguistic phenomena in Horace's poetry, which are often given inadequate attention in commentaries and criticism, work as meaningful parts of a poem. While such syntactic Grecisms, as they are often called, are present in all Augustan poetry, Horace has acquired a greater reputation for syntactic audacity, especially in his *Odes*. Joseph Addison, for instance, believed Horace surpassed Virgil in this regard, claiming that, "Virgil is full of the Greek Forms of Speech, which the Criticks call Hellenisms, as Horace in his *Odes* abounds with them much more than Virgil."[7] A "distinguished Horace specialist" has turned it into a principle of Horatian hermeneutics: if you don't understand his Latin, translate it literally into Greek.[8] Nevertheless, such a striking feature of Horace's language—if it is indeed as striking as his reputation suggests—is sometimes treated as if it were an inert feature of his literary medium, part of the background rather than the foreground of his language. In such treatments it is difficult to recognize the poet whom Quintilian regarded as *verbis felicissime audax* (*Inst.* 10.1.97) and whose Grecisms he singled out for attention.

To help restore this feature of Horace's poetry to critical attention, the chapter aims both to survey the presence of syntactic Grecisms throughout Horace's poetry and to zero in on some valuable expressive functions they perform. While Grecisms are by definition Greek in origin (leaving aside the issue of hyper-Grecisms), some actively constitute a foreign allusion and others do not. Among those that do allude, many occur

---

[7] *Spectator* (2.85, 2.6 January 1712). J. W. Mackail expresses a similar judgment in his description of Horace's lyric style (1923: 46): "His audacities—if one cares to call them so—in the use of epithet, in Greek constructions (which he uses rather more freely than any other Latin poet), and in allusive turns of phrase, are all carefully calculated and precisely measured." The judgment likely derives from Quintilian's assessment of Horace's Grecisms (*Inst.* 9.3.17): *ex Graeco vero tralata vel Sallusti plurima, quale est:* [*vulgus*] *"amat fieri," vel Horati, nam id maxime probat: "nec ciceris nec longae invidit avenae."*

[8] Mentioned in by passing by Horsfall (1995: 229).

in Horace's direct translations from Greek, where the syntactic interference maintains a sense of foreign presence. For instance, when Horace translates an Alcaic motto (μηδὲν ἄλλο φυτεύσῃς δένδρεον ἀμπέλω, Alc. fr. 342 V.), his language preserves the Greek aspect by his use of a perfect subjunctive: *Nullam, Vare, sacra vite prius severis arborem* (*C.* 1.18.1). Instead of fully domesticating Alcaeus into Latin, the syntactic aberration marks both manner and content as foreign. The effect resembles the use of Latinisms in English literature to evoke a classical presence, such as when Ben Jonson dons his Roman toga to address his friend, the antiquary William Camden: "Camden, most reverend head, ..." What sounds unusual in English ("reverend head") establishes a close connection with classical content and manner (e.g., *cari capitis*, Hor. *C.* 1.24.2; *Il.* 8.281, *Od.* 1.343; Ὦ κοινὸν αὐτάδελφον Ἰσμήνης κάρα, Soph. *Ant.* 1).[9]

Even without constituting foreign allusions, Grecisms also provide a way of elevating language to distinguish it from ordinary registers of speech. Merely by differing from ordinary norms of the language, syntactic interference, in Addison's words, "throws it out of Prose." As will be shown, Horace employs Grecisms of this sort not only for formal and generic reasons, but also to enliven his speech and enlarge its semantic range, an effect described in his famous advice on *callidae iuncturae*: *dixeris egregie, notum si callida verbum*| *reddiderit iunctura novum* (*AP* 47–48). Horace turns theory into practice in the following lines of the *Ars Poetica* by transforming the ordinary *invideo* into the passive *invideor* on analogy with φθονοῦμαι (*AP* 56). The compression and syntactic density that Grecisms produce occasionally provides a mimetic mirror for the content it

[9] Carne-Ross (2010: 24–25) discusses the afterlife of this construction, an example of a Grecism borrowed into English via Latin.

describes, such as the *Wortknoten* that describes Lyde's hairstyle (*C*. 2.11.23–4): *incomptum Lacaenae | more comam religata nodum*.

Before exploring the role of syntactic interference in Horace's poetry, however, it is necessary first to address some of the linguistic and conceptual difficulties that have arisen in connection with the term "Grecism"—in this chapter used interchangeably with "syntactic interference from Greek." While the term has been widespread in classical scholarship since the Renaissance, variation in usage has made it an unwieldy tool for literary criticism. Roland Mayer has even proposed that the term should be discarded as anachronistic and replaced by terminology drawn from the toolbox of ancient grammar (e.g., *figura Graeca, hellenismos*).[10] Two related difficulties must be addressed: first the linguistic challenge of identifying syntactic interference and distinguishing it from related phenomena (archaisms, colloquialisms, etc.), which is particularly hard to do in the case of ancient languages; and secondly the critical challenge of assessing how such constructions sound and feel in particular literary contexts.

Confronting these issues first, Section 2 of this chapter distinguishes three varieties of Grecism that are relevant for assessing syntactic interference in Horace and in Latin literature more generally: direct Grecisms, where the interfering syntax is entirely foreign (e.g., the accusative of reference *saucius pectus*, the nominative-with-infinitive construction *navium ait celerrimus*); parallel Grecisms, where foreign interference overlaps with a native, but non-standard, construction (e.g., the dative of motion towards *egerit Orco*, the use of the perfect infinitive with an aspectual sense *curat tetigisse*); and apparent Grecisms, entirely native constructions that may seem Greek in a Hellenizing

[10] See Mayer (1999).

context (e.g., the particle *o* to introduce a vocative, hypotaxis in *Du-* or *Er-Stil*). While there are evidentiary problems in identifying and distinguishing all three varieties of Grecism, the first two can be exhaustively catalogued within Horace's poetry. This procedure furnishes the evidence, provided in Appendix 1, for the survey of Horace's Grecisms in Section 2.2 and the discussion of particular functions of Grecism that concludes the chapter in Section 3. By combining recent work in linguistics with literary sensitivity, it is hoped that a thorough treatment of the matter will not only shed light on their significance in Horace, but provide a model for treating similar linguistic features elsewhere in Latin literature.

2. Varieties of Grecism

2.1 LITERARY INTERFERENCE: PROBLEMS AND PRINCIPLES

Greek has left evidence of its extensive influence on Latin syntax at all periods of their contact. Even archaic Latin, though the full extent of influence has been a matter of sharp disagreement, bears witness to its influence: the participial system, for instance, underwent early and extensive remodeling in relation to Greek syntax.[11] While some syntactic interference was transitory and confined to individual idiolects, such as in the letters of the Greek-speaking soldier Claudius Terentianus, other forms of interference

[11] On the Greek influence on Latin participial function, see Wackernagel (2009: 360, 365–56), Laughton (1964: 43–45). Dubuisson (1985) and Poccetti et al. (1999), following Giorgio Pasquali, consider early Latin syntax to have been deeply transformed by archaic contact with Greek. Given the difficulty of establishing long-term syntactic influence in much better documented periods, these claims remain conjectural.

became integrated over time.[12] Several of the changes to Latin syntax that characterize the Romance languages are likely the result of such long-term Greek influence, such as the development of the article.[13] This influence is apparent at both elite and sub-elite levels of the language: for instance, in non-standard Latin one finds such forms of interference as the *genetivus temporis* and the genitive of exclamation.[14]

The language of Latin literature was especially susceptible to the influence of Greek syntax.[15] Interference of this sort—for instance, the accusative of respect (e.g., *nuda genu*, Verg. *A.* 1.320) and the dative with verbs of fighting (e.g., *noli pugnare duobus*, Catul. 62.64)—has been known and recognized since antiquity. Some of the earliest examples can already be documented in Ennius' *Annales* and his tragedies, such as the retained accusative with a verb in the middle voice (e.g., *succincti corda machaeris*, Enn. *Ann.* 519 Sk.) and an incipient accusative of respect (e.g., *fossari corpora telis*, Enn. *Ann.* 583 Sk.).[16] In addition to creating a socially exclusive poetry, which was based on elite bilingual training, such effects served various formal and expressive ends: they demonstrated Latin's credentials as a literary medium on the model

---

[12] Adams (2003: 496–497), for instance, discusses idiolectical Grecisms in the Latin of Anthimus, a Greek doctor in Italy (e.g., *est quando* ~ ἔστιν ὅτε), and Claudius Terentianus (e.g., *factum est* with dative + infinitive).

[13] See Coleman (1975: 117), supplemented by Adams (2003: 518–19) on the development of the article in Romance under Greek pressure. Calboli (2009: 114–21) offers qualifications. Löfstedt (1959: 88–119) surveys Greek influence on late Latin.

[14] Adams (2003: 497–520) surveys several examples of sub-literary syntactic interference in both Roman Greek and Greeks' Latin.

[15] In addition to Coleman's (1975) fundamental work on syntactic interference in Latin, other valuable treatments of the poetic use of Greek syntax include: Brenous (1895), Wackernagel (2009: 94n2, 172, 231, *pass*.), Löfstedt (1956: 2.406–57), H–Sz (764–6), Lunelli (1988 *pass.*), Campanile (1984), Görler (1985), Maurach (1995: 87–92), Muecke (1997), Mayer (1999), Adams (2003: 422, with n24), Courtney (2004), Calboli (2009). For a fuller bibliography, see Appendix 1.

[16] The second example remains conjectural. Skutsch (1985: 66–67) provides an overview of Greek in Ennius. On Ennius's imitation of Greek usages, see Maurach (1995: 87–8 with bibl.), Jocelyn (1999: 180), and Rosén (1999: 21 with n28).

of Greek, differentiated the *sermo poeticus* from non-literary language, helped meet the prosodic demands of writing in complex, imported meters, and reduced the presence of "fussy, unproductive" monosyllables, such as prepositions.[17] These have come to be called "Grecisms" in English or more specifically "syntactic Grecisms" to distinguish them from other manifestations of Greek influence, such as loanwords and calques. Several European languages have adopted similar terminology, including Italian (*grecismi*) and German (*Gräzismen*), while French (*hellénismes*), Spanish (*helenismos*), and Portuguese (*helenismos*) have stuck more closely with the ancient designation *hellenismos*.[18]

The richness and polyvalence of interference in literature makes it particularly difficult to investigate by ordinary linguistic means. In contrast to accidental interference, which is immediately perceptible as such, interference in literature typically extends native usage in subtler ways and, as a result, may hold interpretations in play. For instance, Milton's "knew not eating death" can be understood, not only as a form of Greek interference ("she knew not *that* she was eating death") but also in monolingual terms: "eating" as either a circumstantial participle modifying Eve ("she knew not, *while* she was eating death") or as an epithet of death ("she did not know the *devouring* power of death"). Though it may be difficult to adjudicate between these interpretations on purely linguistic grounds, Kenneth Haynes has shown that the concentration of multiple

[17] Quinn's comment (1963: 199) on "fussy, unproductive" monosyllables is quoted by Horsfall (1995b: 230).

[18] Dionisotti (1995) discusses the ancient notion of *hellenismos*.

meanings into a single line—their logopoeic quality—is one of the advantages Milton gained by importing foreign syntax into *Paradise Lost*.[19]

Linguists also face another challenge in approaching literary interference in a corpus language such as Latin: the thinness of its archive. In some cases, the appearance of ambiguity may be the result not of deliberate ambiguity but rather the shortage of evidence and inadequate *Sprachgefühl*. A complex example of interference in German syntax, cited by Jacob Wackernagel, illustrates this difficulty and offers lessons to classical scholars.[20] In German the *Fehlen des Artikels* is a common feature of legal and technical expressions, such as *Kläger tritt auf* . . . or *Beklagter erklärt* . . ., which originated as a fifteenth-century Latinism in legal formulas of the type *reus tritt vor* and *testis gibt Erklärung ab*. The absence of article in these examples resulted originally from code-switching into Latin, where no article was available. In nineteenth-century Romantic *Lieder*, we find linguistically identical instances of the *Fehlen des Artikels*, such as Goethe's "Knabe sprach" ("Heldenröslein") and Schiller's "Meister muss sich immer plagen" ("Das Lied von der Glocke"). If this were the only evidence available, it might be tempting to label these deviations Latinisms from legal language. Yet the real source of the interference involves a different language entirely: Herder's contemporary *Volkslieder* (pub. 1774), which contains translations of English ballads. Herder sometimes drops the article in German where his English originals do: for instance, "when day was gone" becomes "als Tag war um." Paradoxically, the syntactic Anglicism came to be used by Goethe and Schiller to create a native, *völkisch* style. There are

[19] Haynes (2004: 79).
[20] See Wackernagel (2009: 20–21) with Langslow's footnotes.

several lessons here for the classical linguist: the impression of ambiguity can be misleading, syntactic interference can spread quickly from a fragile source, and foreign expressions can also create apparently native effects.

Grecisms in Latin literature present similar interpretive challenges and expressive potential: most can be plausibly analyzed not only in bilingual terms as manifestations of syntactic interference but also in monolingual terms as deviant native constructions. To take a particularly ambivalent crux from a Horatian fable, the impoverished generosity of the country mouse towards his urban counterpart is described in the following way (*S.* 2.6.83–84): *neque ille | sepositi ciceris, nec longae invidit avenae* ("He was not one to begrudge the choice chickpea nor the long oat"). Three different explanations can account for the unparalleled use of the verb *invideo* with a complement in the genitive case, each of which has a different implication for the tone and atmosphere of the poem. According to one, which has Quintilian's ancient imprimatur, this is a high-flown imitation of Greek syntax, influenced by the construction of the Greek verb φθονεῖν ("to envy" *cum genetivo*); a second approach, suggested by Paul Lejay, interprets it as an archaizing revival of older uses of the genitive with verbs of fullness or privation (e.g., *privare, carere*); and finally, R. G. G. Coleman cites colloquial parallels in the use of *dare* and *sumere* with the genitive.[21] Is this construction then a Grecism, archaism, or colloquialism, or perhaps some odd combination of the three? To my ear, the elevation of the passage is decisive: the elevated Grecism focalizes the proud generosity of the poor

[21] For these differing accounts, see Muecke (1993: *ad loc.*), Lejay (1911: *ad loc.*), and Coleman (1975: 137–38). Lejay writes, "Ce n'est pas une imitation artificielle de φθονεῖν τινος, comme l'a cru Quint., IX, 3, 17; mais, plus probablement, dans chacune des langues, le reflet de la confusion primitive du génitif et de l'ablatif au singulier dans la déclinaison athématique et dans celle des mots féminins. Invidere avec le gén. ne se trouve plus avant Hilaire de Poitiers."

mouse in an act of Homeric beneficence, a comical but not derisive contrast. Another hint of this is the litotes (*non invidit*), a figure of speech more common in Greek than Latin.[22]

Since there is no simple formula or method to apply, each case must be approached individually. Nevertheless, a few rules of thumb may come in handy when attempting to assess the presence and significance of interference in a Latin literary text. In the first place, it is important to note the difference between the diachronic origin of a Grecism and its synchronic value in context. A foreign construction may quickly lose any sense of its foreign origin and become a poeticism or a generic mannerism, as happened with the *Fehlen des Artikels* as a marker of *Lieder*-style. In the case of Latin literature, several Grecisms began their career as markedly foreign and poetic turns of speech in Augustan poetry but were regarded as mere poeticisms by the time of Tacitus (e.g., *nudae bracchia et lacertos*, Tac. *Ger.* 17.2).[23] Indeed, Quintilian (*Inst.* 9.3.17) complains that the Greek accusative of respect (e.g., *saucius pectus*), a striking departure from Latin syntax used sparingly by Horace, had been vulgarized to the extent that it appeared in the published proceedings of the Senate (*Acta diurna*). A similar banalization has occurred in the history of English word order. Thomas Carlyle, who imported many Teutonisms into English, appears to have revived an archaic usage in which the verb of speaking precedes its subject (e.g., "says the President"); by the 1950s it was a cliché of journalese and appeared regularly in *Time* magazine. Commentators who labeled something a Grecism

[22] Litotes occurs frequently in the *Odes*: for instance, *non levis* (*C.* 1.24.17), *non humilis* (*C.* 1.37.32), *non bene* (*C.* 2.7.19), *non dedecuit* (*C.* 2.12.17).

[23] Löfstedt (1956: 2.425–30) discusses several of Apuleius's Grecisms, such as the accusative and genitive of reference, that were mediated through Augustan poetry.

on diachronic grounds without surveying its synchronic appearances have done only half their job.

It follows, as a second rule of thumb, that context, not history, is the most important guide for resolving synchronic ambiguities. This is especially important given the amount of linguistic evidence no longer available to classicists: a crucial text that links a construction to the language of Roman accounting or early lyric style (i.e. Laevius) may simply be missing. Moreover, because syntactic constructions are often the product of multiple linguistic processes, a Grecism that sounds like a legalism in one context may be a grand epicism in another. For instance, while *caput* often works as a familiar legalistic synecdoche to mean "person" (e.g., *capitis poena*), Horace's *pudor . . . tam cari capitis* (*C.* 1.24.2) evokes epic and tragic antecedents (e.g., φίλη κεφαλή, *Il*. 8.281. *Od*. 1.343, S. *Ant.* 1). Conversely, an entirely native construction can come to sound Greek under the right pressure, such as the vocative particle *o,* which Cicero uses to recall the atmosphere of a Platonic dialogue.[24]

2.2 VARIETIES OF GRECISM: DIRECT, PARALLEL, APPARENT

These rules of thumb will be helpful for understanding and applying the following classification of Grecisms, which aims to distinguish several similar phenomena that are often classed together by commentators and linguists.[25] In discussions of Latin literature,

[24] Dickey (2002: 226) notes that Cicero (*est enim, ut scis, quasi in extrama pagina Phaedri his ipsis verbis loquens Socrates: Adulescens etiam nunc, o Phaedre, Isocrates est*, Cic. *Orat*. 41) reproduces Plato's original ὦ Φαῖδρε (*Phaedr*. 278e).

[25] While the tripartite distinction is new, the differentiation between full Grecisms and "partial" Grecisms is sometimes made (see below). For the diachronic history of individual constructions in this chapter and the Appendix, I have relied fundamentally on Coleman's (1975) authoritative account, supplemented by Calboli (2009), as well as the works cited above in n15.

the label "Grecism" is usually applied to three different kinds of syntactic phenomena, each with a different linguistic profile and relationship to Greek: direct Grecisms, in which the construction has no native precedent; parallel Grecisms, in which a Greek usage happens to parallel an archaic or non-standard Latin construction; and apparent Grecisms, native constructions that may nonetheless sound Greek under limited circumstances. While only the first of these entails full-scale syntactic borrowing, all three phenomena reveal the pressure of Greek syntax on Latin and, for that reason, may be considered forms of interference. Accordingly, all three varieties of Grecism must be taken under consideration when attempting to assess the presence of Greek in Horace's Latin poetry. Though I outline these categories here, I have not attempted to apply these labels systematically in the Appendix.

The first of these categories, here called direct Grecisms, involves marked departures from ordinary Latin syntax that can only be accounted for by Greek influence. Among them are constructions such as the accusative of reference (e.g., *saucius . . . pectus,* Verg. *A.* 12.5), the *nominativus cum infinitivo* to introduce indirect speech (*ait navium fuisse celerrimus,* Catul. 4.1–2), and the postponement of certain particles (e.g., *lupi ceu,* Verg. *A.* 2.355). While the existence of analogous native constructions may make integration easier, direct Grecisms are full syntactic borrowings that cannot be explained by internal development alone.[26] Despite their clearly foreign origin, however,

[26] The existence of similar native constructions, which assist the integration of direct Grecisms, may occasionally make it hard to distinguish between direct and parallel Grecisms. For instance, the *nominativus cum infinitivo*, an undisputed direct Grecism, resembles the ordinary construction with passive verbs of speech (e.g., *dicitur esse navium celerrimus*). Similarly, the adoption of the pure accusative of respect, a direct Grecism, was encouraged by an archaic usage in which a perfect passive participle of dressing governed a retained accusative (e.g., *indutum . . . pallam*, Pl. *Men.* 511–12). For the differentiation among various inherited and extended forms of the accusative, see App. 1 and Courtney (2004).

direct Grecisms do not necessarily sound Greek everywhere they occur in Latin literature. The tendency for writers of post-Augustan prose, such as Tacitus and Apuleius, to adopt direct Grecisms from Augustan poetry, including the Greek accusative of reference, suggests that banalization occurred over time. Among the direct Grecisms in Horace are the following: *tremis ossa*, *S.* 2.7.56 (App. 1.4); *animum mitior*, *C.* 3.10.18 (App. 1.5); *Daunus agrestium* | *regnavit populorum*, *C.* 3.30.11–12 (App. 2.2.3); *vir ait esse paratus*, *Ep.* 1.7.22 (App. 4.1); and *incoctus fefellit*, *Epod.* 3.7 (App. 4.2).

Parallel Grecisms (sometimes called "partial Grecisms"), the second type to consider, are constructions that can be interpreted either in terms of Greek interference or as deviant (i.e. obsolescent, non-standard, colloquial) native constructions.[27] From a historical point of view, these were inherited, native constructions that had come to be excluded from the repertoire of classical Latin, perhaps because they were felt to be too archaic or colloquial. As a result, when they do appear, they are usually marked alternatives in relation to the syntactic norm. Similarity to Greek constructions led to their revival in literary environments. Among these are: the internal accusative (e.g., *dulce loquitur* ~ ἡδὺ λαλεῖ; cf. App. 1.2), the genitive governed by certain adjectives (e.g., *artis peritus* ~ ἐπιστήμων τῆς τέχνης; cf. App. 2.1), the dative of motion towards (*illi venit* ~ αὐτῷ ἔρχεται; cf. App. 3.1), and the complementary infinitive with certain adjectives (e.g., *callidus dicere* ~ δεινὸς λέγειν; cf. App. 6.1).[28] From a synchronic point of view,

[27] Löfstedt and Hofmann–Szantyr call this category *partielle Gräzismen*, a label that is potentially misleading, insofar as it suggests that these Grecisms are hybrid forms that sound partly Greek and partly Latin *at the same time*. Instead they tend to sound wholly Greek or wholly native, or perhaps ambivalent between the two, but not halfway in between.

[28] Coleman (1975: 122) describes this phenomenon compendiously (L^R is the receiving language and L^S is the source language; S^1 and S^2 represent the historical change from one syntactic construction, S^1, to another, S^2): "The diachrony of L^R [= Latin] shows $S^1 > S^2$. The influence of S^1 in L^S [= Greek] leads

parallel Grecisms may be interpreted either in bilingual terms as interference or in monolingual terms as archaisms or colloquialisms. As a result, more than other Grecisms, parallel Grecisms have been subject to extensive disagreement and misunderstanding.[29]

As a complex example of such a parallel Grecism, which is variously colloquial, elevated, and Grecizing, it is worth briefly considering the *da mihi bibere* ("let me drink") construction.[30] The construction attracted an unusual number of comments about its register from ancient grammarians, whose observations are valuable to compare against the surviving linguistic evidence. Linguists usually describe it as a substantival infinitive, in which *bibere* is functioning as the object of a verb that normally governs a noun in the accusative case (e.g., *mitte sectari*, *C.* 1.38.3; cf. App. 6.3). Although the use of an infinitive as the subject or object of a clause was native to Latin (e.g., *bibere da usque plenis cantharis*, Pl. *Per*. 821; *meridie bibere dato*, Cat. *Agr*. 89), it was widely excluded from classical prose.[31] Where similar constructions do occur in classical prose, such as Cicero's *mitte dicere* (Cic. *Quinct*. 85), they are regarded as archaizing and solemn.[32] Classical poets appear to have revived the archaic construction under the influence of Greek δός μοι πιεῖν (e.g., *magnum dat ferre talentum*, Verg. *A*. 5.248). Responding to its occurrences in the *Aeneid*, Servius often remarks on its Greek, poetic

---

either to the retention in L^R of an obsolescent S^1 alongside S^2 or even to its revival after it had become obsolete."

[29] For instance, even Löfstedt has written about parallel Grecisms (*partielle Gräzismen*) as if the discovery of a native parallel could mitigate its foreignness, but they are not hybrid forms in the same way that some vocabulary items are (e.g., *depugis* < *de* + πυγή).

[30] On this construction, see Penney (1999: 256–57), Ferri (2008: 131), and most recently Ferri and Probert (2010: 30 with n39).

[31] See Coleman (1975: 138–39) on the indigenous use of the infinitive as the subject or object of a clause (e.g., *non moriri certius = non mors certius est*, Pl. *Capt.* 732; *hic vereri perdidit = hic verecundiam perdidit*, Pl. *Ba.* 158), which is not found in Caesar or Livy, and in Cicero is restricted to the philosophical works.

[32] *TLL* (s.v. *mitto* VIII.1177.15–24) classifies Cicero's example under the subheading *usu sollemni*.

quality.[33] Meanwhile, the inherited construction appears to have survived continuously in colloquial Latin, as a result of which it occurs in sub-literary texts, such as the Vulgate (e.g., *dicit ei Iesus da mihi bibere*, John 4:7) and, despite the explicit censure of Donatus, schoolroom dialogues from the third and fourth centuries AD.[34] Writing in the fifth century, Pompeius condemns the construction as sub-literary, and perhaps also implies that it is the result of pressure from colloquial Greek.[35] Presumably the remark is derived from earlier grammatical literature, since Pompeius is unlikely to have known Greek firsthand.[36] Thus, at various times and in different contexts the same syntactic construction, a substantival infinitive following the verb *dare*, appears to be have been perceived in four different ways: as a solemn archaism (Cicero), an elevated Grecism (Virgil), a native colloquialism (Vulgate), and a sub-literary Grecism (*Hermeneumata*).

The label "Grecism" is often applied to a third and final category of syntax, which is not an instance of syntactic borrowing at all, but which merits consideration alongside the previous manifestations of Greek influence. These items, which can be called apparent Grecisms, are by themselves ordinary Latin constructions that can be found in both prose and verse. Despite being unmarked, neutral constructions, in certain contexts and under certain kinds of pressure they may sound Greek. For instance, in the opening satire in Book 2, Horace invokes the *virtus Scipiadae et mitis sapientia Laeli* (*S.* 2.1.72), using two seemingly innocuous genitives of possession (*Scipiadae*, *Laeli*). Yet in its

---

[33] For instance, Donat. (Verg. *A.* 5.248): *Graecum est duo verba coniungere, ut paulo post* [= *5.262 donat habere viro*], *sed hoc datur poetis.* See Servius's additional citations of this as a *figura Graeca* (e.g., *dederatque comam diffundere ventis*, Verg. *A.* 1.319; 10.235; 10.701; 12.97; 12.211).

[34] See Ferri (2008: 131) and Donatus (Ter. *An.* 484).

[35] Pompeius (*GL* 5.213.13): *quotiens ita volueris facere* [using an infinitive as a noun], *Graece loqueris aperte, "da mihi bibere"* δός μοι πιεῖν.

[36] On Pompeius's tralaticious scholarship, see Kaster (1988: 139–68).

context the construction is immediately recognizable as a Latin counterpart to the Homeric σθένος Ἰδομενῆος construction (e.g., *Il.* 13.248), in which a possessive phrase makes a grandiose substitute for a proper name.[37] Though there is no departure from the range of acceptable Latin syntax, the construction acquires Grecizing color from its close relation to Greek *Kunstsprache*. In a similar way, something as innocuous as an adjective in apposition to a vocative might evoke the solemnity of an archaic Greek ode when it occurs in the context of a hymn (e.g., *Mercuri facunde nepos Atlantis*, *C.* 1.10.1).[38] Among other examples, one might also cite the use of the particle *o* to introduce a vocative, or the use of *quippe* with a participle, which closely reproduces Greek ἅτε with a participle.[39] Apparent Grecisms are the hardest to pin down of the three, since their number is potentially very large and they lack formal grammatical clues to indicate their existence.

These three categories provide a basic framework for assessing the influence of Greek on Horace's poetic syntax. Since Roland Mayer has championed the ancient designation *figura Graeca* as a superior alternative to "syntactic Grecism," it is worth emphasizing the difference between the ancient grammatical approach to these phenomena and our own.[40] While ancient commentators from Quintilian to late antique

---

[37] Horace used the construction earlier in the *Satires* in a parodic context (*Proscripti Regis Rupili pus atque venenum*, *S.* 1.7.1) and at *S.* 2.1.72 uses the device to establish a contrast between the public grandeur of Scipio and Laelius and their private horsing-around. See Muecke (1993: *ad loc*). Other occurrences in Latin: Lucr. 3.996; Stat. *Bell. Germ*. fr. 1 Morel. This is similar to the βίη Ηρακλείη construction, which also appears in Latin (e.g., *odora canum vis*, Verg. *A.* 4.132).

[38] N–H *ad loc*. The "appositional style" in hymns was imported from Greek lyric (e.g., Ϝῶναξ Ἄπολλον, παῖ μεγάλω Δίος, Alc. fr. 307a V.). On the use of a participle in the vocative case in an appositional address, see further Brenous (1895: 89–94), Löfstedt (1956: 1.103), Fordyce (1985) on Verg. *A.* 7.425.

[39] See Dickey (2002: 226) on *o*. On *quippe* with a participle, see N–H on *C.* 1.31.13–15 (*dis carus ipsis, quippe ter at quater* . . .) with Calboli (2009: 137).

[40] Mayer (1999).

scholiasts were sensitive to the distortions in Latin syntax that resulted from Greek influence, their notion of *figura Graeca* does not straightforwardly correspond to what we have been calling "syntactic interference." Roman grammarians relied on an inadequate conceptual and descriptive apparatus for analyzing syntax. Since their notion of syntax was essentially confined to case-governance, obvious manifestations of Greek influence, such as in word order, eluded them. Moreover, since their interest was normative rather than descriptive, their aim was not to describe the perception of Greekness wherever it could be found, but to distinguish acceptable from unacceptable usages.

Additional problems hinder any attempt to recover the ancient notion of *figura Graeca*: its usage appears to differ among commentators and even within the same commentary. This may be the result of inconsistent application, lack of a fully-formed concept, and the vagaries of the transmission of these texts, which were frequently abridged and modified. Even if grammarians had sought to describe the synchronic effect of Greek constructions, one would have to reckon with the enormous chronological gap between the Augustan period and the reception by grammarians, and, as we have seen, perceptions can change dramatically in the space of a few years and differ at the same time among different readers. Though the comments of ancient grammarians are often insightful and provide valuable evidence for the study of interference, they cannot be used as a guide to syntactic Grecism without the aid of linguistics.

While rightly decrying the historical bias of most work on Grecisms, Mayer has also offered a more fundamental objection to the investigation of interference in Latin literature. Drawing on the research of experts in contemporary bilingualism, Mayer

claims that true syntactic interference is rare among competent bilinguals and that, as a result, its existence should be suspect in classical literature. While it is true that syntactic leakage is uncommon in the everyday conversation of fluent bilingual speakers, the effects one finds in Latin literature are an entirely different matter: not the result of conversational slippage but deliberate design. Mayer's argument can be refuted by consulting our own intuitions about syntactic interference in English literature, where similar phenomena occur. Though remoteness from the classical languages makes it considerably harder to reconstruct the lived experience of such interference, classical scholars have as an advantage one of the richest and most exhaustive bodies of grammatical documentation in existence. They are fortunate, moreover, to be able to coordinate this with the perceptions of ancient scholars and the claims of poets such as Horace.

