Introduction

J. N. ADAMS & R. G. MAYER

The Muses were not warmly welcomed by the peoples of ancient Italy. The Etruscans, for instance, who clearly had a dramatic poetry, never produced a literature that we know of. Other peoples in Italy too, though they doubtless composed songs and performed dramas, for instance the Atellan farces, have not left a written literature of texts. (It is significant that Ennius, who claimed to have three hearts — Greek, Latin and Oscan — did not undertake to produce Oscan poems in writing.) The Romans too sang panegyrics, according to Cicero (Brutus 75), but of the Italic peoples only they in the course of time embarked upon the enterprise of committing newly composed poems to writing as texts, and that only after their city had been a political and social organism for some five centuries.

To some degree they owed this change of heart to accident; as chief city of the peninsula in the third century, Rome proved a magnet for literary (among other) talents, and some of her earliest authors were semigraeci, according to Suetonius, Gramm. 1, brought up in the Hellenic tradition of writing. Their first steps were not taken in vain, and for about two hundred and fifty years thereafter Latin-speakers developed an impressive verse literature, generally modelled upon the Greek. Their task was by no means easy, since their medium, the Latin language, was not a match for the suppler forms of Greek, varied by distinct dialects, especially the Attic (Quintilian in the late first century AD still reckoned that Latin was no match for it in comedy: mihi sermo ipse Romanus non recipere uideatur illam solis concessam Atticis uenerem, Inst. 10.1.100). Indeed, the heart of the problem was that Latin lacked altogether an artificial, yet universally received, poetic diction and syntax, such as we find in Homer and Hesiod (cf. Jocelyn (1969a: 38) ‘in third-century Latium there seem to have been no commonly recognised traditions of public poetry . . . in place of the three very distinct vocabularies of the Attic stage they offered one’). The language did however have traditional resources of high style,
for instance, alliteration, lexical and morphological archaism, which had long been exploited in prayers and the terminology of law (cf. Jocelyn (1969a: 39 with notes)). What the first writers of Latin poetry had above all to do was to develop the resources of their language, and so far as possible create the impression of a poetic medium out of what lay to hand. They thus remained true to the character of the native language as they perceived it; for example, poetic compound words were in general more restricted in both frequency and type than in Greek (Palmer 1954: 102–3). But they elaborated it into a medium that satisfactorily ranged from satire and invective through elegy, drama and lyric, to the grandest heroic epos. The study of this process of linguistic development in verse and its results has long occupied professional students of the language (there is a convenient summary in Palmer (1954: 95–118)). But since there are still new things to be said about the ways in which the poets used the Latin language, we decided to organize a symposium at which philological aspects of poetic usage in the classical period would be discussed. The British Academy generously undertook to host the sessions and to publish the proceedings.¹

We have tried to group the essays together so far as their themes suggest relationships within the collection. The order is as follows.

First, R. G. G. Coleman tackles the topic at the heart of the symposium and broadly surveys the concepts of poetic diction, discourse and register. Many of the issues he touches upon, e.g. archaism and the debt to Greek, recur in the later essays, but he widens the focus to include the use of metaphor and of specifically poetic syntax. There follow two studies on word order by J. N. Adams and R. G. M. Nisbet; the former concerns the relationship between ordinary usage and certain ‘poetic’ patterns, the latter the highly artificial structures of Horace. The influence of Greek and the use of technical vocabularies are the themes of the papers by R. G. Mayer on the concept of grecism, D. R. Langslow on scientific language and D. Sedley on Lucretius’ philosophical language; the latter two complement each other. W. Görler and J. H. W. Penney focus upon syntactic matters, Görler upon unexpected usages of transitive verbs which may amount to metaphor, Penney upon features that derive from the oldest stratum of the language’s usage. The remaining studies are all concerned with stylistic variation within particular authors or genres: H. Petersmann and J. G. F. Powell on satirists, H. D. Jocelyn on Catullus, R. Maltby on elegists and E. J. Kenney on Ovid.

¹ Dr S. J. Harrison delivered a paper on Virgil’s etymologizing of names, but, on learning of the imminent publication of J. J. O’Hara’s True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay (Ann Arbor 1996), decided that his own contribution did not advance the matter sufficiently beyond O’Hara’s to justify its inclusion in this volume.
We now attempt neither a summary of the content of the papers published nor a general definition of 'poetic language', but rather seek to highlight some of the recurrent themes of the volume and to clarify some of the terminology used.

Terms such as 'common parlance' (Kenney p. 402), 'ordinary discourse' (Jocelyn p. 343), 'everyday language' (Jocelyn p. 342), 'ordinary language' (Jocelyn pp. 350, 351), 'speech, spoken language' (Coleman p. 33, Adams p. 98), 'colloquialism' et sim. (Coleman pp. 38, 39, 43, 84) and even 'Vulgar Latin' (Coleman pp. 40, 46) abound in the volume. Since they may either overlap or be used inconsistently, it is appropriate to offer an overview here.

