

depicted as a personal letter written by Catilina. But there can be no doubt that, stylistically-oriented artificial elaborations apart, case-forms were considered by the Romans the 'higher' variant of the two, and that datives and genitives replacing expected or 'more normal' prepositional phrases are to be dubbed, if not 'hyperurbanisms',<sup>22)</sup> at any rate urbanisms. Literary Latin was formed and crystallized by a process of choosing, by elimination of one of two coexisting doublets,<sup>23)</sup> which led to unification and resulted in imparting the chosen form a distinct character of a 'high' form.

As to partitive objects and subjects, fairly common in the form of prepositional phrases, it may well be that it is under this form that they originated: partitive construction, like prepositional phrase (as against case-form), belongs to the domain of popular style.<sup>24)</sup> And since the consciousness of the difference of levels between prepositional phrase (in lower language) vs. inflected case-form (in more elevated language) had become well-rooted—and hypercorrections bear witness to that—this correspondence became operative also for partitive constructions. Pliny's *uenire uictimarum* should be evaluated as a literary counterpart, or even substitute, of a prepositional partitive construction, a substitute chosen because of the stigma of colloquialism marking the prepositional phrase.

## Adjectives in -osus and Latin Poetic Diction

By PETER E. KNOX, Columbia University

It used to be a generally accepted notion among commentators on Latin poetry that adjectives formed with the suffix *-osus* were principally a feature of colloquial diction. The assessment of *formosus* by B. Axelson is typical: "Wie so manche andere Bildungen auf *-osus* hatte *formosus* ein etwas triviales Gepräge, das es für die hohe Di-

---

<sup>22)</sup> So Löfstedt, *Syntactica* I<sup>2</sup>, 191.

<sup>23)</sup> See W. Kroll, "Die Entstehung der lateinischen Schriftsprache", *Glotta* 22 (1933), pp. 1-27, especially p. 13.

<sup>24)</sup> See Szantyr, p. 59.

stanzsprache als weniger geeignet denn *pulcher* erscheinen ließ.”<sup>1)</sup> It is true that adjectives of this type are common in contexts that suggest currency in the spoken language: 63 adjectives in *-osus* are found in the comedies of Plautus<sup>2)</sup> and they are common as well in Cicero’s letters and the surviving portions of Petronius’ *Satyricon*.<sup>3)</sup> But this represents a one-sided view. Certainly there is nothing intrinsically colloquial about the suffix; and the same properties that led to its popularity in the *sermo plebeius* were responsible for its adaptation by the Roman poets. Indeed, the frequent appearance of epithets in *-osus* in Latin epic has led other scholars to an entirely different appraisal. According to this formulation, the use of adjectives in *-osus* is a conscious poeticism designed to provide the Romans with equivalents for Greek epic adjectives in *-όεις* and *πολυ-*.<sup>4)</sup> But the practice of the Roman poets is not entirely consistent with either view, for each poet makes use of a different set of adjectives in *-osus*. The explanation for this variation obviously depends upon a number of stylistic criteria. As one scholar put it recently, it is clear that “some adjectives in *-osus* are (to put it simply) ‘poetic’, others ‘colloquial’ and that context and usage must determine the nature and poetic purpose of any word.”<sup>5)</sup> But some general tendencies do emerge from the study of examples. An examination of the distribution of adjectives in *-osus* throughout Latin poetry of the classical period will help to distinguish the circumstances under which the form might be considered to have a poetic or colloquial tone. In this context it will also be necessary to examine the

<sup>1)</sup> *Unpoetische Wörter* (Lund 1945), 61. For some reservations on Axelson’s work see the review by A. Ernout, *RPh* 21 (1947), 55–70. Cf. F. T. Cooper, *Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius* (New York 1895), 122–32; W. A. Baehrens, *Sprachlicher Kommentar zur vulgärlateinischen Appendix Probi* (Halle 1922), 118–19; F. Ruckdeschel, *Archaismen und Vulgarismen in Horaz I* (Munich 1910), 18.

<sup>2)</sup> This figure is taken from A. Maniet, *Plaute: Lexique Inverse* (Hildesheim 1969), 62–63.

<sup>3)</sup> There are 46 adjectives in *-osus* in Cicero’s letters, while Petronius uses 42.

<sup>4)</sup> E. g. M. Leumann, “Die lateinische Dichtersprache”, *MH* 4 (1947), 130: “Ohne Zusammenhang mit metrischen Bedürfnissen, vielmehr als Wiedergabe griechischer epischer Adjektive auf *-όεις* und Komposita mit *πολυ-* sind im Latein der Dichtersprache in der Funktion von Epitheta ornantia die Adjektiva auf *-osus* stark vermehrt worden.” Cf. also Leumann’s *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (Munich 1977), 341–42; Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich 1965), 754; P. Fedeli, *Properzio: Il primo libro delle elegie* (Florence 1980), 462.

