

ALMA MATER STUDIORUM – UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA
DIPARTIMENTO DI FILOLOGIA CLASSICA E ITALIANISTICA
CENTRO DI STUDI RETORICI E GRAMMATICALI

PAPERS ON RHETORIC

XI

EDITED BY

LUCIA CALBOLI MONTEFUSCO

EDITRICE «PLINIANA»

PERUGIA 2012

Augustus on Style and Language (a reassessment of some fragmenta and testimonia)*

Ramón Gutiérrez González

1. The doctrine of *elegantia*

Suetonius, in chapter 86 of the *Life of Augustus*, gives a vivid account of the style of the *Princeps*, which he defines as *elegans* and *temperatum*; then he illustrates the aforementioned characterization by putting together different statements of Augustus about the subject:

Suet. *Aug.* 86.1-3 (1) *Genus eloquendi secutus est elegans et temperatum vitatis sententiarum ineptiis atque concinnitate et [Epist. frg. 52 M.; inc. 123 C.] “reconditorum verborum”, ut ipse dicit “fectoribus”; praecipuamque curam duxit sensum animi quam apertissime exprimere. ... (2) Cacozelos et antiquarios, ut diverso genere vitiosos, pari fastidio spreuit exagitabatque nonnuquam; in primis Maecenatem suum, [Epist. frg. 34 M.; inc. 125 C.] cuius “myrobrechis”, ut ait, “cincinnos” usque quaque persequitur et imitando per iocum irridet. Sed nec Tiberio parcat [Epist. frg. inc. 124 C.] et exoletas interdum et reconditas voces aucupanti. M. quidem Antonium ut insanum increpat, [Epist. frg. 29 M.; 38a C.] quasi ea scribentem, quae mirentur potius homines quam intellegant; deinde ludens malum et inconstans in eligendo genere dicendi ingenium eius, addit haec: (3) [Epist. frg. 30 M.; 38b C.] “tuque dubitas, Cimperne Annius an Veranius Flaccus imitandi sint tibi, ita ut verbis, quae Crispus Sallustius excerptis ex Originibus Catonis, utaris? an potius Asiaticorum oratorum inani[bus] sententiis verborum volubilitas in nostrum sermonem transferenda?” et quadam epistula Agrippinae neptis ingenium conlaudans: [Epist. frg. 25 M.; 78 C.] “sed opus est”, inquit, “dare te operam, ne moleste scribas et loquaris”.*

Suetonius' report gathers material from different dates and probably coming in its whole from Augustus' letters¹. The oldest element might be the citation from a missive addressed to Marc Antony, which can be dated between the publication of Sallust's *Catilina* (after the end of 43 BC) and 32 BC, the date of the break between

* I am very grateful to Profs. Calboli, Calboli Montefusco, Garcea and Uría Varela for their suggestions, which have considerably improved this contribution.

¹ Cf. Cugusi 1979: II 447.

Augustus and Marc Antony²; the newest, in turn, is perhaps the quotation from the letter sent by Augustus to Agrippina the Elder (born in 14 BC). Nevertheless, as we will try to show, a main idea is present throughout: the demand for clearness (*explanatio*) and the priority of *docere* (not *delectare* or *movere*) as the main *officium oratoris*.

Suetonius describes Augustus' style as *elegans* and *temperatum*. For understanding the adjective *elegans*, as Wölfflin (1896: 162) has shown³, we must take in hand the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. The *elegantia* – we are there told – was one of the virtues of the speech, with the *compositio* ('arrangement') and the *dignitas* ('distinction')⁴. The *Auctor* defines *elegantia* in the following way, dividing it in two parts, *Latinitas* ('purity') and *explanatio* ('clearness'):

Rhet. Her. 4.12.17 **Elegantia** est, quae facit, ut unu<m> qui<d>que pure et aperte dici videatur. Haec tribuitur in Latinitatem <et> explanationem. **Latinitas** est, quae sermonem purum conservat, ab omni vitio remotum. Vitia in sermone, quo minus is Latinus sit, duo possunt esse: soloecismus et barbarismus. ... **Explanatio** est, quae reddit apertam et dilucidam <o>rationem. Ea comparatur duabus rebus, usitatis verbis et propriis. Usitata sunt ea, quae versantur in consuetudine cotidiana; propria, quae eius rei verba sunt aut esse possunt, qua de loquemur.

And now let us consider each of both parts of the *elegantia*, and first among them, the *explanatio*, which seems to have been considered by Augustus the chief part of the 'elegance'.

2. *Explanatio*

From Suetonius' account it emerges that, for Augustus, *elegantia* was mainly based on its second element, *explanatio* (σαφήνεια): cf. *Aug.* 86.1 *praecipuamque curam duxit sensum animi quam apertissime exprimere*⁵. This fact cannot be regarded as casual, since clarity (as well as purity) was also the main stylistic concern

² Cf. Lebek 1970: 170; Bardon (1968: 35) placed this letter between 41 and 35 BC: "la lettre 2 est fort aimable: elle décrit un Antoine conquis par l'éloquence asiatique et il est vraisemblable qu'Antoine se trouvait alors en Asie; d'autre part, le ton n'est pas celui du jeune homme encore peu sûr de lui et qui revient juste d'Apollonie; le fragment doit donc se placer entre 41 et 35".

³ Cf. Giordano 2000: 36 and see also Wölfflin 1893, on Caesar's *elegantia*. A recent and detailed discussion of the latter subject can be found in Garcea 2012: 49-77.

⁴ The *Auctor* presents a partial reelaboration of Theophrast's ἀρεταὶ τῆς λέξεως: on this point, see first Calboli 1993²: 300-302 and Calboli Montefusco 1979: 437-439.

⁵ "Vielleicht im Gegensatz zu der Dunkelheit und Zweideutigkeit des Tiberius", writes Wölfflin (1896: 162).

of his adoptive father, as stressed by Garcea in his recent monograph on Caesar's *De analogia*⁶. This appeal to *explanatio*, and therefore to the use of the *usitata verba* (the common words), led first of all to a polemic against the Archaists⁷. In spite of this, the *Princeps* did not at all despise the works of the old Latin authors. In order to illustrate the links between the Augustean Restoration and the rising interest in the old Latin writers, Lebek (1970: 338-339) quoted Liv. *Perioch.* 59, 8-9 and Suet. *Aug.* 89, 2, where it is stated that Augustus read in the Senate the speeches *De prole augenda* of Metellus Macedonicus (188-115 BC) and *De modo aedificiorum* of Rutilius Rufus (158-78 BC)⁸. Certainly, Augustus' main concern lays in the content, not in the language of these speeches⁹. The *Princeps*, indeed, was following *avant la lettre* Favorinus' maxim *vive moribus praeteritis, loquere verbis praesentibus* (Gell.

⁶ In the case of Caesar, Garcea argues for the influence of Philodemus of Gadara. In fact, according to him, "the fragmentary nature of the sources demands caution, but we can nevertheless observe that Caesar's alliance between purity [*Latinitas*] and clarity [*explanatio*] in some ways restores a fundamental place to *σαφήνεια* and its sources, as vigorously reaffirmed by Philodemus of Gadara" (Garcea 2012: 11). The author develops these ideas in chapter 6 of his monograph (Garcea 2012: 114-124).

⁷ Those Archaists were, first of all, the imitators of Sallust, which are commonly thought to represent a third generation of the Atticist movement (see Leeman 1955: 201-202; 1963: 164-165; cf. Calboli 1975: 59-60; 1987: 42; 1997b: 262). One of the major representatives of this tendency was Annius Cimber, mentioned by Augustus in Suet. *Aug.* 86.3 (on Cimber, see Lebek 1970: 160-170). Regarding Marc Antony, Calboli (1997a) has shown by the analysis of Antony's letters (the only major extant documents of his style: Cic. *Att.* 10.8 A; 10.10.2 and 14.13 A) that only the Asianism of the triumvir can be ascertained (see also Lebek 1970: 175). On the occasional use of ancient words by Tiberius, we may first say that Tacitus puts in Tiberius' mouth ancient forms and constructions: mainly, *duint* in *Ann.* 4, 38, 3 and *fungi* with accusative in *Ann.* 4.38.1 (see Syme 1958: I 284 n. 6; Levick 1976: 230-231; cf. Miller, 1968: 16, where other examples, not so certain, are given). Furthermore, archaisms can be also verified in Tiberius' *Senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre*, as a feature of the juridical language (see Calboli 1998: 128-130; 2000: 10-11).

⁸ Suet. *Aug.* 89.2 *etiam libros totos et senatui recitavit et populo notos per edictum saepe fecit, ut orationes Q. Metelli de prole augenda* [frg. 5: ORF p. 108] *et Rutili de modo aedificiorum* [frg. 2: ORF pp. 169-170], *quo magis persuaderet utramque rem non a se primo animadversam, sed antiquis iam tunc curae fuisse*. Liv. *Perioch.* 59.8-9 *Q. Metellus censor censuit, ut cogerebantur omnes ducere uxores liberorum creandorum causa. Extat oratio eius* [frg. 4: ORF p. 107], *quam Augustus Caesar, cum de maritandis ordinibus ageret, velut in haec tempora scriptam in senatu recitavit*.

⁹ Cf. Suet. *Aug.* 89.2 *in evolvendis utriusque linguae auctoribus nihil aequae sectabatur, quam praecepta et exempla publice vel privatim salubria, eaque ad verbum excerpta aut ad domesticos aut ad exercituum provinciarumque rectores aut ad urbis magistratus plerumque mittebat, prout quique monitione indigerent*.