The 'language' of Latin poetry was of course Latin (note the remarks of Coleman p. 25), though admittedly a Latin which sometimes took elements of vocabulary, syntax, morphology, word order and even sound from Greek, or in the case of satire from other languages or dialects of Italy (Petersmann pp. 292, 308–9). It is easy to exaggerate the differences between the varieties and registers of extant Latin. Terms freely used such as the 'language of medicine', 'legal Latin' have the effect of diminishing the common elements shared by technical, colloquial and other varieties of the language. Indeed despite the currency of the capitalized expression 'Vulgar Latin' it is well to remember that in the active voice, at least, a good deal of the verb morphology found in the high literary language of the classical period passed on into the Romance languages; the masses of ordinary speakers were using much the same verb system as the small literate élite, and not a grossly simplified, or different, language. And in poetry there are no extensive differences between the morphology and syntax of the various poets.

'NEUTRAL' TERMS

Powell (p. 324) notes that any language is bound to contain a large number of words and constructions that are neutral as regards register (cf. p. 325: 'much of Juvenal's vocabulary, and more of his sentence construction than is often supposed, is simply neutral for register'). 'Neutrality' seems to us to be a useful concept to embrace the words, morphology and syntax shared at any one time by different forms of writing and speech. If one were to assess the distribution and stylistic level of the words that make up the first seven lines of the Aeneid (some 50+), one would find that no more than a small handful of terms (about four) were not 'neutral' Latin, though the issue is complicated by the fact that words in combination have syntax, order and morphology, and in all three areas there are departures
from the strictly neutral in the seven lines. Not that morphological departures amount to much: only superum has an ending which is not standard Latin, and even that is not particularly striking (Coleman p. 41, Petersmann p. 305).

We believe that when Kenney (p. 402), speaking of a use of infundo in Ovid, attributes it to ‘common parlance (rather than colloquial) . . . in Ovid’s day’, he was thinking of our neutral Latin. And elsewhere (p. 405), commenting on famam . . . tenebo, he notes that it is difficult to detect anything in either diction or the combination of words that tends to place a phrase such as this in a specific register: ‘In this sense its literary effect can be classified as “neutral”’ (our italics).

‘PROSAIC’ TERMS

There may be a difference between words that are ‘neutral’ Latin, and those that are ‘prosaic’. If a word were avoided entirely by poets, but used for instance by Cicero in his speeches, it might in theory qualify for some such designation as ‘prosaic’, ‘unpoetic’ or the like. But words belonging to the common stock of the language, at home as well in verse as prose — in Aen. 1.1–7 note for example arma, uir, primus, ora, fatum, uenio, litus, multum (adverbial), ille, terra, iacto, etc. — cannot reasonably bear such a designation. Thus, while we agree with the gist of Coleman’s observation (p. 55) on epigram 85 of Catullus (odi et amo) that it is the ‘most remarkable case in Latin of a sequence of prosaic [sic] words combining to create a powerful effect’ (and cf. his later remark, ‘every word here is prosaic’), we would suggest that most of the words in question are not ‘prosaic’ in the restricted sense defined above, but neutral.2

‘FORMAL’ SPEECH OR PROSE

Another example of Kenney’s may be used to introduce a slightly different category of usage, which further suggests the need for a refinement of the blanket term ‘prosaism’. At Her. 17.37–40 Ovid has the construction non quo . . . sed quia, noted by Kenney (p. 407) as a favourite of Cicero’s, and found apparently nowhere else in Latin poetry. Here par excellence is a ‘prosaism’ (Kenney p. 407), but in this case one might feel that that is too

2 Mayer (1994: 16 with the references in n. 57) briefly tackled this issue of designating words in poetry as prosaic, by pointing out that the English word bears connotations that do not satisfactorily describe the usage of formal Latin prose.
imprecise a term, since in English ‘prose’ embraces a vast spectrum of texts or utterances from the most mundane piece of conversation to highly formal rhetoric. The construction was perhaps more at home in formal prose or speech (and its attestation in Cicero’s letters as well as his speeches does not invalidate that suggestion) than in non-elaborate, functional or colloquial prose or speech. By its very nature it is overtly rhetorical, in that it tends to contrast an actual reason with an attributed or rejected reason (Kenney p. 407), and as such it is a more complex manifestation of the type of opposition which takes the form of ‘not A but B’.3

Kenney (p. 412) accounts for Ovid’s admission of this usage of what we might label ‘formal’ prose or speech from the more ‘adversarial tone of these epistles as compared with the single Heroides’.

The Latin language had resources of word order and collocation for expressing effects carried in English by, say, intonation. Focused terms were typically placed at the head or end of a colon, and an initial focused term could be further highlighted by attaching to it certain types of enclitic, such as focusing particles, e.g. quidem, the copula (which statistically is more common after the predicate in the order subject-predicate-copula), or alternatively a nominative personal pronoun (ego, tu), even when that pronoun was not motivated by its own emphasis. This type of placement of ego/tu was certainly at home in formal speech or prose, and indeed it seems to have given rise to certain hackneyed oratorical collocations such as credo ego, which opens Cicero’s Pro S. Roscio and is found in speeches in Livy (Adams p. 105). It probably occurred across a wider spectrum of speech than the non quo . . . sed quia construction, but the categories we are setting up do not have absolutely clear-cut boundaries and the evidence is inadequate to determine how far down the scale of formality a construction such as credo ego extended. Certainly the presence of the structure in, say, Catullus would seem to reflect an attempt to catch the tones of formal speech in certain types of verse (hendecasyllabic, elegiac).