<sup>5)</sup> D. O. Ross, *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, Mass. 1969), 54.

relationship between Latin forms in *-osus* and their counterparts in Greek.

With the exception of comedy already noted, adjectives in *-osus* appear to have had little role in Roman poetry before the neoterics. Only three such adjectives are found in the fragments of Ennius' *Annals*, and Lucretius has only nine adjectives in *-osus* in the *De Rerum Natura*.<sup>6)</sup> Vergil may fairly be said to have been the first to import adjectives in *-osus* into Latin poetic diction on a large scale. He uses 40 adjectives in *-osus* a total of 106 times:<sup>7)</sup>

*animosus, annosus, aquosus, cliosus, dumosus, formosus, fragosus, frondosus, fumosus, generosus, harenosus, herbosus, lacrimosus, lapidosus, latebrosus, limosus, maculosus, montosus, muscosus, nemorosus, nimbosus, onerosus, palmosus, piscosus, ramosus, religiosus, rimosus, saetosus, saxosus, sinuosus, spumosus, squamosus, tenebrosus, umbrosus, undosus, uadosus, uentosus, uillosus, uirosus, uitiosus*

A glance at this list is of little help in determining the stylistic level of this formation. For this purpose it is necessary to look beyond the poets to the distribution of these adjectives in prose.

The potential of the *-osus* suffix for forming descriptive adjectives is of obvious utility in many phases of the language. In prose these adjectives are most notably at home in the treatises of the agricultural writers, where they serve an obvious purpose in conveying information about the quality of soil, topography, and other details.<sup>8)</sup> In the *De Agricultura* Cato uses 18 adjectives in *-osus*, several of which are later employed by Vergil: *aquosus, fumosus, harenosus, herbosus, umbrosus, uentosus*.<sup>9)</sup> From his practice in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* it is clear that Vergil deliberately cultivates many adjectives in *-osus* for their descriptive potential and rustic associations. Thus, in the opening book of the *Georgics* Vergil begins the section on irrigation:

---

<sup>6)</sup> Ennius: *frondosus, imperiosus, studiosus*. Lucretius: *globosus, mammosus, mendosus, neruosus, odiosus, ramosus, scelerosus, scruposus, uentosus*.

<sup>7)</sup> The list provided by Ernout (above, n. 1), 64, on which Ross (above, n. 5), 56 relies, contains only 26. Ernout gives a fuller, but still incomplete, list in his monograph, *Les adjectives latins en -osus et en -ulentus* (Paris 1948), 82.

<sup>8)</sup> See Cooper (above, n. 1), 122.

<sup>9)</sup> The remaining adjectives in Cato are *calamitosus, cariosus, cretosus, fistulosus, flexuosus, inuidiosus, luxuriosus, morbosus, rubricosus, stercorosus, studiosus, sumptuosus*. Similarly, Varro uses 29 adjectives in *-osus* 70 times, Columella 102 adjectives in *-osus* 327 times.

umida solstitia atque hiemes orate serenas,  
agricolae; hiberno laetissima puluere farra,  
laetus ager.

(*Geo.* 1.100–102)

As Macrobius informs us, this passage contains a close imitation of a country song: *hiberno puluere, uerno luto grandia farra, camille, metes*.<sup>10</sup>) The rustic associations continue with the description of a channel across the slope:

et, cum exustus ager morientibus aestuat herbis,  
ecce supercilio *clinosi* tramitis undam  
elicit.

(*Geo.* 1.107–9)

This is the first attested occurrence of *clinosus*. Vergil uses the word once more in the *Georgics* (2.212), and it appears twice in Ovid (*Am.* 1.14.11, *Fast.* 3.415), but is otherwise common during the classical period only in Columella and the elder Pliny.<sup>11</sup>) This adjective has no recognizable equivalent in Greek epic diction, nor does it appear in a context which suggests that background.

A similar case is *muscosus*. It is first attested in Latin prose in a letter from Cicero to his brother in a detailed account of the condition of an estate: *iam nihil alsius, nihil muscosius* (*Q. fr.* 3.16). *Muscosus* is introduced into poetry by Catullus and adopted by Vergil in the *Eclogues*:

*muscosi* fontes et somno mollior herba,  
et quae uos rara uiridis tegit arbutus umbra,  
solstitium pecori defendite.