3. Grecisms in Horace

3.1 SURVEY OF HORACE'S GRECISMS

Though Horace has rightly gained a reputation for verbal audacity and an intensely Grecizing style, a survey of direct and parallel Grecisms in his work suggests that the origin of this reputation lies elsewhere: not in the formal invention of new Grecisms but rather in the way he uses familiar Grecisms to create new lexical meanings and thicken the texture of his writing. From a purely formal perspective, Horace's Grecizing syntax is no more innovative than any other Augustan poet's; indeed, in most respects it appears to

be more restrained than Virgil's.[41] For instance, compared with Virgil's free use of the Greek accusative of respect, an Augustan development, Horace's employment of the accusative seems tame and conventional. Only two Greek accusatives that qualify as direct Grecisms in his poetry. The first, *tremis ossa pavore* (*S.* 2.7.57, App. 1.5), an instance of an intransitive verb with an accusative of respect, occurs mock-heroically in the mouth of a Greek slave, Davus.[42] The second, *animum mitior* (*C.* 3.10.18, App. 1.6), is the only certain instance of a Greek accusative of respect that complements an adjective.[43] By contrast, Virgil employed both Grecisms far more often throughout his oeuvre.[44] Even Propertius, who uses it at least three times, appears to employ this direct Grecism more often than Horace.[45] Moreover, Horace fails to imitate some of Virgil's boldest experiments with the accusative, including the use of a retained accusative after verbs of writing and depicting (e.g., *inscripti nomina regum . . . flores* "flowers inscribed with the names of kings", Verg. *E.* 3.106–7), a construction that enters post-Augustan prose (e.g., Apuleius *Met.* 9.12).[46]

---

[41] Virgil is also more audacious with his poetic extensions of the ablative, which are not the result of Greek influence; see Horsfall (1995b: 226–31) and Muecke (1997: 759–80).

[42] This high-style Grecism contrasts with the colloquial loanwords in his speech that also help to characterize him; on high-style borrowings see Chapter 2. The wording has several close parallels in earlier Latin hexameters (*tremit artus*, Lucr. 3.489; Verg. *G.* 3.84) and Greek antecedents (e.g., *Il.* 15.627; Eur. *Med.* 1169).

[43] See App. 1.5 on this and two doubtful instances (*C.* 1.21.11–12; 2.11.23–24). The first of these is examined in greater detail below in 3.5.

[44] Examples from the Aeneid: *capita alta corusci, lacerum ora manusque ambas, maculosus alvum, nudus membra, tempora nudus, plenae crura* (*apis thymo*), *faciem tauro propior, sacra comas* (*laurus*), *saucius pectus, saucius ora, os umerosque deo similis, faciem simillima, tumidus praecordia*. Since the frequency increases across Virgil's poetry, Norden suggests that Virgil grew increasingly experimental in this respect.

[45] These are: *verba levis* (2.5.28), *pectora nuda* (2.24b.52), and *saucius latus* (2.8.22).

[46] Courtney (2004: 428) categorizes these as the seventh of twelve forms of "Greek" accusative; cf. Coleman (1975: 124–25). Courtney's classification provides another measure of Horace's restraint: of the eleven varieties of "Greek" accusative that Virgil uses, Horace omits three entirely (categories 3, 6, and 7) and uses another two sparingly (categories 11 and 12, the two direct Grecisms quoted above).

Horace's formal restraint with the accusative is representative of his relation to Grecizing syntax in general: though willing to follow direct and parallel Grecisms found in Virgil and earlier poets, Horace rarely innovates on his own. One of the few direct Grecisms that occurs for the first time in his oeuvre is the *sensit delapsus* construction, in which a participial phrase complements a verb of perception (in place of normal Latin *sensit se delapsum esse*; see App. 4.2). Horace uses this construction, which will receive further examination below (cf. Section 3.4) three times in the *Epodes* (e.g., *gaudet . . . decerpens*, *Epod*. 2.19), twice in the *Odes*, and three times in the *Epistles*.[47] Horace also appears to have been the first to use the genitive as a complement to particular verbs, most famously in *Daunus agrestium regnavit populorum* (*C.* 3.30.11–20, App. 2.2.3).

Another area of Horatian innovation is in his deployment of the infinitive, both as a complement to particular adjectives (e.g., *durus componere versus*, *S.* 1.4.8; cf. App. 6.1) and in a final sense (e.g., *certat . . . tollere*, *C.* 1.1.8; App. 6.2). Though Horace was not the first poet to use these parallel Grecisms (*nulli solvere lentum*, Lucil. 414–15 M.) nor the only contemporary to do so (e.g., *boni inflare*, Verg. *E*. 5.1), they occur with notable frequency in his poetry. It is also one of categories of Grecism that changes over the course of Horace's writing: it appears rarely in *Satires* 1 and the *Epodes* but with striking frequency in later works, most audaciously the *Odes*. Several innovative constructions of the infinitive with specific verbs combine a formal extension of usage with a semantic shift. For instance, Horace uses *amare* with an infinitive complement,

[47] Other occurrences in Augustan poetry in works published shortly after the *Epodes* (ca. 30 BC), which may suggest simultaneity: *gaudent perfusi sanguine fratrum* (Verg. *G*. 2.510); *pulsata indignis saepe queror minibus* (Prop. 1.16.6); *sensit medios delapsus in hostis* (Verg. *A*. 2.377; cf. 5.575, 12.6, 12.82, 12.634, 12.702).

with or without a Greek loan-shift to mean "be accustomed to" (e.g., Μοῖσα μεμνᾶσθαι φιλεῖ, Pi. *N.* 1.12).[48] Another example is the use of *audio* in a virtually passive sense with a complementary infinitive (effectively a synonym of *clueo*), which is first attested in *Satires* 2 (*S.* 2.6.20): *Matutine pater, seu Iane libentius audis*.[49] As simultaneously syntactic Grecisms and loanshifts, these examples illustrate a common tendency for syntactic innovation to coincide with semantic shifts. Even though Horace does not often invent new classes of Grecism, as these last examples show, he often uses subtle syntactic shifts to bring out new Greek meanings in individual words.

Another surprising feature of Horace's direct and parallel Grecisms, in addition to their lack of formal originality, is that genre appears to play only a minor role in their distribution. While certain Grecisms tend to cluster in one genre or another, very few are strictly confined to only one part of the corpus. Even apparently high-style Grecisms, such as the *nominativus cum infinitivo* construction (*ait fuisse navium celerrimus*) or the gnomic perfect (e.g., *nil sine magno | vita labore dedit mortalibus*, *S.* 1.9.59–60), appear in hexametrical as well as lyrical and epodic contexts.[50] Nevertheless, genre may play some role: although few categories of Grecism are uniquely found in the *Satires* or *Epistles*, several Grecisms do appear to be mostly confined to Horace's lyric and epodic

---

[48] Quint. (*Inst.* 9.3.17) cites an occurrence from Sallust (*Jug.* 34.1): *amat fieri*. Aside from this, the earliest occurrence is at *Epod*. 8.16: *iacere amant* (with Watson *ad loc.*). Other instances include: *S.* 1.10.60, *S.* 2.3.20, *S.* 2.3.214, *S.* 2.5.96, *C.* 1.2.50, *C.* 2.3.10, *C.* 3.9.24, *C.* 3.16.10, *Ep.* 1.14.9, *AP* 197 (?). Commentators disagree over the extent to which each of these examples constitutes a loan-shift ("to be accustomed to") or is merely a synonym of *cupio*. See further Grassmann (1966: 62–65).

[49] As Coleman (1975: 136–37) explains, Horace replicates the semantic relation between κλύω and ἀκούω, which are partial synonyms, by extending the archaic meaning of *clueo* ("I am reputed") to *audio*. Horace uses *audio* in the same way also at *S.* 2.6.20, *S.* 2.7.101, *Ep.* 1.16.7, *Ep.* 1.17.38.

[50] It may suggest that the latter form could be either high-style or colloquial. Many gnomic perfects could also be analyzed, as Brink suggests, as "empirical perfects". If one ignores gnomic perfects that are negativized or accompanied by a temporal adverb, then the class of gnomic perfects is limited to the *Odes* and *Epodes*.

poetry. Among these "lyricisms" or "quasi-lyricisms", which have one hexametric citation at most, are: the infinitive of purpose (App. 6.2), the Greek accusative of respect with an adjective (e.g., *mitior animum,* App. 1.6), the genitive as a complement to verbs of ruling and ceasing (e.g., *regnavit populorum,* App. 2.2.3), and the dative of motion towards (e.g., *egerit Orco,* App. 3.1). One of the most amusing and generically appropriate of these is the use of the genitive to specify the recipient of a toast: Horace appears to have been the first writer to adapt this ordinary Greek construction into Latin (e.g., *sume cyathos amici sospitis, S.* 1.9.59–60; App. 2.2.4). In addition, a preponderance of Horace's epexegetical infinitives (App. 4.1) and genitive complements to adjectives (App. 2.1) also occur in the *Odes* and *Epodes,* as these are some of Horace's most effective tools for recreating the effect of Greek poetic compounds in Latin. Since several of the Grecisms that occur in the hexameters are clearly mock-heroic (e.g., *tremis ossa, S.* 2.7.57; *egerit Orco, S.* 2.5.49), it would be difficult to use generic distribution as a guide to register without close reference to context.

Little as one can conclude about the influence of genre, even less can be said about chronology. Few Grecisms occur with sufficient frequency to allow reliable conclusions to be drawn about Horace's syntactic development. It has been claimed that Horace's use of the Greek accusative of respect is a late or mature development, but this only appears so if one includes features that do not belong, such as the use of *cetera* "in other respects" (= τἆλλα), which is a lexical rather than syntactic issue.[51] Grecisms of the type *desine querelarum* (genitival complement in place of ablative, App. 2.2.2) occur in

[51] Even if one were to count occurrences of *cetera* alongside the other two accusatives of respect, do occurrences in *Satires* 2, *Odes* 3, and *Epistles* 1 really count as "late"?

Odes 2, 3, and 4, but not *Odes* 1. Among the Grecisms that appear rarely in Horace's earliest works (*Satires* 1 and the *Epodes*) are the following: the perfect infinitive used in place of a present infinitive (e.g., *nequis humasse velit Aiacem*, *S.* 2.3.187; App. 51) and the epexegetical infinitive (App. 6.1).

3.2 GRECISMS AT WORK

Though the formal range of Horace's syntactic Grecisms is not particularly striking, compared with Virgil's innovations, much of their power derives from their effects in context: their capacity to resonate in a foreign key, dislocate the familiar meanings of words, transfigure everyday language, and condense his poetry into the mosaic-like structures which Nietzsche admired for providing "dies Minimum in Umfang und Zahl der Zeichen, dies damit erzielte maximum in der Energie der Zeichen."[52] To complement the formal survey of Grecisms in the previous section and Appendix, this final section identifies three related functions that Grecisms perform in Horace's poetry, drawing especially on Kenneth Haynes's discussion of interference in English literature.[53]

In the first place, sometimes interference constitutes a striking allusion to the foreign, whether to a specific Greek passage or to a foreign author's style. This effect is especially apparent in Horace's initial mottoes, where a Grecism may closely reproduce the syntax of the original (e.g., *C.* 1.18.1 *nullam . . . severis arborem*, *C.* 1.18.1) or suggest an alien presence by means of a construction not found in the original (e.g., *quem sumis celebrare*, *C.* 1.12.1). The relationship with a foreign model that these Grecisms help establish often becomes an important thematic element in the rest of the poem. Even

[52] Colli and Montinari (1969: 155).
[53] Haynes (2004: 75–103).

when they do not occur at the start of a poem, Grecisms are sometimes a key ingredient in Horace's translations, where they preserve the pressure of an alien original (e.g., *o pater et rex | Iuppiter, ut pereat positum robigine telum*, *S.* 2.1.42–43; a rendition of Call. *Aet*. 110.48 Pf.). The effect is also an important component of Horace's "Pindarizing" style (e.g., *C.* 4.2) where the object of imitation is not a single word or line but rather an author's whole style.

More commonly interference serves not to allude to a foreign presence but to depart from the norms of ordinary language. By definition a high or poetic style is not everyday language; it works by means of its unlikeness to quotidian speech, as already Aristotle recognized (*Poetics* 22). Accordingly, one function of Horace's syntactic Grecisms is to elevate language above the register of ordinary speech, or, to adapt Addison's words, to throw it out of prose. As I hope to show, Horace prevents these elevated Grecisms from becoming mere mannerisms by using them as a source of semantic innovation, novelty, and poetic compression. A survey of Horace's use of the the *sensit delapsus* construction will round off this section by illustrating the variety of uses to which he put the same Grecism.

In addition to elevating the register, Grecisms can also thicken the texture of Horace's writing in more complex ways so as to hold in suspense multiple interpretations or to create a seductive verbal image of the content. The final section concerns two instances where Horace's use or alleged use of Grecisms seems to transcend the bounds of intelligibility. Though editors and commentators have sometimes sought to interpret or emend these ambiguities out of Horace, a surreal and imagistic use of language sometimes appears to be the main point. For instance, editors have sharply disagreed

about the ending of *Odes* 1.21, where it is unclear whether Horace invites the Muses to hymn the island of Delos, famous with respect to Apollo's shoulder, or to hymn the shoulder of Apollo itself (*C.* 1.21.10–12): (*tollite . . .*) *Delon Apollinis* | *insignemque pharetra* | *fraternaque umerum lyra*. Similarly, in spite of editorial interventions, the interlaced word order at the ending of the *Odes* 2.11 provides a mimetic counterpart to the Lyde's unloosed hair (*C.* 1.11.22–24): *age, cum lyra* | *maturet incomptam Lacaenae* | *more comam religata nodo*.

Before turning to these three functions of Greek syntax—foreignizing Grecisms (3.1), elevated Grecisms (3.2), and mimetic or "logopoeic" Grecisms (3.3)—it is worth briefly mentioning an issue that has been excluded from the investigation: colloquial and informal Grecisms. While most of the interference in Horace's poetry appears to relate to literary varieties of Greek, occasionally colloquial or sub-literary Greek syntax appears to have left its trace on his poetry as well. For instance, various Greek conventions of naming appear, including the "genitive of filiation" (e.g., *Canidia Albuci* "Canidia the daughter of Albucius", *S.* 2.1.48), a Greek epistolary salutation (*Celso gaudere* ~ Κέλσῳ χαίρειν, *Ep.* 1.8.1), and the address by professional title (*euge poeta* ~ χαῖρε ἰατρέ, *AP* 87).[54] Medical Greek may also be responsible for the following constructions: *purgor bilem* (*AP* 302, a mediopassive construction with retained accusative?), *morbi purgatum illius* (*S.* 2.3.27, where the genitive of separation may be influenced by Greek usage), and

[54] Adams (2003: 511–12) shows that the "genitive of filiation" without *filius* or *filia* (e.g., *Agathadorus Diophanis* "Agathadorus son of Diophanis") is common in Greeks' Latin as well as texts influenced by Oscan. See Mayer (1994) on *Ep.* 1.8.1. Ps.-Acro on *AP* 87 (*pace* Brink) describes the greeting as influenced by Greek practice: *hoc secundum Graecos, qui cum nomine salutant officii,* χαῖρε ἰατρέ.

doleo construed with an accusative (*dolitura multum*, *Epod*. 15.11; *quid sit dolitura negatum*, *S.* 1.2.112).[55]

3.3 FOREIGNIZING GRECISMS

Several of Horace's Grecisms occur in or near the first line of a lyric poem, where they are well placed to make a statement about the style and content of what follows.[56] In at least two of these poems, Horace's *Quem virum* (*C.* 1.12) and his ode to Varus (*C.* 1.18), the Grecism coincides with a Greek motto, where the opening lines of a poem establish a close verbal relationship with a specific lyric antecedent. According to Alberto Cavarzere, the second of these is *l'esempio più evidente di "motto"*, and it will exemplify the use of Grecisms to allude to a foreign presence, especially as part of a translation.[57]

Addressing a certain Varus (Quintilius Varus or P. Alfenus Varus), the ode begins with a strong exhortation to plant grapes (*C.* 1.18.1–2):

> Nullam, Vare, sacra vite prius severis arborem
> circa mite solum Tiburis et moenia Catili.
>
> Varus, you should plant no tree in preferene to the god-given vine around the genial soil of Tiber and the walls of Catilus. (transl. Rudd)

The first line of the poem immediately establishes a close verbal and metrical relationship with a verse by Alcaeus, likely to be the opening of a poem also composed in Greater Asclepiads: μηδὲν ἄλλο φυτεύσης πρότερον δένδρεον ἀμπέλω ("plant no other tree before the vine", Alc. fr. 348 V.). Though it is hazardous without the remainder of

---

[55] The use of *doleo* with an accusative appears clearly modeled on Greek syntax first in the works of Scribonius Largus, writing under Claudius.

[56] Horace's mottoes include: *Epod*. 4.3, *C.* 1.2.1, 11.1, 12.1, 18.1, 3.23.1.

[57] Cavarzere (1996: 171).

Alcaeus's poem to judge Horace's ode in relation to it, it is clear that Horace has developed his poem in a wholly novel direction: already the second line places us firmly on Italian soil. Even more unexpectedly, midway through the ode at line seven, the argument appears to turn back on itself, so that a poem that began as a dithyrambic ἀρεταλογία of wine becomes a meditation on moderation in drinking. This second half changes in style as well, incorporating hymnic elements, including invocations of Bacchus, and adopting an "elaborate, compressed, and allusive" style that derives from Hellenistic poetry.[58] After a series of variations and developments, the Alcaic theme appears to return in the final line of the poem. The personification of *Fides*, one of Bacchus's attendants whom Horace enumerates, is described as *perlucidior vitro* (16), a characterization that elaborates a metaphor from Alcaeus (οἶνος γὰρ ἀνθρώπω δίοπτρον, fr. 333 V.).[59] As often with mottoes, the forceful allusion to a Greek original provides a yardstick with which to measure Horace's departures from the model and his ability to domesticate a genre that is culturally, temporally, and linguistically alien.

A striking departure from ordinary Latin syntax in the opening line helps to emphasize Alcaeus's foreign presence. It is unusual to find a perfect subjunctive (*severis*) in a jussive subjunctive clause, even more unusual in one that is not prohibitive.[60] Though Latin inherited an aspectual distinction in prohibitive subjunctive clauses (*ne facias* : *ne feceris* :: μὴ ποίῃς : μὴ ποιήσῃς), the aspectual significance of the perfect in

---

[58] N–R (229).

[59] A similar metaphor was used by Aeschylus (fr. 393 N.^{2}): κάτοπτρον εἴδους χαλκός ἐστ', οἶνος δὲ νοῦ. As Cavarzere (1996: 172) notes, the image may have been mediated by Callimachus (τόφρα δ' ἔην ὑάλοιο φαάντερος οὐρανὸς ἦνοψ, *Hecale* fr. 18.2 Hollis).

[60] On the perfect subjunctive in prohibitions, see L–Sz (336–37). As in Alcaeus's verse, the negation falls on a single word *arborem* rather than the clause as a whole, which is formally a positive injunction ("plant no tree!").

these constructions appears to have been lost already in early Latin. In Ciceronian usage, the difference is a matter of register: *ne feceris* appears as a formal and archaizing alternative to the more colloquial *ne facias*. According to Coleman, the preservation of such perfect subjunctives, especially in poetry, was likely the result of the influence of Greek, where the aspectual distinction remained in force, and hence qualifies, in our terminology, as a parallel Grecism.[61] It appears that Horace and other Augustan poets attempted to recreate aspectual distinctions in the Latin verb based on a few fossilized forms and their feeling for Greek usage. This is suggested not only by the use of the perfect subjunctives in jussive clauses, but also by the fashion for perfect infinitives in place of present infinitives, which often seem to have aspectual force, and the spread of the "gnomic" perfect in statements about the present and future.[62]

By using the perfect subjunctive, Horace has perceptibly stretched Latin usage to accommodate the pressure of his foreign source. The form *severis* is, in fact, a morphological calque on Alcaeus's aorist subjunctive (φυτεύσῃς), and it is part of a remarkably faithful translation from Greek. Though the ordering is different, five of Alcaeus's six words (with the exception of ἄλλο) are matched by close Latin equivalents. Even had Horace's audience been ignorant of the source text, the dislocation from ordinary syntax would probably have alluded to an alien presence in these lines. The strong exotic flavor of this initial motto makes all the more striking Horace's subsequent departures from Alcaeus and from his Greek context, such as the turn to Tibur in the second line, the exhortation to moderation midway through, and the appearance of the

[61] Coleman (1975: 133).
[62] See App. 5.2 for more "aorist" jussive subjunctives in Horace.

Roman personification of *Fides* in the final line of the poem. This Roman element is already hinted at in the opening verse by Horace's two linguistic departures from his source text: the inclusion of a vocative *Vare*, which contextualizes the poem, and the addition of the adjective *sacra* to qualify *vite*, which adds a sacral quality absent from the original. Though the epithet has roots in Greek tragedy (e.g., τὸν ἱερὸν βότρυν, Eur. *Hypsipyle* fr. 765 N.[2]), its proximate source appears to be a line from Ennius's *Athamas*: *illis Lyaeus vitis inventor sacrae* (*scen.* 121 Joc.).[63] The Ennian "update" in effect administers a small correction to Alcaeus, hinting at a Roman sense of piety and self-control, which will be developed by the poem's abrupt turn to moderation in line 7 and its hymn to restraint.

By leaving a trace of Greek pressure on his syntax, Horace has adopted a foreignizing mode of translation that seeks to preserve a sense of the text's alien origin.[64] Milton's sonnet that begins "Lawrence of vertuous Father vertuous son" shows how the strategy sounds in English: the opening line adapts both the content and the style of Horace's *C.* 1.16.1 (*o matre pulchra filia pulchrior*) in a way that leaves no doubt about its Latinate origin. By contrast, assimilative or domesticating strategies of translation aim to recreate the source text by entirely native means. Alexander Pope's free imitations of Horace, which finds contemporary equivalents for ancient allusions (e.g., *sub regno Cinarae*, *C.* 4.1.1, becomes "in the gentle Reign of my Queen Anne"), stand at one end of this side of the spectrum. Horace draws on both modes of translation throughout his

[63] Pasquali (1964: 10).

[64] On foreignizing translations in English and other literatures, see Carne-Ross (2010: 19–48) and Haynes (2004: 77, 86–90).

poetry: for instance, in the *Satires* he provides an effortlessly Latinate rendering of an epigram by Callimachus, one of the longest close translations in his work.[65]

While Latin poets prided themselves on creating assimilated impersonations of Greek models, it was also valuable on occasion to let the strain of foreign pressure show through, as Horace does at the start of the Varus ode. A syntactic Grecism that alludes in this way to its exotic source might serve to heighten a thematic contrast between native and foreign, show off a translator's *sprezzatura*, or, at its most ambitious, change the nature of Latin in accordance with Greek usage. For instance, Virgil's *ut vidi ut perii, ut malus me abstulit error* (*E.* 8.41) with its audacious, correlative *ut* shows how close he can come to Theocritus's Greek before turning away to paraphrase (ὡς ἴδεν, ὡς ἐμάνη, ὡς ἐς βαθὺν ἅλατ' ἔρωτα, Theocr. 3.42).[66] Cicero lets Aratus's gnomic aorists peek through in his description of a crow anticipating the arrival of rain: *fuscaque non numquam cursans per litora cornix | demersit caput et fluctum cervice recepit* (*Prog.* fr. 4.8–9 = *Div.* 1.14). The verbs *demersit* and *recepit* correspond to Aratus's gnomic ὑπέτυψε and ἐβάψατο.[67] Catullus's well-known rendition of Sappho also employs a syntactic Grecism,

---

[65] Though Horace has changed the epigram's voice from first-person to third-person and has cut it to its essentials, his version (*S.* 2.1.2.105–8) is a faithful imitation of the source (Call. *Epigr*. 31 Pf.).

[66] Clausen comments apropos of Virgil's imitation of Theocritus (1995: 325): "Such parallels are most evocative when they recall the movement of the original . . . the use of the second *ut* as correlative strains the possibilities of Latin, but it recalls the Theocritean prototype." Readers are split between interpreting the second and third *ut* as correlatives ("as I saw, I perished") or taking them as exclamatory ("as I saw, how I perished!"), a view first proposed by Servius (*ad loc.*). Timpanaro (1978: 219–87) and Clausen prefer the former interpretation, citing Catullus (*sic virgo, dum intacta manet, dum cara suis est*, 62.45), while Coleman (1975: *ad loc*.) and Lipka (2001: 50) follow the second. Timpanaro surveys the history of interpretation. The ambivalence here, which appears to me impossible to resolve, makes this an example of the kind of "logopoeia" and syntactic density that is treated in Section 3.5 below.

[67] Aratus (949–52) has: ἤ που καὶ λακέρυζα παρ' ἠιόνι προὐχούσῃ | κύματος ἐρχομένου χέρσῳ ὑπέτυψε κορώνη, ἤ που καὶ ποταμοῖο ἐβάψατο μέχρι παρ' ἄκρους | ὤμους ἐκ κεφαλῆς ("or perhaps a chattering crow along a projecting shore-line dips its head into an oncoming wave on the shore, or perhaps immerses itself in a river from its head to the top of its shoulders" transl. D. Kidd). Kidd (1997: *ad loc*.) notes Cicero's semantic success in handling the difficult ὑπέτυψε.

dulce ridentem (51.5, an adverbial accusative), to reproduce Sappho's γελαίσας ἰμέροεν (fr. 31.5 V.). In another translated passage from Callimachus's *Coma Berenices*, Catullus stretched the syntax of *adiuro*, which normally governs a prepositional clause (e.g., *per te*), and the enclitic *-que* to accommodate an oath from the original (*adiuro teque tuumque caput*, Catul. 66.40), which renders σήν τε κάρην ὤμοσα σόν τε βίον (Call. *Aet.* 110.40 Pf.).[68] Similar Grecisms also occasionally appear in prose: quoting Chrysippus, Cicero uses a Greek internal accusative (*stadium currere*) to convey the foreign philosophical tone of the original (Cic. *Off.* 3.42): *scite Chrysippus, ut multa, "qui stadium, inquit, currit, ..."*[69]

There are several more examples in Horace where a syntactic Grecism alludes to a foreign source by providing a syntactic calque on the original. For instance, when Horace translates the Homeric epithet νεφέλῃ εἰλυμένος ὤμους (*Il.* 5.186), he does so by reproducing the "retained" accusative in Latin (*C.* 1.2.31): *nube candentis umeros amictus*. Horace alludes to Sappho via Catullus's adaptation by preserving the adverbial accusative of both (*C.* 1.22.23–24): *dulce ridentem Lalagen amabo | dulce loquentem* (cf. γελαίσας ἰμέροεν, Sapph. 31.5 V.). Another example of the same construction occurs in *longum clamet*, an allusion to the Homeric μακρὸν ἀυτεῖν. Horace's *magna coronari Olympia* (*Ep.* 1.50) may also reproduce a Simonidean flavor with its Grecizing internal accusative.[70] Lastly, Horace's rendition of a prayer from Callimachus (ὡς Χαλύβων

---

[68] Both constructions may be parallel Grecisms. Cicero's use of *Iovem lapidem iurare* (*Fam.* 7.12.2) suggests an archaic survival, and Skutsch (on Enn. *Ann.* 170 Sk.) has argued that there were native precedents for *-que -que* (cf. Dunkel 1982). Fraenkel (2007: 142–44, 413) argues that the absence of the construction *noctesque diesque* from Plautine *Sprechvers* indicated its Greek origin.

[69] The original does not survive for comparison (cf. *SVF* 3.173.10).

[70] A similar construction is found at Simonides (fr. 188b) Ἴσθμια δίς, Νεμέᾳ δίς, Ὀλυμπίᾳ ἐστεφανώθην. Though Ὀλυμπίᾳ is dative, Ἴσθμια shows the same use of an internal accusative as Horace.

ἀπόλοιτο γένος, *Aet*. 110.48 Pf.) for the destruction of iron uses *ut* to introduce an optative subjunctive, a rare construction that has been felt to imitate the ὡς from the original (*S*. 2.1.42–44): *o pater et rex | Iuppiter, ut pereat positum robigine telum.*[71]

More often, however, a syntactic Grecism, which Horace does not model on his source, alludes to a foreign source. A prominent example of this occurs at the opening of *Odes* 1.12, which contains another Greek motto (1–2): *quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri | tibia sumis celebrare, Clio*. Aside from the significant addition of the choice between lyre and flute, which perhaps indicates a hesitation between choral and monodic lyric, Horace has generally remained faithful to the sense of his Pindaric model (τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν, Pi. *O*. 2.1).[72] Instead of Pindar's κελαδήσομεν, however, Horace has changed the person of the verb and reframed the future tense as an infinitive of purpose (*sumis celebrare*). Infinitives of purpose (App. 6.2) are rare in Latin texts when not attached to a verb of motion. As Alex Hardie has observed, Horace also establishes a partial sound/sense correspondence between *cele*brare and κελα<u></u>δήσομεν.[73] Even though Horace's partial Grecism does not remain faithful to the syntax of his source, the departure from ordinary syntax, in addition to the Greek inflection of *heroa*, further intensifies the sense of a foreign presence behind these

---

Since the dative ending -ᾳ is correpted, it would have easy for a Greek corrector to regularize the first internal accusative across all three nouns. Possibly Horace relied on such an edition of Simonides.

[71] For this use of *ut* see *OLD* (s.v. *ut* 42). Horace imitates Callimachus via Catullus's more faithful rendition (66.48): *Iuppiter, ut Chalybon omne genus pereat*.

[72] Morgan (2010: 269) reads the choice between lyre and tibia as an introduction of tentativeness to Horace's imitation of Pindar, which is reflected by the un-Pindaric choice of meter and the poem's preference for small-scale Roman values. By contrast, Lowrie (1995: 36) read the disjunction as an evocation of lyric poetry in its entirety.

[73] Hardie (2003: 403).

words and prepares the audience for the complex play between Greek and Roman themes in the poetry that follows.[74]

Another example of this technique occurs when Horace attempts to combine two distinct Homeric sources (*C.* 2.4.10–12): *ademptus Hector* | *tradidit fessis leviora tolli* | *Pergama Grais*. The passage alludes primarily to one passage from the *Iliad*, in which Priam speaks of Hector (*Il.* 24.243–44): ῥηίτεροι γὰρ μᾶλλον Ἀχαιοῖσιν δὴ ἔσεσθε | κείνου τεθνηῶτος ἐναιρέμεν (*tollere*). However, Horace also combines it with a secondary Homeric passage, in which Hector speaks to Achilles (*Il.* 22.287–88): καί κεν ἐλαφρότερος (*levior*) πόλεμος Τρώεσσι γένοιτο | σεῖο καταφθιμένοι. Horace retains the infinitive construction from one, where it was part of the predicate, and combines it with the comparative adjective from the other to form an epexegetical infinitive, which registers the effort to drink from the Homeric spring. It has also been suggested that Horace's definition of a *vir bonus et sapiens* (*vir bonus et sapiens dignis ait esse paratus*, *Ep.* 1.7.22), which contains two Grecisms, a *nominativus cum infinitivo* and the use of a dative with *dignus* (~ ἐτοῖμος), owes its syntactic form to its relationship to a Greek philosophical source.[75]

One notable feature of Horace's foreignizing Grecisms is the way that the language sometimes combines multiple temporal frames within a single translation. This was the case with Horace's rendition of Alcaeus in *Odes* 1.18: the archaic flavor of Greek lyric (*severis*) is combined with a hint of second-century tragedy (*sacra . . . vite*).

---

[74] Assessments of the relationship between the rest of this poem and Pindar vary considerably: Fraenkel (1957: 291–97), Feeney (1998: 111–13), Hardie (2003), and most recently Morgan (2010: 260–74).

[75] See Mayer (1993: *ad loc*) on these Grecisms. Chrysippus has been proposed as a source as well as Aristotle's definition of the ἐλευθέριος.

Similarly, Horace twice alludes to Greek originals by using Catullus as a proximate source: his rendition of Sappho derives from Catullus (*dulce ridentem Lalagen amabo | dulce loquentem, C.* 1.22.23–24; imitates Catul. 51.5 and Sapph. fr. 31.5 V.) as well as his Callimachean prayer for the destruction of weaponry (*o pater et rex | Iuppiter, ut pereat positum robigine telum, S.* 2.1.42–43; imitates Catul. 66.48 and Callim. *Aet*. 110.48 Pf.). In the discussion of Horace's mottoes such effects are usually called *contaminatio,* a term borrowed from textual criticism. Catullus in his own version of Sappho's ode to Anactoria provides a similar instance: though the content is archaic, the postponement of the conjunction *sed* (*lingua sed torpet*, 51.9) confronts Sappho with Hellenistic technique.[76] Parallel Grecisms present a similar temporal juxtaposition in themselves: insofar as they are the result of both native inheritance and foreign pressure, they may allude both to the archaic period of their source text as well as to a time frame in the more recent Roman past. Though the tension between these two frames of reference is not always felt or developed, it does sometimes play a role, as in *Odes* 1.18, which confronts an Alcaic drinking song with Ennian piety. The temporal juxtapositions that these linguistic artifacts create—between archaic and Hellenistic Greece and between early Greece and second-century Rome—remind us that Horace is viewing his lyric predecessors with Hellenistic eyes.