1, 10, 4); and not by chance, this philosopher is referred by Gellius to have quoted Caesar's *De analogia* to defend his point of view:

Gell. 1.10.1-4 *Favorinus philosophus adulescenti veterum verborum cupidissimo et plerasque voces nimis priscas et ignotas in cotidianis communibusque sermonibus expromenti: "Curius" inquit "et Fabricius et Coruncanus, antiquissimi viri, et his antiquiores Horatii illi trigemini plane ac dilucide cum suis fabulati sunt ... Sed antiquitatem tibi placere ais, quod honesta et bona et sobria et modesta sit. Vive ergo moribus praeteritis, loquere verbis praesentibus atque id, quod a C. Caesare, excellentis ingenii ac prudentiae viro, in primo de analogia libro scriptum est [Anal. frg. 2 G.], habe semper in memoria atque in pectore, ut 'tamquam scopulum, sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum'".*

According to Garcea (2012: 86), there are good reasons for thinking that Favorinus did not distort the doctrine of the authority that he was quoting; therefore, it can be sustained that Caesar, when saying *sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum*, was banning both neologism and archaism from speech. Indeed, Favorinus stressed the need of speaking *plane* and *dilucide*, and archaisms and neologisms are the opposite of the *verba usitata* required for achieving *explanatio*.

Furthermore, we can say that Archaism and Asianism were for the *Princeps* two sides of the same coin: *cacozelos et antiquarios, ut diverso genere vitiosos, pari fastidio sprevit* (Suet. *Aug.* 86.2)¹⁰; both tendencies led to a contravention of *explanatio*, even if by different (but complementary) means. The archaists avoided the *verba usitata*; the Asianists, in turn, while privileging *ornatus*, disregarded the *verba propria*. Indeed, we can say in this regard that Augustus, like Caesar and the Atticists¹¹, rose up against the preponderance of *ornatus* over the other *virtutes elocutionis*. Such prevalence was backed up by the mainstream of contemporary oratory and rhetoric, and can be illustrated by Crassus' treatment of *ornatus* in the third book of Cicero's *De Oratore*. Crassus, in fact, while retaining the four Theophrastean ἀρεταὶ τῆς λέξεως ('Ἐλληνισμός, σαφήνεια, πρέπον and κατασκευή),

¹⁰ On the Archaists, see n. 7. For a characterization of the Asianism in its two faces (the bombastic and the jerky style), see first of all the contributions by Calboli (1986: 1050-1073; 1987; 1988; 1997a: 14-16). *Cacozeli* is a scornful denomination for the followers of Asianism, or at least it was first a disdainful labelling (cf. Cugusi 1973: 122; Norden 1958: I 263 n. 2 writes that it was "die gewöhnliche Bezeichnung für die Asianer"). Gelsomino (1959: 121-122) argues that Suetonius probably took this term from Augustus, since it does not appear elsewhere in the works of the historian; even though, I think that it is more probable that the phrase *cacozelos et antiquarios, ut diverso genere vitiosos* eqs. (Suet. *Aug.* 86.2) may come from Suetonius himself, aiming to give a summary of the collected testimonies and to stress Augustus' stance.

¹¹ See Garcea 2012: 51-53.

considered the two former to be no more than prerequisites for oratory¹² – or ἀρεταὶ ἀναγκαῖαι, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus calls them¹³.

The reject of a distorting *ornatus* is clear in Augustus' criticism on Maecenas' style: Suet. *Aug.* 86.2 ... *Maecenatem suum, cuius 'myrobrechis', ut ait, 'cincinnati' usque quaque persequitur et imitando*¹⁴ *per iocum irridet.* The metaphor 'unguent-dripping curls' (as Rolfe 1914: 253 puts it) points to the preponderance, in the case of Maecenas, of an affected form against the content (thus *cincinnati*), as well as to the prevalence of *delectare* at the expense of *docere* (hence *myrobrechis*)¹⁵. Crassus, in fact, employs the same metaphor of the *cincinnati* when warning against a super-

¹² Cic. *De Orat.* 3.37-38 *Quinam igitur dicendi est modus melior ... quam ut Latine, ut plane, ut ornate, ut ad id, quodcumque agetur, apte congruenterque dicamus?* [cf. 1.144] *Atque eorum quidem, quae duo prima dixi, rationem non arbitror expectari a me puri dilucidique sermonis ... Linquamus igitur haec, quae cognitionem habent facilem, usum necessarium.*

¹³ Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 22 (V 358, 19-22 U.-R.); cf. Volkman 1885: 394-396; Stroux 1912: 72-80.

¹⁴ Cf. Macr. *Sat.* 2.4.12 *Idem Augustus, quia Maecenatem suum noverat stilo esse remisso, molli et dissoluto, talem se in epistulis quas ad eum scribebat saepius exhibebat, et contra castigationem loquendi, quam alias ille scribendo servabat, in epistula ad Maecenatem familiari plura in iocos effusa subtexit* [Epist. frg. 32 M.; 47 C.]: *"vale mi ebum Medulliae, ebur ex Etruria, lasar Arretinum, adamas Supernas, Tiberinum margaritum, Cilniorum smaragde, iaspi Iguvinorum, berulle Porsenae, carbunculum Hadriae, ἴνα συντέμω πάντα, μάλαγμα moecharum"*. "Suetonio [Aug. 86.3] quoque hanc Augusti epistulam prae oculis fuisse licet colligi" (Malcovati 1969: 20). The text is heavily corrupted and different emendations have been proposed: see the discussion in Gelsomino 1958; Rodríguez-Pantoja 1973; Kaster 2010: 41-42; and cf. also Cugusi 1973: 154-160; 1979: II.2 404-406. I have given the text of Willis' Macrobius (1984), which for this passage I prefer to Kaster's (2011). The scholars generally sustain that Augustus' parody takes its cue from the poem of Maecenas quoted by Isid. *Orig.* 19.32.6 [Maecen. *Carm.* frg. 2 B.: FPL p. 251], which I cite according to Blänsdorf's text: *lucentes mea vita, nec smaragdōs / beryllos mihi, Flacce, nec nitentes / <nec> percandida margarita quaero / nec quos Thynica lima perpolivit / anellos nec iaspīos lapillos* (cf. Gelsomino 1958: 149-150; Avallone 1962: 309 n. 4; 311; Malcovati 1969: 20; Mattiacci 1995: 68 n. 3; Giordano 2000: 22-24. Conversely, Courtney 1993: 277 argues that Augustus "probably [was] not referring specifically to this poem"; Hollis 2007: 319 says the same. In turn, Nicastri (1980: 266-267) ventured that perhaps Maecenas' frg. 2 was composed as an answer to the letter of Augustus quoted by Macrobius (a rather strange proposal).

¹⁵ The adjective *myrobrechis* is a *hapax*, from the Greek μυροβρεχίς. The *ThLL* (VIII 1746, 7-9) reports this Greek word as conjectural; even though, it can be found in *III Maccab.* 4, 6 (see *LSJ* 1155 s. v.; Gelsomino 1959: 127; Cugusi 1979: II.2 447), where it is applied to the bridal hairstyle. Thus, we may consider that Augustus took in loan a word of the contemporary Hellenistic Greek: a learned allusion to the term μυροβόστρυχος employed by Meleager (*A.P.* 5, 146, 5), as Gelsomino (1959: 127) doubtfully ventures, doesn't seem very probable. The related word *myrobrecharius*, quoted by Cugusi (1979: II.2 p. 447), relies on controversial epigraphic evidence (*CIL* VI 2129*): see *ThLL* VIII 1745, 84-1746, 6.

fluous and immoderate use, even in poetry, of ornaments: *atque eo citius in oratoris aut in poetae cincinnis ac fuco offenditur, quod sensus in nimia voluptate natura, non mente satiantur* (Cic. *De Orat.* 3.100). The same reference to women's coquetry is present in Cic. *Orat.* 79 (in regard to the aesthetics of Atticism): *tum removebitur omnis insignis ornatus quasi margaritarum, ne calamistri quidem adhibebuntur. Fucati vero medicamenta candoris et ruboris omnia repellentur: elegantia modo et munditia remanebit*. Here, instead of *cincinnati* we find the related term *calamistri* ('curling iron')¹⁶, which was also applied to Maecenas by the Ciceronian Messalla in Tacitus' *Dialogus*:

Tac. *Dial.* 26.1 *ceterum si omissio optimo illo et perfectissimo genere eloquentiae* [that is, Cicero's one] *eligenda sit forma dicendi, malim hercule C. Gracchi impetum aut L. Crassi maturitatem quam calamistros Maecenatis aut tinnitus Gallionis: adeo melius est orationem vel hirta toga induere quam fucatis et meretriciis vestibus insignire*.

Putting all these passages together, we can admit a widespread analogy between *cultus* and *ornatus*¹⁷, which had implications for the perception of the ἦθος of the orator. Obviously, such perception depended on the position of the audience regarding the grade of admittance of *ornatus*, but nevertheless stylistic fastidiousness was generally taken as a sign of effeminacy or, even worse – as Messalla puts it – of meretricious lasciviousness (given the link between *ornatus* and *delectare*). Maecenas, in fact, is described as effeminate in Seneca's letter 114. "The main theme of *Epistle* 114 – as Byrne (2006: 85) writes – is that a man's *oratio* is a reflection of his *vita* [...] Everything about Maecenas' *vita* can be inferred from his *oratio*, including how he walked, his effeminacy, pretence and exhibitionism". Maecenas' mannerisms, as Seneca stresses in the same letter, became apparent in the use of bizarre figures of thought (*sensus miri*) and expression (*ambages compositionis, verba transversa*): *Epist.* 114.8 *hoc istae ambages compositionis, hoc verba transversa, hoc sensus miri, magni quidem saepe, sed enervati dum exeunt, cuius manifestum facient: motum illi felicitate nimia caput*. Quintilian, in turn, gave an explanation to those last features of Maecenas' prose: according to the rhetorician, the hyperbata and the anomalous word order of the Augustean writer were caused by his search

¹⁶ Cicero draws on the same term *calamistri* in *Brut.* 261, in reference to those who may wish to garnish Caesar's historical works, which are defined by Cicero as *nudi ... recti et venusti, omni ornatu orationis tamquam veste detracta*. Here we have again the same link between *vestitus* and *ornatus*.