(*Ecl.* 7.45–47)

Neither the content nor diction of this passage suggests epic. In poetry the adjective is found again only in Propertius, while elsewhere it is at home only in the prose treatise of Varro and Pliny.<sup>12</sup>) For Vergil's contemporary readers the associations of this adjective in *-osus* could certainly not have depended on familiarity with Greek epic, which knew no equivalent form.

<sup>10</sup>) *Macr.* 5.20.18; cf. Buechner, *FPL*<sup>2</sup>, p.42.

<sup>11</sup>) Cf. *TLL* III.1356.29 ff. There is an isolated occurrence at *Juv.* 5.55.

<sup>12</sup>) *Prop.* 2.19.30, 2.30.26, 3.3.26; *Varro R.* 1.9.5; *Plin. Nat.* 12.9. Cf. *TLL* VIII.1698.78 ff.

Vergil applies the same process of selection and adaptation to the diction of the *Aeneid*. A case in point is found in the catalogue of Italian heroes in the Seventh Book:

et te *montosae* misere in proelia Nersae,  
Vfens, insignem fama et felicibus armis.  
(*Aen.* 7.744–45)

This is an isolated occurrence in poetic diction of *montosus*, an adjective commonly found in prose treatises. Thus Varro *R.* 2. 1. 16: “pas-cendi . . . ratio triplex, in qua regione quamque potissimum pascas et quando et qui, ut capras in *montosis* potius locis quam in herbidis campis.”<sup>13)</sup> The equivalent Greek form *ὄρώδης* is not attested in epic diction. Vergil’s use of *montosus* seems to be motivated by his interest in conveying the variety of the Italian landscape in vivid notices rather than the suggestion of Homeric epic. Indeed, the emphasis that has been laid upon the association of adjectives in *-osus* with Greek adjectives in *-όεις* or *πολυ-* seems to have been largely misplaced.<sup>14)</sup>

Vergil’s allusions to the epic, that is Homeric, background are purposeful and usually clear. Thus his description of the Ionian islands:

iam medio apparet fluctu nemorosa Zacynthos  
Dulichiumque Sameque et Neritos ardua saxis.  
(*Aen.* 3.270–71)

These lines are a clear reminiscence of a Homeric passage, and *nemorosa* an equivalent for *ύλήεις*:

Δουλιχίῳ τε Σάμῃ τε καὶ ύλήεντι Ζακύνθῳ  
(*Od.* 1.246)

But not every adjective with such an equivalent form in Greek epic is meant to evoke that background. For example, commentators suggest that the adjective *harenosus* recalls Homeric *ήμαθόεις*, but there is little to suggest this in its unique appearance in Vergil’s description of Mercury’s flight to Libya:

haud aliter terras inter caelumque uolabat  
litus harenosum ad Libyaee.  
(*Aen.* 4.256–57)

<sup>13)</sup> *TLL* VIII.1459.78–80 “in dactylis inde a Verg.” is somewhat misleading. In poetry of the classical period it is attested elsewhere only at Stat. *Theb.* 4.179.

<sup>14)</sup> For example, of the six adjectives cited by Leumann, “Die lat. Dichtersprache” (above, n.4), 130, three have no such equivalents: *frondosus*, *nimbosus*, *squamosus*.

Homeric *ἡμαθόεις* is a fixed epithet for Pylos, with different associations. If Vergil has a Greek context in mind here, it is probably Apollonius of Rhodes: *Ἄβαρνίδος ἡμαθόεσσαν | ἡίονα*. 1.932–33. But *harenosus* is an old form, attested in prose as early as Cato and recurring frequently in later technical writers.<sup>15</sup> If Vergil did have in mind Homeric *ἡμαθόεις*, it is a significant indication of his method in general that he uses a familiar Latin word. *Harenosus* is later adopted by Propertius in his Fourth Book at 4.1.103 *harenosum Libyae Iouis antrum*, and at 4.4.19 *uidit harenosis Tatium proludere campis*. It becomes a regular epithet in Ovid's poetry, where it occurs five times, and is then passed to the poetic stock of Flavian epic, a familiar pattern.