**COLLOQUIALISM AND ORALITY**

Educated speakers may admit in informal utterances or writing ‘colloquial’ usages which they exclude from their formal performances and tend to associate with the lower social dialects (see Cic. Fam. 9.21.1 on plebeius sermo as appropriate to epistles). Two cases in point might be Cicero’s

---

3 Compare again the remarks of Mayer (1994: 18) on Hor. Ep. 1.8.4 haud quia, a poeticization of the Ciceronian formula.
use of *uenire in buccam* in the letters, where *bucca* has the sense of *os* and anticipates, e.g. Fr. *bouche* (see Powell (p. 328)), and Lucilius’ use of *demagis*, whence Sp. *demás* (see Petersmann (p. 305)). The colloquial usage of the educated does not however overlap completely with that of the uneducated.

There is another dimension to the colloquial. We refer to various forms of imperfect performance which are associated with oral delivery. Recently attempts have been made to identify universal features of oral performance (Koch 1995), features alluded to by Coleman (p. 24) as ‘false starts, nonce mispronunciations, abrupt and ungrammatical transitions, anacolutha, rambling pleonasm and banal repetition, not to mention mere noise’. There is a difference between the deliberate use in colloquial speech, or indeed high literature for that matter, of an item belonging mainly to the lower, non-literary registers (e.g. *bucca = os, demagis*), and the failure under conditions of stress or in a heated spoken exchange to complete an utterance according to accepted norms of correct grammar. A usage of the first type may be called a ‘colloquialism’, but features of unsuccessful oral performance are not deliberate, and they may occur even in formal surroundings when the speaker is intent on avoiding colloquialisms. Features of this second type are of limited interest to classical scholars, because real Latin speech does not survive. Nevertheless, even in poetry attempts are sometimes made to reproduce unprepared speech, and it is in such attempts that the imperfections of orality are likely to be found, as for example the aposiopesis in Neptune’s speech in *Aen.* 1.135 *quos ego* . . . or the agitation of Nisus at 9.427. In the conversation which Catullus constructs in c. 10 certain features typical of oral performance seem to have been incorporated. At 10.29–30, for example, there is a case of what has been called ‘segmentation’, whereby a noun which begins a sentence is left suspended, to be picked up by a pronoun: *meus sodalis . . . is sibi paruit.* Koch (1995: 135), claiming the phenomenon as a universal of oral delivery, illustrates it from Plautus and the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, and there are comparable examples to be found in the letters of Claudius Terentianus (P. Mich. viii.468.27–8), which were probably dictated to scribes. Jocelyn (p. 361) describes some repetitions of *paro* in the same conversation as ‘studied unconcern’, an expression which we would interpret as descriptive of (deliberately) imperfect oral performance. On repetitions and orality, see Koch (1995: 138); though it has to be said that the determinants of verbal repetition are complex, and cannot be assigned *en bloc* to the imitation of oral performance (Wills (1996)).

Catullus’ second speech in the poem also has several pieces of ‘syntactic incoherence’ (28–9, 32; see in general Koch (1995: 133–4)). There can be no doubt that Catullus was seeking in this poem to capture linguistically
not only the tones of conversation, but more specifically the confusion inflicted by the encounter with the woman and its effects on his syntax and sentence structure.

It can be assumed that, if in a written text such as a poem, a writer admits such incoherence, he will have special reasons for doing so. Oral features introduced into what on the surface is a narrative text (as distinct from a reported conversation) are potentially more interesting. We note in passing that Freudenburg (1993: 13 with notes), arguing that Horace intended to construct Sat. 1.1 in accordance with a ‘conversational logic’, draws attention to one or two features which independently have been ascribed to oral performance.

Linguistic usages associated with oral performance occupy only a marginal place in Latin poetry. Rather more extensive are ordinary colloquialisms, but these are far from easy to classify and their motivation is not always easy to grasp. An obvious function of colloquialism in poetry was to impart a conversational style appropriate to a particular context, or more generally to a genre or type of writing. The dialogue in Hor. Sat. 1.9 naturally has colloquialisms, such as the intensive misere (14) and si me amas (38; familiar from Cicero’s letters, and now in a letter from Vindolanda, Tab. Vind. ii 233), but it would be difficult to sustain the view that Horace has tried to distinguish the speeches from the narrative portions of the satire in this respect; the whole poem, like the Satires in general, has a colloquial veneer. As Coleman (p. 39) remarks, ‘in satire ... occasional echoes of sermo cottidianus were appropriate’. And so it is that colloquialisms ‘from the ordinary language’ in Catullus 10 (Jocelyn p. 363) are not merely to be found in the conversation itself, but in the body of the (hendecasyllabic) poem, which is by this means, as by others which Jocelyn discusses, distinguished from, e.g. the lyric poems (cf. Jocelyn p. 364).

Colloquialisms may be more striking in a ‘poetic’ setting. Powell shows that one of Juvenal’s constant tricks was to introduce what he calls a ‘mismatch of registers’ (p. 326), ‘either between one word and another in the same passage, or between sentence structure or verse structure and vocabulary, or an incongruity between the content and the level of language used to express it’. This procedure may involve the use of a colloquialism in an inappropriate context, as e.g. the deflating caballus with Gorgoneus of Pegasus, and the cluster of everyday words alongside epic mannerisms in the description of the man killed in the street by the collapse of a cartload of marble (Powell pp. 326, 327).