¹⁷ This link has an Aristotelian precedent. In the third book of the *Rhetoric*, when dealing with the metaphors and epithets, the Stagirite uses the image of clothing for stressing the need of congruence: *Rhet.* 1405 a 13-14 ἀλλὰ δεῖ σκοπεῖν, ὡς νέω φοινικίς, οὕτω γέροντι τί (οὐ γὰρ ἡ αὐτὴ πρέπει εἶσθής).

for a 'lascivious rhythm' (cf. Fairweather 1981: 249-250)¹⁸. This latter feature, as well as the immoderate use of figures of thought, may have been regarded as faulty by Augustus, since Suetonius (*Aug.* 86.1) reports that the *Princeps* avoided the *concinntitas* and the *sententiarum ineptiae*¹⁹. The case of Maecenas, as illustrated by Quintilian, makes clear that the seeking for *concinntitas*²⁰ may produce an anomalous word order detrimental to *perspicuitas*. An analogous consideration can be made regarding the excesses with the figures of thought. So, Augustus throws back in Antony's face the fact of writing *quae mirentur potius homines quam intellegant* (Suet. *Aug.* 86.2)²¹; and similarly, Agrippina's style is said by Augustus to be nothing more than *moleste scribere et loqui* (Suet. *Aug.* 86.3). In fact, both fell into the faulty device of *κακόζηλον*, which, as implied by Quintilian (*Inst.* 8.3.58), goes against *explanatio*, since it consists – among other features – of saying things in an unnatural way: *est autem omne cacozelon utique falsum, etiam si non omne falsum cacozelon: est <enim quod>*²² *et dicitur aliter, quam se natura habet et quam oportet et quam sat est* (cf. Iul. Vict. p. 90, 8-9 G.-C.)²³.

¹⁸ Quint. *Inst.* 9.4.28 *quaedam vero transgressionones et longae sunt nimis ... et interim etiam compositione vitiosae, quae in hoc ipsum petuntur, ut exultent atque lasciviant, quales illae Maecenatis: 'sole et aurora rubent plurima'; 'inter <se> sacra movit aqua fraxinos', 'ne exaequias quidem unus inter miserrimos viderem meas'. Quintilian links the *lascivia* with the Asiatic style in *Inst.* 2.5.22 and 10.1.43; with the exotic rhythms, in 9.4.6; with the *sententiole* in 12.10.73 (see Cugusi 1973: 122-123; cf. Güngerich 1980: 115). On Maecenas' style and works, see Kappelmacher 1928: 220-229; Schanz-Hosius 1935: 20-21; Norden 1958: I 292-294; Avallone 1962: 121-167; André 1983.*

¹⁹ Cf. Cugusi 1973: 121 "forse esso [sc. *il nome di Mecenate*] è implicito anche nella polemica di Augusto contro *cacozeloi* e *sententiarum ineptiae atque concinntitas*".

²⁰ Cf. Wölfflin (1896: 180): "Der Kaiser vermied leere Phrasen und die Schönrednerei, welche, von dem Principe des Isokrates ausgehend, auf rhythmisch gebaute Sätze hinauslief".

²¹ Same criticisms in Cic. *Phil.* 3.21 *sententiole edicti cuiusdam memoriae mandavi quas videtur ille peracutas putare: ego autem qui intellexeret quid dicere vellet adhuc neminem inveni*. On the *sententiae*, see Norden 1958: I 138-139; 232 n. 1; 280-285; Fairweather 1981:202-207. They were one of the main stylistic features of the jerky Asiatic style, but they were also present, even if to a lesser degree, in the bombastic fashion of Asianism: cf. Cic. *Brut.* 325 *genera ... Asiaticae dictionis duo sunt: unum sententiosum et argutum, sententiis non tam gravibus et severis quam concinnis et venustis ... aliud autem genus est non tam sententiis frequentatum, quam verbis volucre atque incitatum, quale est nunc Asia tota, nec flumine solum orationis, sed etiam exornato et faceto genere verborum*.

²² This is Butler's reading, accepted by Russell (2001) in his Loeb edition of the *Institutio oratoria*.

²³ See also Demetr. *Eloc.* 186-188 (*κακόζηλον* by means of figures of speech and figures of thought); Longin. 3.4 (*κακόζηλον* is specially caused by seeking to delight the audience).

3. *Latinitas*

The link between Caesar's and Augustus' position regarding the *Latinitas* is clearly stated in Gellius (10.24.2): *divus etiam Augustus, linguae Latinae non nescius munditiarumque patris sui in sermonibus sectator*. Here, instead of the adjective *elegans* used by Suetonius when describing Augustus' *genus dicendi* (Aug. 86.1), we find a related term, *munditiae*. Indeed, *elegantia* and *munditia* appear together twice in Cicero, namely in *Fam.* 9.20.2 and *Orat.* 79. The second passage is quite interesting, since it presents further implications of the concept 'elegantia', and precisely in a passage where the Arpinate gives a 'recipe' for making a speech in the Atticist fashion:

Cic. *Orat.* 78-79 *tum removebitur omnis insignis ornatus quasi margaritarum, ne calamistri quidem adhibebuntur. Fucati vero medicamenta candoris et ruboris omnia repellentur: elegantia modo et munditia remanebit. Sermo purus erit et Latinus, dilucide planeque dicitur, quid deceat circumspicietur: unum aberit, quod quartum numerat Theophrastus in orationis laudibus: ornatum illud suave et affluens.*

Here, from the point of view of the Atticists, *elegantia* and *munditia* are identified with the lack of a prominent *ornatus*. Augustus, of course, can be considered *elegans* also in this sense (cf. p. 113 ff.), but Gellius does not imply it. Indeed, he is discussing the correctness of the 'adverbs' *diēquintī* et *diēquintē*²⁴ instead of *diē quintō*, and consequently pointing to the *Latinitas*, not to the *ornatus*. Even though, the quoted passage from Cicero's *Orator* proves that *elegantia* and *munditia* are related concepts. Both terms have several fields of application: indeed, for understanding the concept of *munditia* we can appeal to that of ethics and put forward Cic. *Off.* 1.130, a passage in which the Arpinate (following the Stoic Panaetius)²⁵ defines *munditia* as a middle term between a wild carelessness and an affected neatness:

Cic. *Off.* 1.130 *adhibenda praeterea munditia est, non odiosa neque exquisita nimis, tantum quae fugiat agrestem et inhumanam neglegentiam. Eadem ratio est habenda vestitus, in quo sicut in plerisque rebus mediocritas optima est*²⁶.

²⁴ They are really forms of the locative: *diē quintī* > *diē quintē* (as results of an analogical levelling) > *diē quintē* (according to the *correptio iambica*); cf. Neue-Wagener: II³ 652; Kühner-Holzweissig 1912: 293-294; Sommer 1948: 340; Leumann 1977: 426; Cavazza 1989: 303 n. 2. Regarding the label 'adverb' given to these forms by Gellius (as well as by Macrobius, *Sat.* 1.4.20) we may say that such a term was for the ancients a hotchpotch which contained several word-classes: see Swiggers-Wouters 2002.

²⁵ See Pohlenz 1943: 133; Dyck 1996: 307.

²⁶ Cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.2.65-66 *mundus erit qua non offendat sordibus atque / in neutram partem cultus miser.*

Thus, Gellius' statement, which regards the *elocutio*, may imply that Augustus, like Caesar, looked for *munditia* in speech, namely by rejecting the *corrupta consuetudo* as well as the arbitrary emendation of the language without a basis in the common linguistic use²⁷ (as, for instance, the Asianist Sisenna did). Nevertheless, as far as I can see, the context does not allow a clear interpretation of the litotes *non nescius*: it could be either emphatic or merely limitative. Indeed, Fronto considered Augustus less elegant than Caesar, pointing out the pleasantry (*lepos*) of the former as the more prominent feature of his style – it is clear that this erudite gentleman had in mind Augustus' letters (*contra*, Giordano 2000: 37)²⁸.

Among the modern scholars, Gagé (1982: 614) expressed a view which is to some extent similar to that of Fronto. According to the French scholar, “dans le fond de sa nature, Octave, à notre avis, suit rarement les tendances les plus particulières de César: rien de plus différent, par exemple, de ce que nous savons du *De analogia* composé par l'*imperator*, par rapport aux tendances connues chez Auguste, son goût des vocables concrets éventuellement populaires, et d'une orthographe sans prétention savante”. Even though, Gagé did not take into due consideration the material collected by Wölfflin (1896), mainly from the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, which represents a first-hand document of the higher style employed by the *Princeps*; in this regard, Gagé gives too much weight to the information reported by Suetonius, as well as other indirect sources, about Augustus' *sermo cotidianus*.

Indeed, one should take into account the diaphasic variations when analyzing the speech of the *Princeps*: and first of all, because Augustus himself acknowledged that the level of language had to fit in with the communicative situation. The following passage from Quintilian should be interpreted in this light:

²⁷ Cf. Cic. *Brut.* 261 *Caesar autem rationem adhibens* [that is, the analogy] *consuetudinem vitiosam et corruptam pura et incorrupta consuetudine emendat. Itaque cum ad hanc elegantiam verborum Latinorum eqs.*; see Garcea 2012: 103-109.