[76] Callimachus favored the postponement of ἀλλὰ to unusual positions in the line (see Pfeiffer on *Aet.* 110.60). On unusual postpositions of particles and conjunctions in Latin, especially as a "neoteric" mannerism, see: Munro (1873: on Lucr. 2.1050), Kroll (1980: on Catul. 64.93), Fordyce (1978: on Catul. 23.7), Austin (1955: on Verg. *A.* 4.33), Ross (1969: 67–69), Platnauer (1951: 94), N–H (on *C.* 1.18.3), and Courtney (2003: 242) on Varro of Atax fr. 8 Courtney. If Baehrens's emendation of Laevius (fr. 12a Courtney) is correct, which Courtney accepts, this provides the earliest postponement of *et*. The postposition of δέ is common in Greek poetry, beginning with Homer (Denniston 1996: 187–89).

While the examples discussed from Horace have all provided close translations of an identifiable Greek source, Grecisms also allude to a foreign source when the object of imitation is not a specific passage but, more generally, a foreign author or style. To evoke the presence of Pindar, for instance, Horace relies on a range of compositional techniques, such as dense imagery, priamels, abrupt shifts of topic, complex subordinate sentences that run across several stanzas.[77] Syntax also plays a role in Horace's Pindarizing style, as Horace's Augustus ode (*C.* 1.12) shows. While the interference in the opening line (*sumis celebrare*) alludes to a specific textual source, as discussed above, Grecisms in the rest of the poem evoke the sense of a foreign presence without engaging in direct translation of a specific textual source: *super Pindo* (6), *blandum . . . dicere* (11–12), *superare . . . nobilem* (26–27), *defluit saxis* (29), *ponto . . . recumbit* (31–32), *mittes . . . lucis* (59–61).[78] It would be possible to extend this observation by examining Grecisms in other poems that are usually identified as Pindaric, such as *C.* 2.20, 3.1–6, 3.11, 3.27, 4.2, 4.8.

3.4 GRECISMS AS ELEVATION AND INNOVATION

While some Grecisms allude to specific Greek passages, more commonly interference serves to differentiate the language of Latin poetry from ordinary speech. Though Greek provides the syntactic model and literary authority behind these deviations, their most salient quality is, not Greekness as such, but distance from the registers of everyday

[77] Race (2010) treats Horace's Pindaric style most recently and provides a guide to earlier bibliography. Jocelyn (1993, 1995b) radically denied the influence of Pindar on Horace, though this has met with little acceptance.

[78] Jocelyn (1993, 1995b) surveys the syntactical Grecisms in these poems along with other Greek features, such as vocabulary.

speech. Despite the loss of novelty over the centuries, the opening words of *Odes* 1.22 provide an outstanding illustration of such a construction: *integer vitae scelerisque purus*. In ordinary Latin, the adjectives *integer* and *purus* would govern an ablative of respect (*integer vita, scelereque purus*); however, Horace here construes them unexpectedly with the genitive, which recalls the syntax of such Greek adjectives as ἁγνός, καθαρός, ἀκήρατος (all *cum gen*.). Undoubtedly Greek provides a model that licenses such a departure from ordinary usage. Yet it would be unpromising, to say the least, for Horace to begin a meditation on purity by sounding like a foreigner. Fortunately, its relevant quality does not appear to be its proximity to Greek syntax, but rather its distance from everyday speech. By demonstrating syntactic apartness, the construction offers the first hint of one of the poem's main themes, the separation of the lover/poet from regular society (17–18): *pone me pigris ubi nulla campis | arbor aestiva recreatur aura* . . . The main function of the Grecism is not to relate the poem to a specific Greek antecedent or invoke a foreign atmosphere, but to throw the language out of prose. Readers of post-Romantic English-language poetry, which avoids the high style and sticks closely to the "selection of language really used by men," tend to denigrate such effects instinctively, as Nisbet and Hubbard do by calling the Grecism "mannered" and describing the opening of the poem as "grandiloquent." Yet differentiating between levels of speech is a legitimate function of language, and it is one that syntactic Grecisms were often engaged to perform. Poetry, nevertheless, face a risk over-using such devices to the point that they become clichéd and content-free, and I hope to show in this section that Horace's supple and intelligent use of them anticipates this potential criticism.

Elevated Grecisms were especially attractive to Roman poets because Latin lacked the lexical and phonological variety, furnished by dialect, that Greek poets used to distinguish varieties of poetic speech from each other and from ordinary language. Without a similarly variegated lexicon, Latin writers, who sought to make Latin a fit medium for literary expression on the model of Greek, relied more heavily on syntax than lexicon as a means of effecting some of the same meta-linguistic distinctions. As a result, syntactic Grecisms came to constitute an important ingredient in the Latin *sermo poeticus*, principally the language of epic and tragedy, which demarcated it from other varieties of speech. Grecisms fulfill this role in Catullus's *epyllion* on the marriage of Peleus and Thetis (*c.* 64), his closest approach to epic: in addition to its higher-than-average density of Greek loanwords and inflections, the poem contains three parallel Grecisms of a kind not found elsewhere in the collection.[79] However else these Grecisms may relate to the Hellenistic style and mythological content of the poem, they help elevate the register of the *epyllion* higher than other poems in the collection. Since the association of Grecisms with the higher reaches of poetry was often more significant than their foreign origin, in some cases it may be less misleading merely to call them poeticisms.

Sometimes Grecisms helped Roman poets solve formal challenges posed by the adaptation of Latin prosody to Greek meters. For instance, in several Grecizing constructions the accusative and the genitive provide, in effect, substitutes for the

[79] Three Greek accusatives of respect of two varieties: (64.64–65) *non contecta levi velatum pectus amictu,* | *non tereti strophio lactentes vincta papillas* (cf. App. 1.1.3) and (64.207–8) *mentem caligine Theseus* | *consitus* (cf. App. 1.1.4). The poem also contains Greek loanwords (e.g., *gaza*, 46; *calathiscus*, 319; *chorea*, 287) and Greek inflections (*Phasidos*, 3; *Pelea*, 21; *Minoidi*, 247).

ablative, where the ablative is metrically impossible, and the use of a perfect infinitive in place of a present infinitive helps compensate for Latin's shortage of short syllables.[80] By cutting out prepositions and other particles, many Grecisms also tend towards verbal compression: an effect valued for metrical convenience as well as stylistic distinction. Grecisms could also serve, conversely, to alleviate some of the ambiguity that resulted from poetic compression. This appears to be one of the chief functions of the "Greek" accusative of respect in Horace's poetry, and it helps explain why these accusatives almost always appear in conjunction with an ablative: almost as a rule, an accusative of respect will appear in place of an ordinary ablative of respect when the presence of a nearby ablative of means might lead to ambiguity.[81]

However, if the only function of such Grecisms were to advertise the register of an utterance or to fit language into meter, reliance on them might easily lapse into cliché, as their significance declines, or mannerism, if linguistic deformation is sought for its own sake. The habitual recycling of such effects tends to drain them of their force and significance, as happened to many Victorian poeticisms disdained as "Wardour Street English" (e.g., "o'er", "thou", "o", etc.). Horace, however, employs poetic Grecisms not only for formal reasons, to elevate his register or to indicate a generic affinity, but also in ways that engage closely with the content and create a sense of linguistic freshness.

---

[80] For instance, in the phrase *operum solutis* (C. 3.17.16), the genitive of separation (App. 2.2.2) substitutes for the more idiomatic but metrically untenable **ŏpĕrĭbus solutis*. For observations on the influence of meter on Horace's language, see Éngel (1914).

[81] In Horace's poetry, all the deviant accusatives that are governed either by a perfect passive participle or a finite passive verb are accompanied by an ablative in the same clause (cf. App. 1.1 and 1.3). The two exceptions are with a verb of dressing (*induo,* App. 1.1.2), an archaic usage which occurs once in Horace, and the medical Grecism *purgor bilem* (*AP* 302). Another apparent exception within App. 1.3 (*magna coronari contemnat Olympia*, *Ep.* 1.1.50) should arguably be classed as an internal accusative. In these contexts, the use of an ablative of respect next to another ablative might have introduced ambiguity, which could have been avoided in prose.

Placing a familiar word in an unfamiliar Greek construction, in addition to elevating the register, often extends the semantic range by evoking a Greek parallel or creates a sense of defamiliarization by some other means.

Horace articulates some of the literary principles behind these effects in the *Ars Poetica*, where he describes the use of *callidae iuncturae* to render language exceptional (*AP* 46–48) and defends the *licentia* to enrich the Latin lexicon by drawing on Greek (*AP* 48–53). Though there his emphasis is on diction, Horace employs a syntactic Grecism to translate some of this theory into practice. The effect was widely noted by the ancient commentators and became a commonplace example of verbal innovation among later grammarians (*AP* 55–58):

> ego cur, adquirere pauca
> si possum, invideor, cum lingua Catonis et Enni
> sermonem patrium ditaverit et nova rerum
> nomina protulerit?
>
> And why should they grumble if I succeed in bringing a little in, when the diction of Ennius and Cato showered wealth on our fathers' language and gave us unheard of names for things? (transl. Rudd)

Horace has, uniquely in classical Latin, transformed the intransitive verb *invideo* into a pure passive construction (*invideor*) rather than employ the ordinary methods of passivization (*invidetur mihi*, *in invidia esse*, *invidiam habere*, etc.).[82] The ps.-Acronian scholia pick up on this semantic shift (*ad loc.*): *mire, dum de fingendis verbis loquitur, secundum Graecos ipse fincxit "invideor". Invideor idest invidiam patior; nam invideor*

[82] The *TLL* cites only one additional instance of a finite passive form (Fulg. *Aet. mund*. 172.8: *conlator lucis ab adversariis invidetur*), though there are examples of the perfect passive participle and the gerund.

negatur posse dici, aut invideor prohibeor.[83] The construction is modeled on φθονοῦμαι, the passive form of φθονέω, and it draws on the Greek word's semantic range, which often means "refuse" with an infinitive complement (*LSJ* s.v. II). The resulting sense of *invideor* thus inhabits the middle ground between "I am begrudged" and "I am forbidden." While one effect of the interference is to impart a sense of stylistic distinction, its novelty and extended meaning showcases Horace's commitment to linguistic renewal.

A case in point from Horace that illustrates his successful handling of poetic Grecisms is the *sensit delapsus* construction (< ᾔσθετο ἐμπεσών), in which a participial clause serves as an argument to a verb of perception or another Greek verb that ordinarily governs a participle (e.g. λανθάνω, καρετερέω).[84] The construction offers a Latin writer several formal advantages: in addition to its poetic elevation, the construction is more concise than the prosaic alternative, the *accusativus cum infinitivo*, which makes it more forceful and easier to fit into verse. Moreover, it is one of the few syntactic Grecisms that Horace appears to have invented or developed: the earliest instances in Latin literature appear in the *Epodes* (ca. 30 BC; *Epod.* 2.19, 3.7, 5.67–68). Since analogous constructions appeared soon after in the *Georgics* (ca. 29 BC; e.g., *gaudent perfusi sanguine fratrum*, Verg. *G.* 2.510) and Propertius's *monobiblos* (ca. 28 BC; e.g., *pulsata indignis saepe queror manibus*, Prop. 1.16.6), it is unsafe to place too much emphasis on precise chronology. But whether or not it was Horace's innovation, he appears to use it more

[83] Other grammarians took up this observation: August. *Regula* (*quamquam Horatius poeta "invideor" dixit, sed hoc nova usurpatione*, *GL* 5.512.17–18), Prisc. (*GL* 3.271).

[84] See App. 4.2. As we have seen, Milton later adapted the construction into English ("knew not eating Death"), for whom it was both a Grecism and a Latinism.

often—eight times—and with a wider range of Latin verbs than other Augustan poets.[85] Briefly surveying its occurrences in Horace's poetry will provide insight into the function and significance of elevated, poetic Grecisms.

The three earliest occurrences in the *Epodes* do not appear to establish a relationship with any known Greek model, but instead serve to elevate Horace's language. In *Epodes* 2, which mocks the pastoral fantasies of Alfius the Roman moneylender, various poeticisms help distance Alfius's idyll from everyday life so as to exaggerate and ultimately undermine it.[86] In the following passage, Alfius imagines the arrival of autumn in terms of an over-the-top personification (*Epod*. 2.17–22):

> vel cum decorum mitibus pomis caput
> Autumnus agris extulit,
> ut gaudet insitiva decerpens pira
> certantem et uvam purpurae,
> qua muneretur te, Priape, et te, pater
> Silvane, tutor finium!
>
> when in the countryside Autumn raises his head arrayed with ripe fruit, how he enjoys picking the pears he grafted and the clusters that rival the dyer's purple to reward you, Priapus, and you, Father Silvanus, for watching over his land! (transl. Rudd)

In addition to the postponed conjunction (*certantem et*), two forceful Grecisms—a participial construction with *gaudeo* (*gaudet . . . decerpens* ~ ἥδεται δρέπων) and a dative following a verb of fighting (*certantem . . . purpurae* ~ μάχομαί τινι)—dissociate Alfius's language from quotidian experience and elevate it to the world of poesy. Porphyrio's comment on these lines is particularly apt (on line 17): *poetica fantasia finxit Autumnum*

---

[85] Among Augustan poets, Horace is the first to the use the construction with *fallo* (*Epod.* 3.7) and *gaudeo* (*Epod.* 2.19, *Ep.* 2.2.107 ~ ἥδομαι, χαίρω) and uniquely employs it with *doleo* (*iniecta monstris Terra dolet suis*, *C.* 3.4.73) and *duro* (*Ep.* 1.1.82 ~ καρτερέω). The *TLL* fails to cite the construction with *duro*.

[86] Aside from Grecisms, these include: poetic plurals (e.g., *mella*, 15), the ellipsis of *est* (e.g., *beatus ille*, 1), and substantivized participles (e.g., *mugientium*, 11).

quasi corporalem deum pomis coronatum. Alfius's labored syntax, no less than the poetic personification, underscores the nature of his *fantasia*.[87] As the poem goes on to show, Alfius's lack of touch with the reality of country life is a major failing, and the elevation sustained by Grecisms and other poeticisms is a symptom of that general failure of realism. Appropriately enough, when the same construction with the verb *gaudeo* recurs in Horace's Epistle to Florus, it describes another class of dreamers and self-deluders. By its pompous elevation, the same Grecism neatly captures the self-deception to which, according to Horace, poets are liable (*Ep.* 2.2.106–8):

> ridentur mala qui componunt carmina; verum
> gaudent scribentes et se venerantur et ultro,
> si taceas, laudant quidquid scripsere beati.
>
> People who write incompetent verse are a joke; however, they *enjoy* composing and treat themselves with sincere respect, and if *you* say nothing they'll actually praise their own productions. (transl. Rudd; emphasis his)

The other two instances of the construction in the *Epodes* both depend on the verb *fallo* and occur in connection with magic and witchcraft. The first forms part of Horace's denunciation of garlic (*Epod.* 3.5–6): *num viperinus his cruor | incoctus herbis me fefellit* ("has it escaped me that the blood of vipers was distilled into these vegetables?"). As with Alfius's fantasy, the mismatch between elevated style and ordinary content is part of the humor. It is more difficult to judge the tone of the second occurrence in *Epodes* 5, which describes in an edgy and occasionally realistic way the murder of a well-born Roman boy. Yet its appearance within Canidia's prayer to Nox and Diana, a magical ἀποπομπή which aims to avert divine wrath from the speaker towards her target Varus,

[87] Watson (2003: *ad loc.*) notes Porphyrio's comment but justifies these Grecisms misleadingly by invoking their "Dionysiac context."

guarantees its elevated register (67–68): *atqui nec herba nec latens in asperis | radix fefellit me locis* ("but it has not escaped me that the herb is hiding in rough places"). The use of both constructions in connection with witchcraft may suggest that to the Roman ear there was something potentially devious about this construction with its evasive participal.

To round off the picture, I will briefly consider the remaining occurrences of the construction in Horace's poetry. While poetic elevation is an important factor when Horace uses the Grecism in the Roman Odes, the compression also enables Horace to place particular emphasis on the action described by the participle (*C.* 3.4.73): *iniecta monstris Terra dolet suis.* As Gordon Williams observes, Horace elides the miraculous and fabulous elements of the Gigantomachy legend in order to humanize the story and accordingly uses this participial construction to allude to the *iniectio terrae*, part of burial rites.[88] Elsewhere in *Odes* 3, the same Grecism helps describe the superiority of relaxed poverty to political achievement (*C.* 3.16.30–32): *et segetis certa fides meae | fulgentem imperio fertilis Africae | fallit sorte beatior* ("it escapes the brilliant owner of fertile Africa that the certain reliability of my field is more fortunate in allocation"). The magnificence of this stanza depends on the density of its texture, almost to the point of obscurity, and the word order, which postpones the most important word, *beatior*, to the final position. The emphasis that the construction casts on the participle also helps to explain its appearance at *Ep.* 1.1.82, where the participle is further thrown into relief by its placement at the end of the hexameter: *eadem possunt horam durare probantes*? ("can any persevere *to approve* the same thing for an hour?") The final instance provides an

[88] Williams (1969: 52).

excellent illustration of the value of the construction, not only as a source of poetic distinction but also so as to achieve gnomic compression (*Ep.* 1.17.10): *nec vixit male, qui natus moriensque fefellit* ("one does not live badly whose birth and death escape notice"). In ordinary Latin the sentence would be perhaps twice as long, but the poetic licenses Horace takes with the gnomic perfects and the Grecizing use of *fallo* pares the thought down to a memorable *sententia* that recalls Epicurus's λάθε βιώσας.

Because of their elevated register, such Grecisms also make an effective resource for parody, especially in the *Satires.* Horace's satire on *captatio* (*S.* 2.5) has already come under examination for its parodic combination of high and low register loanwords, but it also displays effective parodic use of syntactic Grecisms. For instance, Tiresias's epicizing language belies his description of inheritance law (*S.* 2.5.49): *siquis casus puerum egerit Orco*. The dative of motion towards (*Orco*), which Horace uses elsewhere in the *Odes*, imitates a common Homeric construction (e.g., Ἀιδὶ προίαψεν) both syntactically and through its personification of the Underworld.[89] Yet it is comically out of touch with the subject of the dialogue. Similarly, Grecisms serve to mock Horace's schoolmates, the children of great centurions, and exaggerate their snobbery (*S.* 1.6.74): *laevo suspensi loculos tabulamque lacerto*. The high style Greek accusatives (*loculos*, *tabulam*), rare in Horace's poetry when not referring to body parts, mock the students' childish pride.

[89] See App. 3.1 (e.g., *Panthoiden iterum Orco demissum, C.* 1.28.10–11; *Caelo supinas si tuleris manus, C.* 3.23.1).

3.5 GRECISMS AS SYNTACTIC EXPRESSIONISM

By way of conclusion, I would like to consider two passages in Horace where the unusual syntax has occasioned obstinate disagreement among commentators and critics. While difficulties in these passages have sometimes been removed or mitigated by emendation, my aim is to suggest that the difficulty is inherent to the syntax, and indeed part of the effect being sought. The Grecisms in these passages push Horace's language to the edge of meaning, perhaps to the point of indeterminacy, but they do so for cogent reasons of expression: in order to hold multiple interpretations in play, to thicken the texture of the writing, and to mirror the complexity of the content. To call these constructions "mannered" implies their complexity is not justified by the content or is pursued for its own sake, but I hope to show this is not the case: rather than "mannered," it may be better to consider these effects "experimental", mimetic, or logopoeic.

The first passage comes from Horace's short but intricately sculptured hymn to Diana and Apollo in *Odes* 1. Horace's poem reworks Catullus's context-free poem 34 into a hymn in celebration of Augustus's temple of Apollo Palatinus, which featured statues of Diana and her mother flanking Apollo.[90] In the course of four stanzas, Horace addresses a choir of girls and a choir of boys, bids them praise Diana and Apollo respectively, and dictates a prayer for them in the concluding stanza that anticipates an end to war and pestilence. In contrast, however, to the limpid and direct style of Catullus 34, Horace's hymn is full of syntactical involutions and rich bilingual puns. These begin in the second stanza, addressed to Diana's choir of girls (*C.* 1.21.5–9):

---

[90] See Feeney (1998: 43).

vos laetam fluviis et nemorum coma
quaecumque aut gelido prominet Algido
  nigris aut Erymanthi
    silvis aut viridis Gragi.

You girls, sing of the goddess who delights in rivers and whatever foliage of trees stands out on chilly Algidus, or in the dark woods of Erymanthus or of green Mount Gragus. (transl. West)

Though Shackleton Bailey ends this stanza with a full stop, the verb must be understood (*canite*) or supplied from the subsequent stanza (*tollite*). One sign of Horace's sophistication is the etymological play on the name Algidus ("cold"), a mountain range on the eastern edge of the Colline Hills, which Horace glosses as *gelidus*.[91] Yet the most complex feature in this stanza involves the division of nouns and adjectives across the final two lines: each appears to complete the sense of the other.[92] The third *aut*-clause, *aut viridis Gragi*, requires *silvis* to be understood from the previous clause, while conversely the previous *aut*-clause, *nigris aut Erymanthi* | *silvis*, which lacks an epithet to describe Mount Erymanthus, seems to be supplemented by the adjective *viridis* from the following line. While the resulting pattern of sound and syntax offers its own aesthetic fascination, it remains difficult to pin down precisely the prose meaning of these verses. Nisbet and Hubbard write (*ad loc*.), "probably both adjectives are felt in both clauses; both mountains are green and their woods are dark"; other commentators have taken different views of the matter.[93] The blurring of colors and the density of syntactic texture corresponds well to the sense being conveyed.

---

[91] See N–R *ad loc*.

[92] Though it is easy to write about "lines" on the page, it should be remembered that the final two verses of the Third Asclepiad were originally understood as a single unit, an elaborated version of Asclepiad, which appears in the first two lines.

[93] According to the alternative view, *nigris* refers only to the woods of Erymanthus, a mountain in Arcadia famous for its wildness and impassibility (e.g., δενδροκόμης Ἐρύμανθος, Rufinus, *AP* 5.19.5). Ps.-

The next stanza offers a similar, but more radical, interpretive crux, which hinges on the interpretation of a Grecizing accusative. The stanza, which contains Horace's instructions to the choir of boys, reads as follows (9–12):

> vos Tempe totidem tollite laudibus
> natalemque, mares, Delon Apollinis
> insignemque pharetra
> fraternaque umerum lyra.
>
> You boys, raise Tempe no less often with your praises, and Delos, birthplace of Apollo, his shoulder shining with the quiver and his brother's lyre. (transl. West)

Another etymological pun, as David West notes, sustains the note of sophistication from the previous stanza: *Delos*, the name of the island (< δῆλος), is glossed by a Latin equivalent *insignem*. Superficially, the structure of the final three lines, with its threefold *-que*, parallels the structure of the previous stanza with its triple *aut*. Even the placement of *-que*, though an enclitic, seems to match the position of *aut* in each of the verses. Interpretations of the meaning and syntactic structure of this stanza, however, diverge wildly. The main point of contention is whether to take *umerum* as another direct object of *tollite*, parallel with *Delon* and *Tempe* ("praise Delos, the birthplace of Apollo, and his shoulder, famous for the quiver and his brother's lyre"), or as a direct Grecism, an accusative of respect, which modifies *insignem* ("praise Delos, the birthplace of Apollo, famous both for his quiver and his brother's lyre with respect to his shoulder").

All modern editors since Nisbet and Hubbard have preferred the first, more syntactically straightforward reading, despite the incongruousness of praising Apollo's

---

Acro's prose rendering (*C.* 1.21.5) is as follows: *ordo est: vos dicite laetam comam nemorum et quaecumque prominet fluviis aut Algido gelido aut nigris silvis Erymanthi aut nigris silvis viridis Gragi.*

shoulder ("praise Tempe, Delos, and the shoulder of Apollo").[94] This reading also has the authority of the ps.-Acronian scholia on its side, which provide the following prose rendition: *vos, mares, tollite Tempe totidem laudibus et Delon natalem Apollinis, et umerum insignem pharetra et fraterna lyra* (on 5). By contrast, the second interpretation requires positing at least two syntactic difficulties: an accusative of respect after the adjective *insignem*, a forceful Grecism that occurs only once elsewhere in Horace's poetry (*mitior animum*, *C.* 3.10.18), and an instance of *enallage*, in which the adjective *insignem* has been transferred from *Apollinis* to the substantive on which it depends, *Delon*. Despite these oddities, Porphyrio adopts this interpretation without hesitation, and it was subsequently defended by, among others, Bentley, L. Müller, Orelli, and Peerlkamp, T. E. Page, and Kießling and Heinze.[95] What this reading loses in syntactic directness it makes up for in structural neatness: the boy choir now has two objects of praise (Tempe and Delos) and Apollo has two divine attributes (*insignem pharetra lyraque*), like Diana in the previous stanza (*laetam fluviis et nemorum coma*). It seems more appropriate for the epithet *insignem . . . pharetra*, which renders the poetic compound εὐφαρέτρας (e.g., τὸν εὐφαρέτραν Ἀπόλλω, S. *Tr.* 208), to describe Apollo than his shoulder. Moreover, its most persuasive defender may be Statius, whose close imitation of this passage clearly takes *insignis* to govern an accusative of respect (*Theb.*

[94] Romano (in Venini et al. 1991–1997), West (1995), and Syndikus (2001) follow Nisbet's and Hubbard's lead. Courtney (2004) also rejects the first reading out of hand.

[95] The replacement of *umerum* by *umeros*, conjectured by L. Müller, does not seem to be a necessary improvement for this interpretation (*pace* N–H). The singular often appears in place of the plural when speaking of body parts in this way (cf. Virgil's *nuda genu* and English "on bended knee"). Bell (1923: 67–71) cites more examples in Latin and Greek poetic diction.

7.206–7): *Amphion . . . lyra galeam tauroque insignis avito* ("Amphion remarkable for the lyre and the paternal bull on his helmet").[96]

Faced with these two interpretations, each of which has its ancient defenders and its own assortment of advantages and shortcomings, the best solution may be to accept both as irreconcilable possibilities. Both interpretations involve exceptional language: a reader must be prepared to accept either Apollo's "famous shoulder" as the object of praise, an extreme example of metonymy, or an experimental Greek accusative with *enallage*. Horace's highly patterned word order in both stanzas seems designed to repel rather than invite patient, semantic disentanglement. Their density of texture creates the greatest possible distance from the language of everyday prose and provides a counterpart to the elevation of divinity. For an analogous use of thick syntax to convey a divine presence, it is possible to compare Horace's ode to Bacchus, *Bacchum in remotis* (2.19). While the poem is about personal revelation rather than a choral hymn, its elaborately patterned language, which contains at least one Grecism (*turbidum* | *laetatur*, 2.19.6–7), is both a mark of Horace's ἔνθεοι φρένες and a verbal offering to the god.

One final example of syntactic indeterminacy occurs at the end of Horace's ode to Quinctius (*C.* 2.11). The theme of its final stanza is not divine worship, but the hairstyle of Lyde, a prostitute hastily summoned to help relieve Quinctius's cares. Friedrich Klingner prints the following conservative text (*C.* 2.11.22–4):

> eburna dic age cum lyra

---

[96] Silius followed Statius in the reminiscence (*insignis flexo galeam per tempora cornu*, Sil. 1.415) and uses the adjective once more with an accusative of respect (*genus insignis . . . Fulvius*, Sil. 12.470). The only two additional occurrences of *insignis* with an accusative of respect cited by the *TLL* occur in Avienus's translation of Aratus (*insignis ardens venas ophiuchus*, 226, where *insignis* corresponds to φαεινόμενον; *longos insignis aquarius artus*, 648).

maturet, in comptum Lacaenae
more comam religata nodum.

> Go on; tell her to grab her ivory lyre and hurry up, tying her hair into an unkempt knot, Spartan style. (adapted from Rudd)

Unfortunately, the syntactic difficulty here is made harder to address by the presence of serious textual uncertainty. The combination of syntactic and textual difficulty is not surprising, suggesting that corrections were introduced early into the transmission in order to ease interpretation.[97] The manuscripts of Horace present three different readings for *comam*: in addition to *comam* (Greek letter manuscripts), one finds *comas* (DERδ^2) and *comae* (ABλ^1). Similar three-way splits can be found throughout the text of Horace.[98] A second textual problem is whether to retain the word division *in comptum*, as most manuscripts do, or to read *incomptum* as a single word, preferred by many recent editors. To add an additional level of complexity, Torrentius (1608) proposed two conjectures that have been accepted by many editors, including Bentley, Brink, and Shackleton Bailey (*incomptam* for *incomptum* and *nodo* for *nodum*). The result of these variants and conjectures is that over the last century at least four different versions of the text have been printed and defended.

My aim, however, is not to adjudicate among these proposed readings but to challenge some of the guiding assumptions on which critics of this passage usually rely. Despite the principle *lectio difficilior potior*, most textual criticism aims to reduce syntactic complexity and bring it into accordance with an author's known usage. Hence, the version accepted by Bentley, Brink, and Shackleton Bailey, though it involves

---

[97] Scribes occasionally normalized Grecisms out of the text of the *Aeneid* (e.g., 9.789, 10.154, 10.331); see Mayer (1999).

[98] For instance, see Brink (1971: 25–28) for some instances in the *Ars Poetica*.

changing the text in two places, presents the least syntactic difficulty.[99] Naturally this assumption breaks down where complexity is an author's aim and language becomes deliberately experimental. There are indeed good reasons for wanting highly involuted syntax here: Kießling and Heinze admired Horace's *Wortknoten*, the mimetic relationship between syntax and sense. Nisbet and Hubbard took this suggestion another step forward, noting that "the elaborate symmetry of the sentence is at variance with the simplicity it describes," a contradiction that has parallels elsewhere in the poem.[100] Horace, however, does not appear troubled by the apparent tension between simplicity and refinement. Rather, in Epicurean fashion, he asserts the essential identity of both: true refinement *is* simplicity and vice versa.[101] Whatever Horace wrote at the end of this poem, it seems likely that highly wrought syntax was one means of asserting this antinomy. If the resulting language was ambivalent, its ambivalence may have been inherent to maintaining an apparent contradiction. Readers ought, therefore, to be on guard against simplifications of the text that end up reducing such tensions in this poem and elsewhere.

As we have seen, interference from Greek syntax provided Horace with a valuable stylistic resource. In terms of their grammatical form, Horace's Grecisms are rarely innovative and resemble those found in contemporary poetry; in a few respects, especially his use of the accusative of respect, Horace appears more restrained than

---

[99] The chief motivation for changing *nodum* to *nodo* involves its similar to a related passage (*dic et argutae properet Neaerae | murreum nodo cohibere crinem*, *C.* 3.14.21–22). However, if the ending of *C.* 2.11 were a linguistic experiment, the ending of *C.* 3.14 could well be a kind of correction or *pentimento* of Horace's previous syntax.

[100] N–H (169) contrast the colloquial informality (*cur non, vel hac,* 13; *sic temere*, 14; *potamus*, 17; *ocius*, 18; *maturet*, 23) with its luxurious grandeur (*rosa odorati,* 14; *dissipat Euhius*, 17).

[101] Horace's collocation *simplex munditiis* (*C.* 1.5.5) illustrates the apparent tension between simplicity and refinement.

Virgil. Sometimes Grecisms create a foreign atmosphere, especially when Horace wants to leave an identifiable trace of the original text in his translations of archaic lyric (e.g., *C.* 1.18.1). More often they impart a sense of stylistic distinction and elevation, which is not specifically Greek in tone. In addition to distinguishing his language from ordinary prose, elevated Grecisms increase the power of Horace's writing by their compression and density. In two instances, just discussed, the density of such writing has led to textual uncertainty (*C.* 1.21.9–12, 2.11.22–4).