Adjectives thus assimilated to epic diction from earlier associations in prose treatises may properly be called "poetic". But their poetic quality does not derive from reminiscence of Greek equivalents. Of the adjectives in -osus employed by Vergil, only eight others have such equivalents in Homer: *fumosus* : *αἰθαλόεις*, *herbosus* : *ποιήεις*, *limosus* : *ἰλυόεις* (A. R.), *piscosus* : *ἰχθυόεις*, *saxosus* : *παιπαλόεις*, *umbrosus* : *σκιόεις*, *uentosus* : *ἠνεμόεις*, *uillosus* : *λαχνήεις*. But it is not clear that in any case Vergil means specifically to recall the epic form. At the beginning of the Aristaeus episode of the Fourth *Georgic* Vergil describes the sources of the great rivers:

Phasimque Lycumque  
et caput unde altus primum se erumpit Enipeus,  
unde pater Tiberinus et unde Aniena fluenta  
*saxosus*que sonans Hypanis Mysusque Caicus  
(*Geo.* 4.367–70)

Vergil uses *saxosus* twice elsewhere (*Ecl.* 5.84, *Geo.* 2.111), but not in his epic, where he prefers *saxeus*. Once again, *saxosus* is found frequently in prose treatises, and its use in verse apparently evokes this background, not epic *παιπαλόεις*. It occurs once later in Propertius and Ovid's *Ibis*, but is common only in Silius. Similarly, although *uentosus* might appear an obvious reminiscence of Homeric *ἠνεμόεις*,<sup>16</sup> that might not have been its only, or most important association. It occurs as early as Cato and never becomes exclusively poetic pro-

<sup>15</sup>) Cato *Agr.* 34.2, 131; Colum. 4.22.8, 8.16.8, 8.17.9; Vitruv. 2.3.1, 2.6.5, 8.6.3; Plin. *Nat.* 6.46, 17.44, 18.134.

<sup>16</sup>) So Ross (above, n. 5), 54; Leumann, *Laut- und Formenlehre* (above, n. 4), 342.

perty.<sup>17)</sup> Similar reservations may be expressed in the case of exclusively poetic adjectives such as *piscosus*. While Vergil's *piscoso ... amne* (*Aen.* 11.457) may faintly recall Homeric *πόντω ἐν ἰχθυόεντι* (*Il.* 16.746), it is also a convenient substitute for the metrically intractable *pisculentus*.<sup>18)</sup> The poetic quality of adjectives in *-osus* employed by Vergil is fixed not by discovering Greek equivalents, but by assessing the associations of each word in context. Vergil, as we have seen, created a stock of ornamental epithets by drawing on the descriptive adjectives already found in prose treatises. A brief look at Ovid will find this process still at work in his poetry.

Of the adjectives in *-osus* that Vergil may fairly be said to have imported from the descriptive vocabulary of rustic Latin, a great many found their way into Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: *aquosus*, *dumosus*, *harenosus*, *herbosus*, *lapidosus*, *limosus*, *maculosus*, *nemorosus*, *nimbosus*, *onerosus*, *piscosus*, *ramosus*, *sinuosus*, *squamosus*, *tenebrosus*, *umbrosus*, *uillosus*. Many of these words pass on to the diction of the Flavian epics, where few new additions are found;<sup>19)</sup> however, the process of adaptation remains active in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. *Creto-sus* is a common word in the treatises of Cato and Varro, as well as other technical writers.<sup>20)</sup> But in poetry it occurs only once, in the Seventh Book of the *Metamorphoses* in a catalogue of the Cyclades:

hinc humilem Myconum *cretosaque* rura Cimoli  
florentemque Syron, Cythnon, planamque Seriphon  
marmoreamque Paron.

(*Met.* 7.463–65)

Neither this adjective nor the alternative *creteus*, attested only at *Lucretius* 4.298, won wider acceptance in poetry. Vergil, for instance, preferred circumlocution with the noun: *rapidum cretae ... Oaxen*, *Ecl.* 1.65. But in order to expand the resources of poetic diction available for landscape description in the *Metamorphoses* Ovid, as Vergil had done before him, was willing to adapt the vocabulary of technical Latin. Other adjectives in *-osus* which occur in the *Metamorphoses* and elsewhere are attested only in the prose agricultural treatises.

<sup>17)</sup> Cf. *OLD* s.v.

<sup>18)</sup> This form occurs as early as *Plat.* *Rud.* 907 and *Cato Hist.* 97 P.

<sup>19)</sup> Statius, for example, coins no new adjectives in *-osus*, and in the *Thebaid* uses 28 adjectives of this type 64 times. Of these, 26 had been used earlier by Ovid. *Silius Italicus* 25 (79 times), *Valerius Flaccus* 13 (21), *Lucan* 28 (46).