²⁸ In point of fact, this judgement of Augustus' style takes place inside an overall view of the eloquence of the Roman emperors, which is thought by Fronto to have declined from Caesar onwards: Fronto p. 123, 4-10 v. d. H.² *Caesari quidem facultatem dicendi video imperatoriam fuisse, Augustum vero saeculi residua elegantia et Latinae linguae etiam tum integro lepore potius quam dicendi ubertate praeditum puto, post Augustum nonnihil reliquiarum iam et vietarum et tabescentium Tiberio illi superfuisse, imperatores autem deinceps ad Vespasianum usque eiusmodi omnes, ut non minus verborum puderet quam pigeret morum et misereret facinorum.* Such an idea is somehow present in Tacitus (*Ann.* 13.3.2-3), even if in a more balanced way: he states that *Augusto prompta ac profluens quae deceret principem eloquentia fuit.*

Quint. *Inst.* 1.6.19 *sed Augustus quoque in epistulis ad C. Caesarem scriptis [Epist. frg. 23 M.; 74 C.] emendat quod is 'calidum' dicere quam 'caldum'²⁹ malit, non quia id non sit Latinum, sed quia sit odiosum³⁰ et, ut ipse Graeco verbo significavit, περιεργον.*

We can assume that Augustus, in reply to a letter of Gaius in which the latter employed the learned form *calidus*, urged him to use the colloquial form *caldum*³¹, as being more consonant with the tone of a private letter³². As Augustus himself stressed, it was not a matter of *Latinitas*, but of *πρέπον*³³. In one thing Gag   was right compared to W  lfflin (1896: 163), who wrote that Augustus “war mit der Grammatik so vertraut, dass er gelegentlich selbst f  r die Grosskinder den Schulmeister machte”. In fact, as Suetonius reports, the *Princeps* did not play the part of a *grammaticus* (‘school master’), but of a *litterator* (‘writing master’):

Suet. *Aug.* 64.3 *nepotes et litteras et notare [Lipsius: notare codd.] aliaque rudimenta per se plerumque docuit, ac nihil aequo elaboravit quam ut imitarentur chirographum suum.*

As we can see, the main goal of Augustus’ teaching was, so to speak, calligraphy. The *Princeps*, indeed, did not follow – as Gag   (1982: 614) correctly pointed out – a ‘science of orthography’:

Suet. *Aug.* 88.1 *orthographiam, id est formulam rationemque scribendi a grammaticis institutam, non adeo custodit ac videtur eorum potius sequi opinionem, qui perinde scribendum ac loquamur existiment.*

²⁹ Cf. Halm (1869: 367): “*calidam dicere quam caldam coni.* Keilius coll. *Gramm. Lat.* IV 198, 3; 581, 22; I 553, 20; in hac enim voce (*aqua calda*) forma breviata videtur in usu fuisse”. On *cal(i)da* ‘hot water’, see *ThLL* III 151, 75-152, 4. This emendation does not seem necessary; either to take *cal(i)dum* as a noun, meaning ‘wine mixed with hot water’ (cf. *ThLL* III 154, 35-48). Ax (2011: 260-261) argues that only in the case of the adjective is witnessed a difference of linguistic level between the full and the syncopate form, and that the adjective appears here as neuter because it is used metalinguistically.

³⁰ Burmann (1720: I 76 *ad loc.*) proposed to read *otiosum*, in the idea that it fits better the Greek *περιεργον*, but such proposal produces a tautology (‘superfluous and needless’). Furthermore, there are several occurrences of the adjective *odiosus* applied to words, phrases and other manifestations of the language (see *ThLL* IX.2 461, 24-42). In this regard, note Quint. *Inst.* 1, 6, 40 (on archaisms) *sed opus est modo ... quia nihil est odiosius adfectatione*, where *adfectatio* stands close to *περιεργία* (see also n. 33).

³¹ On the colloquial character of *caldus* (instead of *calidus*), see Ax 2011: 259-260 and *ThLL* III 151, 30-36.

³² See the discussion in Ax 2011: 259-261.

³³ As stressed by the Greek term *περιεργον* employed by Augustus; cf. Quint. *Inst.* 8.3.55 *etiam quae periergia vocatur, [cum] supervacua, ut sic dixerim, operositas, ut a diligenti curiosus et religione superstitio distat* (cf. Pisani 1938: 228; Gelsomino 1959: 121; Cugusi 1973: 131; 1979: II.2 421; Giordano 2000: 32).

This rejection of the ‘science of orthography’ certainly reveals a difference with Caesar, who discussed orthographical questions in his treatise *De analogia*³⁴. At any rate, even if Augustus thought that orthography – at least to some extent – had to reflect the real pronunciation, he did distinguish in this regard between a *corrupta* and an *incorrupta consuetudo*: thus, as Suetonius reports (*Aug.* 88.1), he took as a sign of roughness and ignorance to write *ixi* instead of *ipsi*³⁵. This being so, it cannot be sustained that Augustus was less concerned than Caesar with the orthography (and the *Latinitas* in general). The difference between both men may be that Caesar vigorously appealed to the *ratio* for ascertaining the *incorrupta consuetudo*, whereas Augustus mainly relied in his *Sprachgefühl*³⁶.

The latter was at least the idea sustained by the emperor Hadrian, as reported by Iulius Romanus:

Char. Gramm. p. 271, 10-20 B. *Obiter divus Hadrianus Sermonum libro I quaerit an Latinum sit ‘quamquam’ inquit ‘apud Laberium [Mim. 158 R.] haec vox esse dicatur’, et cum Scaurus [frg. 10 K.] Latinum esse neget ... quamquam divus Augustus reprehendens Ti. Claudium ita loquitur [Epist. frg. 18 M.; 94 C.] ‘scribis enim perviam ἀντὶ τοῦ obiter’. Sed divus Hadrianus ‘tametsi’ inquit ‘Augustus non pereruditus homo fuerit, ut id adverbium ex usu potius quam lectione protulerit’.*

In fact, the adverb *obiter* before Augustus is only documented in Laberius (as transmitted by the quotation of Hadrian), and after Laberius appears used now and then by a handful of authors, such as Seneca the Younger, Petronius, Ps.-Quintilian, Juvenal, and the jurist Pomponius (see *ThLL* IX.2 67, 39-43; Martzloff 2012: 609-612). However, the important fact is that Pliny the Elder (as the *ThLL* reports) uses *obiter* 30 times: and Pliny, as Mazzarino (1949: 52) stresses, “è il grammaticus che ha sentito la *consuetudo* come vita vera della lingua”. In turn, the adverb *per-*

³⁴ See Garcea 2012: 33-35.

³⁵ Suet. *Aug.* 88.1 *nec ego id notarem, nisi mihi mirum videretur tradidisse aliquos, legato eum consulari successorem dedisse ut rudi et indocto, cuius manu ‘ixi’ pro ‘ipsi’ scriptum animadverterit. Ixi* is a hypercorrect form noting [i(s)si:], the vulgar pronunciation of *ipsi*. Such aberrant orthography was possible, since both /ks/ and /ps/ evolved into /l(s)s/ among unlearned speakers: see *ThLL* VII.2 293, 50-54; Sommer 1948: 247-248; Väänänen 1966: 64-65; Bejarano 1974. 93. Väänänen ventures that perhaps the legate confused the sound of the Latin letter <x> with that of the Greek <ψ> (1966: 65), but this explanation seems quite implausible.

³⁶ Adams (2007: 16) perhaps goes too far when stating that “it was above all the emperor Augustus who disregarded the prescriptions of the *grammatici*”. Among other facts, he points out that “he used prepositions with the names of towns for clarity (*Aug.* 86.1), though it was a practice classed as solecism by grammarians over a long period (see Quint. *Inst.* 1.5.38, Pompeius *GL V* 252, 21-22)”; cf. Adams 2005: 78 and see p. 126 ff.

viam can only be found with certainty in the quotation of Tiberius present in the cited fragment (see *ThLL* X.1 1866, 47-51). Thus, Augustus was accusing Tiberius of coining neologisms³⁷. This appeal to the *usus* is quite significant³⁸. Malcovati (1969: XXIV), in turn, considered that Augustus “ad ἀνωμαλίαν [...] proclivem fuisse” – but we may say that she based such an affirmation on erroneous grounds³⁹. The *Princeps* was also reputed to be an anomalist by Pisani (1938: 233-235), who put forward some orthographical inconsistencies in the *Monumentum Ancyranum*⁴⁰, as well as the genitive *domos* and the form *cocuntur* transmitted by Suetonius (*Aug.* 87, 1-2)⁴¹. These phenomena made Pisani conclude that “Augusto, quando l’uso gli

³⁷ That can be seen as a manifestation of Tiberius’ Asiatic style, as was the case of the Asianist Sisenna (cf. *sputatilica* Cic. *Brut.* 260): see Dihle 1957: 196-198; Calboli 1962: 225-228; 1986: 1135-1136; cf. Norden 1958: I 184-189. I will not conceal that Martzloff (2012: 610) does not think of a neologism in the case of *perviam*, but simply of a high-sounding word. In turn, the colloquial character of the word *obiter* is argued by Adams (2003:568-569), due to its appearance in the Vindolanda Tablets. Cf. also Giordano 2000: 41 “Augusto [...] consiglia di usare *obiter*, proprio per evitare che *perviam*, usato etimologicamente [?], risulti ambiguo al lettore meno colto”.

³⁸ Cf. Giordano 2000: 35 “Le prese di posizione ortografiche, morfologiche, lessicali, stilistiche di Ottaviano Augusto si possono riassumere nel principio che *usus* e *simplicitas* devono guidare chi scrive”.

³⁹ Malcovati 1969: XXIV “Augustus igitur contra grammaticorum praecepta, eadem verborum formas, quibus in cotidiano sermone uteretur, in epistulis quoque adhibere consueverat. Unde efficimus licet eum ad ἀνωμαλίαν [...] proclivem fuisse”. I don’t see what the *sermo cotidianus* has to do with the anomaly, the latter being a matter of usage (*usus*, *consuetudo*), not of diaphasic or diastratic variations (*sermo*).