Chapter 4

Puris Verbis: Purism and the Avoidance of Greek

1. Linguistic Purism

1.1 CHAPTER OVERVIEW

While previous chapters have examined the presence of Greek in Horace's poetry, the final chapter takes the measure of its absence. In an area of sustained linguistic contact, such as Rome in the late Republic, the choice not to use a foreign language could be as significant as the decision to employ it. In *Satires* 1.10, a touchstone of the chapter, which will receive an extended interpretation in Section 3, Horace declares his refusal either to write Greek poetry or to mix the two languages *Canusini more bilinguis*, "in the manner of a two-tongued Canusian." I argue that Horace partly means to distance himself from the practice of code-switching—speaking Greek within the context of a Latin utterance—a phenomenon that characterized earlier Latin satire and, at least to some extent, earlier lyric poetry as well. Because Greek was a familiar component of Latin style, its absence could sometimes be perceptible and significant. For instance, Horace describes a dream visitation from the god Quirinus, a tutelary deity associated with the foundation of Rome and sometimes identified with the deified Romulus, who commands him to stop composing Greek poetry. Quirinus warns Horace off *Graeci versiculi* with the following words (*S.* 1.10.34–35):

> in silvam non ligna feras insanius ac si

magnas Graecorum malis implere catervas.

> Carrying timber to a forest would be no crazier than your choosing to swell the packed ranks of the Greeks. (transl. Brown)

Rather than quote a familiar Greek proverb (γκαῦκα εἰς Ἀθήνας), as Horace's educated contemporaries might have done, Quirinus cites, or perhaps invents, a Latin equivalent: *in silvam non ligna feras*. In English, we can compare the expression "coals to Newcastle." Given the prevalence of Greek tag-switching in educated Latin speech, Quirinus's choice to use Latin here is especially marked or pointed: it provides a live demonstration of his advice to Horace not to write Greek. Fittingly enough, Quirinus speaks like a Latin purist. The translation of the tag into Latin is only one of the ways that Horace has naturalized a Greek original, since the entire dream sequence has been modeled a familiar passage from Callimachus's *Aetia* (fr. 1.21–4 Pf.), in which Apollo warns Callimachus not to write grand poetry.[1]

The present chapter attempts to identify and explore the significance of similar moments in Horace's poetry where Greek is perceptible by its absence. After introducing the phenomenon of linguistic purism, both in general and as regards antiquity, the chapter identifies several techniques that Horace employed to avoid outright language mixture (e.g., translation, calques, periphrasis, and lexical assimilation). Evidence of absence is of course difficult to establish, especially when reconstructing the linguistic choices faced by a speaker two millennia ago. To overcome this challenge the chapter proceeds

[1] Zetzel (2002) discusses the entire episode and its relation to Callimachus.

comparatively: by identifying actual instances of code-switching in the works of Horace's predecessors and close contemporaries, it attempts to show where his use of Latin might have represented a significant departure from expected practice.

1.2 INTRODUCTION TO LINGUISTIC PURISM

When languages come into contact with one another, it is common for some speakers to want to purify their language of foreign influence, for instance, by avoiding loanwords and other borrowings, coining native alternatives, altering their pronunciation, or forbidding the use of another language entirely. Doing so is one manifestation of linguistic purism, a general label for any collective effort to cleanse a language of undesirable features, which may be defined morally (e.g., by favoring "clean words" over "talking dirty"), socially (preferring upper class usage to slang and professional jargon), or ethnically (native vs. foreign words).[2] Purism contributed to the standardization and codification of the European vernaculars in early modern Europe (e.g., the *Academia della Crusca*, founded in 1582, and its *Vocabolario*, first published in 1612) and, more recently, has figured in the nationalism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (e.g., the recent French concern to replace Anglicisms like *la shuttle* and *le computer* with *la*

[2] Burke (2004: 141–59) introduces purism as a historical and sociolinguistic phenomenon and surveys linguistic purism in the early modern period. Thomas (1991: 10–12) offers the following working definition: "Purism is the manifestation of a desire on the part of a speech community (or some section of it) to preserve a language from, or rid it of, putative foreign elements or other elements held to be undesirable (including those originating in dialects, sociolects and styles of the same language). It may be directed at all linguistic levels but primarily the lexicon. Above all, purism is an aspect of the codification, cultivation and planning of standard languages." Recent contributions to the study of linguistic purism include: Langer and Davies (2005), Davies (2006), and Mugglestone (2006).

navette and *l'ordinateur*). While some purist movements have addressed a wide audience, such as an entire nation or language community, purism has also been a feature of literary movements that limit their concern to a minority of speakers, such as Mallarmé's call for poets to "purify the language of the tribe" (*donner un sens plus pur au mots de la tribu*), or the emphasis of English neoclassical critics on purity and chasteness of diction. Various factors may encourage the development of linguistic purism, such as a fear that group identity is under threat, a desire to broaden or narrow the boundaries of a language community, a perception of cultural inferiority, the administrative needs of a centralized state, and changes in the technology of communication.

While purism has had a more significant effect on the development of other European languages, such as French and German, it has also been an intermittent presence in the history of English. Its influence was strongest during the Counter-Reformation, when Protestants coined alternatives for religious loanwords that seemed too Catholic (e.g., John Cheke's (d. 1557) coinage of "overseer" for "bishop" < ἐπίσκοπος; "gainrising" for "resurrection" < *resurrectio*), and again in the wake of the Restoration of Charles II (1660), which encouraged Daniel Defoe's enthusiasm for an English language academy and influenced the plan of Samuel Johnson's dictionary.[3] The last serious manifestation may have been the foundation of the Society for Pure English

[3] Geers (2005) surveys purism in English. Burke (2004: 146) places Defoe's project for a language academy and Johnson's *Plan of a Dictionary* (1747) in the context of the Restoration.

in 1913, which stopped publishing its tracts soon after the Second World War. Purism of a moderate kind continues to shape contemporary writing, for instance, through the recommendations of style guides like *Fowler's English Usage*, written by one of the Society's founders.[4] Although neoclassical writers, such as John Dryden, Alexander Pope, and Oliver Goldsmith especially admired purity as a virtue of style, "pure English" as a register of diction has been an expressive resource since the Renaissance. For instance, the following lines from Shakespeare's *Macbeth* powerfully modulate between Latinate and Anglo-Saxon registers (*Macbeth*, 2.2):

> With all great Neptunes Ocean wash this blood
> Cleane from my Hand? no: his my Hand will rather
> The multitudinous Seas incarnadine,
> Making the Greene one, Red.

The final line provides a plain and almost entirely monosyllabic gloss on the Latinate word "incarnadine". As if to offset the rhetorical force of the previous lines, Macbeth's plain speaking seems to give direct expression to his pain and guilt.[5]

In the ancient world, linguistic purism was one result of languages and communities coming into contact with one another. As early as the fifth century BC, sophists, such as Prodicus of Chios, seem to have concerned themselves with aspects of linguistic standardization (e.g., ὀρθότης ὀνομάτων, Prodicus *DK* T11). It may that their philosophical interest in language and standardization was partly a response to the

[4] See the entries "Gallicisms", "French words", "barbarisms", "hybrids and malformations" in Fowler (1926; repr. 2009).

[5] Haynes (2004: 41–42) discusses this passage in relation to purism.

communicative needs of Greek elites, who maintained political ties across the Greek world. The concept of ἑλληνισμός (e.g., Hdt. 1.58)—the idea of a shared community of Greek identity based on overlapping bonds of language, culture, and kinship and opposed to τὸ βαρβαρικόν—received its greatest impetus from the Persian Wars.[6] It became enshrined as one of the four *virtutes dicendi* in the aftermath of the conquest of mainland Greece by Macedonians, who had adopted Attic as a language of social prestige.[7] Perhaps the most extreme instance of ancient purism in action is the Atticist movement of the second century AD, which sought to cleanse the Greek *koine* and assimilate it to the Attic dialect spoken some five centuries earlier.[8] In this environment, Sextus Empiricus (S. E. *M.* 1.234) noted that using the wrong word for "breadbox", the loanword πανάριον (< *panarium*) instead of the native, classical term ἀρτοφόριον, invited ridicule. Many factors encouraged the rise of Atticism, including the encroachment of Latin throughout the eastern Mediterranean, nostalgia for the glory of the Greek past, and the cultural prestige of Attic literature.

---

[6] The earliest reference to ἑλληνισμός may derive from Theagenes of Rhegium in the sixth century (*DK* T1a). Vassilaki (2007) surveys the development of the concept of ἑλληνισμός; see also Versteegh (1987), Saïd (1991), and Silk (2009). Hall (2002) has argued that Greek identity precipitated not in the eighth century with the creation of pan-Hellenic religious festivals, but as a result of the fifth century Persian Wars.

[7] Stroux (1912) traces the origin of ἑλληνισμός as a virtue of speech to the rhetorical teachings of Theophrastus. Leiwo (1996) discusses some expressions of linguistic nationalism during the Persian Wars and in the court of Alexander the Great.

[8] Kim (2010) provides a helpful orientation to linguistic purism in the Second Sophistic. On bilingualism in the High Empire, see Corbier (2008) and Rochette (2010).

Linguistic purism was also an important factor in the standardization of classical Latin and the history of its literature.[9] The earliest surviving imitations of Greek literature by Livius Andronicus (active ca. 240–207 BC) and Cn. Naevius (active ca. 235–204 BC) seem to have maintained a cultural and linguistic distance from their models.[10] By contrast, Ennius's *Annales* ushered in a more thoroughly Hellenized poetic style. An epitaph for Naevius, written in Saturnians at an uncertain date and attributed to the poet himself, mourns the loss of an earlier state of linguistic perfection (Gell. 1.24.1): *itaque postquam est Orcho traditus thesauro | obliti sunt Romae loquier lingua Latina*.[11] The epitaph appears to hint at the concept of *Latinitas*, a word which only first appears in extant literature at the beginning of the first century BC. The desire to rid Latin of Greek elements seems to have become a prominent issue in the 160s during the final phases of the Macedonian Wars, when Rome was consolidating her control over the Balkan

[9] Petersmann's (2004) discussion of Latin standardization is seminal. Other discussions include: Kaimio (1979: 297–315), Dubuisson (1984), Desbordes (1991), Flobert (1994), and Fuhrmann (2001), Dench (2005: 299–315).

[10] Petersmann (2004) locates the first moment of standardization around the year 338 BC with the solidification of Roman rule over Latium. Solta (1974), following Devoto, speculates that some of the vast changes to the language in this period may result from an "antisabinische Reaktion" following the reduction of Sabine prestige. Livius avoids morphological calques, Greek inflections, and provides cultural translations for un-Roman aspects of Homeric language and religion (e.g., the aversion to ἕρκος ὀδόντων, *Odus.* fr. 3 Bl.; the translation of θεόφιν μήστωρ, *Odus.* fr. 10 Bl.; and *Monetas filia* for Μοῦσα in fr. 21 Bl.). According to Varro, Accius first introduced Greek inflections (e.g., *Hectŏra* for *Hectōrem*).

[11] As Courtney (2003: 48) suggests, the epitaph may imply a contrast between the purity of archaic poetry and the Hellenizing style of Ennius's *Annales*. There is no consensus regarding its date of composition, but it must antedate Varro's citation of it, supposing Varro himself was not its author; Müller (2001: 293n5) discusses its date and composition.

peninsula.[12] Such purism was both a nativist response to the threat that the resulting influx of Greek slaves and luxury goods posed to traditional markers of Roman identity, exemplified by the attitude of Cato the Elder, and an expression of philhellenism which the governing elite used to mark social distinctions among each other.[13] Internal developments may also be relevant, such as the controversies in the early second century over the composition of the Roman citizen body and its governing class.[14] The strongest contemporary evidence for this concern are the scripts of Terence's plays (160s BC), which differ markedly from Plautus's comedies in the frequency of loanwords and code-switching.[15] Perhaps partly on the basis of his own testimony (*in hac est pura oratio*, Ter. *Hau.* 46), Terence was remembered in the late Republic as the purist *par excellence*: in Caesar's words, a *puri sermonis amator* (Suet. *Poet.* fr. 11 Rost.). In popular memory he was long associated with Scipio Aemilianus, regarded as an aristocratic model of *purus sermo*.

Linguistic purism continued to be an explicit concern for many writers in the late Republic, whose language, canonized as classical Latin, was the product of purification

---

[12] Habinek (1998: 44–45) describes the "culture wars" of Republic playing out through a discourse of linguistic correctness: "from the linguistic/political struggles of the late third and early second centuries BCE emerged the 'imagined community' of Roman nationhood."

[13] Consider A. Postumius Albinus's boastful justification for writing bad Greek (*nam sum, inquit, homo Romanus natus in Latio, Graeca oratio a nobis alienissima est*, Gel. 11.8.3) and Cato's attack on his hypocrisy (Plb. 39.1; Plut. *Cato* 12.5). On this episode, see Adams (2003: 12n37).

[14] For instance, the enfranchisement and place of freedmen in the *comitia tributa* was a live political issue in 174 and 169. Attempts to broaden the *prima classis*, beginning with Cato's initiative as censor in 184, met with resistance (Crawford 1992: 78–79).

[15] On purism as a feature of Terence's style, see Maltby (1985), Müller (1997), Jocelyn (1999), Karakasis (2005: 83–89), and Müller (2007).

and standardization.[16] Julius Caesar's treatise *De analogia* advocates an even more extreme form of standardization and purity.[17] Among the features he recommends avoiding are: common vocabulary (*tamquam scopulum sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum*, fr. 2 Fun.), foreign inflections (e.g., *Calypsonem*, fr. 20 Fun.), and archaisms (Quint. *Inst.* 1.5.63). Caesar's purist convictions, like Cicero's, applied to public rather than private speech and co-existed with his admiration for Greek language and literature.[18] As these example suggest, purism in the late Republic was increasingly given shape and expression through the disciplines of grammar and rhetoric. Two related watchwords that presided over these developments were *Latinitas* ("Latinity") and the collocation *purus sermo* ("pure speech"), both of which make their earliest appearance in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, written perhaps in the 80s BC, where the two are closely equated (4.17): *Latinitas est quae sermonem purum conservat ab omni vitio remotum*.[19] Both keywords show a significant debt to Greek rhetorical theory: *Latinitas* is a calque on ἑλληνισμός and the adjective *purus* may relate to the use of καθαρός in Greek rhetorical theory (e.g., ἡ καθαρὰ τοῖς ὀνόμασι, καὶ τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν χαρακτῆρα σώζουσα διάλεκτος, Dionys. *Ep. Pomp*. 3.16). Nevertheless, in practice these qualities were opposed to linguistic defects arising from foreign influence (*barbarismos* and *soloecismus*), as well

[16] See Palmer (1961: 95–147), Rosén (1999), and Clackson and Horrocks (2007: 183–228).
[17] Willi (2010) discusses Caesar's *De analogia*.
[18] See Kaimio (1979: 130–31),
[19] Ancient discussions of *latinitas* include: Varro (Diomedes *GL* 1.439.15-16); Cicero (*de Orat.* 3.42–44); and Quintilian (esp. *Inst.* 1.6). For introductions to the concept and development of *Latinitas*, see Díaz y Díaz (1951) and Desbordes (1991). Grebe (2000) studies the view of Varro and Quintilian; Coleman (2001) studies Quintilian; Vainio (1999) collects evidence for purism in late antique grammar.

as many other nonstandard forms of speech (e.g., vulgarities, provincialisms, technical jargon).[20]

1.3 PURISM AND CODE-SWITCHING

Purists vary in the bilingual phenomena whose presence they seek to minimize. While loanwords are perhaps the most obvious targets, syntax, morphology, and calques have all at various times been the object of purist attention. Since it is one of the most visible forms of linguistic interaction, code-switching has also commonly been a focus of purism. Code-switching refers, broadly speaking, to the sensible intrusion of one language into conversation conducted in another, as when an English speaker mentions a "faux pas" or compliments an artwork as a "*tour de force*".[21] Although the term "code-switching" is a recent coinage, recognition of the phenomenon is considerably older and can be found among classical writers.[22] Code-switching differs from a range of other bilingual phenomena, such as syntactic interference, lexical borrowings, and calques, although the boundaries are fuzzy-edged.[23] For instance, there is a perceptible difference

---

[20] Müller (2001: 231–58) surveys the notion of *purus sermo* and related concepts as applied to Latin.

[21] Gardner-Chloros (2009) leaves the term undefined. Myers-Scotton (2008: 239) defines it generally as "the use of two language varieties in the same conversation." Adams (2003: 19): "I generally use the term here to describe a full-blown switch from one language into another within one person's utterance or piece of writing."

[22] On the ancient concept of code-switching, see Jocelyn (1999: 89–94) and Adams (2003: 19–20). The rhetorical device σαρδισμός (Quint. *Inst*. 8.3.59), named after the inhabitants of Sardis who spoke a mixture of Greek and Lydian, may be a close equivalent of "code-switching". See below, n111.

[23] Gardner-Chloros (2009: 2, 167–70) defends the essential fuzziness of the concept of code-switching. See Adams (2003: 26–27): "Hard and fast rules cannot be laid down for distinguishing between code-switching and borrowing . . . ."

between the word "*tour*" in the phrase "*tour de force*" and the use of the loanword "tour" in the phrase "a tour of Pittsburgh" even though, from the point of view of spelling and etymology, the words are identical. As this example shows, the pronunciation, typography, and linguistic context may all be relevant for distinguishing a code-switch from a borrowing, although these forms of evidence are not always available. Code-switching proliferates in areas with a dense concentration of bilingual competence: for instance, in Strasbourg, at least until recently, French and Alsatian were frequently mixed in conversation; similarly, code-switching has often been studied among Latino populations in New York City. In these communities, switching may happen so frequently that it becomes impossible to identify a single base or matrix language in which a given conversation occurs.[24]

A purist aversion to code-switching can be found in sources close to home. Henry Fowler's advice on "Gallicisms" to readers of *The Dictionary of Modern English Usage* (1926) partly concerns the use of code-switching:

> It would be a satisfaction to have a table divided into permissible [French] words, forbidden words, and words needing caution . . . Only fools will think it commends them to the English reader to decorate incongruously with such bower-birds' treasures as *au pied de la lettre, à merveille, bien entendu, les convenances, coûte que coûte, quand meme, dernier resort, impayable, jeu de mots, par exemple, robe de chamber, sans doute, tracasseries,* and *sauter aux yeux*; yet even these, even the abominations beginning and ending the list, are in place as supplying local colour or for other special reasons on perhaps five per cent. of the occasions on which they actually appear. Every writer who suspects himself of

[24] Gardner-Chloros (2009: 46) discusses the difficulty of assigning a matrix language in Strasbourg.

> the bowerbird instinct should make and use his own black list, and remember that acquisitiveness and indiscriminate display are pleasing to contemplate only in birds and savages and children.[25]

Fowler provides some thoughftul rules-of-thumb for regulating language alternation in formal prose. Much like Horace, as we will see, Fowler especially seeks to limit ostentatious tag-switching—the use of short, foreign phrases, which usually are syntactically unintegrated into the source language. As with Horace, Fowler's anxiety on this front mainly concerns social performance: the fear that working too hard to show off one's cultural capital might come across as merely *déclassé*. While Fowler's recommendations may seem reasonable, they represent a form of purism, an attempt to control a manifestation of language contact that freely occurs in informal settings. Characteristically, purists such as Fowler do not attempt to limit code-switching *tout court*, but only in specific speech environments, usually characterized by greater formality. For instance, in some bilingual areas it was once common to penalize schoolchildren for switching into the language of lower prestige in the classroom: while it may be justifiable on pedagogical grounds, in practice it often seems to have been about maintaining formality and enforcing social hierarchies.[26] Within a single community, many attitudes towards code-switching are likely to co-exist, and different codes of

[25] Fowler (1926: 212).

[26] For instance, Arthur (2001) documents secondary-school students in Botswana who were punished for switching from English into a native language.

conduct are likely to govern language alternation in different settings (e.g., at the dinner table, in the market, on a speaker's podium).[27]

An aversion to code-switching, at least within certain environments, also characterizes the attitude of educated Latin speakers in the late Republic. Cicero concisely makes the point in his *Tusculan Disputations*, as he prepares to translate a passage from Epicharmus (*Tusc.* 1.15): *scis enim me Graece loqui in Latino sermone non plus solere quam in Graeco Latine*. Curiously Cicero justifies his refusal to quote Epicharmus in the original by referring to his practice as a speaker of Greek, with which he assumes his audience to be familiar. Evidently, greater restrictions were placed on code-switching in formal Greek speech than ordinarily obtained in Latin. By importing a Greek standard of linguistic decorum to his Latin dialogues, Cicero partly means to elevate Latin to a position of greater prestige. Since code-switching occurred abundantly in the speech of educated Romans, as Cicero's letters themselves attest, its absence in certain contexts appears all the more striking.

The earliest explicit testimony for an aversion to code-switching may come from a late second-century *comoedia togata*, in which the speaker complains that a certain Numerius has scolded him for speaking Greek inappropriately (Afran. *com*. 272–73 Ribb.):

---

[27] Gardner-Chloros (2009: 81–82) shows that attitudes towards code-switching within the London Greek-Cypriot community vary by, among other things, social status.

> nam me pudet ubi mecum loquitur Numerius
> aliquid sufferre Graece: irridet me ilico.
>
> For I am ashamed when Numerius speaks with me to offer anything in Greek: he ridicules me on the spot.

The playwright Terence, already mentioned as a model of *purus sermo*, also clearly displayed an aversion to code-switching. While the dramatic scripts of Plautus contain nineteen full-blown switches, a single doubtful instance can be found in all of Terence's six scripts: the exclamation *phy* (*An.* 412).[28]

Cicero's theory and practice reveal an aversion to code-switching under identifiable circumstances.[29] He spoke most explicitly about purism in his philosophical writings, which aimed to make Hellenistic philosophy more easily available to his contemporaries and to establish Latin as a respectable medium for philosophical reflection.[30] In the *De officiis*, he associated code-switching with τὸ ἄπρεπον (*Off.* 1.111):

> ut enim sermone eo debemus uti qui †notus† est nobis, ne ut quidam Graeca verba inculcantes iure optimo rideamur, sic in actiones omnemque vitam nullam discrepantiam conferre debemus . . .
>
> For just as we ought to use that language which is known to us, lest (like some people) by trampling over Greek words we are very justly mocked, thus we ought to bring nothing untoward into our public duties and our entire life . . .

---

[28] Jocelyn (1999).

[29] On code-switching in Cicero, see Dunkel (2000), Swain (2002), and Adams (2003: 308–46). On Cicero's purism, see Oksala (1954) and Kaimio (1979: 309–11).

[30] Plut. *Cic.*40 with Powell (1995, 2004).

The phrase *ut quidam Graeca verba inculcantes* suggests that Cicero had in mind specific writers or speakers who used Greek words within a Latin utterance; possibly, as Andrew Dyck suggests, Titus Albucius, mocked by Lucilius (fr. 89–95 M.) for using Greek in an inappropriate, public context.[31]

The frequency of code-switching in Cicero's works varies widely according to genre, audience, and context.[32] The speeches show the most restraint: of the four full-blown switches, three occur apologetically in the Verrines (*Verr.* 2.50, 4.128, 5.148). The fourth is a verbatim quotation of a line from Plautus's *Trinummus*, which happens to contain the Greek verb οἴχεται (*Pis.* 61 quoting Pl. *Trin.* 419). In his philosophical writings, Cicero introduced Greek words parenthetically in order to gloss a native calque (e.g., *quos* δαίμονας *appellant,* Cic. *Tim.* 38), but regularly translated foreign terminology, tags, and literary citations into Latin.[33] By contrast, Cicero's correspondence contains an abundance of language alternation. However, even in his correspondence Cicero tends to avoid code-switching in certain recognizable situations for instance, when writing formal letters, such as letters of recommendation, addressing

[31] See Dyck (1996: 281–82).

[32] Swain (2002) provides a general overview of the distribution and motivations for code-switching in Cicero's work.

[33] Hartung (1974: 20–21) identifies the special contexts in which Cicero allows code-switching in his philosophical dialects: when the point of a quotation depends on a single Greek word (e.g., *Fin.* 5.92; *Div.* 2.118), when he cannot find an alternative (e.g., *Div.* 2.111), and in order to introduce a Latin neologism (e.g., *N. D.* 1.50). Nieschmidt (1913: 40–42) discusses the survival of Greek characters in Cicero's writing.

unfamiliar acquaintances or social superiors, and grieving over the death of his daughter Tullia.[34]

The emperor Tiberius provides a final example of an aversion to Greek in action. According to Suetonius, Tiberius hesitated to use the loanword *monopolium* before the Senate without an apology and refused to allow the word ἔμβλημα to stand in a senatorial decree, insisting it be replaced with a native alternative.[35] Since the word *emblema* had long been naturalized in Latin as a word for a mosaic or ornamental inlay, it is curious that the emperor would object to it more strongly than to *monopolium*, which appears to be a more recent borrowing.[36] It may be the case that the Emperor applied more stringent standards or purity to a senatorial decree than to a senatorial speech. Another possibility is that the Senate used ἔμβλημα in a sense that remained foreign to Latin ("fine" or "payment"), which would make the citation not a loanword but a live code-switch.[37] In any case, the anecdote portrays the emperor as a pedant, who not only corrects the Senate, but like a rhetorician provides specific instructions about how to replace the

---

[34] For restrictions on code-switching in Cicero's letters, see Swain (2002). Adams (2003: 313–16) accounts for the relative infrequency of code-switching in Cicero's letters to Paetus (*Fam.* 9.15–26) as a form of accommodation to the latter's purism.

[35] The two sources for this anecdote are: Suet. *Tib.* 71 and Dio Cass. 57.15.1–3. On this anecdote, see Dubuisson (1986).

[36] The word *emblema* had been domesticated in Latin as a third-declension noun as early as Lucilius (85); cf. Var. *R.* 3.2.4; Cic.*Var.* 4.37. The only occurrence of the word *monopolium* in Latin after Tiberius's citation of it is Plin *Nat.* 8.135.

[37] Although Dio claims the word refers to silver objects with golden inlays (τὰ ἄργυρα τὰ χρυσοῦν τι ἔμβλημα ἔχοντα), he may have been mistaken. The word appears in the sense of "fine" or "payment" in several legal papyri (*LSJ* s.v. 7). It may be relevant that Suetonius describes Tiberius as reacting to the word being read aloud (*recitaretur*), so that his perception of its foreignness had nothing to do with the script in which it was written.

offending vocabulary: *commutandam censuit uocem et pro peregrina nostratem requirendam aut, si non reperiretur, uel pluribus et per ambitum uerborum rem enuntiandam*. In mentioning the use of periphrasis, Tiberius also provides an amusing example of one. Rather than employ a borrowing (*periphrasis*) or a morphological calque (*circumlocutio*, *circumitio*) to refer to the device, he uses a wordy alternative, *ambitus verborum*. Clearly this seemed the least Greek way of rendering the compound into Latin.[38]

These examples support a few generalizations about the avoidance of code-switching in Rome. First, an aversion to code-switching was far from being a sign of general hostility to Greek; on the contrary, it was often an adjunct to or even a form of philhellenism. For Cicero, applying a Greek standard of linguistic decorum to Latin, traditionally regarded as a language of lower prestige, was a way of insisting on their parity. As Suetonius makes explicit, Tiberius's purism had nothing to do with either his practical ability to speak Greek or his overall attitude towards Greece. By both these measures, Tiberius was remarkably philhellenic: not only did he receive better linguistic training than Augustus, but he displayed highly cultivated literary and philological tastes. The same is true of Terence, who vaunted his ability to translate Greek. Cicero's attitude to Greece, though many-sided, also involved great admiration for classical literature and

[38] The word appears in Latin first as *cicumitio* (*Rhet. Her.* 4.32) and Quintilian uses an integrated loanword (*periphrasis*, *Inst.* 8.3.53). Cicero seems to have used *circuitus verborum* to refer to the Greek term περίοδος (*Or.* 3). Other Latin alternatives included: *circuitus loquendi*, *circumscriptio*.

philosophy.[39] For these writers, the avoidance of Greek seems rather to have been a sign of mastery over the language and a way of setting themselves apart from less educated speakers who may have used Greek tags reflexively without much comprehension.

The second, related point that these examples raise is that the permissibility of code-switching varied according to elocutionary context. It is crucial to Suetonius's anecdotes that both involved the Roman Senate, an institution that was central to Roman identity. Its close association with *Latinitas* is evident in the way that the Greek language was not permitted to be heard until quite late in its history, even though many senators were bilingually competent. Not just senatorial speech, but public speech of any kind was held to a higher standard of purism than ordinary conversation. A comparison between the Greek in Cicero's letters and the Greek in his speeches makes this difference very clear: whereas the letters are full of code-switching, bilingual wordplay, and a large number of loanwords, these features are absent or sharply reduced in his speeches. Purism of this sort is one aspect of the greater formalization and control to which public speech is generally subjected.

Finally, writers used certain recognizable strategies to avoid and find substitutes for code-switching. According to Suetonius, Tiberius's admonition to the Senate included specific advice about how to avoid using Greek words by finding a native alternative or expressing the matter by circumlocution. Cicero provided more detailed advice in the *De*

[39] Zetzel (2003) treats Cicero's attitude to Greece.

finibus (*Fin.* 3.15) for assimilating Greek philosophical vocabulary to Latin: besides the use of neologisms, he mentions expanding the semantic range of an existing word (a loan-shift), periphrasis, and direct assimilation, if taste and authority permit it. Cicero followed this advice closely in his philosophical works, which abound in calques, periphrases, loan-shifts, and integrated loanwords.[40] Lucretius, Seneca and Quintilian also addressed the challenges of translating technical vocabulary into Latin.[41] The existence of such strategies makes it possible to identify particular passages where a writer avoids using Greek, for instance, by substituting a calque or translating an aphorism, even where it may not be overtly signaled.

2. Horace's Purism

2.1 HORACE'S CONCEPT OF PURITY

Purity is a prominent concern for Horace, both as an aesthetic value and a moral virtue. It was once deemed so central to his literary criticism that early in the last century Horace was bracketed with Calvus and Messalla Corvinus as a card-carrying "Atticist".[42] Horace's epistle to Augustus (*Ep.* 2.1), for instance, puts purity at the center of his brief account of the development of Latin literature under Greek influence. Defending the value of contemporary poetry, Horace memorably describes the progress of Roman

[40] See Hartung (1974), Powell (1995), and Nicolas (2005).
[41] See, for instance, Sen. *Dial.* 9.2.4 on translating εὐθυμίαν; Quint. *Inst.* 2.14.1. On Lucretius's philosophical vocabulary, see Fögen (2000), Sedley (2003), and Nadjo (2005).
[42] For instance, see Ullman (1915).

literature as if it were a drainage project in which Greek culture and refinement (*munditiae*) expelled the noxious effluence (*grave virus*) of Latin rusticity (*Ep.* 2.1.156–59):

> Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis
> intulit agresti Latio. sic horridus ille
> defluxit numerus Saturnius et grave virus
> munditiae pepulere.
>
> When Greece was taken she took control of her rough invader, and brought the arts to rustic Latium. Then the primitive meter of Saturn dried up; and the fetid smell gave way to cleaner air. (transl. Rudd)

According to this perspective, the development of Latin literature is a progressive act of purification that aims to eliminate Latin uncouthness. Using similar language and imagery in the following epistle, Horace compares good poetry to a pure and powerful river (*puro simillimus amni*) that enriches the Latin countryside and ameliorates its harshness through healthy cultivation (*sano cultu*) (*Ep.* 2.2.120–23):

> vehemens et liquidus puroque simillimus amni
> fundet opes Latiumque beabit divite lingua.
> luxuriantia compescet, nimis aspera sano
> levabit cultu, virtute carentia tollet.
>
> Flowing strong and clear like an unpolluted river he will spread prosperity enriching the land with the wealth of his language. He will show his skill and care by pruning the over dense, stripping untidy pieces, and taking out the feeble. (transl. Rudd)

The characterization of good poetry as a pure river invites comparison with Callimachus's *Hymn to Apollo* (2.108–12), in which Apollo praises the pure and undefiled (καθαρή τε καὶ ἀχράαντος) trickle of the Castalian stream. While Horace generally associates himself and his friends with the virtues of purity and fastidiousness,

he characterizes earlier poets as dirty and unkempt, particularly Lucilius who is *vitiosus* and flows *lutulentus* (*S.* 1.4.8–13). Even though Lucilius scratches his head and chews his nails (*S.* 1.10.71), he still represents a polished improvement (*limatior*) over the archaic *turba seniorum poetarum* (*S.* 1.10.64–66).[43]

Horace's concern for purity, cleanliness, and refinement is not simply an aesthetic preoccupation. The vocabulary of purity (e.g., *castus*, *cultus, liquidus*, *merus*, *mundus*, *purus*, *sanus*, *sincerus*) and impurity (e.g., *horridus*, *immundus*, *inconditus*, *insanus*, *lutulentus*, *sordidus*) has a moral dimension as well. For instance, Horace compares the loss of genuine virtue to the tarnishing of a clean vessel (*S.* 1.3.55–56): *at nos virtutes ipsas invertimus atque | sincerum furimus vas incrustare.* It is characteristic of Horace that the language he uses for literary evaluation is continuous with his ethical terminology.