A factor which sometimes determined or justified the use of a colloquialism was the influence exerted by the traditions of a genre. Coleman (p. 38) notes that at Aen. 6.779 Virgil uses uiden in Anchises’ solemn address.
to his son. The colloquial pronunciation which underlies this form might be justified from the fact that it is located in a speech, albeit a solemn one, but an additional influence noted by Servius was that the usage was Ennian (see *Ann.* 622 Sk with Skutsch's n.). Why Ennius used the colloquialism is another question, since the context is lost, but where Virgil was concerned the presence of a colloquialism in an elevated context could obviously be defended from an ancient precedent (Coleman p. 38).

It is a curious fact brought out by Coleman (p. 43) that sometimes literary prose usage distanced itself more sharply from colloquialism ‘than poetic usage felt the need consistently to do’. A nice illustration is provided by an aspectual nuance which could be given to the perfect, particularly the perfect infinitive. A perfect infinitive dependent on a modal verb such as *uolo* may refer to future rather than to past time; that is, it envisages a hypothetical act as already a concrete, accomplished reality at an indeterminate future time. This usage is familiar in prohibitions in early laws, such as *nei quis eorum Bacanal habuisse uelit* in the *S.C. de Baccanalibus*, where its motivation has been well described by Daube (1956: 37–49). It seems to be absent from classical prose, and one might be tempted to see it as an archaism as used in Augustan verse, particularly in the second half of the pentameter, where the metrical utility of the -uisse form is especially clear (for a discussion see Smith's note on Tibull. 1.1.29–32). However, in a letter from Vindolanda written by a *decurio*, the linguistic level of which is shown by the substandard forms *habunt* = *habent* (whence Fr. *ont*) and *rediemus* (future), there is now a vivid use of the perfect infinitive *fecisse* in unambiguous reference to future time, and the possibility opens up that the perfect infinitive had never lost this aspectual potentiality in spoken colloquial Latin, though it was considered unacceptable for some reason in ordinary literary prose.

Another case in point is discussed by Penney (pp. 258–9): *dico* + subjunctive, a construction which is old and seems to be inherited, is admitted in poetry, but in prose is confined to informal letters, both literary and sub-literary. (This construction perforce will be most likely to appear in speech rather than narrative.)

We would suggest, following Coleman, that the Latin poetic language was not a register whose syntactic, phonetic or morphological norms were determined either by the norms of the educated language at the time of composition, or by the norms obtaining at a particular social or stylistic

---

4 See Bowman and Thomas (1996: 324): *cras quid uelis nos fecisse, rogo, domine praecipias* (Inv. no. 93.1544).

5 There are a few examples in Livy, though sometimes clear imitations of legal language, e.g. at 39.14.8, and others in artificial Imperial prose writers such as Pliny the Elder (see Kühner–Stegmann (1955: ii 1.133–4)).
level of the language at any one time. Poets in most genres were more tolerant than orators or historians of usages across a wide stylistic spectrum, from the archaic to the colloquial. A colloquialism, as noted above, might of course have the function of giving an appropriate tone to a genre or a particular context, but equally some colloquialisms which cannot be accounted for in this way may simply have been raised to acceptability because they were potentially useful (e.g. metrically), or because some other factor gave them respectability in the poet's eyes. Thus in the case of the completive use of the perfect infinitive Coleman suggests (p. 83) that 'Greek influence also helped to re-establish the purely aspecual distinction between infinitives in the complements of certain verbs'.

It seems likely, for example, that poets embraced various phonetic colloquialisms, that is colloquialisms of pronunciation, for the sake of metrical convenience (Coleman p. 33 'the great majority of phonetic devices for overcoming unmetricality can be directly linked to known facts of ordinary Latin speech'), though the evidence is difficult to assess. Latin had a strong stress accent, and unaccented vowels, particularly those in final syllables, were subject to various types of weakening (Coleman p. 36). The shortening of long o in final position in verbs no doubt began in words of iambic structure (Coleman p. 38), but in Augustan poetry it is found in words (including verbs) of other structures as well (Coleman p. 38). In Cicero on the other hand in clausulae the -o ending of the first-person singular generally seems to be treated as long (e.g. Fam. 9.7.2 exspecto tuas litteras, where long o would give a double cretic; cf. Fraenkel (1968: 164 with n. 4, 166-7, 170) for various verb-endings treated as long), and in the Vindolanda writing tablets (early second century AD) scribes quite often mark the final o with an apex, both in iambic (e.g. rogo) and other types of verbs. This habit at the very least betrays a lingering awareness well after the Augustan period among careful scribes that a long o in this position was more 'correct', however they actually pronounced such words. There is then a possibility that in the Augustan period, in non-iambic words at least, shortening of the final o was more a feature of colloquial than of careful formal speech. The fact that in Seneca's later plays short final o shows some increase in verbs suggests that in the first century AD the status of final o in verbs had not crystallized in the judgement of the educated; and this in turn implies a certain boldness on the part of earlier poets in exploiting developments which had not fully percolated through to the educated language. Coleman (p. 38) remarks that 'what is characteristic of the poetic register is not so much the intro-

---

duction of the shortened forms but the retention side by side with them of the older forms'.