⁴⁰ For instance, the spelling of the dative-ablative pl. of the first declension nouns in *-ia* and second declension in *-ius*: 4 *auspicis*, 16 *municipis*, 16 *stipendis*; but 14 *consiliis*, 21 *municipiis*, 15 *manibiis* (see Sommer 1948: 331; 350-351; Leumann 1977: 429).

⁴¹ Suet. *Aug.* 87.1-2 *Cotidiano sermone quaedam frequentius et notabiliter usurpasse eum, litterae ipsius autographae ostendant, in quibus ... ad exprimendam festinatae rei velocitatem, ‘celerius quam asparagi cocuntur’ [sc. scribit]. Ponit assidue ... item simus pro sumus et domos [domuos Ritschl] genetiuo casu singulari pro domuos [domnos vel domus var. l.]. Nec umquam aliter haec duo, ne quis mendam magis quam consuetudinem putet. Cf. Mar. Victorin. *Gramm.* VI p. 9, 4-6 *divus Augustus genetivo casu ‘huius domos meae’ per o, non ut nos per u litteram scripsit. Messala, Brutus, Agrippa pro ‘sumus’, ‘simus’ <scripserunt>*. Regarding *simus* (instead of *sūmus*) several explanations have been proposed. Neue-Wagener (III³ 594) sees in *simus* an analogy with the verbs of the third conjugation (v.gr. *legimus*, *dicimus*) and even of the fourth (*ferimus*) – the latter makes no real sense, taking in account the opposition *simus* pres. indic. / *simus* pres. subj. Indeed, Stolz (1894: 138, followed by Pascal 1918: 36) only mentions a possible analogy with the third conjugation (thus Bejarano 1974: 92), putting forward, as an alternative explanation, to see in *simus* an enclitic (and unstressed) form of *sūmus*; thus, *secūti sūmus* > *secūti simus* (documented in *CE* 186, 6*

permetteva la scelta tra due forme, adoperava l'una o l'altra di esse secondo che più si addiceva al suo caso e senza darsi pensiero delle arbitrarie delimitazioni dei grammatici. In contrapposto per questo particolare a Cesare, egli era anomalista" (Pisani 1938: 235; cf. Malcovati 1921: XVI).

I think that Pisani may be right when he says that Augustus did not take much care in following *arbitrary* prescriptions of the grammarians, but from this fact it does not necessarily follow that the *Princeps* was an anomalist. Indeed, the discussion is not perfectly focused, and furthermore Pisani put together different facts. First, we have to take into due account that Augustus, conversely to Caesar, was not a grammarian: thus, it has no much sense to label him as an anomalist or an analogist. One should rather inquire whether Augustus, as a speaker, arbitrarily followed the *usus* or tried somehow to emend it; and, in the latter case, whether he limited himself to choosing between concurrent forms with the aid of some criteria (analogy, etymology) or was prone to neological innovations. Certainly this is a question of degree, and Augustus may have varied upon occasions his principles, since he was not trying to apply a linguistic theory for shaping his speech. And we may say that, given the present state of the art, this subject is not easy to verify, and a rapid overview comes up with some contrasting facts (as we will later exemplify). At any rate, and given Augustus' seeking for *perspicuitas*, it is quite reasonable to expect that the language of the *Princeps* may have heavily relied on the *consuetudo*.

Coming back to Pisani, we can first say that the form *cocuntur* (which, according to Pisani 1938: 229 represents the current pronunciation of *coquantur* or *coquuntur*), cannot be easily adduced, even if it represents a phonetic evolution which obscures the analogy with other forms of the verb in which the labiovelar /k^w/ does not precede a back vowel (viz. *coquere*, *coquantur*). The first reason is that *cocuntur* relies on the textual tradition of Suetonius, and it is a well-known fact that the medieval scribes fitted to their contemporary uses the orthography of the texts they were copying. Second, and more important, the form *cocuntur* forms part of a pet-expression of Augustus' *sermo cotidianus*, and we have seen (p. 119) that the *Princeps* admitted that a word may assume different forms (viz. pronunciations) depending on the diaphasic situation. So nothing prevents him admitting an 'ana-

B.). This is also the solution adopted by Leumann 1977: 522-523, who also appeals to the presence of the labial *m* – the latter being the only reason given by Stolz-Schmalz (1900: 38; 162) and Kühner-Holzweissig (1912: 63) for explaining *sūmus* > *simus*. It is worth noting that Marius Victorinus reports that the same form *sīmus* was used by Messala, Brutus, and Agrippa; if so, this form has to be considered in the first century BC a diaphasic, not a diastatic variant. I am not quite sure that the same can be said of CE 186, 6 B *secuti simus*, above quoted.

logical' *coquuntur* as the learned form of the 'anomalistic' *cocuntur*. The form *domos* gen. sg. also appertains to Augustus' *sermo cotidianus*. Suetonius (*Aug.* 87.2), it is true, writes that Augustus always used such a form instead of *domuos* (or *domus* as part of the textual tradition transmits)⁴²: even though, he is referring to the letters of the *Princeps*, in which, as we have seen in the case of *calidus* / *caldus*, he did use forms which he thought fitting for lower levels of communication. Furthermore, it is not possible to draw sure conclusions from the use of the form *domos*, since its nature is subject to debate. Pisani (1938: 229-230) takes *domōs*, with a short *o*, as the phonetic evolution of the gen. **domuos* (like *senatuos*: see n. 42), by the loss of a consonantal *u* – a process which Pisani takes as characteristic of vulgar Latin (but see Leumann 1942: 167 "ich würde dann allerdings **domus* erwarten, nach *serus* für *servos* usw.": cf. Leumann 1977: 137-138)⁴³. Kretschmer (1892: 453), in turn, proposed as etymon **domōu-s*, presenting a lengthened-grade of the root **domu-*. Leumann (1977: 442) thought of an analogy with the abl. *domō*: thus, if *domū*: *domūs*, then *domō* → *domōs*.

Other scholars tempted the way of dialectalism. Meillet (1906: 4) saw in *domōs* < **domous* "une forme patoise", which relied on the monophthongation **ou* > *ō*, documented in the Umbrian and in the rural Latin dialects. Meillet was following a proposal of Mohl (1899: 50-51), who furthermore pointed out that Augustus was

⁴² See the discussion in Malcovati 1970. She acutely writes (p. 183): "non avrà voluto il grammatico Svetonio tentare egli stesso una spiegazione della forma anomala usata da Augusto, facendo derivare *domus* [sic! read *domos*] da un *domuos* forse ancora esistente ai tempi suoi in antiche iscrizioni?" In fact, *senatuos* gen. can be found in the *SC de Bacchanalibus* (*CIL* I² 581, 21). The genitive and the dative sg. of the nouns of the fourth declension was quite a burning issue in the first century BC, due to the contrasting endings given to those cases in the archaic and classical period (see Lomanto 1993; Garcea 2012: 223-228). Thus, regarding the genitive of the animate names (which is the case of *domos*), we find first the root with a full-grade and the athematic ending of genitive *-s with a zero-grade: so, -*ou-s* (*senatous* *CIL* I² 2197, 4) > -*ū-s* (*senatus* *CIL* I² 834, 2). Then, we find the root with a zero-grade and the ending in full grade: -*u-os* (*senatuos* *CIL* I² 581, 21). Beside these endings, we find -*u-is*, which relies on an analogy with the third declension (*fructuis* Varro *Rust.* 1, 2, 19); -*i*, in turn, with the second (*senati* *CIL* I² 636, 2); cf. Neue-Wagener I: 536-541; Kühner-Holzweissig 1912: 393-395; Sommer 1948: 388-389; 403-404; Leumann 1977: 441-442. Caesar seems to have given preference to the gen. -*ūs* (see Garcea 2012: 227), which is the form present in the *Monumentum Ancyranum*: so, 4 *ex senátús consulto*; 8 *iussu populi et senátús*; 20 <*ex decreto*> *senatus*.

⁴³ But later Pisani (1962: 181) appears uncertain between *domōs* < **domuos* or *domōs* < **domous*, "monottongazione rustica di -*ou*". Regardless of its etymology, Pisani sees in *domos* a 'rustic' and 'vulgar' form.

born in Velitrae, “en pays volsque”⁴⁴. A similar explanation is given by Coleman (1990: 7) and Joseph and Wallace (1992: 109-111)⁴⁵; they add epigraphic evidence, mainly from the neighbouring Nola and from the Volscian area, for supporting the aforementioned monophthongation. Mohl, Coleman and Joseph-Wallace give a socio-linguistic explanation. According to Mohl (1899: 51), the genitive *domōs*, thanks to Augustus, made concurrence to *domūs* “même dans le langage de la haute société romaine”; it was due to the fact that the *Princeps*, who avoided the archaisms, favoured “une forme plus jeune et plus usitée dans la langue courante de cette Italie dont la politique impériale s’efforçait d’affirmer l’unité en face a des provinces”. Mohl’s reasoning is not sound: if *domōs* was a dialectalism, consequently it was not a current form; moreover, there are no proofs that it was widespread among learned society. In turn, Joseph and Wallace (1992: 110-111) argued that such genitive was a populist feature, since Augustus “courted ordinary Romans” and *domōs* led to “a pronunciation that would have been recognized by the lower classes of Romans as provincial perhaps but clearly at their level”. Indeed, they rely on Coleman (1990: 7) who argued that “a dynast who could affect colloquialisms like *caldus* and rustic similes like *celerius quam asparagi cocuntur* might well have affected the occasional Italian pronunciation in the cultivation of his image”. I wonder what was Augustus’ point of employing such an alleged dialectal (viz. rustic) form *domōs* for captivating the mob. In point of fact, such a proposal does not take into account that only the *plebs urbana* took part regularly in the assemblies: thus, a dialectal trait may have rather been perceived as alienating for the audience⁴⁶. I think that Sommer (1948: 388)⁴⁷ may be right when describing the gen. *domōs* as plainly puzzling, and therefore nothing can be deduced from its use by Augustus in the *sermo cotidianus*⁴⁸.