Horace's handling of bilingual phenomena reflects this concern for purity. Niall Rudd has provided an effective illustration by comparing a passage in Horace's *Satires* (1.3.44–48) with its literary model in Lucretius (4.1160–63). While Lucretius cited Greek amatory nicknames to illustrate the power of self-deception (e.g., *melichrus, dorcas, chariton*), Horace has transposed the argument into the domain of pure Latinity. In place of foreign nicknames, Horace substitutes aristocratic *cognomina* (e.g., *Strabo, Pullus, Varus, Scaurus*), which are affectionately misleading in a similar way. Unlike Lucretius,

[43] On the issue of purity in Horace's criticism of Lucilius, see Rudd (1982: 86–131) and Classen (1998).

however, who scorns a lover's illusions, Horace defends moderate self-deception as a form of charity necessary for friendship. Horace's transformation of Lucretius' Greek into Latin is thus one of several axes along which he has inverted his predecessor's argument and thoroughly revalues the practice under consideration.

Further manifestations of purity with respect to Greek become apparent when Horace's language is viewed in comparative perspective. For instance, the *Satires* contain a much lower frequency of Greek loanwords than the work of Lucilius: approximately 6 loanwords per 100 verses compared with Lucilius's 16.[44] The *Odes* show a low tolerance for Greek-style poetic compounds, such as *centimanus* (*C.* 2.17.14) and *tauriformis* (*C.* 4.14.25).[45] By contrast, such compounds abound in Latin tragedy and in Laevius's lyric poetry (e.g., *subductisupercilicarptores*, fr. 16 Courtney). Finally, compared to earlier Latin poets, Horace appears to restrict his use of Greek morphology. For instance, he avoids the first declension genitive singular ending *-ēs* (< -ης), which Catullus employed (*Arsinoes*, Catul. 66.54), and the genitive plural ending *-ōn* (< -ων), which occurs in Varro's *Menippean Satires* (*Ludon*, Var. *Men.* 96). Even Horace's titles may suggest a commitment to *purus sermo*: the names *Libri sermonum* and *Libri carminum*, if the citations by ancient grammarians are accurate, represent a departure both from contemporary titulature, where Greek was the rule for poetry (e.g., Virgil's *Bucolicon*,

[44] Oksala (1982) counts the frequency of loanwords in Horace, Lucilius, and many other Latin authors.

[45] Jocelyn (1993: 107) documents Horace's avoidance of certain types of compound adjective, such as those formed with the prefix *multi-*.

and *Aeneis*; Laevius's *Erotopaegnion*), and from Greek literary terminology (e.g., *satura, melos*).[46]

Perhaps the most striking manifestation of purism in Horace's work, however, is his avoidance of code-switching. Nearly all the Greek that appears in his writing presents some degree of lexical integration. In integrating Greek proper names, Horace appears to have followed other Augustan poets in using a hybrid system of inflections that were neither fully Greek nor fully Roman.[47] Even common nouns that appear with Greek morphology, such as *melos* (*C.* 3.4.2), are arguably not genuine instances of code-switching. While true code-switching is characterized by syntactic flexibility, Horace employs a highly restricted set of Greek endings with such nouns: the nominative singular, nominative plural, accusative singular, and accusative plural. Moreover, all but two of the fifteen common nouns that appear with Greek endings (*melos*, *C.* 3.4.2; *nomisma*, *Ep.* 2.1.234) had already appeared in Latin texts prior to or contemporary with

---

[46] Henriksson (1956) collects Greek book titles in Rome. Horsfall (1981: 107–9) reviews the ancient evidence for Horace's titles. Although Horace refers to his satiric compositions as *saturae* (*S.* 2.1.1; 2.6.17), he titled the books *Libri sermonum*. The dubious and contested origins of the word *satura* (cf. Suerbaum 2002: 298–99, for Greek, Etruscan, and native etymologies) may have been among the factors influencing Horace's preference for *sermo* in the formal *subscriptio*. *Sermo* has the further advantage of suggesting two additional generic models that lay behind these compositions: diatribe (διατριβή; Jocelyn 1979b for reservations) and philosophical dialogue (διάλογος). In the case of his lyrics, Horace's preference for *carmen* over *melos*, the usual word for lyric (e.g., Enn. *Ann.* 293 Sk.; Naev. *trag*. 20; Acc. *trag.* 238; Hor. *C.* 3.4.2), or *ode* (cf. the title to Stat. *Silv.* 4.5, if it is Statius's own) indicates his ambition to domesticate Greek lyric. The titles of the *Epistles* (*Libri epistularum* / *Libri sermonum*?) and the *Epodes* (*Liber epodon* / *Iambi*?) have been disputed; cf. Horsfall (1979b, 1979c, 1981) and Jocelyn (1979b).

[47] Frei (1958: 64–67, 150–55) establishes this point in relation to Horace's use of first-declension Greek nouns. Housman (1910) describes the hybrid inflectional system in more detail. For instance, the inflection of *Atrides* is regularly as follows (* indicates form unattested in Horace's poetry): sing. nom. *Atrīdēs,* gen. *Atrīdis,*dat. **Atrīdī,* acc. *Atrīdēn,* abl. **Atrīdē* or **Atrīdĕ,* voc. *Atridă*.

Horace. Thus they do not appear to be unfamiliar borrowings in Latin. Moreover, there is no evidence in the manuscripts that any of these were originally written in Greek script, a characteristic of most of the code-switching that appears in Latin literature (e.g., Plautus's scripts, Cicero's correspondence, Varro's *Menippean Satires*, Seneca's philosophical writing, Juvenal's *Satires*).[48] Though the absence of Greek characters may not seem decisive, given the inconsistent handling of Greek in the transmission of Latin texts, it is striking that even in the case of Lucilius, an author whose works are only indirectly preserved, one can detect the original presence of Greek script.[49] The absence of Greek script appears to be a distinguishing characteristic of Augustan poetic texts, not always imitated by later poets, such as Juvenal, Martial, and Ausonius.[50]

The avoidance of code-switching in Horace's poetry represents a marked departure from both earlier Latin satire, such as the work of Lucilius and Varro, and earlier Latin lyric, represented by the extant fragments of Laevius. Lucilius's text presents abundant evidence of code-switching, which has been assembled and discussed by Chahoud (2004), such as the citation of an entire hexameter from the *Odyssey* (ἢ πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν, Lucil. 463 M.). Despite the exiguous remains of Laevius's *Erotopaegnia*, there is at least one instance of genuine language alternation

---

[48] Jocelyn (1999: 169n5) discusses the traces of Greek letters the manuscript tradition of Plautus (e.g., Pl. *Cap.* 729, *Persa* 159).

[49] Reinhardt (2005: 156) argues for the presence of Greek script in text of Lucilius, supported by Petersmann (1999: 300–1 with n17), and Trappes-Lomax (2002: 611).

[50] To my knowledge, Greek script does not appear in recent editions of Horace, Virgil, Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid. By contrast, three instances of Greek script occur in Juvenal's *Satires* (6.195; 9.37; 11.27). Rochette (2007) discusses code-switching in Ausonius.

(Πανὸς ἀγάπημα, Laev. fr. 31 Courtney). It is also noteworthy that a later satirist such as Juvenal returns to the earlier freedom to permit code-switching (αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα κίναιδος, 9.37).

Horace's discussion of bilingualism in *Satires* 1.10, which will be examined in greater detail in the last section of the chapter, illuminates his relationship to code-switching and other bilingual phenomena. The poem stages a debate between Horace and an antiquarian critic over the value of Lucilius's poetry. One of the critic's first points in defense of Lucilius is that his mixture of Greek and Latin was a great accomplishment (*at magnum fecit quod verbis Graeca Latinis | miscuit*, 20–21), the result of which he compares to a pleasant mixture of Greek and Italian wine (*at sermo lingua concinnus utraque | suavior, ut Chio nota si commixta Falerni est*, 23–24). While the critic lacks the terminology to speak about code-switching directly, the chief issue of contention appears to be Lucilius's code-switching, of which there are more than 60 instances in the surviving fragments.[51] In response, Horace opens up several lines of attack against his critics: first, he suggests that they are late-learners (*seri studiorum*, a phrasal calque on ὀψιμαθεῖς), who use Greek awkwardly and excessively; secondly, he points out the absurdity of using Greek in public contexts when orators like Pedius and Messalla sweat over their diction; finally, he mentions Canusium (It. *Canosa*), a town on the Aufidus

[51] Adams (2003: 19–20) takes these words as referring to code-switching. It could be that the critic also has in mind Lucilius' use of Greek loanwords, which are also abundant, but loanwords are permissible even in the refined public speeches of a purist like Valerius Messalla. Chahoud (2004) includes 60 items in her lexicon of Lucilius's Greek; although the majority are genuine code-switches, including several full quotations of Homer, others may be unintegrated borrowings.

river in Horace's native Apulia, as a negative model of language mixture.[52] When Horace derides them as *bilingues*, the word brings together its original Plautine meaning ("deceitful") with the neutral significance of δίγλωσσος ("bilingual") and sums up this line of objection to language mixture.[53] Speaking another language is an ethical failure akin to deceit, insofar as it involves misrepresenting or betraying one's in-born identity.

The debate in *Satires* 1.10 provides two opposed vantage points from which to evaluate code-switching: while the interlocutor presents code-switching as a refined, bravura performance, Horace insists that it is inept, deceitful, and disreputable. Horace sketches both views with the usual degree of comic hyperbole and the argumentative overstatement that characterize ancient dialectic. Although in point of practice Horace's sympathy clearly lay with the opinions he articulated *propria persona*, both views are part of the cultural background against which Horace's use and avoidance of Greek gain their significance.

Like other writers who avoided code-switching, Horace used several techniques to translate, assimilate, or substitute for a Greek turn of phrase in contexts where contemporaries might naturally resort to Greek. A comparison between Horace's language and the Greek of previous Roman writers suggests that Horace avoided code-switching and assimilated Greek in four principal ways: for instance, where another user

---

[52] The problem with Canusine bilingualism is difficult to identify but may relate to the presence of Oscan and Greek (Adams 2003: 20). Adams (2003: 370n134) notes the persistence of Greek cognomina into the third century CE.

[53] Poccetti (1986) discusses the history and meaning of *bilinguis*.

of Latin might cite a Greek tag (e.g., τὸν δ’ ἐξήρπαξεν Ἀπόλλων, Lucil. 303–4 M.), Horace adapts the citation into Latin (*sic me servavit Apollo*, *S.* 1.9.77); where contemporaries switch to Greek in order to employ a technical term (e.g., λήκυθος “bombast”, Cic. *Att.* 1.14.3; Plin. *Ep.* 1.2.4), Horace uses a native calque (e.g., *ampullas*, *AP* 97) or a lengthier periphrasis (e.g., ὠμοτριβές *oleum* “raw-pressed oil”, Lucil. 961 M.; *oleo quod prima pressit cella*, *S.* 2.8.45); lastly, in place of an unassimilated Greek word (e.g., ἔπος, Lucil. 343 M.; gen. pl. *Ludon*, Var. *Men.* 96), Horace uses a more fully integrated loanword (*epos*, *S.* 1.10.43; *Lydorum*, *S.* 1.6.1).

These four strategies for avoiding and replacing the direct quotation of Greek—the translation of a tag, calques, periphrasis, and lexical assimilation—characterize Horace’s purism in practice. The first technique, the translation of a tag, is a response to a particular kind of code-switching, called tag-switching or emblematic switching, in which a stereotyped Greek expression is quoted by a Latin speaker. The remaining three devices are different ways to assimilate an individual, unintegrated Greek word into a Latin context. The expressive significance of these four techniques varies according to context: from one perspective they may invite a foreign presence into Horace’s text in the way that syntactic Grecisms and *Fremdwörter* often do, while from another they actively exclude it. It is a paradox of linguistic purism that closure to one source of foreign enrichment presupposes the opening of another.[54] Depending on the genre or the context

[54] Thomas (1991: 94).

in which the device occurs, one or the other perspective may be uppermost. For instance, if someone were to mention "having a white card", contextual clues would determine whether to interpret it as a case of active interference from the French "*carte blanche*"—imagine the phrase spoken by Frenchman who had not yet mastered English idiom—or a way of suppressing the foreign expression as a gesture towards purity or perhaps just to make an interlingual joke. Rather than treat each of these techniques exhaustively, my intention is to provide some representative examples from Horace that are valuable to consider in light of contemporary purism, where a concern to suppress Greek rather than accommodate it appears to be relevant to interpretation.

2.2 TECHNIQUE 1: TRANSLATION OF GREEK TAGS

The term "translation" covers a wide range of bilingual phenomena in Horace's poetry that vary considerably in their size, textual authority, and relationship to an original. Some translations cover multiple lines, such as the four-line translation of an epigram of Callimachus (*S.* 1.2.105–8, which translates Callim. *Ep.* 31 Pf.), while others occur within the scope of a single epithet (e.g., *centum nobilem Cretam urbibus*, *Epod.* 9.29, which evokes the Homeric tag ἑκατόμπολις Κρήτη). Though Horace's rendition of Callimachus is explicitly flagged as a translation, most instances are not. His translations may begin by establishing a close textual relationship to a specific source, such as the motto at the beginning of *C.* 1.4 (*Solvitur acris hiems*, adapted from Alc. fr. 286a V.), before departing significantly in content and style. To a certain extent all the devices to

be discussed below (calques, loan-shifts, periphrasis, and lexical assimilation) represent forms of translation insofar as they render Greek by native means of expression. However, not all translations are manifestations of language purism. Purism is only at issue when there is a presumption that a given expression might ordinarily occur in Greek—in other words, when code-switching is an unmarked convention.

One variety of code-switching that tends to be unmarked is the use of foreign tags, short phrases or other stereotyped expressions that usually require little bilingual competence. For instance, most educated English speakers would recognize the phrase "a certain *je ne sais quoi*" and think little of the code-switch. By contrast, a translation of the same tag into English (a certain "I know-not-what") might raise eyebrows. In this context, translation represents a marked departure from the conventions of ordinary conversation. As J. N. Adams has discussed, educated Latin speech in the late Republic was characterized by a high frequency of Greek tag-switching.[55] Tags range in size from individual Greek words (e.g., σεμνῶς "in a grand style", Lucil. 15 M.), to longer phrases and proverbs (e.g., μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω, Pl. *Most.* 973; γνῶθι σεαυτόν, Juv. 11.27), and citations of familiar lines of verse (e.g., ἢ πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν, Lucil. 463 M. = *Od*. 11.491). It is likely that many of these tags had become common enough in Latin speech that they could be recognized even by speakers without a formal training in Greek. The translation of a familiar Greek tag into Latin might produce a

[55] On the notion of tag-switching as applied to ancient bilingualism, see Adams (2003: 21–22, 131–32).

frisson of recognition and surprise, whose significance depends considerably on the context.

Where Horace's predecessors and contemporaries frequently switched into Greek in order to quote a foreign tag or aphorism, Horace invariably translates such expressions into Latin, either literally (*ad verbum*), or by finding a native equivalent with the same general significance (*ad sensum*). Comparing Lucilius's use of Greek tags with Horace's translations of them provides some measure of the latter's purism. Arguably, Horace translates into Latin at least three tags that Lucilius had cited in Greek. The most obvious of these occurs at the end of *Satires* 1.9: to express his relief at having escaped from a sycophant, Horace quotes a familiar line of Homeric verse (*sic me servavit Apollo, S.* 1.9.62–63, which translates *Il.* 20.443).[56] By translating the verse into Latin, Horace takes the measure of his distance from Lucilius, who conventionally cited the verse in Greek (τὸν δ' ἐξήρπαξεν Ἀπόλλων, Lucil. 303–4 M.). The second instance is also Homeric: while Lucilius used the tag κουρῆν *eupatereiam* (Lucil. 540 M.), Horace renders this into Latin as *magno patre nata puella est* (*S.* 1.2.72). Finally, where Lucilius describes mountains rising into the air with the Greek prepositional phrase *eis aetera* (*tanti se e tenebris montes eis aitera tollent*, Lucil. 799 M.), Horace uses a Latin equivalent *ad caelum* (*quae vos ad caelum fertis rumore secundo, Ep.* 1.10.9). Such "pure" translations give point to Horace's criticism of Lucilius's style as "muddy" (*lutulentus*) and unkempt.

[56] See Tosi (1997: 719).

While the significance of these translations depends on the charged literary relationship between Horace and his predecessor in satire, other instances can be detected by comparing Horace's Latin with Greek expressions that appear to have had currency in Rome. Some of these Greek tags are explicitly noted in the scholia attributed to Porphyrio (e.g., Porph. *C.* 3.6.24 on *de tenero ungui*), which suggests that ancient readers may have been sensitive to this dimension of Horace's style. Interpretive freedom, which Horace admired in translators (e.g., *AP* 132–33), sometimes makes it difficult to coordinate his Latin with an underlying Greek expression. The following list is limited to instances where the verbal correspondence seems sufficiently close and the Greek proverb is adequately attested, or where the parallel has been adduced by an ancient commentator. Citations to the proverb number in Otto (1962) and Tosi (1997) are provided where available:

ad unguem (*S.* 1.5.32, *AP* 294) < εἰς ὄνυχα (e.g., Plut. *de profect. in virt.* 17, Otto 357)
caedimur et totidem plagis consumimus hostem (*Ep.* 2.2.97) < τὸν ξύοντα ἀντιξύειν (e.g., Sophron fr. 149 Kaibel, Otto 60, Tosi 1343)
carum caput (*S.* 2.3.94) < φίλον κάρα (e.g., Eur. *Hipp.* 1238)
de tenero…ungui (*C.* 3.6.24) < ἐξ ἁπαλῶν ὀνύχων or ἐξ ὀνύχων (Cic. *Fam.* 1.6.2, Porph. *ad loc.*, Otto 356, Tosi 634)
equus ut me portat, alat rex, | *officium facio* (*Ep.* 1.17.20–21) < ἵππος με φέρει, βασιλεύς με τρέφει, Diogenian. 5.21, Otto 125–26)
est inter Tanain quiddam et socerumque Viselli (*S.* 1.1.105) < ἢ σπάδων ἢ κηλήτης (Porph. *ad loc.*)
et fortasse cupressum scis simulare (*AP* 19–21) < μή τι καὶ κη<πα>ρισσον θέλεις (Porph. *ad loc.*, Otto 102)
faenum habet in cornu (*S.* 1.4.34) < χόρτον ἔχειν ἔφασαν (Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 71, Plut. *Crass.* 7.9, Otto 93)
in silvam non ligna feras (*S.* 1.10.37) < γλαῦκα εἰς Ἀθήνας (Diog. L. 3.47.8, Lucianus *Nigr.* 1, Otto 323, Tosi 477)

nec meus hic sermo est (S. 2.2.2) < κοὐκ ἐμὸς ὁ μῦθος, ἀλλ' ἐμῆς μητρὸς πάρα (Eur. fr. 484 N., Pl. *Symp*. 177a, Callim. *Hymn.* 5.56 Pf.)
nil sine magno vita labore dedit mortalibus (*S.* 1.9.59–60) < οὐδὲν ἄνευ καμάτου πέλει ἀνδράσιν εὐπετὲς (ps.-Phoc. *Gnom.* 162, Tosi 914, 1685)
oleum adde camino (*S.* 2.3.321) < ἐλαίῳ πῦρ σβεννύεις (Plut. *Prov*. 22, Lucianus *Tim.* 44, Otto 253, Tosi 1188)
parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus (*AP* 139) < ὤδινεν ὄρος, εἶτα μῦν ἀπέτεκεν (Diogenian. 8.75, Porph. *ad loc.*, Otto 234, Tosi 1746)
per extentum funem . . . ire (*Ep.* 2.1.210) < δύσκολόν ἐστι τὸ ἐπὶ σχοινίου περιπατεῖν (Arr. *Epict.* 3.1.2–3, Porph. *ad loc*., Otto 151)
pulmentaria quaere sudando (*S*. 2.2.20–21) < ὄψον συνάγω (Porph. *ad loc*.)
solium Iovis (*Ep.* 1.17.34) < Διὸς θρόνος (Aesch. *Eum.* 229, Theocr. 7.93)
unde venis et quo tendis (*S.* 1.9.62–63) || ποῖ δὴ καὶ πόθεν (Pl. *Phaedr*. 227a)

One general result of such translations is that the meaning of the Latin tags tends to be more transparent and to depend less on cultural knowledge than the Greek equivalent. In this way, Horace's aphorisms may aim to be more accessible than Lucilius's.[57] Translations like these successfully address two different kinds of audience: an educated readership, able to admire Horace's dexterity in assimilating banal Greek tags and turning them into living expressions, and a less cultured audience, which might lack command of the relevant Greek but can still follow the general sense without feeling shortchanged.

Translated tags can carry a special charge of significance when their relationship with Greek is a live issue. For instance, in a letter to M. Curius, Cicero translated the banal Greek tags κτήσει ("by possession") and χρήσει ("by use") into Latin legal jargon (*Fam.* 7.30.2): *cuius* (sc. *Attici*) *quoniam proprium te esse scribis <u>mancipio</u> et <u>nexo</u>,*

[57] The exception to this generalization may be *est inter Tanain quiddam et socerumque Viselli* (*S.* 1.1.105), an expression that continues to puzzle commentators, though its meaning likely depends on the Greek expression ἢ σπάδων ἢ κηλήτης, as Porphyrio recognized.

meum autem usu et fructu, contentus isto sum. While the use of the Latin doublet *manicipio et nexo* may seem unremarkable by itself, it acquires its significance from the larger context of the epistolary exchange. Curius's original letter to Cicero, which is prefixed to Cicero's letter in the *Ad Familiares*, in fact contains the corresponding Greek expression (*Fam.* 7.29.1): *sum enim* χρήσει μὲν *tuus*, κτήσει δὲ *Attici nostri. ergo fructus est tuus, mancipium illius*. Prompted by Curius's colloquial use of Greek, Cicero responds by playfully adopting the formal tone of a jurisconsult and "correcting" Curius's Greek. Thus Cicero's translated tags are marked by their context. In other letters, noticeably his correspondence with Paetus, Cicero appears to make a point of translating Greek tags.[58] In other cases, Cicero might draw attention to his translation of Greek tags by framing them apologetically. For instance, Cicero clearly marks his quotation of an Aristippean commonplace (ἔχω καὶ οὐκ ἔχομαι, Diog. L. 2.75) by explicitly referencing its source (*Fam.* 26.2): *sed tamen ne Aristippus quidem ille Socraticus erubuit cum esset obiectum habere eum Laidas: "habeo" inquit, "non habeor a Laide." Graece hoc melius; tu, si voles, interpretabere*.[59] Elsewhere in the correspondence, Cicero renders the proverb ἡ ὗς τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν with the elliptical *sus Minervam* (*Fam.* 18.3). Writing to Lentulus, Cicero glosses his translation of the tag ἐξ ἀπαλῶν ὀνύχων with an aside that

[58] Adams (2003: 315–16) notes the tendency and speculates about the reasons for this, including that possibility that Paetus may have been more of a purist than Cicero's other intimate correspondents.

[59] As Adams (2003: 315) points out, *habeor* does not correspond precisely in meaning to ἔχομαι. Horace bests Cicero's translation with a freer rendering of the same thought (*Ep.* 1.1.18–19): *nunc in Aristippi furtim praecepta relabor, | et mihi res, non me rebus, subiungere conor.*

both apologizes for the oddity of the expression and draws attention to his effort to write pure Latin (*Fam.* 1.6.2): *a teneris, ut Graeci dicunt, unguiculis*.[60]

In a similar way, Horace harnesses the significance of a marked translation to make a point of the speaker's purity or Latinity. One instance has already been examined: Horace's pointed rendering of the Greek commonplace γλαῦκα εἰς Ἀθήνας into Latin as *in silvam non ligna feras* (*S.* 1.10.34–35). Its significance naturally depends on the speaker: Quirinus appears to hold the Greek tag at arm's length and thereby provides a lively demonstration of his advice to avoid Greek poetry. In *Satires* 1.2 the translation of a Greek tag serves to exaggerate the fastidiousness of a certain Villius, whose distinguishing feature is an addiction to sex with Roman matrons. Sensing the risks involved, Villius's *mutto* (68) warns him in language whose mock grandeur recalls Ennius (*S.* 1.2.69–70):

> quid vis tibi? numquid ego a te
> magno prognatum deposco consule cunnum
> velatumque stola, mea cum conferbuit ira?
>
> What are you up to? Do I demand of you a cunt sprung from a great consul and enveloped in a matron's robe, when my passion has come to a boil? (transl. Brown)

Villius responds to his *mutto*'s epicizing speech by quoting an Homeric tag (*S.* 1.2.71): *quid responderet? magno patre nata puella est* (*S.* 1.2.71). The phrase translates the epithet εὐπατέρεια (e.g., *Il.* 6.292) which Lucilius had originally quoted in Greek (κουρῆν

[60] Horace renders the same or a similar proverb at *C.* 3.6.24: *de tenero meditator ungui*.

eupatereian, Lucil. 540 M.). Citing Homer to justify adultery might have an effeminate air. Translating it fastidiously into Latin only seems to enhance the impression that Villius is being characterized as a *cultus adulter,* a character type familiar from Roman mimes.[61] Thus Villius' penchant to cite Homer in Latin and his attraction to Roman matrons are aspects of the same flaw in his character. Incidentally, the dialogue between the *mutto* and its owner juxtaposes two very different registers of "pure Latin": the *mutto*'s purity is located in archaic diction and direct obscenity, the sort of language that Martial might call *Latina verba* (e.g., the archaic tag *prognatum . . . consule* and *cunnum),* while Villius's purity depends on a Hellenizing aversion to language mixture.

Finally, Horace also uses the translation of tags to engage in literary polemic, as evidenced by his translation of Lucilius's Greek tag (τὸν δ' ἐξήρπαξεν Ἀπόλλων, Lucil. 303–4 M.) at the end of *Satires* 1.9 (*sic me servavit Apollo, S.* 1.9.77). By making a point of his own Latinity and refinement, the tag allows Horace to mark his distance from Lucilius and prepares the way for the following satire (*S.* 1.10), where the issue is more explicitly addressed. Moreover, a demonstration of linguistic urbanity suitably caps a satire that had explored this quality at length through its portrayal of Horace and his awkward interlocutor. Horace provides many more translations of Lucilius's Greek by means of calques and periphrasis. While their markedness varies by context, collectively they create the impression that Horace has deliberately cleaned up Lucilius's style: for

[61] See Wiseman (1985: 30 with n50).

instance, *podagra* (*S.* 1.9.32) vs. *arthriticos* "gouty" (Lucil. 331 M.); *puerilius* (*S.* 2.3.250) vs. *meiraciodes* (Lucil. 187 M.); *exemplaria* (*AP* 268) vs. *archetypa* (Lucil. 111 M.); *faenerator* (*Epod.* 2.67) vs. *tocoglyphos* (Lucil. 497 M.); *Furiae* (*C.* 1.28.17) vs. *Erinys* (Lucil. 170 M.).

2.3 TECHNIQUE 2: CALQUES

In contrast to the preceding section, which examined Horace's renditions of stereotypical tags, the following three sections consider ways of replacing individual Greek words, often of a technical nature: calques, forms of periphrasis, and lexical assimilation. Tag- or formula-switching differs from the spontaneous incorporation of another language's vocabulary into a native frame, which is sometimes called intra-sentential switching.[62] While tag-switching may not require working knowledge of Greek and tends to be syntactically independent of the framing statement (e.g., μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω, Pl. *Capt.* 880), intra-sentential switching usually involves less familiar vocabulary and makes greater demands on the speaker's and audience's bilingual competence (e.g., *quae magis a* ζηλοτυπίᾳ *mea quam ab iniuria tua nata est*, Cic. *Att.* 10.8A.1). Adams distinguishes several categories of intra-sentential switching in Cicero's letters, such as the use of

[62] Adams (2003: 21–25) describes the three-way distinction between tag-switching, inter-sentential switching, and intra-sentential switching, which is sometimes but not always useful to use.

critical terms, euphemistic distancing, coding or exclusion, medical terminology, and evocative switching.[63]

As described already in Chapter 1 (Section 2), a calque is a morpheme-by-morpheme equivalent of a foreign compound that matches the meaning and structure of the original (e.g., *gratte-ciel* < "skyscraper"; *Hammerklavier* < "pianoforte"; "forspeech" < "preface"; *medietas* < μεσότης, Cic. *Tim*. 23; *tauriformis* < ταυρόμορφος, *C.* 4.14.25). By contrast, a loan-shift involves a pre-existing Latin term whose semantic range has been extended to match a foreign synonym (e.g., *virtus* < ἀρετή; *consensus* < συμπάθεια; *iunctura* < σύνθεσις, *AP* 48). Where the line between these phenomena is unclear, impossible to draw, or irrelevant, the word "calque" provides the most general form of reference.[64] Calques and loan-shifts have an ambivalent relationship to linguistic purism: on the one hand, since they offer a convenient alternative to a code-switch, a loanword, or an awkward neologism, purists often welcome them into their language; on the other hand, since they represent a foreign intrusion on a deeper level, purists have sometimes sought to reduce or eliminate their presence.[65] As Thomas writes, "precisely because of their compromising nature, calques offer an excellent litmus test of the intensity of

---

[63] Adams (2003: 308–47).

[64] For instance, it is difficult to determine whether *bilinguis* is a morphological calque on δίγλωσσος, a loan-shift that added a new sense ("bilingual") to an existing word ("deceitful"), or word that independently acquired the same meaning as δίγλωσσος. See Poccetti (1986).

[65] Thomas (1991: 70–21) illustrates the ambivalence of calques in relation to linguistic purism. Several German purists have condemned the use of calques: for instance, the grammarian Johann Christoph Adelung (1732–1806) condemned the use of *Gemeinplatz* as a calque on *locus communis*.

puristic feeling."[66] The history of the Latin compound adjective illustrates several different attitudes towards calques at work: while Livius and Naevius hesitated to create calques on the basis of Greek poetic compounds and preferred freer forms of translation, second-century poets coined them in abundance to enrich the stock of poetic vocabulary (e.g., Ennius's *altivolantum*, Enn. *Ann.* 76 Sk. < ὑψιπέτης). In Augustan poetry, calqued compounds again went out of fashion, not only as a reaction against excessive Hellenizing, but also because of the abundance of compound-formation in subliterary Latin.[67]

For Horace, calques and loan-shifts are sometimes a way of inviting a foreign presence into his poetry, as in his dithyrambic or Pindarizing mode (e.g., *tauriformis*, *C.* 4.14.25 < ταυρόμορφος, Eur. *Ion* 1261) and sometimes a way to keep Greek at a safe distance, by serving as a more acceptable, native alternative to a borrowing or code-switch.[68] Horace acknowledges the tension between native and foreign in his advice about calques in the *Ars Poetica* (*AP* 52–53):

> et nova fictaque nuper habebunt verba fidem si
> Graeco fonte cadent, parce detorta.

---

[66] Thomas (1988: 106).

[67] Ross (1969: 17–26) and Traina (2010) offer useful overviews of compounds in Latin literature. Livius and Naevius seem hesitant to create calques on the basis of Greek compounds (e.g., Livius uses *versutum* as a translation for πολύτροπον, *Odus.* fr. 1 Bl; he also omits entirely the Homeric epithet εὐώπιδα in *Odus.* fr. 14 Bl.). Compound word-formation was more common in subliterary speech than in the literary language of the late Republic (e.g., the Pompeian coinages *scordopardonicus, ululitremulus*; see Boyce 1991: 56).