Coleman (pp. 36–40) discusses various other possible phonetic colloquialisms, but, as he implies (p. 52), it must always be allowed that a development which one might be inclined to see as colloquial, non-standard or informal might in fact by the time of its entry into poetry have become a general trend in the language. Similarly Jocelyn (p. 351) is non-committal about the status of iambic meae in Catullus at the time of writing, and (e.g.) dactylic commoda (p. 361). On balance the shortened forms such as comparasti, audissem, compleunt, in which w was lost with resultant vowel contraction, commented on by Coleman (p. 39) and Jocelyn (p. 361 with n. 127), seem for the period in question to reflect a widespread speech habit (as distinct from a substandard, non-formal pronunciation), despite Jocelyn’s reluctance to commit himself (see Cic. Orat. 157 with Coleman p. 39).7

**ARCHAISM**

Archaism is dealt with in several papers, e.g. by Coleman (pp. 34–5, 43–4), Penney passim, Petersmann (pp. 293, 304). To poets earlier poetry was a reservoir which could be freely drawn on (Coleman (p. 33)), and the poetic register is thus bound to contain usages which at any particular time of writing were old-fashioned. Again Coleman (p. 43 with p. 84) notes that poetic language may align itself with vulgar usage rather than that of educated prose, since a construction which had archaic precedent may have been dropped from the educated language while surviving in lower-class speech. Penney (pp. 251–2) discusses syntactic archaisms used for effect, but particularly important is his demonstration that an ‘archaism’ may in fact represent an innovation: that is, a genuinely archaic pattern may be used in a slightly different way from its correspondent in early Latin (pp. 253–4). He refers for example to a new use of ne + present imperative, which in early Latin had an inhibitive meaning (‘stop doing . . ’), but in later poets can ‘function as a prohibitive with future reference’ (p. 253). It is a moot point whether such developments should be seen as deliberate innovations, or as misunderstandings of earlier idiom. On archaisms which were of uncertain interpretation by the classical period see Coleman (p. 58).

The motivations of a poet in using an archaism may be many-faceted.

---

7 Mayer (1994: 17) drew attention to the fact that such contracted forms are found in Horace’s conversational satires, but are absent from the more ‘documentary’ style of his epistles.
The archaism gives a suitably stately tone to its context, but the poet may have additional reasons for using it. Penney (e.g. p. 255) discusses several cases where a construction might be attributed as well to Greek models as to the influence of earlier Latin. But we would draw particular attention to his observation (p. 260) that various possible features of 'archaic' syntax 'have in common that they make for a denser texture to the sentence, without explicit markers of subordination'. The well-known taste of poets for using various oblique cases in a range of functions unsupported by the prepositions which would have been the norm in prose may look like a carry over from an earlier, 'Indo-European' stage of the language, but in reality the main determinant may have been a desire to keep function words to a minimum. A general aim of this type might on the one hand have the effect of introducing 'archaisms', but equally it might lead to the admission of a current 'vulgarism' (e.g. *dico* + subjunctive; see above p. 8).

**THE INFLUENCE OF GREEK**

Since poetry was recited, the sounds of the language, and particularly devices such as alliteration and assonance which were achieved by the collocation of appropriate words, were a potential sphere of the poet's inventiveness. Although various inherited potentialities of the Latin language of the types referred to were fully exploited, it is well recognized that foreign, i.e. chiefly Greek, sounds also contributed to the texture of Latin poetry (see Coleman pp. 45–6). The sounds of Greek were in various respects admired by Latin speakers (Quint. 12.10.27–8): Greek was supposedly 'sweet' in sound, Latin 'harsh' (Biville (1990 i.71)), and the poet who wanted his *carmen* to sound *dulce* should adorn it with Greek *nomina*: *itaque tanto est sermo Graecus Latino iucundior ut nostri poetae, quotiens dulce carmen esse voluerunt, illorum id nominibus exornent* (Quint. 12.10.33). It was obviously a Greek word which was not integrated into Latin which would most strikingly retain the 'sweet', or in satire peculiar, sounds of Greek, and into that class fall *par excellence* proper names, which were often inflected as Greek by Latin poets; for that reason Quintilian is likely to have meant chiefly 'proper names' by *nominibus* here (see R. G. Austin's commentary ad loc., and cf Quint. 12.10.27). Quintilian in another context was of the view, shared by Messala, referred to there, that Greek names should be Latinized in oratory (1.5.58ff.); for him then poetry was a special case in this respect. The exotic character to Latin ears of certain distinctive Greek sounds cannot be underestimated. There is an anecdote at Quint. 12.10.57 (see Biville (1990: i.158)) about an uneducated person who was asked in court whether he knew *Amphionem*. He said 'no', but
when the speaker dropped the aspirate, shortened the i, and said *Ampionem* he recognized the man.

On names inflected as Greek in Latin verse see Coleman (pp. 46, 47), Jocelyn (p. 352). On the other hand the Latinizing of an exotic name might be significant, as *Serapim* in the highly colloquial poem Catullus 10 (Jocelyn (p. 362)). In elegy Greek inflections are rare (Maltby (p. 380)), and in Horace there is generic variation (Mayer (p. 158)). The whole question of the use of Greek inflections in Latin poetry (which inevitably has a textual dimension) merits a systematic study.

It was not of course only by inflection of proper names that Greek sounds could be imported into Latin verse. An accumulation of Greek words in a line of verse would no doubt have an exotic sound which might take on a symbolic significance. Sedley (pp. 242–3) observes that the almost Greek line Lucr. 2.412 *ac musaeae mele, per chordas organici quae* contrasts with the Latin line that precedes: ‘Where Greece has given us sublime music, Rome’s more characteristic noise is the shrieking sawblades of a workshop’ (Sedley (p. 243)). Similar in effect to the Lucretian line is Tibullus 2.3.60 *barbara gypsatos ferre catasta pedes* (Maltby (p. 381)).