⁴⁴ Let us say that Augustus was quite surely born in Rome, even if the gens Octavia came from Velitrae, where the *Princeps* is supposed to have been raised; see Kienast 2009: 1-2.

⁴⁵ A possible dialectal origin for *domos* is also proposed by Adams (2007: 16 “from the place of his birth”: he obviously thinks that it was not Rome); previously, he only labelled *domos* as “non standard-morphology” (2005: 78). He does not mention why he thinks that *domos* is a dialectalism, or from whom he takes that idea. In turn, Coleman (1990: 7) states that *domōs* “is inexplicable except on the assumption that it was a feature of Volscian dialect of Latin, acquired in his [sc. Augustus’] boyhood at Velitrae”.

⁴⁶ Furthermore, if *domōs* was really a dialectal form, one would expect that its use were restricted to the *sermo cotidianus*: some diatopic traits are usually employed as diaphasic.

⁴⁷ Similarly, Solmsen (1894: 108) considered the gen. *domos* “einer individuellen Sprachgemeinschaftlichkeit” of Augustus, impossible to explain.

⁴⁸ Thus, it cannot easily be taken together with *sīmus* for arguing, as Bejarano (1974: 92) did, that Augustus showed analogistic tendencies in grammar.

We must confess that, given the present state of the art, it is not easy to establish if Augustus' linguistic use tended to analogy or to anomaly. Wölfflin (1896) has shown that in many aspects the language of the *Princeps* echoed the uses of Caesar, who was a moderate analogist. But beyond this general tendency some contradictory facts subsist, which seem to point to a sort of eclecticism – perhaps encouraged by a probable disregard for an aprioristic normative grammar, as it was the case with orthography (cf. p. 120).

This is evident in the case of some controversial proposals of Caesar's, whose comparison with his actual praxis as a prose writer is perhaps not necessarily pertinent. So, for the genitive of the fifth declension, Caesar prescribed the ending *-ē*⁴⁹, but in Augustus only the case ending *-ei* is found: *Var. 2 M. (Suet. Aug. 28.2) eius rei fructum; Epist. frg. 22 M. (73 C. = Gell. 15, 7, 3) in statu rei publicae; Hist. frg. 6 M. (Plin. Nat. 2.94) undecimam horam diei*; similarly, even if Caesar commended the reduplication in *e* in the perfects⁵⁰, Augustus wrote *excucurristi (Epist. frg. 35 M.; 62 C. = Prisc. Gramm. II 533, 13)*⁵¹. To give only a last series of examples, we can put forward that the case of the gen. pl. in *-um* of the second declension is quite puzzling. Augustus alternates between the gen. plur. *deorum (Hist. frg. 6 M. = Plin. Nat. 2.94 deorum immortalium numina)* and *deum (R. Gest. div. Aug. 19 aedem*

⁴⁹ Gell. 9.14.25 *sed C. Caesar in libro de analogia secundo [frg. 26 G.] huius 'die' et huius 'specie' dicendum putat* (see Garcea 2012: 230-234). In Caesar this genitive is only present in *Gall. 2, 23, 1 acie (aciei var. l.)*; see Garcea 2012: 234 and *ibid. n. 283*.

⁵⁰ Gell. 6.9.15 *sic M. Tullius [Op. inc. frg. 18 G.] et C. Caesar [Anal. frg. 30 G.] 'mordeo, memordi', 'pungo, pepugi', 'spondeo, spepondi' dixerunt* (see Garcea 2012: 241-245). As Garcea (2012: 242) stresses, "the statement by Gellius finds no echo in the *usus scribendi* of the two writers", if one leaves aside the controversial *pepugisset* in *Cic. S. Rosc. 60*. The vowel *e* is what is expected in such prefixes in perfects; the presence of *i, o* or *u* (the case of *excucurristi*) is due to an assimilation with the first vowel of the stem: see Leumann 1977: 586-587.

⁵¹ The perfect *excecurri* cannot be found (but *occecurri* Tubero frg. 2 H. = Gell. 6, 9, 11). *Excucurri*, in turn, is documented not only in Plautus (*Bacch. 359; Most. 359*), but also among Augustus' contemporaries (*Bell. Hisp. 21, 2; Liv. 1.15.1; 2.17.2; cf. also Plin. Epist. 3.4.2; Suet. Galba 18, 2; Mart. Cap. 8, 865*); see Neue-Wagener III 354-355. The presence of the reduplication in the compounded verb *excurrere* is noteworthy: there was a tendency to leave aside the reduplication in the perfects of such verbs (see Leumann 1977: 587): thus, *excurrebant* Liv. 25, 30, 10; Plin. *Nat. 17, 16 excurrere*; Quint. *Inst. 10.5.16 excurrit*. – Leumann (1977: 586) puts forward that a perfect *depeposcit* (instead of *depoposcit*) can be read in *R. gest. Div. Aug. 25*, but Briscoe (2005: 69 n. 109) has shown that this statement is erroneous. Perhaps Augustus avoided such perfects because he felt them to be archaic (cf. Adams 1990: 244 on *spepondi* for *sponodi*). Note also that Garcea (2012: 245), in regard to these perfects, writes that Caesar "seems rather concerned with the possibility of reconciling the laws of analogy with the usage of authors from the past".

deum Penátium, 20 templa deum), whereas Caesar only employs the gen. pl. *deorum* (*Civ.* 2.5.3; *Gall.* 1.12.6; 5.52.5; 6.14.6; 6.16.3; 6.21.2). The exclusive use of *deum* in the *Res gestae* can be explained as an influence of religious language, which gave preference to the gen. pl. *deum* with nouns like *templa, fana, delubra, ara, simulacra* and alike (see Kühner-Holzweissig 1912: 460; Sommer 1948: 349). Thus, *Caes. Civ.* 2.5.3 *templa deorum immortalium* has to be seen as a conscious reject of the gen. pl. *deum*, invoking the analogy: cf. Varro *Ling.* 8.70 *quaerunt, si sit analogia cur appellant omnes aedem **deum** Consentium et non **deorum** Consentium?* Consequently, Augustus followed the *usus* against the analogy in such cases. Not differently, the *Princeps* made use of the common gen. pl. *nummum* and *sestertium* (cf. Kühner-Holzweissig 1912: 460; Neue-Wagener: I 169-170; Sommer 1948: 349)⁵², but quite surprisingly, instead of *XVvirum*, Augustus wrote *XVvirorum* in *R. Gest. div. Aug.* 22, a form which was undoubtedly perceived as an analogical innovation, as we can easily deduce from *Cic. Orat.* 156 *alias ut necesse est, cum trium virum, non virorum, et sestertium, nummum, non sestertiorum, nummorum*⁵³, *quod in his consuetudo varia non est* (anyway, *decemvirorum* is the usual gen. pl. in Livy: see *ThLL* V.1 128, 38-42; Neue-Wagener: I 176-177)⁵⁴. Note also that Pliny, the supporter of the *consuetudo*, writes *XV virum* (*Nat.* 28, 12; and so did Tacitus *Ann.* 6, 12, 1; 11, 11, 1); whereas *XV virorum* can only be found in Statius *Silv.* 4.3.142 and in some late authors (*Cens. Nat.* 17.9; 17.10; 17.11; *Porph. Hor. Carm. Saec.* 69; *Schol. Hor. Carm. Saec.* 69; *Serv. Auct. Aen.* 3.332; *Serv. Aen.* 6.73).

The only possible conclusion is that we are in need of a thorough study on Augustus' *Latinitas*, a research that without doubt shall take its cue from Garcea's *Caesar* – a book that, as we have seen, has thrown new light on a quite obscure period of the history of Latin Grammar.

4. Appendix: prepositions, perspicuity and diaphasic variation

Suet. *Aug.* 86.1 *quod quo facilius efficeret* [sc. to achieve perspicuity] *aut necubi lectorem vel auditorem obturbaret ac moraretur, neque praepositiones urbibus addere neque coniunctiones saepius iterare dubitavit, quae detractae afferunt aliquid obscuritatis, etsi gratiam augeant.*

⁵² *Epist.* 7 M. (84 C. = Suet. *Aug.* 71.3) *viginti milia nummum*; *R. Gest. div. Aug.* 15 *millia nummum*; 16 <sest>ertium ... *sexsiens milliens*; 16 *seste<rtium> q<uater m>illien<s>* 17 *sestertium milliens<s>*. There are no examples of *nummorum* and *sestertiorum* in Augustus.

⁵³ But *nummorum* is also employed by Cicero: see Neue-Wagener: I³ 169.