[68] For a discussion of calques in Horace, see Traina (*Enc. oraz.*(s.v. *composti nominali*) and Bo (1934–1944).

> New and freshly created words are also acceptable when channelled from Greek, provided the trickle is small. (transl. Rudd)

The formulation *nova fictaque nuper verba* covers calques, loan-shifts, and perhaps recent borrowings.[69] Horace's advice involves a paradox: a calque or loan-shift achieves its Roman *fides*—its citizenship in the community of the Latin language—by means of a moderately Greek origin. Quintilian also acknowledges the risk of a calque seeming too "tough" (*durus*, Quint. *Inst.* 2.14.1).

Comparing Horace's calques and loan-shifts with parallel code-switches in Latin texts helps to explore this tension. The comparison will show that Horace's calques sometimes gain significance by conspicuously refusing to be Greek. One context where this is most apparent is in Horace's vocabulary of literary criticism, which aims to be clear, native, and non-technical. For instance, Horace characterizes tragic in terms of *ampullae* ("bombast") and *sesquipedalia verba* ("foot-and-a-half words", *AP* 97): *proicit ampullas et sesquipedalia verba*. *Ampullae* is a loan-shift that here imports a technical meaning ("bombast") from the Greek word λήκυθοι. In its rhetorical sense, λήκυθοι appears twice in Latin literature as a code-switch (*nosti illas* ληκύθους, Cic. *Att.* 1.14.3; *Marci nostri* ληκύθους, Plin. *Ep.* 1.2.4).[70] Cicero's and Pliny's use of the Greek word is a distinctive kind of code-switching that Adams describes in relation to the use of critical terms, influenced by the convention of rhetorical schools and which persists in ancient

[69] See Brink (*ad loc.*) and Dufallo (2005).
[70] *Ampullae* also occurs in this sense in [Verg.] *Cat.* 5.1. See Brink *ad loc.*

school commentaries.[71] By adapting the term into Latin and avoiding a code-switch, Horace avoids sounding too much like a grammatical professional—low-class types like Demetrius Tigellus (*S.* 1.10.90–91) and the rhetor Heliodorus (*S.* 1.5.2–3).

There are many similar examples in the vocabulary of Horace's literary criticism. For instance, the phrasal calque *provisam rem* for "content" (*AP* 311) is a rendition of the more technical expression προνοούμενα (e.g., Phld. *Rh.* 5.3 Jensen). By pressing into service two words from common usage (*res* and *providere*) to stand in for Hellenistic rhetorical jargon, Horace helps keep the texture of the *Ars Poetica* light, familiar, and non-professional. Horace's famous coinage, *callida iunctura* (*AP* 47–48), presents another instance of an aversion to technicality. *Iunctura*, a loan-shift from σύνθεσις ὀνομάτων, provides a more elegant alternative to technical renditions, such as *verba iuncta*, *iunctio*, and *coniunctio*. Horace's aversion to technical Greek expressions is already apparent in his earliest literary criticism. In the *Satires*, one finds Hellenistic terms rendered by innocuous loan-shifts, such as *tristis* (*S.* 1.10.11 < πικρός) and *iocosus* (*S.* 1.10.11 < χαρίεις). By Latinizing these expressions, Horace's practice differs markedly from the way Lucilius flaunted Greek grammatical and rhetorical terminology

[71] Adams (2003: 323–29) collects examples of Cicero's use of Greek "critical terms", comparing them with code-switching in the commentaries of Donatus on Terence. As he writes (Adams 2003: 328), "to account for the frequency of the type one must look for a special determinant, and that surely lies in a convention of the rhetorical schools of using a Greek critical vocabulary."

(e.g., *atechnon*, Lucil. 186 M.; *cacosyntheton*, Lucil. 377 M.; *lexeis*, Lucil. 84 M.; *poeticon*, Lucil. 495 M.).[72]

Horace also uses calques to emphasize his own refinement in contexts where purity is at issue. For instance, in *Satires* 1.10 Horace replies sharply to a critic who had insisted on overvaluing language mixture (*S.* 1.10.20–21):

> "at magnum fecit quod verbis Graeca Latinis
> miscuit." o seri studiorum
>
> "But his was a great achievement, in combining Greek words with Latin." You late learners! (transl. Brown)

The apostrophe, *seri studiorum*, is a phrasal calque on the Greek compound ὀψιμαθεῖς ("late-learners"), which appears as a code-switch in Cicero (*Fam.* 9.20.2) and Gellius (11.7.3).[73] The term refers to social climbers who acquired their grammatical and linguistic training later than the ordinary age at which well-born Romans began their education.[74] Hence, they were likely to have been born without the wealth or the aristocratic connections necessary to secure the trappings of *doctrina*. Because of their resulting status insecurity and inadequate training, they were depicted as prone to shoddy demonstrations of erudition, such as Trimalchio displays in describing how Ulysses escaped the Cyclops by twisting off his thumb (Petr. 48.7).[75] Specifically to defuse the

---

[72] See Chahoud (2004) on Lucilius's Greek grammatical and rhetorical terminology.
[73] Occurrences of the word in Greek include: Isocr. 10.2, Pl. *Sph.* 251b, and Epicur. fr. 173.
[74] Theophrastus treats the character type of the "opsimath" (Thphr. *Char.* 27); see Kaster (1995: 234–35) and Davies (2007).
[75] On Trimalchio's mythological erudition, see Boyce (1991: 101).

charge of ὀψιμαθία, Trimalchio insists that he read Homer as a boy (Petr. 48.5): *ego puer apud Homerum legere.* Horace's calque simultaneously rebukes his critics for being *déclassé* and by suppressing the possibility of a code-switch demonstrates the linguistic finesse they lack.

On several occasions Horace used a calque to express something that Lucilius had said using un-integrated Greek. The weight to give each of the following examples varies greatly, but collectively they provide a measure of Horace's preference for calques in place of Greek. A dagger (†) indicates textual uncertainty:

crudus (*S.* 1.5.49) < ἀπεψία (Lucil. 923 M.)
elementa (*S.* 1.1.26) < *stoicheia* (Lucil. 790, 792, 794 M.)
exemplaria (*AP* 268) < †*archetypa* [*archaeotera*?] (Lucil. 111 M.)
faenerator (*Epod.* 2.67) < *tocoglyphos* (Lucil. 497 M.)
Furiae (*S.* 1.3.98) < *Eumenidum* (Lucil. 170 M.)
indoctus (*AP* 212) < *idiota* (Lucil. 649 M.)
lucerna (*S.* 1.6.124) < *lychnos* (Lucil. 15 M.)
ludus (*S.* 1.6.72) < *scolen* (Lucil. 756 M.)
podagra (*S.* 1.9.32) < ἀρθριτικός (Lucil. 331 M.)
puerilius (*S.* 2.3.250) < *meiraciodes* (Lucil. 187 M.)
sapienter (*C.* 2.10.22; *C.* 4.9.48; *Ep.* 1.10.44) < *sophōs* (Lucil. 511 M.)[76]

Given the degree of uncertainty in the transmission of Lucilius, it is in some cases difficult to determine whether the previous examples were code-switches or loanwords, but the overall impression is clear. It is noteworthy that two instances show Horace preferring native medical vocabulary to Lucilius's Greek terminology (*crudus* and *podagra*) since medical code-switching forms a significant part of Cicero's corpus of

[76] Biville (1996) disusses Greek exclamations of approval, such as *sophōs*.

code-switching.[77] In contrast, the *Epistles*, perhaps adopting a slightly more intimate tone, once use a medical loanword, *hydropicus* "dropsical" (*Ep.* 1.2.34; first occurrence) for which a native alternative existed (*aqua intercus*, Lucil. 764 M.).[78]

Calques also figure in various kinds of mock-philosophizing registers, where they are not so much gestures of purity as parodies of a kind of purism exemplified by the philosophical vocabularies of Lucretius and Cicero. For instance, Horace masses several strange calques at the beginning of the pseudo-philosophical speech of the rustic farmer Ofellus (*S.* 2.2.5–7):

> cum stupet in vanis acies fulgoribus et cum
> acclinis falsis animus meliora recusat,
> verum hic impransi mecum disquirite.
>
> [Learn not] when the vision is dazed by crazy glitterings and when the mind is inclined to false appearances and rejects better things, but here and now, unlunched, join me in an investigation. (transl. Muecke)

The adjective *acclinis* is likely a loan-translation of the Stoic term εὐέμπτωτος ("inclined in disposition towards"; Posidon. *ap.* Gal. 5.434). The verb *disquirite*, which occurs only here and in the Vulgate, is a morphological calque on the verb διαζητεῖν which is used of philosophical investigation (e.g., Pl. *Resp.* 258b). Finally, the neuter plural adjectives to express an abstract (*falsis*, *meliora*) are likewise characteristic of philosophical

[77] On medical code-switching, see Adams (2003: 340–41).

[78] In his lyric poetry, Horace invests *dirus hydrops* with an odd grandeur where it symbolizes avarice (*C.* 2.2.13).

discourse.[79] The two calques, *acclinis* and *disquirite,* which have the patina of philosophical discourse without much actual content, reinforce the impression that Ofellus is aping a style of philosophical lecture. The epithet *abnormis sapiens* encapsulates his strained relationship to philosophical jargon: *abnormis* appears to be a hybrid formation (*ab* + *norma* < νόρμη), appearing only here, perhaps meant to be an equivalent for the Greek term ἐκλεκτικός. *Sapiens* is an old-fashioned calque on φιλόσοφος, which Cicero only uses in his speeches, preferring the more ordinary loanword *philosophus* in his letters and dialogues.[80]

Loan-shifts can serve a similar parodic purpose, as in the following account of human evolution composed in a Lucretianizing style (*S.* 1.3.96–104):

> quis paria esse fere placuit peccata, laborant
> cum ventum ad verum est; sensus moresque repugnant
> atque ipsa utilitas, iusti prope mater et aequi.
> Cum prorepserunt primis animalia terris,
> mutum et turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia propter
> unguibus et pugnis, dein fustibus atque ita porro
> pugnabant armis, quae post fabricaverat usus,
> donec verba quibus sensus vocesque notarent
> nominaque invenere . . .
>
> Those who have laid down that all transgressions are more or less equal are up against it when it comes to real cases; instinct and tradition are ranged against them, and so is expediency, which is in essence the mother of justice and fairness. When living creatures crawled forth from the newly fashioned earth, a dumb and lawless breed, they fought over acorns and lairs with nails and fists, then with clubs, and so in turn with the arms which experience had subsequently fashioned, until they discovered verbs and nouns with which to articulate their cries and their feelings . . . (transl. Brown)

---

[79] Muecke (1993: *ad loc*). On Horace's use of neuter plurals, see N–H on *C.* 1.29.16.
[80] Stang (1931) discusses the distribution of *philosophus* and *philosophia* in Cicero's writing.

At least two of these doublets are loan-shifts: *sensus moresque* (97) calques the Greek doublet πάθη καὶ ἤθη, and *verba nominaque* (103–4) marks the distinction made in Greek grammar and philosophy between ῥήματα ("predicates") and ὀνόματα ("substantives").[81] Both evoke an analytical style one encounters in philosophical contexts in which a pair of ordinary synonyms is invested with a technical distinction. The profusion of such doublets and pseudo-doublets in this passage suggests a writer comically grappling with precise philosophical distinctions even where there are none to make. Horace parodies and adapts Lucretius in other contexts in which purity is at issue (e.g., *S.* 1.3.44–48).

Two additional classes of calques deserve attention as manifestations of purism: cultural adaptations of mythological names, such as *Furiae* (*S.* 1.3.98) for *Eumenides* (Lucil. 170 M.; Catul. 64.193; Var. *Men.* 117) or the equivalence between Favonius (*C.* 1.4.1) and Ζέφυρος, and calques on sexual vocabulary, such as *cauda* "tail / penis" (*S.* 1.2.45 < οὐρά "tail / penis") and *alicui oppedere* "fart at someone" (*S.* 1.9.69–70). This last is a unique expression in Latin that urbanely reproduces the vulgarity of Old Comedy (< καταπέρδεσθαί τινι, Arist. *Plut.* 617; *Vesp.* 614). By importing Greek metaphors and compounds into the Latin sexual vocabulary, Horace manages to be simultaneously vulgar and learned.

[81] The doublet recurs at *AP* 234.

2.4 TECHNIQUE 3: PERIPHRASIS

Periphrasis (περίφρασις, *circumlocutio*), the use of several words where a single word or a shorter phrase would be semantically adequate, furnishes a third technique for avoiding or replacing Greek. Ancient rhetorical treatises recommend its use either as a source of stylistic elevation (e.g., *auras vitales carpit*, Verg. *A.* 1.387, as a substitute for *vivit*) or as a way to avoid violations of literary decorum that would result from the presence of *verba obscena*, *sordida*, and *humilia* (e.g., *toto proflabat pectore somnum*, Verg. *A.* 9.326, a euphemism for *sterto*).[82] While calques aspire to be one-for-one substitutions of the vocabulary they reproduce, a periphrasis leaves open a wider semantic gap, and the resulting tension between revelation and concealment is essential to its effect. The emperor Tiberius included periphrasis prominently in his list of ways to avoid using an inappropriate Greek word (*per ambitum verborum*, Suet. *Tib.* 71).

As Tiberius's advice suggests, periphrasis was a common strategy for avoiding unassimilated Greek and incorporating it into Latin. For instance, since Latin lacked a one-to-one equivalent for the term φυτά ("plants") as a general category, Cicero translates the term by means of expressions such as *eae res quae gignuntur e terra* (*Acad. Post.* 1.26, *Fin.* 4.13, *Cat. M.* 52).[83] Cicero perhaps preferred a circumlocution in this case because a calque would have felt too foreign or technical; compare, for instance,

---

[82] On periphrasis from a rhetorical perspective, see Quint. *Inst.* 8.6.59–60, Maurach (1995: 74–80), and Lausberg (1998: 269–71).

[83] Powell (1995: 293).

Vitruvius's less successful *nascentia* (Vitr. 7.7.1). While Cicero's periphrasis successfully substitutes for the word φυτά, its verbosity, intentionally or not, reminds a bilingual audience of the unequal relationship between source and target language.

Because periphrasis often leaves a noticeable lexical gap between the two languages, the figure of speech enables Horace to hold certain kinds of vocabulary at arm's length. Sometimes the suppression of a word is coy and playful: for instance, in the *iter Brundisinum,* Horace apologizes for being unable to mention the name of a town (perhaps Herdoniae?) along the journey (*S.* 1.5.87): *mansuri oppidulo quod versu dicere non est*. To illustrate the effect, Porphyrio quotes an analogous passage from Lucilius, who avoids naming a Roman holiday that cannot be scanned in hexameters (Lucil. 229 M.): *servorum est festus dies hic, | quem plane <h>exametro versu non dicere possis*.[84] Horace's rendition of his model includes what almost amounts to a second periphrasis: besides compressing Lucilius' *possis* into the simple copulative *est*, a common Grecism (ἔστι = ἔξεστι), Horace has replaced the loanword *hexametro* with more neutral word *versu*.[85] Indeed, Horace never uses the word *hexameter*, and elsewhere finds playful substitutions (e.g., *pedibus senis*, *S.* 1.10.59; *me pedibus delectat claudere verba*, *S.* 2.1.28). In effect, Horace manages to ward off both the unmetrical name of the

[84] Pfeiffer (1991) suggests that Lucilius refered to a festival in honor of the birth of Servius Tullius that fell on the Ides of August; its name is not attested.

[85] Mayer (1999: 181) discusses the use of *esse* for *posse*, such as: *S.* 1.2.79, *S.* 2.5.103, Verg. *G.* 4.447.

oppidulum and a technical loanword characteristic of Lucilius' critical jargon. The absence of both words is a palpable source of the line's humor.

Horace's circumlocutions for a Greek word or expression fall into two semantic categories: technical jargon and erotic vocabulary. In the first category belong instances such as *oleo quod prima pressit cella* (S. 2.8.45), an admiring description of the fare at Nasidienus' banquet, which substitutes for ὠμοτριβές ("raw-pressed"), a term used by Lucilius (ὠμοτριβές *oleum Casinas*, Lucil. 961 M.). Similarly, Horace refers to the lowest note on the scale, called νήτη in musical jargon and sometimes borrowed into Latin (e.g., *nete*, Vitr. 5.4.5), by calling it (*S.* 1.3.8): *resonat quae chordis quattuor ima*. Within the same line, the phrase *chordis quattuor* stands for the term τετράχορδον ("tetrachord"). Several of Horace's circumlocutions are sexual: for instance, *tentigine rumpi* "to be racked with desire" (*S.* 1.3.8) seems to be a polite circumlocution for Lucilius's direct vulgarity ψωλοκοποῦμαι "I am affected by priapism" (Lucil. 304 M.).[86] Similarly, where Lucilius uses the Greek participle *diallaxon* to describe sex euphemistically (*et cruribus crura diallaxon*, Lucil. 306 M.), Horace expands the expression into a pure Latin circumlocution (*S.* 1.2.125): *haec ubi supposuit dextro corpus mihi laevum* (*S.* 1.2.125). The following list contains these instances of periphrasis:

[86] The verb appears also in the margin of a text written in the first century CE: *PLond.* 3.604 B col. 7 (cf. *LSJ* Suppl. s.v.).

oleo quod prima pressit cella (*S.* 2.8.45) < ὠμοτριβές *oleum Casinas* (Lucil. 961 M.)
modo summa | voce, modo hac, resonat quae chordis quattuor ima (*S.* 1.3.8) < ὑπάτη and νήτη ὑπάτη (both transliterated by Vitr. 5.4.5)
pedibus senis (*S.* 1.10.59; cf. *me pedibus delectat claudere verba*, *S.* 2.1.28) < *hexameter* (*quem plane hexametro versu non dicere possis*, Lucil. 229 M.)
haec ubi supposuit dextro corpus mihi laevum (*S.* 1.2.125) < *diallaxon* (*et cruribus crura diallaxon*, Lucil. 306 M.)
tentigine rumpi (*S.* 1.3.8) < *hoc est cum* ψωλοκοποῦμαι "I am affected with priapism" (*hoc est cum* ψωλοκοποῦμαι, Lucil. 304 M.)

2.5 TECHNIQUE 4: LEXICAL ASSIMILATION

The final technique to consider is lexical assimilation, the use of loanword in place of unintegrated code-switch or a *Fremdwort*. Horace sometimes prefers an assimilated loanword (e.g., *lyra*, *Epod.* 9.5), where earlier writers might have used a less integrated form (e.g., λύρα, Var. *Men.* 70). Because of the absence of relevant comparanda, it is often difficult to know the extent to which Horace's assimilated form is the result of diachronic change or a synchronic preference. In either case, the evidence illustrates one dimension in which Horace's language was noticeably "purer" than his predecessors'. A comparison between the code-switching and unintegrated loanwords in Lucilius and Varro, on the one hand, and Horace's borrowings, on the other, reveals the following ten cases of lexical assimilation:

Attica virgo (nom. fem. sing. *S.* 2.8.13) = *Atticon hoc est* (Lucil. 1199 M., referring to a kind of coin), *Attices philosophiae alumna* (Var. *Men.* 141)
Chius (as adj. *Epod.* 9.34; *S.* 1.10.24, 2.3.115, 2.8.15, 2.8.48; *C.* 3.19.5; 4.13.7) = Χῖός τε δυνάστης (Lucil. 1131 M.)
Delphica (abl. fem. sing. *C.* 3.30.15) = *Delphice cantat columna* (nom. fem. sing. Var. *Men.* 320)
epos (*S.* 1.10.43) = ἔπος (Lucil. 343 M.)

Ionicus (*Epod*. 2.54; *C*. 3.6.21) = ἰωνικός (Var. *Men*. 357)
Lydorum (*S.* 1.6.1) = *Ludon* (Lucil. 96 M.)
lympha (nom. fem. sing., *S.* 1.5.24) = *lymphon* (gen. pl., Var. *Men.* 50)
lyra (*Epod.* 9.5, 17.39; *C.* 1.6.10, 1.10.6, 1.12.1, 1.21.12, 1.38.2, 2.11.22, 3.3.69, 3.19.20, 3.28.11, 4.1.22, 4.3.23, 4.15.2; *Ep.* 1.18.43, 2.2.86; *AP* 407) = λύρα (Var. Men. 349 title)
nomisma (*Ep.* 2.1.234) = περὶ <u>νομισμάτων</u> (Var. *Men.* 342 title)
poetica mella (acc. neut. pl., *Ep.* 1.19.44) = *scit <u>poeticon</u> esse* (Lucil. 495 M.)

This list reveals several varieties of assimilation that characterize borrowings from Greek: transliteration, phonological adaptation (e.g., application of Latin phonetic rules), and morphological assimilation. More than one kind of assimilation may be in evidence: for instance, ἰωνικός (Var. *Men.* 357) becomes Horace's *Ĭōnicus* (*Epod.* 2.54; *C.* 3.6.21), which exhibits transliteration and morphological assimilation, but retains its long vowel in hiatus. In addition to the word *Ionicus*, transliteration occurs in the following cases: *Chius* (*S.* 1.10.24) for Χῖος (Lucil. 1131 M.); *epos* (*S.* 1.10.43) for ἔπος (Lucil. 343 M.); *lyra* (*Epod*. 9.5) for λύρα (Var. *Men.* 349, 543); *nomisma* (*Ep.* 2.1.234) for νόμισμα (Var. *Men.* 342 title). Except for *epos* and *nomisma*, all these loanwords had already appeared in Latin prior to the occurrence of the code-switched form, hence it is difficult to establish which of the forms is marked.

In addition, several examples show Horace using a native inflection with a word that had earlier appeared with borrowed morphology: for instance, *Attica* (*S.* 2.8.13) for *Attices* (Var. *Men.* 141) and *Atticōn* (gen. pl., Lucil. 1199 M.); *Delphicus* (*C.* 3.30.15) for *Delphicē* (nom. sing., Var. *Men.* 320); *Lydorum* for *Lydōn* (gen. pl., Var. *Men.* 96); *lympha* (*S.* 1.5.24) for *lymphōn* (gen. pl., Var. *Men.* 50); *poetica* (*Ep.*1.19.44) for *poeticōn*

(gen. pl., Lucil. 495 M.). With such a small corpus it is difficult to generalize, but it does seem that a few factors are in play: first, Horace eliminates several morphemes that he seems to exclude categorically (gen. pl. *-ōn* as in *Ludon*; gen. sing. *-ēs* as in *Attices*); secondly, the bulk of the morphological assimilation occurs in the case of adjectives (e.g., *Delphicus -a -um, Lydus -a -um, Atticus -a -um, poeticus -a,-um*). Since it was Lucilius's general practice to use Greek inflections with Greek adjectives and Varro seems to have continued this to some degree, the use of native inflections is a significant departure from the style of earlier satire.[87]

3. The Pathology of Bilingualism: Satires *1.10*

The final satire in Horace's first book of *Satires* presents itself as a rejoinder to critics of Horace who have read and taken offense with some of his earlier literary and programmatic claims (esp. *S.* 1.4). Among the first issues to arise in *Satires* 1.10 is the question of language mixing: namely, the blending of Latin and Greek, which Horace's critics had praised as a virtue of Lucilius's style. The poem is not a manifesto on purism, but a humorous, exaggerated, and partial contribution to a critical dialogue about Lucilius and earlier satire. Nevertheless, since it provides insight into the significance of Horace's purism, it complements the issues presented in the first half of the chapter. My reading highlights two risks that Horace associates with improper language mixture: late-learning

[87] Housman (1972: 2.687) noted Lucilius's tendency to use native inflections with borrowed nouns but to use Greek inflections with borrowed adjectives.

(ὀψιμαθία) and confusion about one's identity (*bilinguis more Canusini*). Both risks are relevant to understanding Horace's relationship to Greek in general and the significance of avoiding Greek at particular moments.

3.1 THE ARGUMENT

The satire begins as a response to the charge, attributed to unnamed critics, that Horace has criticized Lucilius unfairly and develops into a heated elaboration and defense of his satirical principles. Its first word, *nempe,* which admits a concession (*OLD* s.v. 4), thrusts the reader immediately into the midst of an exchange in which Horace has found himself on his back foot.[88] The dispute takes as its starting point the claims Horace had made about Lucilius at the end of *Satires* 1.4: although he was a great moralist and humorist, his style lacked enough polish to meet contemporary standards. In reaffirming his earlier criticism, Horace presses the case that Lucilius lacked stylistic polish and elaborates on the qualities necessary for a successful satirist: humor, brevity, limpidity, and the ability to construct arguments in a variety of different modes (lines 5–14). He then draws a distinction, common in ancient theories of humor, between the *ridiculum* and the *acre,* emphasizing the importance of the former and associating it with the Greek old comedy (lines 14–17), which Horace greatly admires. This prompts the reflection (lines 17–19) that Horace's critics, who now begin to reveal more definite identities—a certain

[88] The first eight lines are generally accepted as a contemporary interpolation: see, for instance, the discussion in Brown (1995: 183–84). Freudenburg (1993) attractively explains its form as a *praescriptio,* a legal brief.

Hermogenes and a *simius iste* who does nothing but recite Calvus and Catullus (*doctus cantare Catullum*)—have shamefully never read Attic comedy.[89] There are two related implications here: Horace's critics never acquired a sufficient education to be able to read Old Comedy and, as a result lacked the requisite knowledge to be adequate judges of contemporary satire. As Feeney observes, they seem to miss the Augustan program of blending Alexandrian with archaic and classical models.[90] Partly this is an insinuation about their poor education and, by extension, their social standing. The point is reiterated by the syntax of *doctus*: the epithet, a watchword of Catullus and his circle, which normally stands on its own as a mark of cultural achievement, is perverted by the addition of a qualifying infinitive (19): *nil praeter Calvum et doctus cantare Catullum* ("educated—to parrot nothing but Calvus and Catullus"). The possession of liberal *doctrina*, which had been valued precisely because it was opposed to practical knowledge, is reduced by the epexegetical infinitive into mere "knowledge-how", the training of a pet monkey. Without a real education, Horace's critics are left to imitate Calvus and Catullus in the place of Greek literary models.

At this moment in the satire, the interlocutor is given space to respond and raise a new point in defense of Lucilius: he was highly accomplished at mixing Latin and Greek (*at magnum fecit quod verbis Graeca Latinis | miscuit*, 20–21). The subject followed

---

[89] On these and other critics present in the poem: cf. Rudd (1982: 163). On the insult *simius iste*, see Cossarini (1985).

[90] Feeney (2009: 208–9).

naturally on Horace's previous point, which was to impugn the ability of his critics to read Greek literature and, in effect, to question their education and social standing. By showing himself to be a sensitive appreciator of Lucilius's use of Greek, the interlocutor asserts his bilingual credentials against Horace's insinuation to the contrary. Indeed, by employing language that evokes aristocratic social performance (e.g., *concinnus* and *suavior*) and the loanword *Chīō* (pronounced *à la grecque* with the long vowel preserved in hiatus) the critic's language acquires an elevated hauture. The full text of the exchange reads as follows (*S.* 1.10.20–30):

> "at magnum fecit quod verbis Graeca Latinis
> miscuit." o seri studiorum, quine putetis
> difficile et mirum Rhodio quod Pitholeonti
> contigit? "at sermo lingua concinnus utraque
> suavior, ut Chio nota si conmixta Falerni est."
> cum versus facias, te ipsum percontor, an et cum
> dura tibi peragenda rei sit causa Petilli?
> scilicet oblitus patriaeque patrisque Latini,
> cum Pedius causas exsudet Poplicola atque
> Corvinus, patriis intermiscere petita
> verba foris malis Canusini more bilinguis.
>
> "But he accomplished something great insofar as he mixed Greek with Latin words." Alas late learners! Do you mean to think that it is a marvelous and difficult achievement that *occurred* to Pitholaus of Rhodes? "But conversation is smoother that harmonizes with both languages, just as when a Falernian vintage has been mixed together with one from Chios." When you are scribbling verses, I ask you (I mean you), or also when you need to plead the case in defense of Petillius?—naturally, having forgotten your homeland and father Latinus (although Pedius and Corvinus Poplicola sweat out their trials) you prefer to interlard foreign words with native, a bilingual in the manner of a Canusine.

The interlocutor makes two points on behalf of language-mixing: that it is a great achievement (*magnum fecit*), and, secondly, that it is more socially and aesthetically pleasing.[91] The repetition of forms of *misceo* throughout the passage (*miscuit, permixtum, intermiscere*) alludes to a common derivation of the word *satura* from a kind of mixed food offering (*lanx satura*).[92] The issue of language contact is cast in terms of cooking: if satire is a mixed dish (*lanx satura*), what are the right ingredients and in what proportions?

3.2 BILINGUALISM AND CLASS: THE TROUBLE WITH LATE-LEARNERS

Horace's rebuttal takes into account each of these two claims in turn. In reply to the interlocutor's first point, that mixing Greek and Latin was a great accomplishment, Horace belittles the practice as trivial and amateurish, characteristic of late-learners (ὀψιμαθεῖς) eager to show off their thin veneer of learning. The issue of ὀψιμαθία is indeed central to the question of code-switching in antiquity and relevant for understanding Horace's avoidance of it. Quoting Greek was a form of social performance that required a great deal of tact and sensitivity: only because it could so easily go wrong might it serve as an effective indicator of social status and a tool of inclusion or exclusion. The rhetorician C. Iulius Victor (fourth century AD) described code-switching

---

[91] For this sense of *magnum*, compare Cic. *Ver.* 5.1.68: *etiamne id magnum fuit, Panhormum litteras mittere?*

[92] Quintilian provides an instance of similar wordplay when he describes *aliud genus saturae . . . mixtum* (*Inst.* 10.1.95); similarly Livy writes *impletas modis saturas* (7.2.7). For puns on *satura*, see Gowers (1993: 109–26).

as if it were a kind of tight-rope walk, from which it was easy to stray into different sorts of performative error (*Ars rhetorica* 448.29–30 Halm): *Graece aliquid addere litteris suave est, si id neque intempestive neque crebro facias.* Quoting Greek is charming (*suave*), so long as one takes care not to do it inappropriately (*intempestive*) or too often (*crebro*). What counted as inappropriate could not be stipulated in advance but must be learned through practice and experience: such knowledge represents a form of social habitus, whose acquisition is effective proof of one's social standing. As Horace suggests, ὀψιμαθία is one way in which code-switching could easily backfire: alternating languages too frequently might suggest that the speaker was attempting to compensate for a perceived deficit of cultural knowledge and social status. As discussed above, in the case of a late-learner, such as Trimlachio, over-eagerness to demonstrate one's learning was often accompanied by defective knowledge.

The risk of ὀψιμαθία partly depended on the relationship between the speaker and the audience: code-switching among intimates, such as between Cicero and Atticus, incurred little danger, since both men were familiar with each other's backgrounds and intentions; in these contexts, using Greek projected a sense of intimacy and shared understanding. Similarly, a social superior ran little risk by code-switching to an inferior, who was hardly in a position to take offense or offer correction. This is surely one reason for the high frequency of code-switching in the letters of Augustus and in the *Satires* of an aristocrat such as Lucilius, where it projects a high level of confidence and security in

their social station; indeed, it can be a way of asserting dominance, as the rejection of formality and politeness codes often are.[93]

The situation became much more fraught when there was a lack of familiarity between the interlocutors or when the speaker was markedly inferior to his addressee. A social inferior such as Horace, a freedman's son, was in an especially tight spot: quoting too much Greek could offend his audience if it seemed as if he was using it to over-reach his station or speak too familiarly with his superiors. Such a gaffe would be the linguistic equivalent of the freedman in *Epodes* 4 who dressed himself in the clothes of a *tribunus militum*, or the praetor Tillius with his extravagant retinue in *Satires* 1.6. Thus, for Horace the avoidance of Greek was partly a matter of avoiding the charge of ὀψιμαθία: being a social upstart or pretender in a social milieu that was full of them. Horace was not compelled to eliminate demonstrations of familiarity with Greek entirely, however, but only to transform them into Latin through translation. One result of this procedure was that Horace effectively addressed two different audiences at once, where Lucilius with his code-switching had only anticipated one. To a monolingual audience, Horace's Latin largely made sense on its own terms without reference to a second language. An

[93] To the excellent resume of circumstances Adams identifies for code-switching (2003: 297–416) could be added one more: the flouting of linguistic norms to demonstrate one's higher status to an inferior. For instance, when Pomponius Porcellus rebuked Tiberius for using a foreign word (Suet. *Gramm.* 22), the lawyer Ateius Capito came to the emperor's defence by observing that the emperor's language was Latin by definition: if words are coins, then it is the emperor who coins them. By breaking ordinary rules of linguistic propriety, an emperor could provide a striking demonstration of his exceptional position. In this context, it makes sense why Tiberius should take great care not to use Greek in front of the Senate, since doing so might come across as a display of power.

educated, bilingual audience would have recognized Horace's translations of Greek tags and expressions and admired the linguistic accomplishment as well as the cultural knowledge Horace thereby deployed.