The relationship between Greek syntax and Latin is a complex one, much debated and variously described. There can be no doubt that poets consciously imitated Greek syntax, as readers in antiquity frequently noted (see Mayer passim on the comments of scholiasts particularly). Sometimes a particular purpose can be discerned in a special context, as perhaps Catullus 4.2 *uit fuisse nauium celerimus* (see Coleman (p. 84)), but more usually the borrowed syntax was simply a means of distancing poetic language from the banal. Syntactical grecism is thus arguably one of the factors which contributed to Latin the specifically poetic syntax it lacked from the start. Nevertheless many ‘grecisms’ turn out on closer inspection to be traceable back at least partly to certain native structures which had been extended or revived under Greek impetus: see Penney (p. 263): ‘these [phenomena] could be seen as purely analogical Latin developments, or one might accept that there was reinforcement from Greek’; see further Penney (pp. 255, 256, 262–3), Coleman (p. 79 (adverbial neuter), p. 80 (some uses of the genitive), p. 81 (an accusative use), p. 83 (perfect infinitive; cf. above p. 8)).

Greek words are as interesting in their avoidance as in their use. Petersmann (pp. 301–2) notes the absence of Greek from a Roman context in Lucilian satire (a context enhanced by archaism), and Maltby (p. 380) notes that Tibullus is more sparing in his use of Greek words than both Propertius and Ovid; Propertius on the other hand has more mundane Greek words from humble spheres than the other elegists. Petersmann (pp. 299–300) discusses similar features in Lucilius, 181–8M; but in general
Petersmann addresses himself to the way in which early satire provides evidence of the social tensions surrounding the use of Greek in Roman daily life, and its reflection in literature. He draws attention to the rising tide of linguistic purism in Rome (p. 292 on Ennius) which deprecated at least on formal occasions the employment of Greek. Lucilius carries the debate on further (Petersmann (pp. 298–301)), and is far from indiscriminate in his interweaving of Greek into the Latin texture of his satires.

The papers of Langslow and Sedley are complementary. Both deal to some extent with 'technical terminology' in poetry, terminology which in Latin is often of Greek origin (see Sedley (p. 228) for a definition of the expression 'technical term'; Langslow (p. 190) prefers to speak of 'special vocabulary'). Petersmann (pp. 300–1) draws attention to the vast technical vocabulary — mainly literary critical — borrowed from Greek by Lucilius. But there seems to have been some feeling against the admission of banal (Greek) technical terms in some genres of poetry, at least as used literally within a technical context or to evoke a technical discipline (see below). Lucretius does not borrow, or in Sedley's terminology 'transliterate', the technical terms of Greek philosophy (though Lucilius had: see Petersmann (p. 301)), nor does he even attempt to find a similar Latin term instead of the Greek (Sedley (p. 230)). Instead he uses a range of metaphors for a single Greek term (Sedley (p. 230): see below). In using non-technical Greek words he acted not out of 'caprice' (Sedley (p. 238)), but 'to conjure up for the readers a Greek or an otherwise exotic context' (Sedley (p. 238)). The avoidance or use of Greek is thus functional rather than ornamental or merely learned. On the one hand Lucretius enhanced his philosophical aim, by 'making Epicurean philosophy ... at home in his own native language', as a result of which 'he proves to us its true universality' (Sedley (p. 246)), while on the other he sought to give particular colour to certain contexts.

Langslow notes generic variations in the admissibility of 'special' vocabulary, with the more conversational genres such as comedy, satire and epigram showing no restriction in the use of banal technical terms not allowed in epic (pp. 191–2). Technical (often Greek) vocabulary is not however completely avoided in the 'higher' genres, but it tends not to be banal; Langslow lists (p. 195) three different purposes for which more exotic technical terms are used sensu proprio in these genres, particularly epic. On the other hand the desire to avoid terms felt to be inappropriate for some reason provided poets with an opportunity of displaying their inventiveness (Langslow (pp. 195–7)). Lucan, for example, avoids conventional disease names, Latin as well as Greek, and produces some clever periphrases (Langslow (p. 196)).

Langslow (pp. 198ff.) makes the interesting case that in (high) poetry
(Greek) technical vocabulary is often exploited in metaphorical, as distinct from literal, usage (see below). In theory the poet who paraphrases a medical term in its literal sense may admit that term as a metaphor. This insight has the additional benefit of opening the way to the identification of technical terms current within various disciplines: the metaphor will depend for its effect on the reader's familiarity with the source domain and its phraseology (Langslow (p. 198)), and the phraseology must therefore be current.

**METAPHOR**

Ordinary speech in any language tends to be shot through with systematic sets of metaphors, and it has even been suggested that human thought processes are highly metaphorical. Cicero was well aware that metaphors were commonplace in peasant speech (Coleman (pp. 68–9)). If there is anything 'poetic' about metaphor, it does not lie therefore in the use of metaphors as such, though it was the practice in formal oratorical prose for the speaker to qualify a metaphorical expression with a modest pronoun or adverb or both, e.g. *uelut quidam*, a practice unknown to poetry. 'Density' of metaphor might well be thought to characterize poetry, but claims about the incidence of such an elusive phenomenon as metaphorical usage are bound to be unreliable.