⁵⁴ And first in the same passage: *planeque duorum virorum iudicium aut trium virorum capitalium aut decem virorum stlitibus iudicandis dico nunquam.*

The implications of Suetonius' statement are quite controversial. Such use of prepositions with names of cities (instead of the bare cases) does not take place in the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, as Wölfflin (1896: 174) stressed, following Mommsen (1883: 189)⁵⁵. In point of fact, *R. gest. div. Aug. 26 usque ad oppidum Nabata* and *26 ad oppidum Mariba* cannot be taken into consideration, since "die Präposition nicht zu dem Nomen Proprium, sondern zu dem Appellativum hinzutritt" (Wölfflin *ibid.*: cf. Kühner-Stegmann 1976: I 480-481 [§88.2 A. 6]). On the contrary, Wölfflin points out *R. gest. div. Aug. 20 viam Flaminiam a<b urbe> Ari<minum> refeci*, and *Epist. frg. 45 M. (inc. frg. 127 C. = Isid. Nat. 44, 4 [Suet. Prat. frg. 157 p. 244, 4 R.) nos venimus Neapolim fluctu quidem caeco*, where an accusative without preposition denotes the goal of the motion, as was obligatory in good and learned Latin (see Kühner-Stegmann 1976: I 475; Hofmann-Szantyr 1972: 49-50; and cf. Mackay 1999: 230). This being so, Wölfflin (1896: 174) ventured to read in *Suet. Aug. 86.1 praepositiones verbis addere* instead of *praepositiones urbibus addere*⁵⁶: indeed, the Swiss scholar conjectured that Suetonius may have alluded to such constructions in which both the absence and the presence of a preposition was acceptable⁵⁷. At any rate, Wölfflin was misled by the fact of thinking that adding prepositions to the names of towns was in contrast with Augustus' correctness, so praised among the ancients. This view can be resized and qualified. Augustus, as Suetonius reports, was searching for perspicuity; and, in fact, Kühner and Stegmann (1976: I 478

⁵⁵ It is worth quoting the acute observations of the great German scholar: "Augustum [Suet. *Aug. 86, 1*] neque praepositiones urbibus addere dubitavisse neque coniunctiones saepius iterare, ipsum commentarius [*the Res gestae*] non confirmat, sed *similiter* dicitur V 21.23 [§26] *perventum esse ad oppidum Nabata et ad oppidum Mariba*, pariterque scribitur IV 34 [§22] *bis meo nomine et tertium nepotis mei nomine* et repetitur aedis vocabulum IV 5. 24 [§§19; 21] *patientia vix ferenda. Albis V 12 [§26], Danuvius V 47[§30]* (neque tamen mox ubi redit V 48[§30]), *Tanais V 53 [§31]* non nominatur nisi addito fluminis vocabulo; quamquam V 14 [§26] *simpliciter enuntiatur Rhenus*" (Mommsen 1883: 189). In the first edition of this work, instead of "ipsum commentarius non confirmat", Mommsen wrote "quodammodo confirmat" (1865: 144). The implicit idea is clear: the aforementioned addition of *oppidum*, *flumen* and alike to proper names, as well as the needless repetition of words and constructions, have the same purpose of adding prepositions to the names of cities and repeating the conjunctions: to achieve clearness, though taking away some charm.

⁵⁶ This reading was introduced by a first corrector in the MS Florentinus Laurentianus *plut.* 68,7; it can also be found in the MS Berolinensis Latinus fol. 337, as well as in other *deteriores* and ancient editions (see Ihm 1907 *ad loc.*).

⁵⁷ Thus, for instance, he put forward *R. Gest. div. Aug. 21 magná ex parte* and *27 ex parte magná* (instead of an adverbial accusative *magnam* or *maximam partem*), and compared *R. Gest. div. Aug. 17 ex consilio m<eo> co<ns>titutum* with *Cic. Manil. 57 exercitus qui consilio ac periculo illius est constitutus* (see Wölfflin 1896: 175-176).

[§88.1 A. 4]) state that such use of prepositions with names of cities – a feature which was already present as a tendency in colloquial Old Latin – increased its frequency in the Post-classical period, and that “*im Interesse der Deutlichkeit hinzu*”. Then they quote, among other examples, a letter of Servius Sulpicius Rufus, contained in Cicero’s *Ad familiares* (4, 12, 2): *cum ab Athenis proficisci in animo haberem* (see also Schmalz 1881: 100-101). Servius, we know, was not an unlearned person, as Cicero himself recognizes in a famous passage of his *Brutus*⁵⁸. Thus we can admit that adding prepositions to the names of the cities (instead of using the bare cases) was perceived by the learned people as a trait which could be eventually afforded in a colloquial context, like that of a private letter. This diaphasic difference explains the absence of this feature in the *Res gestae*, in contrast with Suetonius’ account: indeed, we should not forget that the historian was drawing his information on Augustus’ *sermo cotidianus* from the letters of the *Princeps* (cf. p. 123). Furthermore, some scholars (e.g. Cugusi 1973: 130-131; Giordano 2000: 38; De Biasi-Ferrero 2003: 281 n. 1 *ad loc.*) state that the following fragment from a letter of the *Princeps* to Vergil can be invoked for crediting Suetonius:

Epist. frg. 35 M (62 C = Prisc. Gramm. II 533, 13) excucurristi a Neapoli.

Unfortunately it does not really prove anything, because we lack a valid context. According to the standard rules of Latin, the preposition *a(b)* with the name of a city expresses that the movement has its origin in the surroundings of the former (cf. Kühner-Stegmann 1976: I 477 [§88 1a]). Thus, *excucurristi a Neapoli* primarily means “you rushed to leave the neighborhood of Naples”. Augustus does not state that Vergil was lodging inside the city, so nothing allows us to think that *a Neapoli* means “from the city of Naples”.

References

- Adams, James Noel (1990), “The Latinity of C. Novius Eunus”, *ZPE* 82, pp. 227-247.
 Adams, James Noel (2003), “The new Vindolanda Writing-Tablets”, *CQ*, n.s. 53, pp. 530-575.
 Adams, James Noel (2005), “The *Bellum Africum*”, in Reinhardt-Lapidge-Adams (2005), pp. 73-96.
 Adams, James Noel (2007), *The regional diversification of Latin 200 BC – AD 600*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
 André, Jean-Marie (1983), “Mécène écrivain (avec, en appendice, les fragments de Mécène)”, *ANRW* II 30.3, pp. 1765-1787.

⁵⁸ Cic. *Brut.* 151 *non enim facile quem dixerim plus studi quam illum* (sc. Servium) *et ad dicendum et ad omnes bonarum rerum disciplinas adhibuisse.*

- Avallone, Riccardo (1962), *Mecenate*, Napoli, Libreria Scientifica Editrice.
- Ax, Wolfgang (2011): *Quintilians Grammatik (Inst. orat. 1, 4-8)*, Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter.
- Bardon, Henry (1968²), *Les empereurs et les lettres latines d'Auguste à Hadrien*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- Bejarano, Virgilio (1974), "Augusto escritor", *HAnt* 4, pp. 87-109.
- Briscoe, J. (2005), "The language and style of the fragmentary republican historians", in Reinhardt-Lapidge-Adams (2005), pp. 53-72.
- Burmman, Peter (1720), *M. Fabii Quintilianii De institutione oratoria libri duodecim*, voll. I-II, Lugduni Batavorum, apud Joannem de Vivie.
- Byrne, Shannon N. (2006), "Petronius and Maecenas: Seneca's calculated criticism", in Shannon N. Byrne-Edmund P. Cueva-Jean Alvares (edd.), *Authors, Authority, and Interpreters in the Ancient Novel*, Groningen, Barkhuis Publishing & Groningen University Library, pp. 83-111.
- Calboli, Gualtiero (1962), *Studi grammaticali*, Bologna, Nicola Zanichelli editore.
- Calboli, Gualtiero (1975), "Cicerone, Catone e i neoatticisti", in Alain Michel-Raoul Verdère (edd.), *Ciceroniana. Hommages à Kazimierz Kumaniecki*, Leiden, Brill, pp. 51-103.
- Calboli, Gualtiero (1986), "Nota di Aggiornamento", in Eduard Norden, *La Prosa d'Arte Antica*, Roma, Salerno editrice, vol. II, pp. 971-1185.
- Calboli, Gualtiero (1987), "Asianesimo e Atticismo: retorica, letteratura e linguistica", in *Studi di retorica oggi in Italia*, Bologna, Pitagora editrice, pp. 31-53.
- Calboli, Gualtiero (1988), "Asiani (Oratori)", in Francesco Della Corte (ed.), *Dizionario degli scrittori greci e latini*, vol. I, Milano, Marzorati, pp. 215-232.
- Calboli, Gualtiero (1993²): *Cornifici Rhetorica ad C. Herennium*, Bologna, Pàtron (1969¹).
- Calboli, Gualtiero (1997a), "The Asiatic Style of Antony: some considerations", in Beate Czaplá-Tomas Lehmann-Susanne Liell, *Vir bonus dicendi peritus. Festschrift für Alfons Weische zum 65. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, pp. 13-26.
- Calboli, Gualtiero (1997b), "Atticismus", in *DNP* II, coll. 262-263.
- Calboli, Gualtiero (1998), "Le *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone patre*, quelques considérations linguistiques", in Bruno Bureau-Christian Nicolas (edd.), *Moussylanea. Mélanges de linguistique et de littérature anciennes offerts à Claude Moussy*, Louvain-Paris, Peeters, pp. 117-130.
- Calboli, Gualtiero (2000), "The *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone patre*: Asianism and juridical language", in Lucia Calboli Montefusco (ed.), *Papers on Rhetoric* III, Bologna, Clueb, pp. 1-26.
- Calboli Montefusco, Lucia (1979): *Consulti Fortunatiani Ars rhetorica*, Bologna, Pàtron.
- Cavazza, Franco (1989): Aulo Gellio, *Le notti attiche*, libri IX-X, Bologna, Zanichelli.
- Coleman, Robert (1990), "Dialectal variation in republican Latin, with special reference to Praenestine", *PCPhS* 216, pp. 1-25.
- Courtney, Edward (1993): *The fragmentary Latin poets*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Cugusi, Paolo (1973), *Studi sull'epistolografia latina. II Le età ciceroniana e augustea*, Sassari, Gallizzi.