Two examples of bilingual interaction within the satire help to demonstrate Horace's claims: *seri studiorum*, a rendering of the Greek word ὀψιμαθεῖς, and the name *Pitholeonti*, a hybridized and epicized form of name *Pitholaus*. As discussed above, rather than switch into Greek in order to cite the term ὀψιμαθεῖς, Horace ostentatiously avoided the practice under dispute and instead offered a Latin substitute. His refusal to speak Greek offered a pointed demonstration to his critics how to handle language alternation. Appropriately enough, it came in the form of an insult hurled in their direction. If Kießling and Heinze are correct in speculating that Lucilius might have used the Greek form of the word (ὀψιμαθεῖς), Horace's rebuke was also aimed at his satirical predecessor. Possibly Horace had in mind a more contemporary target: the satirist Varro Atacinus, who makes an appearance later in the poem and was associated with late-learning.[94] Horace's translation has a strained and artificial quality to the substitution that needs to be reckoned with: the use of the genitive with *serus* is late and poetic (a "genitive of the sphere of activity") and the expression never takes root in Latin, as other

[94] Varro Atacinus is cited as a failed writer of satire in Horace's poem (*hoc erat experto frustra Varrone Atacino, S.* 1.10.46). According to Jerome's *Chronicon*, Varro Atacinus learned Greek late in life: *qui postea XXV annum agens Graecas litteras cum summo studio didicit*. Possibly Horace puns on the writer's *agnomen* later in the same satire: ***intacti*** *carminis auctor* (*S.* 1.10.66), where *in-tactus* might allude to Ἀ-ταξ. However, it is unclear whether the author's surname *Atacinus* refers a Spanish river called the Atax (the modern Aude), the name of a *vicus* of Narbo, or was a self-standing cognomen characteristic of the region. See Courtney (2003: 235–36).

coinages of Horace sometimes do. Partly it serves to draw attention to the translation as a translation, so that one feels the Greek moving beneath it, a quality also emphasized by the Grecizing particle *o*.[95] Partly it points up the strenuousness and effort involved in speaking pure Latin, as if to show that the greater difficulty is not mixing languages but artfully avoiding it. Finally, there may be a touch of self-caricature involved; Horace is rarely willing to make an argument without at the same time showing himself aware of its shortcomings.

The allusion to "Pitholaus of Rhodes" marshals another kind of linguistic interaction to amplify Horace's scorn. Following Bentley's suggestion, most commentators agree that this is a reference to the Hellenophile, poetaster, and critic of the Augustan regime, M. Otacilius Pitholaus, who seems to have settled in Rhodes.[96] In the first place, Horace uses Greek naming conventions—the combination of *cognomen* and ethnic—to parody his "going native".[97] Lucilius had played similarly with Greek naming conventions in mocking the Hellenophile praetor T. Albucius (88–94 M.): not only does his cohort address him using the symposiastic toaste *chaere*, but they use his *praenomen* in imitation of Greek practice.[98] Horace has also changed Pitholaus's name to magnify the absurdity: he has declined the name as if its nominative were *Pitholeon* ("ape-lion" <

---

[95] On the use of the particle *o* "to make an address sound Greek," see Dickey (2002: 226).

[96] The identification was first made by Bentley (1728: 436–37) on the basis the description of Pitholaus at Suet. *Jul.* 72.

[97] On the Albucius episode, see Chahoud (2004).

[98] Lucilius elsewhere uses only the *gentilicium* in direct address. On the differences between Greek and Latin naming conventions, especially with respect to ethnic adjectives, see Dickey (2002: 206–10).

πίθων + λέων) rather than *Pitholaus*. The placement of the word at the end of the verse also makes it impossible to know whether the dative ending is Latin (*-ī*) or Greek (*-ĭ*). In either case, the hybrid form exposes Pitholaus's own hybridity to criticism and parodies the conventions of Greek epic diction.

3.3 BILINGUALISM AND IDENTITY: *CANUSINI MORIS BILINGUIS*

The implicit attack on Pitholaus for "going native" anticipates the substance of Horace's reply to the interlocutor's second assertion, which defends language mixing by an analogy with wine: just as mixing together different vintages of wine produces a more balanced drink, so too speech (*sermo*) becomes more pleasant (*suavior*) when it combines different languages.[99] Although it seems like a far-fetched analogy, other Romans made similar claims without any hint of irony.[100] The sympotic metaphor suggested itself to Ausonius, who addressed a fellow bilingual as (*Ep.* 18.30–31): *Cecropiae commune decus Latiaeque Camenae | solus qui Chium miscet et Amineum*. The adjective *Amineus* appears to be an archaizing term for "Falernian".[101] Similar language can be found on a

[99] Gowers (1993: 128) attractively interprets the mixture of Chian and Falernian as a social gaffe, especially in light of *Satires* 2.8, in which the gourmet Nasidienus offers his guests a choice between Latian Caecuban and Greek Chian (*S.* 2.8.15–17). Blending wines in antiquity seems to have been a way to mask impurities of lower-quality wines; McGovern (2003: 172–73) cites evidence from Egypt for mixing low quality wines. Porphyry (*ad loc.*), however, found nothing wrong with the combination: *Chium dulce est, Falernum austerum; ergo mixtum iucundum fit*. Similarly Ausonius did not hesitate to make a similar comparison.

[100] For instance, Fronto praises code-switching in a letter to M. Aurelius (*Aur.* p. 12.14 Haines): *enimvero omnia istaec inter Graecos versus Latina ita scite alternate sunt a te et interposita, ut est ille in pyrrhica versicolorum discursus.*

[101] On Ausonius's code-switching in general, see Rochette (2007).

late antique statue from Aphrodisias, praising a local official for mixing the Italic Muse with the "sweet-spoken honey of the Attic one": τὸν Ἰταλιώτιδα Μοῦσαν | Ἀτθίδος ἡδυεπεῖ κιρνάμενον μέλιτι.[102] The adjectives in the interlocutor's analogy, *suavis* and especially *concinnus*, which are terms of approval for social performance, evoke the kind of code-switching that the interlocutor has in mind: the elegant Greek tags that formed such an important part of polite Roman conversation.[103] Whereas the interlocutor had first stressed the use of Greek as the hard-won achievement of a proper education, he now claims that the informal use of Greek is an attractive feature of polite repartee.

Horace responds to this second objection not by disputing its premise, but by escalating the disagreement into an *ad hominem* attack, the main thrust of which is to associate his interlocutor with an infamous case of sacrilege, the trial of Petillius Capitolinus. Ultimately, the critic's moral failings turn out to be cognate with his bilingualism, since both arise from a failure to maintain a consistent identity. Horace seems to ask simply for clarification (25–6): *cum versus facias, te ipsum percontor, an et cum | dura tibi peragenda rei sit causa Petilli*? The disjunctive question moves the discussion from poetic style to rhetorical style. While some language mixture might have been appropriate in poetry, surely the interlocutor would agree that it would be downright

[102] Ševčenko (1968) provides a text of the inscription and historical discussion of bilingualism in the Empire. The verb is the *vox propria* for "tempering" wine through the addition of water or other substances, hence the epigram describes a dry Italic base being improved by the addition of Greek sweetness. This seems to be precisely the equation imagined by Horace's interlocutor, as described by Porphyrio: Greek is sweet, Italian is bitter.

[103] Mayer (1985) describes *concinnus* with its "buzz of implication" as the antonym of *ineptus*.

disreputable to alternate languages in the middle of a public trial, especially when such outstanding orators as Pedius and Messalla Corvinus work hard to maintain the quality of their diction.[104]

It has sometimes been claimed on the basis of these lines that Horace means to introduce rhetorical standards into the judgment of Latin poetry; in other words, that satire should maintain the same standards of diction and decorum that contemporary oratory observes.[105] Undoubtedly, Horace admired the pure speeches of Pedius and Messalla Corvinus and wanted to shame his interlocutor by the unequal juxtaposition. The comparison indeed suggests that there were features of rhetorical practice from which Horace felt that contemporary poets could learn. However, it is difficult to imagine that Horace meant to collapse entirely the distinction between *sermo poeticus* and *sermo oratorius*: the dichotomy is a commonplace in rhetorical treatises in the late Republic and Horace himself refers to it at the beginning of the satire (*sermone opus est . . . modo rhetoris atque poetae*, 10–12).[106] Even by rhetorical principles, a private poem addressed to a small, educated audience ought to differ in style from a public speech addressed to a

---

[104] Knorr (2005) argues that three orators are meant: Pedius, L. Gellius Publicola, and Messalla Corvinus. However, the claim partly hinges on the assertion that Messalla Corvinus would not have acknowledged the *agnomen* Publicola, which is cast into doubt by [Verg.] *Cat.* 9.40 (*Messallis Publicolis*).

[105] Oliensis (1998: 40): "The erasure of the distinction between legal and poetic discourse suggests that the poet . . . is henceforth to be judged by the same criteria as the orator whose place is at the very center of Roman political activity. Hence the admixture of Graecisms, often perceived as a mark of refinement and cultivation, is here categorized as déclassé ."

[106] Lausberg (1998: 117–18) defines *decorum* this as, "the fitting together of all the parts which make up the speech or are connected to it in some way." On the distinction between *sermo poeticus* and *sermo oratorius*, see Müller (2001).

large, diverse audience. If this is Horace's argument, it is a bad one—perhaps ironically intended, or serving to characterize the speaker as a *doctor ineptus*.

By bringing up oratory, Horace's aim is not chiefly to claim that poetry should be more like rhetoric. Instead, the reference to Petillius turns the discussion into a referendum on the character of the hitherto unidentified interlocutor (*te ipsum percontor*). It is as if Horace were to say, "How could you be in a position to have an opinion on the proper use of language of any kind, when you are involved in the trial of Petillius Capitolinus?" Little is known for certain about the trial of Petillius Capitolinus, who allegedly stole a garland from the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus while he had been tasked with refurbishing it in 43 BC.[107] For Horace, however, the trial is a byword for duplicity, as his earlier reference to Petillius demonstrates (*S.* 1.4.91–101):

> ego, si risi, quod ineptus
> pastillos Rufillus olet, Gargonius hircum,
> lividus et mordax videor tibi? mentio si qua
> de Capitolini furtis inecta Petilli
> te coram fuerit, defendas, ut tuus est mos:
> "me Capitolinus convictore usus amicoque
> a puero est causaque mea permulta rogatus
> fecit, et incolumis laetor quod vivit in urbe;
> sed tamen admiror, quo pacto iudicium illud
> fugerit." hic nigrae sucus lolliginis, haec est
> aerugo mera: quod vitium procul afore chartis
>
> If I laughed, because the absurd Rufillus smells of breath-fresheners, Gargonius like a goat, do I strike you as malicious and prone to bite? If some mention of Petillius Capitolinus's appropriations cropped up while you were present, you'd defend him in your usual way: "I've

[107] A certain Petillius Capitolinus appears to have been mint master in 43 BC. Porph. (*S.* 1.4.91) provides the only direct reference to his theft and trial. See *NP* (s.v. "Petillius I 2").

> been an associated and friend of Capitolinus from boyhood, he's done no end of services on my behalf when asked, and I'm delighted he's living in the city with no repercussions, but I'm baffled all the same, as to how he got off at that trial." This is the ink of the black uttlefish, this is unadulterated poison. This fault will be far removed from my pages . . . (transl. Brown)

To be a *defensor Petilli*, as Horace describes it here, is not only to defend an impious an act, but subsequently to betray the friend one originally defended. The moral casuistry and the evasive knowingness of the *defensor Petilli* contrasts with Horace's emphasis on sure-footedness in diagnosing people's shortcomings, which he associated with the legacy of Greek Old Comedy (e.g., *siquis erat dignus describi . . . , S.* 1.4.3).

Duplicity of this sort evokes the negative connotations of *bilinguis*: having two tongues was to be disingenuous and immoral. Distrust of multilingualism has deep roots in ancient thought.[108] By mentioning the trial of Petillius Capitolinus in relation to bilingualism, Horace implies that linguistic ambidextrousness of the sort his interlocutor had attempted to defend is a mark of fraudulence. Uncontrolled bilingualism can compromise one's identity, both as a Roman citizen and a moral agent. As Horace goes on to suggest, the *defensor Petilli* is behaving no better than an unscrupulous Apulian

[108] Bilingualism was criticized in a variety of ancient sources. For instance, the chorus of Aristophanes's *Frogs* (578–79) refers contemptuously to Cleon's χείλεσιν ἀμφιλάλοις, his knowledge of Greek and Thracian. Iamblichus in the *de vita Pythagorea* (241) imputes an extreme form of linguistic xenophobia to Pythagoras: "It is said, then, that the Pythagoreans commanded all Hellenes who came into this fellowship to use their native dialect (φωνῇ χρῆσαθαι τῇ πατρῴᾳ), for they did not approve of speaking foreign dialects (τὸ γὰρ ξενίζειν οὐκ ἐδοκίμαζον). And foreigners came to the Pythagorean school, Messapians and Leucanians, Picentines and Romans." Adams (2003: 12) notes that suspicion of bilingualism occurs commonly across cultures, citing Josephus's description of the Jews' dislike for polyglots (*AJ.* 20.264). The Roman imagination tended to imagine villains as multilinguals. Besides the well-known instances of Mithridates VI Eupator and Cleopatra, consider Plautus's Hanno (*Poen.* 112–13): *et is omnis linguas scit, sed dissimulat sciens | se scire: Poenus plane est.*

tradesman.[109] Confused language is an outward manifestation of an inner state, exactly the argument, as we have seen, that Cicero made against language mixing in his *De officiis* (1.111). The Sardinian singer Tigellius, who provides comic relief by appearances in a few satires (*S.* 1.2.3; 1.3.3–19), exemplifies a similar case of confused identity.[110]

In conclusion, Horace's response refuses the terms of the interlocutor's question and changes the subject: he attacks the character of the questioner, further comparing him unfavorably with two elite stars of the Roman court, Pedius and Messalla Corvinus. The terms of the comparison activate a common Roman prejudice, which contrasts the real work of serious men under the beating sun of the Forum (*exsudet*) with the counterfeit activities, whether philosophy or declamation or scholarship, that take place under the shaded colonnade—exactly where the interlocutor's wine mixing and academic questions about language belong. Romans sweat their solutions rather than speculate about them.[111]

---

[109] On bilingualism in ancient Canusium, see Adams (2003: 20, 370n134).

[110] Tigellius seems to have been a historical personage, on familiar terms with Julius Caesar and Octavian, and appearing in several letters of Cicero. The emphasis on his Sardinian ancestry may do more than just express Horace's contempt (*Sardus habebat | ille Tigellius hoc, S.* 1.3.3-4). Sardinians in general had a bad reputation as hybrid descendants of Phoenicians and natives (Cic. *Scaur.* 42–45), and Cicero found Tigellius worse than most (*patria sua pestilentiorem,* Cic. *Fam.* 7.24). Naevius had even coined a humorous verb, *sardo* "to understand like a Sardinian" (*quod bruti nec satis sardare queunt,* Naev. fr. 56 Suerb.[4]). But *Sardus* might allude more specifically to the rhetorical figure of σαρδισμός, which described multilingual mixing (σαρδισμός *appellatur quaedam mixta ex varia ratione linguarum oratio,* Quint. *Inst.* 8.3.59). Cassiodorus, for instance, uses the term in exegeses of several Psalms (*In psalm*. 41.17; 59.11; 107.12) and, according to the *LSJ*, the word ought to be restored by conjecture to the scholia to Dionysius Thrax (Sch. D. T. 447.25). Although it is likely the term originally referred to the dialect mixing that occurred near ancient Sardis, Horace may have connected it with Sardinia, in jest or in earnest. On σαρδισμός, see Radermacher (1922).

[111] Compare Horace's injunction *pulmentaria quaere | sudando* (*S.* 2.2.20–21). The sweat is not only metaphorical, but results from the law courts being open to the weather (Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.27). Similar instances of the metaphor include: Sen. *Contr.* 3 praef. 13; Petr. *Sat.* 2.4; Juv. 7.105, 173. Horace describes

the *vita umbratilis* at *Ep.* 2.2.77: *scriptorium chorus omnis amat nemus et fugit urbem*; Juvenal complains about the *genus ignavum* (7.105), *quod lecto gaudet et umbra* .The strenuousness of the Roman law courts is at the center of Horace's contrast between the life of Greek dilettantism and the hard-working Roman in his epistle to Augustus (*Ep.* 2.1).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, J. N. 1980. “Anatomical Terminology in Latin Epic.” *BICS* 27:50–62.

Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Adams, J. N. 1984. “Female Speech in Latin Comedy.” *Antichthon* 18:43–77.

Adams, J. N. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adams, J. N., M. Janse, and S. Swain, eds. 2002. *Bilingualism in the Ancient World: Language Contact and the Written Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ahern, C. F. 1991. “Horace’s Rewriting of Homer in *Carmen* 1.6.” *CP* 86:301–14.

Appel, R. and P. Muysken. 1987. *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Arnold, T. 1891. *Die griechischen Studien des Horaz*. 2nd edn. Halle: W. Fries.

Arthur, J. 2001. “Codeswitching and Collusion: Classroom Interaction in Botswana Primary Schools.” In *Voices of Authority*, ed. M. Heller and M. Martin-Jones, 57–75. Westport, CT: Ablex.

Asmis, E. 2004. “Philodemus on Sound and Sense in Poetry.” *CErc.* 34:5–27.

Axelson, B. 1939. *Neue Senecastudien*. Lund: Gleerup.

Axelson, B. 1945. *Unpoetische Wörter: Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache*. Lund: H. Ohlssons boktryckeri.

Austin, R. G. 1955. *Aeneidos liber quartus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Austin, R. G. 1977. *Aeneidos liber sextus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bain, D. 2007. “Low Words in High Places: Sex, Bodily Function, and Body Parts in Homeric Epic and Other Higher Genres.” In *Hesperos: Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry Presented to M. L. West on his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. P. J. Finglass, C. Collard, and N. J. Richardson, 40–57. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baldi, P. 1999. *The Foundations of Latin*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Baldwin, B. 1989. “Bi-culturalism and Bi-lingualism in the Roman Empire.” In *Roman and Byzantine Papers*, 138–43. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben.

Balsdon, J. P. V. D. 1989. *Romans and Aliens*. London: Duckworth.

Barchiesi, A. 2000. “Rituals in Ink: Horace on the Greek Lyric Tradition.” In *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*, ed. M. Depew and D. Obbink, 167–82. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Barchiesi, A. 2001. *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and other Latin Poets*. Ed. and transl. M. Fox and S. Marchesi. London: Duckworth.

Barchiesi, A. 2001b. “Horace and Iambos: The Poet as Literary Historian.” In *Iambic Ideas*, ed. A. Cavarzere, 141–64. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bell, A. J. 1923. *The Latin Dual and Poetic Diction: Studies in Numbers and Figures*. London: Oxford University Press.

Bentley, R. 1728. *Q. Horatius Flaccus*. 3rd edn. Amsterdam: Apud Rod. & Jacob. Wetstenios.

Bickel, E. 1951. “*Vates* bei Varro und Vergil.” *RhM* 94:257–314.

Bing, P. 1995. “*Ergänzungsspiel* in the *Epigrams* of Callimachus.” *A&A* 41:115–31.

Biville, F. 1990. *Les emprunts du latin au grec: approche phonétique*. Tome I: Introduction et consonantisme. Louvain: Peeters.

Biville, F. 1994. “Collisions synonymiques dans le lexique latin entre mots hérités et mots empruntés.” In *Les problèmes de la synonymie en latin,* ed. C. Moussy, 47–58. Paris: Press de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne.

Biville, F. 1995. *Les emprunts du latin au grec: approach phonétique*. Tome II: Vocalisme et conclusions. Louvain: Peeters.

Biville, F. 1996. “*Sophos! universi clamamus* (Pétrone 40, 1): Acclamations grecques et latines dans les loisirs des Romains.” In *Les loisirs et l’héritage de la culture classique,* ed. J.-M. André, J. Dangel, and P. Demonst, 310–18. Brussels: Latomus.

Biville, F. 2008. “Situations et documents bilingues dans le monde gréco-romain.” In *Bilinguisme gréco-latin et épigraphie,* ed. F. Biville, J.-C. Decourt, and G. Rougemont, 35–53. Lyon: Maison de l’Orient et de la Méditerranée.

Blümner, H. 1911. *Die römischen Privataltertümer*. Munich: Beck.

Bo, D. 1934–1944. "Gli epiteti della lirica oraziana in relazione a quelli dei modelli greci.” *RIL* 77:233–58.

Bo, D. 1960. *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*. Vol. 3: *De Horati poetico eloquio*. Paravia: Soc. per Az. G. B. Paravia & C.

Bonfante, G. 1994. *La lingua parlata in Orazio*. Venosa: Edizioni Osanna Venosa.

Bourciez, J. 1927. *Le ‘sermo cotidianus’ dans les Satires d’Horace*. Bordeaux: Féret et fils, éditeurs.

Bowersock, G. W. 1965. *Augustus and the Greek World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boyce, B. 1991. *The Language of the Freedmen in Petronius’* Cena Trimalchionis. Leiden: Brill.

Bramble, J. C. 1974. *Persius and the Programmatic Satire: A Study in Form and Imagery*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bramble, J. C. 1982. "Lucan." In *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature,* ed. E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen, II:533–67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brenous, J. 1895. *Étude sur les hellénismes dans la syntaxe latine*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.

Brink, C. O. 1971. "Horatian Notes II: Despised Readings in the Manuscripts of the *Odes*, Book II." *PCPS* 17:17–29.

Brunori, G. 1930. *La lingua d'Orazio*. Florence: Vallecchi.

Brust, H. 2005. *Die indischen und iranischen Lehnwörter im Griechischen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

Burke, P. 2004. *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burke, P. 2009. *Cultural Hybridity*. Malden, Ma: Polity Press.

Butterfield, D. 2008. "On the avoidance of *eius* in Latin poetry." *RhM* 151:151–67.

Cairns, F. 2006. *Sextus Propertius: The Augustan Elegist*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Calboli, G. 2009. "Latin syntax and Greek." In *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax,* ed. P. Baldi and P. Cuzzolin, 1:65–193. 3 vols. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Calboli, G. 2005. "La composition avec le préfixe privative *in-* chez Horace et les poètes de son temps." In *La composition et la préverbation en latin,* ed. C. Moussy, 71–87. Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne.

Campanile, E. 1984. “Grecismi.” In *Enc. virg*, 2:805–807. Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana.

Carne-Ross, D. S. 2010. *Classics and Translation: Essays*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.

Cavalca, M. G. 2001. *I grecismi nel Satyricon di Petronio*. Bologna: Pàtron editore.

Cavarzere, A. 1996. *Sul limitare: il ‘motto’ e la poesia di Orazio*. Bologna: Patròn Editore.

Champlin, E. 1989. *Final Judgments: Duty and Emotion in Roman Wills, 200 B.C. – A.D. 250*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Christes, J. 1997. “Rom und die Fremden: Bildungsgeschichtliche Aspekte der Akkulteration.” *Gymnasium* 104:13–35.

Clackson, J. and G. Horrocks. 2007. *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Clackson, J. 2010. “Colloquial Language in Linguistic Studies.” In *Colloquial and Literary Latin*, ed. E. Dickey and A. Chahoud, 7–11. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Classen, C. J. 1998. “Die Kritik des Horaz an Lucilius in den Satiren I 4 und I 5.” In *Zur Literatur und Gesellschaft der Römer*, 149–69. Stuttgart: F. Steiner.

Clausen, W. V. *A Commentary on Virgil, Eclogues*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Coleman, R. G. G. 1963. “Two Linguistic Topics in Quintilian.” *CQ* 13:1–18.

Coleman, R. G. G. 1975. “Greek influence on Latin Syntax.” *TPhS* 74: 101–56. (Published in 1977)

Coleman, R. G. G. 1989. “The Formation of Specialized Vocabularies in Philosophy, Grammar and Rhetoric: Winners and Losers.” In *Actes du Ve colloque de linguistique latine*, ed. M. Lavency, 77–89. Leuven: Peeters.

Coleman, R. G. G. 1999. “Poetic Diction, Poetic Discourse and the Poetic Register.” In *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, ed. J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer, 21–93. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coleman, R. G. G. 2001. “Quintilian 1.6 and the Definition of *Latinitas*.” In *De lingua latina novae quaestiones*, ed. C. Moussy, 917–30. Louvain: Peeters.

Colli, G. and M. Montinari, eds. 1969. *Nietzsche: Werke: Kritische Gesamtsausgabe.* Abt. 3, Bd. 3: *Der Fall Wagner. Götzen-Dämmerung. Der Antichrist. Ecce homo. Dionysos-Dithyramben. Nietzsche contra Wagner*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter.

Connors, C. 2005. “Epic Allusion in Roman satire.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*, ed. K. Freudenburg, 123–45. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cooley, A. E. 2009, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corbier, M. 2008. “Rome, un empire bilingue.” In *Langues dominantes, Langues dominées*, ed. L. Villard, 29–55. Mont-Saint-Aignan: Publications des Universités de Rouen et du Havre.

Cossarini, A. 1985. “Hor. *Sat.* I 10,18 *Simius iste*.” *Maia* 37:249–53.

Courtney, E. 2003. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Rev. edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Courtney, E. 2004. “The ‘Greek’ Accusative.” *CJ* 99:425–31.

Crawford, M. 1978. “Greek Intellectuals and the Roman Aristocracy in the First Century B.C.” In *Imperalism in the Ancient World,* ed. P. Garnsey and C. R. Whittaker, 193–207. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crawford, M. 1992. *The Roman Republic*. 2nd edn. London: Fontana Press.

Dahlmann, H. 1948. “*Vates*.” *Philologus* 97:337–53.

Dahlmann, H. 1962. “Studien zu Varro *De poetis*.” *AAM* 10:557–676.

Davies, D. 1992. *Purity of Diction in English Verse and Articulate Energy*. London: Penguin Books.

Davies, M. 2007. “Comic *Opsimathia* in Aristophanes’ *Clouds*.” *Prometheus* 33:17–24.

Davies, W. 2006. “Language Education: Correctness and Purism.” In *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, ed. K. Brown, 470–77. 2nd edn. Boston: Elsevier.

De Meo, C. 2005. *Lingue tecniche del latino*. 3rd edn with additions, ed. M. Bonvicini. Bologna: Pàtron.

De Melo, W. D. C. 2007. *The Early Latin Verb System: Archaic Forms in Plautus, Terence, and Beyond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dench, E. 2005. *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Denniston, J. D. 1996. *The Greek Particles*. 2nd edn. rev. by K. J. Dover. London: Duckworth.

Desbordes, F. 1991. “Latinitas: constitution et evolution d'un modèle de l'identité linguistique.” In ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΜΟΣ: *quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecques*, ed. S. Saïd, 33–47. Leiden: Brill.

Díaz y Díaz, M. C. 1951. “*Latinitas*. Sobre la evolución de su concepto.” *Emerita* 19:34–40.

Dickey, E. 2002. *Latin Forms of Address: From Plautus to Apuleius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dickey, E. and A. Chahoud, eds. 2010. *Colloquial and Literary Latin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dionisotti, A. C. 1995. “Hellenismus.” In *Vocabulary of Teaching and Research Between the Middle Ages and Renaissaince*, ed. O. Weijers, 45–58. Turnhout: Brepols.

Dönt, E. “Goethe über Horaz.” *WS* 79:396–99.

Dubuisson, M. 1981. “Utraque lingua.” *AC* 50:274–86.

Dubuisson, M. 1985. *Le latin de Polybe: les implications historiques d'un cas de bilinguisme*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Dubuisson, M. 1986. “Purisme et politique: Suetone, Tibere et le grec au Senat.” In *Hommages à Jozef Veremans*, ed. F. Decreus & C. Deroux, 109–20. Brussels: Latomus.

Dufallo, B. 2005. “Words Born and Made: Horace’s Defense of Neologisms and the Cultural Poetics of Latin.” *Arethusa* 38:89–101.

Dunkel, G. E. 1982. “The Original Syntax of Conjunctive *-$k^{w}e$.” *Die Sprache* 28:129–43.

Dunkel, G. E. 2000. “Remarks on Code-switching in Cicero’s Letters to Atticus.” *MH* 57:122–29.

Dyck, A. 1996. *A Commentary on Cicero,* De Officiis. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Eklund, S. 1970. *The Periphrastic, Completive and Finite Use of the Present Participle in Latin*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Éngel, A. 1914. *De Quinti Horatii Flacci sermone metro accommodato*. Diss. Bratislava.

Ernout, A. 1957. "Le vocabulaire poétique." In *Philologica*, II:66–86. Paris: C. Klincksieck.

Erskine, A. 2001. *Troy between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fairweather, J. 1980. *Seneca the Elder*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fantham, E. 2009. *Latin Poets and Italian Gods*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Farringon, B. 1927. *Primum Graius Homo*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fedeli, P. and I. Ciccarelli. 2008. *Q. Horatii Flacci Carmina Liber IV*. Florence: Felice le Monnier.

Feeney, D. 1998. *Literature and Religion at Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Feeney, D. 2002. "The Odiousness of Comparisons: Horace on Literary History and the Limitations of Synkrisis." In *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry*, ed. M. Paschalis and C. H. Putnam, 7–18. Rethymnon: University of Crete, Dept. of Philology.

Feeney, D. 2005. "The Beginnings of a Literature in Latin." *JRS* 95:226–40.

Feeney, D. 2006. "Criticism Ancient and Modern." In *Oxford Readings in Ancient Literary Criticism*, ed. A. Laird, 440–53. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Feeney, D. 2007. *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Feeney, D. 2009. “Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets.” In *Horace: Odes and Epodes*, ed. M. Lowrie, 202–31. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Feeney, D. 2009b. “Becoming an Authority: Horace on his own reception.” In *Perceptions of Horace: A Roman Poet and his Readers*, ed. L. B. T. Houghton and M. Wyke, 16–38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Feeney, D. and T. Woodman. 2002. *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferrary, J.-L. 1988. *Philhellénisme et impérialisme*. Rome: Ècole française de Rome.

Ferri, R. 2008. “Il latino dei *Colloquia scholica*.” In *Aspetti della scuola nel mondo romano*, ed. F. Bellandi and R. Ferri, 111–78. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Ferri, R. and P. Probert. 2010. “Roman authors on colloquial language.” In *Colloquial and Literary Latin*, ed. E. Dickey and A. Chahoud, 12–41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferri, R. 2011. “The Language of Latin Epic and Lyric Poetry.” In *A Companion to the Latin Language*, ed. J. Clackson, 344–66. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Fischer, O. 1992. “Syntax.” In *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, ed. N. Blake, 2:207–408. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Flintoff, E. 1973. “Lines 116–136 of Horace *Satire* II, 2.” *Latomus* 32:814–17.

Flobert, P. 1994. “*Lingua latina* et *lingua Romana*: purisme, administration et invasions barbares.” In *Grammaire et rhétorique*, ed. J. Dangel, 69-76. Strasbourg: Université des sciences humaines de Strasbourg.

Fögen, T. 2000. *Patrii sermonis egestas: Einstellungen lateinischer Autoren zu ihrer Muttersprache*. München: Saur.

Fögen, T. 2003. *Utraque lingua: A Bibliography on Bi- and Multilingualism in Graeco-Roman Antiquity and in Modern Times*. University of Duisburg-Essen: LAUD Linguistic Agency.

Fontaine, M. 2009. *Funny Words in Plautine Comedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fordyce, C. J. 1978. *Catullus: A Commentary*. Corr. edn. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fordyce, C. J. 1985. *Aeneidos Libri VII–VIII*. Repr. with minor corrections. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.