A distinction can usefully be made, in the manner of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) (and cf. Lakoff and Turner (1989)), between a metaphorical concept, and the potentially unlimited number of surface realizations of that concept. Lakoff and Johnson paraphrase metaphorical concepts in the form 'A is B' (e.g. 'argument is war'), and under headings of this sort they list examples of particular realizations. Any discussion of the 'originality' of a metaphor might attempt to draw a distinction between the originality of the concept and that of the realization. A good deal of Fantham's book (1972) consists in effect in the identification of metaphorical concepts. Originality or inventiveness is far more likely to be displayed in the devising of new or unusual realizations than of new concepts. The person who first used 'exocet' metaphorically, as in a sentence such as 'the next speaker delivered an *exocet* in the form of a telling counter-example which left his opponent floundering', was operating with a familiar metaphorical concept (Lakoff and Johnson's 'argument is war'; or more specifically, 'arguments are weapons'), of which he invented a striking new manifestation. Certain metaphorical concepts may occupy a significant

---

8 Langslow's observation is relevant to the material assembled by Fantham (1972: 16 n. 8).
place in a particular genre of poetry. An obvious example is the metaphor ‘love is slavery’ (also ‘love is warfare’), which is at the heart of elegy.\(^9\)

Görler looks at the nature of some so-called verbal metaphors from a fresh angle, noting that thanks to its highly restricted vocabulary Latin poetry, especially Virgil’s, worked several verbs very hard. These verbs he suggests (p. 282) are in themselves fairly colourless, and form a sort of common denominator in a number of expressions which might be deemed at first glance metaphorical (pp. 282–5). On closer analysis, however, a shift of specific grammatical objects is seen to actualize latent potential in the verb (n. 20), which enhances for the reader the precision of the picture and so produces an ‘effect of alienation’ (p. 282). Thus perhaps the expression is not best described as metaphorical at all. At any rate he warns against a too easy acquiescence in the use of this term.

The point is often made (see Kenney (p. 401 with n. 11); Coleman (p. 55 n. 52)) that, merely to list, in the manner of Axelson, allegedly ‘unpoetic’ words without consideration of their function and collocations in particular contexts is to reveal nothing of their true character. This point may be further illustrated in relation to metaphor, from part of Langslow’s paper. Disease names, as we saw, tend to fall within the category of mundane entities avoided by poets in the higher genres. But, as Langslow shows (see above), there are such terms in poetry, but they are generally used metaphorically or figuratively. A case in point is Horace’s use of hydrops figuratively in reference to avarice (Langslow (p. 199)). The underlying metaphorical concept is in fact banal: it might be paraphrased conceptually as ‘vice is disease’ (for the spread of this concept see Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. Odes 2.2.13). Langslow’s observation has various ramifications. In the first place, the underlying metaphor presumably ceases to be mundane once it is given a new surface realization; we do not know of hydrops used as a manifestation of this metaphor until a much later date,\(^{10}\) and it is perhaps an invention of the poet’s, though with an oratorical precedent, in that the Latin intercus had already been used metaphorically by Cato, Orat. 62. It may be a feature of poetry that metaphorical concepts are reinvigorated by the use of unexpected variants in the vehicle of the metaphor, though it would be rash to suggest that such inventiveness was exclusively the preserve of poets. Secondly, hydrops, which a poet might well have found unacceptable sensu proprio, was clearly capable of a different resonance in metaphorical usage.

Across the full range of technical disciplines, as much today as in antiquity, metaphor is one of the most fruitful sources of new terms (see

\(^9\) See Wyke (1989).

\(^{10}\) See TLL vi 3.3.37.84.
Coleman (pp. 69–70)). Lucretius indeed creates a technical terminology of Epicurean philosophy by means of metaphors, but paradoxically it is a technical terminology which avoids in a curious way the stamp of technicality. Coleman (p. 69) remarks: 'What is characteristic of scientific metaphors is their permanence and univocality. Once the new meaning is assigned, it remains purely referential within the register; there is no ornamental function, no contextual variation and no emotive accumulation from previous occurrences.' Sedley (pp. 230–1, 233), however, shows that Lucretius renders single Greek technical terms not by a single Latin metaphor, but by what he calls 'metaphorical diversification': that is, he uses a range of metaphorical terms for a single technical term. This can be seen as a form of subtlety by means of which a wider range of associations could be embraced than would be possible through a single term; and it was also a means of avoiding in poetry a stereotyped technical vocabulary.

**WORD ORDER; HYPERBATON**

Forms of hyperbaton emerge from the symposium as among the most distinctive features of Latin poetic usage. Powell (p. 323) notes: 'In Latin, the most obvious feature of poetic register as regards word order is persistent hyperbaton of noun and adjective.' Both Jocelyn (p. 355 n. 91) and Powell (pp. 323, 324) remark that much work remains to be done on the subject. Powell (p. 323) recommends as a topic for research an attempt 'to determine a hierarchy of register for different types of hyperbaton'.