- Cugusi, Paolo (1979): *Epistolographi Latini minores. Volumen II: aetatem Ciceronianam et Augusteam amplectens*, 1 Testimonia et fragmenta, 2 Commentarium criticum, Augustae Taurinorum, in aedibus Paravia.
- De Biasi, Luciano and Ferrero, Anna Maria (2003): *Cesare Augusto Imperatore, Gli atti compiuti e i frammenti delle opere*, Torino, Unione tipografica-editrice torinese.
- Dick, Andrew R. (1996), *A commentary on Cicero, De officiis*, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press.
- Dihle, Albrecht (1957), "Analogie und Attizismus" *Hermes* 85, pp.170-205
- Fairweather, Janet (1981), *Seneca the Elder*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- FPL: Jürgen Blänsdorf, *Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum praeter Enni Annales et Ciceronis Germanicique Aratea*, Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 2011⁴.
- Gagé, Jean (1982), "Auguste écrivain", in *ANRW* II 30.1, pp. 611-623.
- Garcea, Alessandro (2012): *Caesar's De analogia*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Gelsomino, Remo (1958), "Augusti epistula ad Maecenatem. Macrobius, *Saturn.* II 4, 12", *RhM* 101, pp. 147-152.
- Gelsomino, Remo (1959), "Il greco ed i grecismi di Augusto - La vita privata", *Maia* 11, pp. 120-131.
- Giordano, Lidia (2000), "Ottaviano Augusto scrittore. Le lettere private", *MAT* serie V, vol. 24, fasc. 2, pp. 3-52.
- Güngerich, Rudolf (1980), *Kommentar zum Dialogus des Tacitus*, aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von Heinz Heubner, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Halm, Karl (1868-1869), *M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis oratoriae libri duodecim*, voll. I (1868) and II (1869), Lipsiae, in aedibus B. G. Teubnerii.
- Hofmann, Johann Baptist and Szantyr, Anton (1972), *Lateinische Syntax und Stylistik*, München, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Hollis, Adrian S. (2007): *Fragments of Roman Poetry (c. 60 BC-AD 20)*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Ihm, Maximilian (1907): *C. Suetoni Tranquilli De vita Caesarum libri VIII*, Lipsiae, in aedibus B. G. Teubnerii.
- Joseph, Brian D.-Wallace, Rex E. (1992), "Socially determined variation in Ancient Rome", *Language Variation and Change* 4, pp.105-119.
- Kappelmacher, Alfred (1928), "6) C. Maecenas", *RE* XIV.1, coll. 207-229.
- Kaster, Robert (2010), *Studies on the text of Macrobius' Saturnalia*, Oxford-New York, Oxford University Press.
- Kaster, Robert (2011): *Ambrosii Theodosii Macrobiani Saturnalia*, Oxonii, e typographeo Clarendoniano.
- Kienast, Dietmar (2009⁴), *Augustus. Prinzeps und Monarch*, Darmstadt, Primus Verlag.
- Kretschmer, Paul (1892), "Indogermanische Accent- und Lautstudien", *HSP* 31 (n.s. 11), pp. 325-472.

- Kühner, Raphael and Holzweissig, Friederich (1912), *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Erster Teil: Elementar- Formen- und Wortlehre*, Hannover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung.
- Kühner, Raphael and Stegmann, Carl (19765), *Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre*, voll. I-II (mit den Zusätzen und Berichtigungen von Andreas Thierfelder), Hannover, Verlag Hahnsche Buchhandlung.
- Lebek, Wolfgang Dieter (1970), *Verba prisca. Die Anfänge des Archaisierens in der lateinischen Beredsamkeit und Geschichtsschreibung* (Hypomnemata: Heft 25), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Leeman, Anton Daniel (1955), "Le genre et le style historique à Rome: théorie et pratique", *REL* 33, pp. 183-208.
- Leeman, Anton Daniel (1963), *Orationis ratio. The stylistic theories and practice of the Roman orators, historians and philosophers*, vols. I and II, Amsterdam, Adolf M. Hakkert.
- Leumann, Manu (1942), "Literaturbericht für das Jahr 1938", *Glotta* 29, pp. 162-176.
- Leumann, Manu (1977), *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, München, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Levick, Barbara (1976), *Tiberius the politician*, London, Thames and Hudson.
- Lomanto, Valeria (1993), "Due divergenti interpretazioni dell'analogia: la flessione dei temi in -u- secondo Varrone e secondo Cesare" in Diego Poli (ed.), *La cultura in Cesare*, vol. II, Roma, Il calamo, pp. 643-676.
- Mackay, Christopher S. (1999), "Expressions to indicate goal of motion in the colloquial Latin of the Early Empire", *ZPE* 126, pp. 229-239.
- Malcovati, Enrica (1921¹, 1969⁵), *Imperatoris Caesaris Augusti operum fragmenta*, Augustae Taurinorum, in aedibus Paravia.
- Malcovati, Enrica (1970) "*Domos, domuos, domus*", *A&R* 15, pp. 181-183.
- Martzloff, Vincent (2012), "Sens et registre de l'adverbe latin *obiter* à la lumière d'un correspondant sabellique", in Frédérique Biville-Marie Karine Lhommé-Daniel Vallat, *Latin vulgaire-latin tradif IX*, Lyon, Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée-Jean Pouilloux, pp. 609-618.
- Mattiacci, Silvia (1995), "L'attività poetica di Mecenate, tra neoterismo e novellismo", *Prometheus* 21, pp. 67-86.
- Mazzarino, Antonio (1949), "Una nuova pagina di Plinio il Vecchio (II)", *Maia* 2, pp. 43-52.
- Meillet, Antoine (1906), *De quelques innovations de la déclinaison Latine*, Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Miller, Norma P. (1968), "Tiberius speaks: an examination of the utterances ascribed to him in the *Annals* of Tacitus", *AJPh* 89, pp. 1-19.
- Mohl, F. George (1899), *Introduction à la chronologie du latin vulgaire*, Paris, Librairie Émile Bouillon éditeur.
- Mommsen, Theodor (1865¹, 1883²): *Res gestae divi Augusti ex monumentis Ancyrano et Apolloniensi*, Berolini apud Weidmannos.

- Neue, Friedrich and Wagener, Carl (1892-1905): *Formenlehre der Lateinischen Sprache*, I (Leipzig, O. R. Reisland, 1902³), II (Berlin, Verlag von S. Cavalry & Co. 1892³), III (Berlin, Verlag von S. Cavalry & Co., 1897³), IV (Leipzig, O. R. Reisland, 1905³).
- Nicastri, Luciano (1980), "Sul *Maecenas* pseudovirgiliano", *Vichiana* n.s. 9, pp. 258-298.
- Norden, Eduard (1958⁵), *Die antike Kunstprosa*, II voll., B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart.
- ORF: *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta*, tertiis curis edidit Henrica Malcovati, I. Textus, Augustae Taurinorum, in aedibus Paraviae, 1953³.
- Pascal, Carlo (1918), "Il suono dell'u dolce nel latino secondo gli antichi grammatici", *Athenaeum* 6, pp. 34-43.
- Pisani, Vittore (1938), "Augusto e il latino", *ANSP* (s. II) 7, pp. 221-236.
- Pisani, Vittore (1962³), *Grammatica latina storica e comparativa*, Torino, Rosenberg & Selier.
- Pohlenz, Max (1943), "Klemens von Alexandria und sein hellenisches Christentum", *NAWG* 1943, pp. 103-180 [= Max Pohlenz, *Kleine Schriften* I, Hildesheim, Olms 1965, pp. 481-558].
- Reinhardt, Tobias-Lapidge, Michael-Adams, James Noel (edd.), *Aspects of the language of Latin prose*, Oxford, The British Academy-Oxford University Press.
- Rodríguez-Pantoja Márquez, Miguel (1973), "El fragmento poético número 1 de Mecenas", *Habis* 4, pp. 105-113.
- Rolfe, John C. (1914): *Suetonius*, vol. I, London-New York, William Heinemann-Macmillan.
- Russell, Donald A. (2001): *Quintilian, The orator's education. Books 6-8*, Cambridge, Massachusetts-London, Harvard University Press.
- Schanz, Martin and Hosius, Carl (1935⁴), *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, Zweiter Teil: Die römische Literatur in der Zeit der Monarchie bis auf Hadrian, München, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Schmalz, Joseph Hermann (1881), "Über den Sprachgebrauch der nichtciceronischen Briefe in den ciceronischen Briefsammlungen", *ZGW* 35, pp. 87-141.
- Solmsen, Felix (1894), *Studien zur lateinischen Lautgeschichte*, Strassburg, Verlag von Karl Trübner.
- Sommer, Ferdinand (1948), *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, Heidelberg, Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag.
- Stolz, Friedrich (1894), *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. Erster Band [...] Erste Hälfte. Einleitung und Lautlehre, Leipzig, B. G. Teubner
- Stolz, Friedrich and Schmalz, Joseph Hermann (1900³), *Lateinische Grammatik. Laut- und Formenlehre. Syntax und Stilistik*, München, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Stroux, Johannes (1912), *De Theophrasti virtutibus dicendi*, Lipsiae, in aedibus B. G. Teubneri.
- Swiggers, Pierre and Wouters, Alfons (2002), "De adverbio: statut et significations de l'adverbe chez les grammairiens latins", in Pierre Swiggers-Alfons Wouters (edd.), *Grammatical Theory and Philosophy of Language in Antiquity*, Leuven-Paris-Sterling (Virginia), Peeters, pp. 287-323.

Syme, Ronald (1958), *Tacitus*, II voll., Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Vänänen, Veikko (1966³), *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes*, Berlin, Akademie-Verlag.

Volkman, Richard (1885²), *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer in systematischer Übersicht*, Leipzig, B. G. Teubner.

Willis, James (1984³): *Ambrosii Theodosii Macrobiani Saturnalia*, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae, in aedibus B. G. Teubneri.

Wölfflin, Eduard (1893), "Elegantia Caesaris", *ALLG* 8, pp. 142-143.

Wölfflin, Eduard (1896), "Epigraphische Beiträge. II", *SBAW*, Jahrgang 1896, 160-187.