Fowler, H. W. 1926. *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fraenkel, E. 2007. *Plautine Elements in Plautus*. Transl. T. Drevikovsky. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fränkel, H. 1932. "Griechische Bildung in altrömischen Epen I." *Hermes* 67:303–11.

Frei, P. 1958. *Die Flexion griechischer Namen der 1. Deklination im Latein*. Winterthur: P. G. Keller.

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

Fuhrmann, M. 2001. "Sprachreinheit: Über die sehr alte Tradition des *Sermo purus*." In *Ein See, drei Länder, eine Sprache*, ed. H. Zabel, 137–62. Paderborn: IFB-Verlag.

Fumaroli, M. 2011. *When the World Spoke French*. Transl. R. Howard. New York: New York Review Books.

Gaertner, J. F. 2000. "Cicero—ein selbstloser Mittler griechischer Geisteskultur?" *Anregung* 46:74–82.

Gardner-Chloros, P. 2009. *Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Geers, M. 2005. “Linguistic Purism in England and Germany.” In *Linguistic Purism in the Germanic Languages*, ed. N. Langer and W. F. Davies, 97–108. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Gildenhard, I. 2007. *Paideia Romana: Cicero’s Tusculan Disputations*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.

Gildersleeve, B. L. 1890. *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*. New York: American Book Co.

Godley, A. F. 1922. *Horace: Odes 5*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Goodwin, W. W. 1900. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*. Boston: Ginn.

Gourevitch, D. 1976. “Les noms latins de l’estomac.” *RPh* 50:85–110.

Gourevitch, D. 1977. “*Stomachus* et l’humeur.” *RPh* 51:56–74.

Gowers, E. 1993. *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gowers, E. 2003. “Fragments of Autobiography in Horace *Satires* I.” *ClAnt* 22:55–91.

Görler, W. 1985. “Eneide: la lingua.” In *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, ed. M. Geymonat and F. Della Corte, 3:262-278. Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana.

Grassmann, V. 1966. *Die erotischen Epoden des Horaz*. Munich: Beck.

Grebe, S. 2000. “Kriterien für die Latinitas bei Varro und Quintilian.” In *Hortus litterarum antiquarum*, ed. A. Haltenhoff & F.-H. Mutschler, 191–210. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Griffin, J. 1986. *Latin Poets and Roman Life.* Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Gruen, E. 1990. *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy*. Leiden: Brill.

Gruen, E. 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Gruen, E. 2006. "Romans and Others." In *A Companion to the Roman Republic*, ed. M. Morstein-Marx and N. Rosenstein, 459–77. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Habinek, T. N. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hahn, 1950. "The Origin of the Greek Accusative in Latin." *TAPA* 91:221–38.

Hall, J. 2002. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Handford, S. A. 1947. *The Latin Subjunctive: Its Usage and Development from Plautus to Tacitus*. London: Methuen.

Hardie, A. 2003. "The Pindaric Sources of Horace 'Odes 1.12'." *HSCP* 101:371–404.

Hardie, A. 2005. "The Ancient Etymology of *Carmen*." *PLLS* 12:71–94.

Harrison, S. J. 1991. *Virgil,* Aeneid 10. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hartung, H.-J. 1974. *Ciceros Methode bei der Übersetzung griechischer philosophicher Termini*. Diss. Hamburg.

Haugen, E. and Mithun, M. 2003. "Borrowing." In *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, ed. W. J. Frawley. New York: Oxford University Press.

Havet, L. 1911. *Manuel de critique verbale appliqué aux textes latins*. Paris: Librairie Hachette.

Haynes, K. 2001. "Dryden: Classical or Neoclassical?" *Translation and Literature* 10:67–77.

Haynes, K. 2004. *English Literature and Classical Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Henrichs, A. 1995. "*Graecia Capta*: Roman Views of Greek Culture." *HSCP* 97:243–61.

Henriksson, K.-E. 1956. *Griechische Büchertitel in der römischen Literatur*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Herwig, W., ed. 1965–1987. *Goethes Gespräche: Eine Sammlung zeitgenössischer Berichte aus seinem Umgang*. 5 vols. Zürich: Artemis Verlag.

Hilgers, W. 1969. *Lateinische Gefäßnamen: Bezeichnungen, Funktion und Form römischer Gefäße nach den antiken Schriftquellen*. Düsseldorf: Rheinland-Verlag.

Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hock, H. H. and B. D. Joseph. 1996. *Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship: An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hoffer, S. E. 2007. "Cicero's Stomach: Political Indignation and Use of Repeated Allusive Expression in Cicero's Correspondence." In *Ancient Letters*, ed. R. Morello and A. D. Morrison, 87–106. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holford-Strevens, L. A. 1993. "Utraque lingua doctus: some notes on bilingualism in the Roman Empire." In *Tria lustra: Essays and Notes Presented to John Pinsent, &c.*, ed. H. D. Jocelyn, 203–13. Liverpool: Liverpool Classical Monthly.

Hollis, A. S. 2007. *Fragments of Roman Poetry c.60 BC – AD 20*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Horsfall, N. 1979. "Doctus sermones utriusque linguae?" *EMC* 23:79–95.

Horsfall, N. 1979b. “Horace, *Sermones* 3?” *LCM* 4.6:117–9.

Horsfall, N. 1979c. “Horace, *Sermones* 3; epilegomena.” *LCM* 4.8:169–71.

Horsfall, N. 1981. “Some Problems of Titulature in Roman Literary History.” *BICS* 28:103–14.

Horsfall, N. 1993. *La villa sabina di Orazio: il galateo della gratitudine*. Venosa: Osanna.

Horsfall, N. 1995. “Rome without Spectacles.” *G&R* 41:49–56.

Horsfall, N. 1995b. *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Horsfall, N. 2003. *The Culture of the Roman Plebs*. London: Duckworth.

Horsfall, N. 2008. *Virgil, Aeneid 2: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.

Housman, A. E. 1972. *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman*. Ed. by J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear. 3 vols. London: Cambridge University Press.

Howard, A. A. 1890. “On the Use of the Perfect Infinitive in Latin with the Force of the Present.” *HSCP* 1:111–38.

Hunter, R. 2006. *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hutchinson, G. O. 2002. “The Publication and Individuality of Horace’s *Odes* Books 1–3.” *CQ* 52:517–37.

Hutchinson, G. 2007. “Horace and archaic Greek poetry.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, ed. S. J. Harrison, 36–49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jakobson, R. 1987. *Language in Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Jernudd, B. and M. Shapiro, ed. 1989. *The Politics of Language Purism*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Jocelyn, H. D. 1977. “The Ruling Class of the Roman Republic and Greek Philosophers.” *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 59:323–66.

Jocelyn, H. D. 1979. “*Vergilius Cacozelus* (Donatus *Vita Vergilii* 44).” *PLLS* 2:67–142.

Jocelyn, H. D. 1979b. “Horace: *Epistles* 1.” *LCM* 4.7:145–46.

Jocelyn, H. D. 1983. “Anti-Greek elements in Plautus' Menaechmi?” *PLLS* 4:1–25.

Jocelyn, H. D. 1993. “*Carm*. 1.12 and the Notion of a ‘Pindarising’ Horace.” *Sileno* 19:101–29.

Jocelyn, H. D. 1995. “*Poeta* and *vates*: concerning the nomenclature of the composer of verses in Republican and early imperial Rome.” In *Studia classica Iohanni Tarditi oblata*, ed. L. Belloni et al., I:19–50. 2 vols. Milan: Vita e pensiero.

Jocelyn, H. D. 1995b. “Orazio e gli ΗΡΩΕΣ della poesia greca.” In *Musis amicus*, ed. R. Coletti, M. Laetitia, and P. Domenicucci, 23–30. Chieti Scalo: Editrice vecchio faggio.

Jocelyn, H. D. 1999. “Code-Switching in the Comoedia Palliata.” In *Rezeption und Identität: die kulturelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Griechenland*, ed. G. Vogt-Spira and B. Rommel, 169–95. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Kaimio, J. 1979. *The Romans and the Greek Language*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Karakasis, E. 2005. *Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaster, R. A. 1988. *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kaster, R. A. 1995. *Suetonius: De grammaticis et rhetoribus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Katz, J. T. 2007. "*Dux reget examen* (*Epistle* 1.19.23): Horace's Archilochean Signature." *MD* 59:207–13.

Keirns, M. E. 1930. *The Use of Greek Words in Roman Satire*. Diss. Chicago.

Kidd, D. A. 1997. *Aratus:* Phaenomena. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kim, L. 2010. "The Literary Heritage as Language: Atticism and the Second Sophistic." In *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, ed. E. J. Bakker, 468–82. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kirsten, G. 1938. *De infinitivi atque accusativi cum infinitivo apud Horatium usu*. Engelsdorf-Leipzig: Druck von C. & E. Vogel.

Knorr, O. 2005. "Three Orators and a Flawed Argument (Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.27–30)." *CJ* 100:393–400.

Korenjak, M. 1999. "*Vates: a vi mentis.* Eine Etymologie Varros und ihr Schicksal in der lateinischen Literatur der frühen Kaiserzeit." *GFA* 2:1–4.

Kroll, W. 1924. *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlerschen Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Kroll, W. 1980. *C. Valerius Catullus*. 6th edn. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Kroll, W. 1988. "La lingua poetica romana." In *La lingua poetica latina*, ed. A. Lunelli, 1–66. Bologna: Pàtron editore.

Krostenko, B. 2001. *Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Landfester, M. 1997. *Einführung in die Stilistik der griechischen und lateinischen Literatursprachen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Langer, N. and W. V. Davies, eds. 2005. *Linguistic Purism in the Germanic Languages*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Langslow, D. R. 2000. *Medical Latin in the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Langslow, D. R. 2002. "Approaching bilingualism in corpus languages." In Adams, Swain, and Janse (2002), 23–51.

Laughton, E. 1964. *The Participle in Cicero*. London: Oxford University Press.

Laurand, L. 1936–1938. *Ètudes sur le style des discourse de Cicéron.*[4] 3 vol. Paris: Sociètè d'èdition "Les Belles letters".

Lausberg, H. 1998. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric.* Ed. D. E. Orton and R. D. Anderson. Leiden: Brill.

Lebek, W. D. 1970. *Verba Prisca: Die Anfänge des Archaisierens in der lateinischen Beredsamkeit und Geschichtsschreibung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Leich, W. 1910. *De Horati in saturis sermone ludibundo*. Weimar: Uschmann.

Leiwo, M. 1995. *Neopolitana: A Study of Population and Language in Graeco-Roman Naples*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Leiwo, M. 1996. "Language Attitude and Patriotism: Cases from Greek History." *Arctos* 30:121–37.

Lejay, P. 1911. *Œuvres d'Horace: Satires.* Paris: Librairie Hachette.

Lindner, T. 2002. *Lateinische Komposita: morphologische, historische und lexikalische Studien*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

Lipka, M. 2001. *Language in Vergil's* Eclogues. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Löfstedt, E. 1956. *Syntactica. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins*. 2 vols. Lund: Gleerup.

Löfstedt, E. 1959. *Late Latin*. Oslo: Aschehoug.

Lowrie, M. 1995. "A Parade of Lyric Predecessors: Horace. *C.* 1.12–1.18." *Phoenix* 49:33–48.

Lunelli, A., ed. 1988. *La lingua poetica latina*. 3rd edn. Bologna: Pàtron editore.

Luther, A. 2003. "Zur Regulus-Ode (Horaz, *c*. 3,5)." *RhM* 146:10–22.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1989. *Words and the Poet*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McDermott, E. A. 1981. "Greek and Roman Elements in Horace's Lyric Program." *ANRW* 2.31.3:1640–72.

McGovern, P. E. 2003. *Ancient Wine: The Search for the Origins of Viticulture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

MacLeod, C. 1979. "Horation *Imitatio* and *Odes* 2. 5." In *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, ed. D. A. West and A. Woodman, 89–102. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacLeod, C. 1982. "Horace and his Lyric Models: a Note on *Epode* 9 and *Odes* 1.37." *Hermes* 110:371–75.

MacMullen, R. 1991. "Hellenizing the Romans (2nd Century BC)." *Historia* 40:419–38.

Mackail, J. W. 1923. *Latin Literature*. New York: C. Scribner's sons.

Maltby, R. 1985. "The distribution of Greek loan-words in Terence." *CQ* 35:110–23.

Maltby, R. 1991. *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. Leeds: F. Cairns.

Maltby, R. 2011. “Servius on stylistic register in his Virgil commentaries.” In *The Latin of Roman Lexicography,* ed. R. Ferri, 63–73. Pisa: Fabrizio Serra Editore.

Mankin, D. 1995. *Horace:* Epodes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mariotti, S. 1986. *Livio Andronico e la traduzione artistica: saggio critico ed edizione dei frammenti dell’Odyssea*. 2nd edn. Urbino: Università degli studi di Urbino.

Mariotti, S. 2001. *Il Bellum Poenicum e l’arte di Nevio: saggio con edizione dei frammenti del Bellum Poenicum*. Bologna: Pàtron.

Marouzeau, J. 1962. *Traité de stylistique latine*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Maurach, G. 1995. *Lateinische Dichtersprache*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Mayer, R. G. 1985. “Horace on Good Manners.” *PCPhS* 211:35–46.

Mayer, R. G. 1994. *Horace: Epistles I.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mayer, R. G. 1999. “Grecism.” In *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, ed. R. G. Mayer and J. N. Adams, 157–225. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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.

Mazzini, I. 1991. “La medicina nella letteratura latina, ii: Esegesi e traduzione di Horat. *Epod.* 11, 15–16 e *Od.* I 13, 4–5.” In *La traduzione dei classici greci e latini in Italia oggi*, ed. P. Janni and I. Mazzini, 99–114. Macerata: Università degli studi di Macerata.

Merkelbach, R. 1972. “Grabepigramm aus Rom.” *ZPE* 9:239–40.

Morgan, L. 2005. “Spartan Tarentum? Resisting Decline in *Odes* 3.5.” *CQ* 55:320–23.

Morgan, L. 2009. “The One and Only *Fons Bandusiae*.” *CQ* 59:132–41.

Morgan, L. 2010. *Musa Pedestris: Metre and Meaning in Roman Verse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Muecke, F. 1993. *Horace:* Satires *II*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

Muecke, F. 1997. “Lingua e stile.” In *Enc. oraz.* 2:755–87.

Mugglestone, L. C. 2006. “Academies: Dictionaries and Standards.” In *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, 12–14. 2nd edn. Boston: Elsevier.

Mullen, A. 2011. “Latin and Other Languages: Societal and Individual Bilingualism.” In *A Companion to the Latin Language*, ed. J. Clackson, 527–48. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Müller, C. F. W. 1908. *Syntax des Nominativs und Akkusativs im Lateinischen*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.

Müller, L. 1894. *De re metrica poetarum latinorum praeter Plautum et Terentium Libri septem*. 2nd edn. St. Petersburg: Rickeri.

Müller, R. 1997. *Sprechen und Sprache: Dialoglinguistische Studien zu Terenz*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Müller, R. 2001. *Sprachbewusstsein und Sprachvariation im lateinischen Schrifttum der Antike*. Munich: C. H. Beck.

Müller, R. 2007. “*Pura oratio* und *puri sermonis amator*: zu zwei Begriffskippen der Terenz-Forschung.” In *Terentius Poeta*, ed. P. Kruschwitz et al., 111–25. Munich: C. H. Beck.

Müller-Lancé, J. 1992. “Die Funktion vulgärlateinischer Elemente in den Satiren des Horaz am Beispiel von sat. 2,5.” In *Latin vulgaire, latin tardif III: actes du IIIème*

Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, ed. M. Iliescu and W. Marxgut, 243–54. Tübingen: M. Niemeyer.

Munro, H. A. J. 1873. *T. Lucreti Cari* De rerum natura *Libri sex*. 3rd edn. 3 vols. Cambridge: Deighton Bell.

Myers-Scotton, C. 2008. *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Nadjo, L. 2005. “Les composés nominaux chez Lucrèce.” In *La composition et la préverbation en latin*, ed. C. Moussy, 89–102. Paris: Presses de l’Université Paris-Sorbonne.

Newman, J. K. 1967. *The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry*. Bruxelles: Latomus, revue d’études latines.

Nicolas, C. 1996. *Utraque lingua: le calque sèmantique: domaine grèco-latin*. Louvain: Peeters.

Nicolas, C. 2005. *Sic enim appello: Essai sur l'autonymie terminologique gréco-latine chez Cicéron*. Leuven: Peeters.

Nieschmidt, W. 1913. *Quatenus in scriptura Romani litteris Graecis usi sint*. Diss. Marburg.

Nilsson, N. O. 1952. *Metrische Stildifferenzen in den Satiren des Horaz*. Upssala: Almqvist & Wiksells.

Nisbet R. G. M. 1995. “The Style of Virgil’s Eclogues.”. In *Collected Papers on Latin Literature*. Ed. S. J. Harrison, 325–37. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Norberg, D. 1944. *Beiträge zur spätlateinischen Syntax*. Uppsala: Almquist & Almquist &Wiksells boktr.

Norden, E. 1957. *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI*. 4th edn. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Noy, D. 2000. *Foriegners at Rome: Citizens and Strangers*. London: Duckworth with the Classical Press of Wales.

Ogilvie, R. M. 1957. "A *calque sémantique* in Livy." *Eranos* 55:201–2.

Oksala, P. 1953. *Die griechischen Lehnwörter in den Prosaschriften Ciceros*. Helsinki: Druckerei A. G. der Finnischen Literaturgesellschaft.

Oksala, P. 1954. "Ciceros Einstellung zum lexikalischen Purismus." *Arctos* 1:132-37.

Oksala, T. 1982. "Zum Gebrauch der griechischen Lehnwörter bei Catull." *Arctos* 16:99-119.

Oliensis, E. 1998. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Otto, A. 1962. *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*. Orig. publ. 1890. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Palmer, L. R. 1961. *The Latin Language*. London: Faber and Faber.

Parry, A. 1989. "The Language of Achilles." In *The Language of Achilles and Other Papers*, 1–7. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Paschalis, M., and M. C. J. Putnam, ed. 2002. *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry*. Rethymnon: University of Crete, Dept. of Philology.

Pasquali, G. 1964. *Orazio lirico: Studi.* Introd. with bibl. addn. A. La Penna. Florence: Le Monnier.

Penney, J. H. W. 1999. “Archaism and Innovation in Latin Poetic Syntax.” In *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, ed. J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer, 249–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Petersmann, H. 1995. “Zur mündlichen Chrakterisierung des Fremden in der Komödie des Plautus.” In *Plautus und die Tradition des Stegreifspiels*, ed. L. Benz, E. Stärk, G. Vogt-Spira, 123–36. Tübingen G. Narr Verlag.

Petersmann, H. 1999. “The Language of Early Roman Satire: Its Function and Characteristics.” In *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, ed. J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer, 289–310. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Petersmann, H. 2003. “Sprache und Stil als ein Mittel der Personencharakterisierung in den Komödien des Plautus.” In *Altera ratio: Klassische Philologie zwischen Sugjektivität und Wissenschaft*, ed. M. Schauer and G. Thome, 108–119. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Petersmann, H. 2004. “Standardisierung und Destandardisierung der lateinischen Sprache in diachroner Sicht.” In *Studia Humanitatis ac Litterarum Trifolio Heidelbergensi dedicate*, ed. A. Hornung, C. Jäkel, and W. Schubert, 235–54. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Petrochilos, N. 1974. *Roman Attitudes to the Greeks*. Athens: National and Capodistrian University of Athens.

Pfeiffer, R. 1991. “Quod versu dicere non est.” In *Kleine Schriften*, 131–37. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Pisani, V. 1981. “Un grecismo nel *Carmen Arvale*?” *PP* 36:243–44.

Platnauer, M. 1951. *Latin Elegiac Verse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Poccetti, P. 1986. “*Bilinguis*.” *A. I. O. N. linguistica* 8:193–205.

Poccetti, P., D. Poli, and C. Santini. 1999. *Una storia della lingua latina: formazione, usi, comunicazione*. Roma: Carocci.

Poccetti, P. 2010. “Greeting and Farewell Expressions as Evidence for Colloquial Language: Between Literary and Epigraphical Texts.” In *Colloquial and Literary Latin*, ed. E. Dickey and A. Chahoud, 100–26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Powell, J. G. F. 1995. “Cicero’s Translations from Greek.” In *Cicero the Philosopher*, ed. J. G. F. Powell, 273–300. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Quinn, K. 1963. *Latin Explorations: Critical Studies in Roman Literature*. London: Routledge and Paul.

Race, W. H. 2010. “Horace's Debt to Pindar.” In *A Companion to Horace*, ed. G. Davis, 147–73. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Radermacher, L. 1922. “Sitzung der philosophisch-historischen Klasse vom 11. Januar.” *Anzeiger d. Wien* 59:1–4.

Raven, D. S. 1965. *Latin Metre: An Introduction.* London: Faber and Faber.

Rawson, E. 1989. “Roman Tradition and the Greek World.” *CAH* 8:422–76.

Reinhardt, T. 2005. “The Language of Epicureanism in Cicero: The Case of Atomism.” In *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, ed. J. N. Adams, M. Lapidge, and T. Reinhardt, 151–77. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ricottilli, L. 2003. “La lingua d’uso in Orazio.” In *La lingua d’uso latina*, J. B. Hofmann, transl. L. Ricottilli, 465–509. Bologna: Pàtron editore.

Risselada, R. 1993. *Imperatives and Other Directive Expressions in Latin: A Study in the Pragmatics of a Dead Language*. Amsterdam: Gieben.

Rochette, B. 1997. *Le latin dans le monde grec*. Brussells: Latomus.

Rochette, B. 2007. "Code-switching chez Ausone." In *Être romain: hommages in memoriam Charles Marie Ternes*, ed. R. Bedon and M. Polfer, 175–95. Remshalden: B. A. Greiner.

Rochette, B. 2010. "Greek and Latin Bilingualism." In *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, ed. E. J. Bakker, 281–93. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Rochette, B. 2011. "Language Policies in the Roman Republic and Empire." In *A Companion to the Latin Language*, ed. J. Clackson, 549–63. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Romaine, S. 1995. *Bilingualism*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rosén, H. 1999. *Latine loqui: Trends and Directions in the Crystallization of Classical Latin*. Munich: Fink.

Rosenstein, N. 1995. "Sorting out the Lot in Republican Rome." *AJP* 116:43–75.

Ross, D. O. 1969. *Style and Tradition in Catullus*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ross, D. O. 1975. *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy, and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rossi, L. R. 2009. "Horace, a Greek Lyrist without Music." In *Horace: Odes and Epodes*, ed. M. Lowrie, 356–77. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ruckdeschel, F. 1910. *Archaismen und Vulgarismen in der Sprache des Horaz*. Munich: Druck der akademischen Buchdruckerei von F. Straub.

Rudd, N. 1982. *The Satires of Horace*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rudd, N. 1986. *Themes in Roman Satire*. London: Duckworth.

Russell, D. A. 1964. *'Longinus' On the Sublime*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Saïd, S. 1991. ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΜΟΣ*: quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Scheid, J. 2003. *An Introduction to Roman Religion*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Schiesaro, A. 2009. "Horace's Bacchic Poetics." In *Perceptions of Horace: A Roman Poet and his Readers*, ed. L. B. T. Houghton and M. Wyke, 61–79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schindel, U. 1984. "Die 'furchtbare Realität' des Geleitgedichts für Vergil." *Hermes* 112:316–33.

Sedley, D. 2003. *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shklovsky, V. 1965. "Art as Technique." In *Russian Formalist Criticism*, ed. L. T. Lemon and M. J. Reis, 3–24. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Silk, M. 2009. "The Invention of Greek: Macedonians, Poets and Others." *In Standard Languages and Language Standards: Greek, Past and Present*, ed. A. Georgakopoulou and M. Silk, 3–27. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Publ. Co.

Skutsch, O. 1985. *Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Solta, G. R. 1974. *Zur Stellung der lateinischen Sprache*. Vienna: Georg Renatus.

Spawforth, A. 2012. *Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stang, N. 1931. "*Philosophia, philosophus* bei Cicero." *SO* 11:82–93.

Steiner, D. 2007. "Feathers Flying: Avian Poetics in Hesiod, Pindar, and Callimachus." *AJP* 177–208.

Steiner, E. 1921. *Das Bedeutungslehnwort in Vergils Äneis*. Diss. Königsberg.

Stroux, J. 1912. *De Theophrasti virtutibus dicendi*. Diss. Strassbourg.

Suerbaum, W., ed. 2002. *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*. *Erster Band: die archaische Literatur*. Munich: C. H. Beck.

Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Swain, S. 2002. "Bilingualism in Cicero? The Evidence of Code-switching." In *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text,* ed. J. N. Adams, M. Janse, S. Swain, 128–67. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Syndikus, H. P. 2001. *Die Lyrik des Horaz*. 3rd edn. 2 vols. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Ševčenko, I. 1968. "A Late Antique Epigram and the so-called Elder Magistrate from Aphrodisias." In *Synthronon: art et archeology de la fin de l'Antiquité et du Moyen âge,* ed. O. Grabar, 29–41. Paris: Klincksieck.

Thesleff, E. 1967. *Studies in the Styles of Plato*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden kirjapaino.

Thomas, G. 1988. "Towards a Typology of Lexical Purism in the Slavic Literary Languages." *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 30:95–111.

Thomas, G. 1991. *Linguistic Purism*. London: Longman.

Thomas, R. 2007. “Horace and Hellenistic Poetry.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, ed. S. J. Harrison, 50–62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, R. 2010 “Grist to the Mill: The Literary Uses of the Quotidian in Horace, *Satire* 1.5.” In *Colloquial and Literary Latin*, ed. E. Dickey and A. Chahoud, 255–65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomason, S. G. 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.

Toher, M. 2005. “Tillius and Horace.” *CQ* 55:183–89.

Tosi, R. 1997. *Dizionario delle sentenze latine e greche*. Milan: RCS Rizzoli Libri.

Traina, A. 1974. *Vortit barbare: le traduzioni poetiche da Livio Andronico a Cicerone*. 2nd edn. Rome: Edizioni dell’Ateneo.

Traina, A., ed. 2002. *Stilistica latina*. Transl. by C. Neri with additions by R. Oniga and revision and indices by B. Pieri. Bologna: Pàtron editore.

Traina, A. 2010. “Style.” In *Oxford Handbook of Roman Studies*, ed. A. Barchiesi and W. Scheidel, 203–19. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Trappes-Lomax, J. M. 2002. “Three Suggestions in Latin Poetry.” *CQ* 52:609–12.

Tränkle, H. 1960. *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.

Treggiari, S. 1991. *Roman Marriages:* Iusti Coniuges *from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Turfan, J. M. 2006. Review of G. Bartoloni and F. Delpino, *Oriente e Occidente: metodi e discipline a confronto*. Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 2005. *BMCRev* 2006.08.10.

Ullman, B. L. 1912. “Horace *Serm.* I. 6. 115 and the History of the Word *Laganum*.” *CP* 7:442–49.

Ullman, B. L. 1915. “Horace, Catullus, and Tigellius.” *CP* 10:270–96.

Urech, H. J. 1999. *Hoher und niederer Stil in den Satiren Juvenals: Untersuchung zur Stilhöhe von Wörtern und Wendungen und inhaltlihe Interpretation von Pasagen mit auffälligen Stilwechseln*. Bern: P. Lang.

Vainio, R. 1999. Latinitas *and Barbarisms according to the Roman Grammarians: Attitudes towards Language in the Light of Grammatical Examples*. Turku: Painosalama Oy.

Vassilaki, S. 2007. “Ἑλληνισμός.” In *A History of Ancient Greek*, ed. A.-F. Christidis, 1118–29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Venini, P., L. Canali, E. Romani *et al*. 1991–1997. *Le opere: Q. Orazio Flacco*. 2 vols. Roma: Istituto poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato.

Versteegh, K. 1987. “Latinitas, Hellenismos, `Arabiyya.” In *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period*, ed. D. J. Taylor, 251–74. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.

Vottero, D. 1974. “La grafia dei termini d’origine greca nelle opera filosofiche di Seneca.” *Atti della Accademia della Scienza di Torino* 108:311–39.

Wackernagel, J. 1916. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht.

Wackernagel, W. 2009. *Lectures on Syntax*. Transl. and ed. David Langslow. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1988. “Review Article: Greek Knowledge, Roman Power.” *CP* 83:224–33.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1998. “To be Roman, Go Greek: Thoughts on Hellenization at Rome.” In *Modus operandi: Essays in Honour of Geoffrey Rickman,* ed. M. Austin, 79–91. London: Institute of Classical Studies.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 2008. *Rome’s Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Waltz, A. 1881. *Des variations de la langu et de la métrique d’Horace dans ses différents ouvrages*. Paris: Joseph Baer et cie.

Wardman, A. 1976. *Rome’s Debt to Greece*. London: P. Elek.

Watkins, C. 1995. “Greece in Italy outside Rome.” *HSCP* 97:35–50.

Watson, L. 1987. “Epode 9, or the Art of Falsehood.” In *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble,* ed. M. Whitby, P. Hardie, and M. Whitby, 119–29. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.

Watson, L. 2003. *A Commentary on Horace’s* Epodes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Watson, P. 1985. “The Selection of Vocabulary in Latin Poetry.” *CQ* 35:430–48.

Weinrich, U. 1974. *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.

Weise, F. O. 1882. *Die Griechishen Wörter im Latein*. Leipzig: Fürstlich Jablonowski’schen Gesellschaft.

Weiss, M. 2009. *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.

Wenskus, O. 1993. “Zitatzwang als Motiv für Codewechsel in der lateinischen Prosa.” *Glotta* 71: 205–16.

Wenskus, O. 1995. “Triggering und Einschaltung griechischer Formen in lateinischer Prosa.” *IF* 100: 172–92.

Wenskus, O. 1996. “Markieren der Basissprache in lateinischen Texten mit griechischen Einschaultungen und Entlehnungen.” *IF* 101: 233–57.

Wenskus, O. 1998. *Emblematischer Codewechsel Und Verwandtes in Der Lateinischen Prosa: Zwischen Nähesprache Und Distanzsprache.* Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

West, D. 1995. *Carpe Diem: Horace Odes I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

West, D. 1998. *Vatis Amici: Horace Odes II*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wickham, E. C. 1896. *Quinti Horati Flacci Opera Omnia*: *The Works of Horace*. 3rd edn. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von. 1913. *Sappho und Simonides: Untersuchungen über griechischen Lyriker*. Berlin: Weidmann.

Wilkinson, L. P. 1959. “The Language of Virgil and Horace.” *CQ* 9:181–92.

Wilkinson, L. P. 1963. *Golden Latin Artistry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willi, A. 2010. “Campaigning for utilitas: style, grammar and philosophy in C. Iulius Caesar.” In *Colloquial and Literary Latin*, ed. E. Dickey and A. Chahoud, 229–42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, B. 1993. *Morality: An Introduction to Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, C. A. 2010. *Roman Homosexuality*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, G. 1962. “Poetry in the Moral Climate of Augustan Rome.” *JRS* 52:28–46.

Williams, G. 1968. *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, G. 1969. *The Third Book of Horace’s Odes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Winbolt, S. E. 1903. *Latin Hexameter Verse*. London: Methuen & Co.

Winford, D. 2003. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Winsbury, R. 2009. *The Roman Book: Publishing and Performance in Classical Rome*. London: Duckworth.

Wiseman, T. P. 1985. *Catullus and his World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wiseman, T. P. 2007. "The Prehistory of Roman Historiography." In *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. J. Marincola, 67–76. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Zacchilli, E. 1988–1989. "I Grecismi lessicali del *sermo cotidianus* nella satire di Orazio." *Sileno* 14:115–36, 15:89–104.

Zetzel, J. E. G. 2002. "Dreaming about Quirinus: Horace's *Satires* and the Development of Augustan Poetry." In *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*, ed. A. J. Woodman and D. Feeney, 38–52, 210–13. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zetzel, J. E. G. 2003. "Plato with Pillows: Cicero on the Uses of Greek Culture." In *Myth, History, Culture in Republican Rome*, ed. D. Braund and C. Gill, 120–38. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.