To some extent hyperbata (in interlacing patterns) may be seen as reflecting patterns adopted by Hellenistic poets (Nisbet (p. 137); Mayer (p. 159) notes in passing some word orders characteristic of Greek and borrowed by Latin poets), but there were types which were rooted in native Latin speech, as for example when a demonstrative, e.g. *hic* with *ego*/*tu* attached, was separated from its noun (Adams (p. 127)). A native pattern such as this, well represented in prose, is obviously not a defining characteristic of poetic language. Where some poets, such as Ovid, differed from prose writers was partly in their readiness to take an inherited pattern and increase its complexity (Adams (pp. 130ff.)), and partly in the much greater frequency of hyperbata which they allowed (see Nisbet (p. 137)). Forty per cent of Horace's adjectives are separated from their nouns (Nisbet (p. 137)), and there is an extraordinary incidence of such separations in Catullus 64 (Jocelyn (p. 355)). In Catullus generic variations are discernible, with separations not so common, it seems, in hendecasyllables (Jocelyn (p. 365)).

In prose hyperbaton is often functional, in that (e.g.) inherently
emphatic adjectives such as *magnus* are often separated from their noun, or, in exploitation of the emphatic potentialities of the final position in a clause, a focused or climactic noun is left to the end. An expectation of its eventual use is created in the reader/hearer by the use of an adjective or genitive which demands, but does not immediately receive, an associated noun (Adams (pp. 128–30)). Nisbet (p. 139) draws attention similarly to the way in which in Horace 'the ear is kept waiting for the corresponding noun', which 'sometimes . . . may surprise the reader'. Horace in this respect was again no more than drawing on a pragmatic resource of the language, rather than of 'poetic language' in particular. Nevertheless his exploitation in the *Odes* for the purpose of emphasis not only of emphatic positions in clauses and sentences in the conventional sense, but also of significant positions in the line of verse, is a phenomenon of greater complexity than anything in prose (Nisbet *passim*; note e.g. p. 145 for the suggestion that 'when the pronoun [out of the Wackernagel position] follows the central diaeresis in the Asclepiad line, . . . it is usually emphatic and perhaps always so').

It has been argued that 'since speaking is correlated with time and time is metaphorically conceptualized in terms of space, it is natural for us to conceptualize language metaphorically in terms of space. Our writing system reinforces this conceptualization. Writing a sentence down allows one to conceptualize it even more readily as a spatial object' (Lakoff and Johnson (1980 126)). It seems likely that some Latin poets had, up to a point, a spatial concept of the structure of their verses. Thus the device of 'vertical responsion', whereby 'a word in one line is sometimes picked up by a corresponding word at the same place in a following line' (Nisbet (p. 146)). The relationship between the words is reinforced by their identical position in the pair of lines viewed as a spatial object. Paradoxically a separation (hyperbaton) may have the effect of juxtaposing (artificially by the norms of prose) two words which enter into some sort of relationship in the meaning of the line. The spatial contiguity underlines the semantic relationship. So at Hor. *Odes* 1.3.10–11 *qui fragilem truci commisit pelago ratem* the double disjunction of the adjectives from their nouns, which creates what is known as a golden line, produces also the juxtaposition of *fragilem* and *truci*, such that 'the fragility of the boat is set against the savagery of the sea' (Nisbet (p. 139)). At *Odes* 1.5.3 *grato, Pyrrha, sub antro* the vocative intrudes into the prepositional phrase and finds its place next to an adjective appropriate to the person named: 'the cave is welcome to Pyrrha' (Nisbet (p. 140)). There may be more to it than that: Pyrrha is enclosed by the cave, spatially in the words of Horace, and in the world he describes. Also worth mentioning here is the phenomenon which Sedley (p. 236), following David West, calls 'syntactical onomatopoeia': that is,
‘intellectual contortion is symbolized by contorted grammar’. Sedley gives two examples from Lucretius, though perhaps the term ‘grammar’ is less than appropriate in the context: it is rather the (contorted) order of words that may arguably have symbolical significance.

It would not do, however, to make too much of spatial symbolism in the structure of verses. Hyperbaton in verse seems usually to be purely mechanical, without any semantic function in a particular context other than to create a recognizably ‘poetic’ disjunctive pattern.

Finally, we wish to express our gratitude to the institutions which enabled the symposium to take place (in April 1995) and to the many individuals who supported the undertaking and made it such an agreeable occasion for all who attended. We thank first and foremost the British Academy for supporting the undertaking from the beginning, and for lodging the symposiasts; Rosemary Lambeth’s cheerful and ready help was particularly welcome. The Institute of Classical Studies hosted an afternoon session at Gordon Square, and provided refreshments afterwards; we thank the then Director, Professor Richard Sorabji, for his hospitality. The Classics Department at King’s College London also hosted a drinks party at the Academy, and we thank the then Head of the Department, Professor Michael Silk, for making this possible. (The College itself however made no contribution from its research funds to this symposium.) The University of Manchester also contributed to that party, and in addition paid the fare of one of the symposiasts, a generous donation. The Swiss Cultural Fund in Britain and the German Embassy generously contributed towards the cost of lodging their symposiasts in London.

Individual colleagues were very supportive, and some who did not give papers acted as chairmen. We are grateful for this service to Sir Keith Thomas PBA, Dr John Briscoe and Professors K. Coleman, E. Fantham, G. J. P. O’Daly, M. D. Reeve, M. Winterbottom. All of the papers were refereed anonymously, either by members of the symposium or by colleagues who generously responded to our appeal; we wish to thank them too for their help.
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