<sup>20)</sup> Cf. *TLL* IV.1188.37–61.

tises: *fruticosus* (6.344),<sup>21</sup>) *iuncosus* (7.231, in the catalogue of lands visited by Medea),<sup>22</sup>) *lacterosus* (11.33),<sup>23</sup>) *torosus* (7.429, of oxen).<sup>24</sup>)

The common view that adjectives in -osus are meant to evoke Greek forms in -όεις and πολυ- must be modified somewhat. The characteristics of the adjectives used by the technical writers make them ideally suited for use in descriptive narrative. Not surprisingly, therefore, we find relatively few in love elegy. Tibullus has only seven adjectives used 13 times:<sup>25</sup>)

*formosus, fumosus, herbosus, iocosus, pomosus, umbrosus, uillosus*

Propertius has 28 adjectives in -osus 79 times, but the majority are found only in the Fourth Book, where the poet is experimenting with objective narrative in elegiac verse:<sup>26</sup>)

*animosus, annosus, aquosus, dumosus, formosus, generosus, hederosus, herbosus, inuidiosus, muscosus, nebulosus, numerosus, operosus, paludosus, pecorosus, plumosus, pomosus, pretiosus, ramosus, rimosus, rugosus, saetosus, saxosus, sinuosus, spinosus, squamosus, umbrosus, uentosus*

But there is one adjective that plays a significant role in erotic elegy, *formosus*, a word that, as Axelson noted,<sup>27</sup>) never appears in epic poetry. Some accounting for this peculiarity of poetic diction seems necessary.

Apart from descriptive epithets associated with the *sermo rusticus*, there was another class of adjectives in -osus open to the Roman poets. Unlike Greek adjectives in -όεις, a great many adjectives in -osus were derived from abstract nouns. Such formations gained wide currency in Latin and, as Ernout notes, “ils sont demeurés, et se sont même accrus dans les langues romanes modernes comme le français et l’italien, et c’est un des éléments les plus productifs que le latin leur ait fournis.”<sup>28</sup>) The apparent connection of such formations in -osus with the *sermo plebeius* is clearly reflected in their distribution

<sup>21</sup>) Also at *Her.* 2.121. It occurs 41 times in *Plin. Nat.*, but not afterwards; cf. *TLL* VI, 1. 1447. 64 ff.

<sup>22</sup>) *Plin. Nat.* 18. 46.

<sup>23</sup>) E. g. *Varro R.* 2. 7. 13, *Colum.* 6. 37. 6; cf. *TLL* VII, 2. 829. 27 ff.

<sup>24</sup>) Compare Ovid’s *colla torosa boum* with *Colum.* 6. 13 *torosa ceruix boum*.

<sup>25</sup>) Cf. Ross (above, n. 5), 59, n. 130.

<sup>26</sup>) The underlined words are found only in *Prop.* 4.

<sup>27</sup>) Axelson (above, n. 1), 61.

<sup>28</sup>) Ernout (above, n. 7), 79.



throughout the literary texts. A selection from Plautus will illustrate: *aerumnosus, curiosus, dolosus, fastidiosus, gloriosus, imperiosus, mali-tiosus, odiosus, pretiosus, sycophantiosus, uitiosus*.<sup>29)</sup> Such formations are an important feature of Latin poetic diction, but they are not distributed evenly throughout the surviving texts. Their use is the result of a deliberate stylistic choice by the poet, as demonstrated by the practice of Catullus. David Ross noted that the adjectives in *-osus* employed by Catullus in his longer poems are familiar poetic types.<sup>30)</sup> In fact, these adjectives fall into the category of descriptive epithets of the type discussed above: *frondosus, muscosus, nervosus, spinosus, spumosus, torosus, uentosus*. Ross further noted that most of the adjectives found in the polymetric poems do not reappear in later poetry. The colloquial nature of these adjectives is suggested by the occurrence of some illicit formations from adjectives: *ebriosus, tenebricosus*.<sup>31)</sup> But there is a further factor to be considered. Of the 14 remaining adjectives in *-osus* found in the polymetrics, eight are formed from abstract nouns: *curiosus, febriculosus, iocosus, laboriosus, morbosus, otiosus, sumptuosus, uerbosus*. Catullus' use of these colloquial adjectives in the polymetric poems reflects his interest in affecting the lively language of everyday idiom.

Adjectives in *-osus* of this type are virtually excluded from epic poetry of the following period, although some forms were clearly adapted to poetry. The earliest attestation of *annosus* in Laberius suggests colloquial associations,<sup>32)</sup> but the word is introduced into Roman poetry by Vergil in an epic simile:

ac uelut *annoso* ualidam cum robore quercum  
Alpini Boreae nunc hinc nunc flatibus illinc  
eruere inter se certant.

(*Aen.* 4.441–43)

Vergil uses *annosus* twice more in descriptions of trees (6.282, 10.766), and it is used freely by poets after Vergil, with only isolated

---

<sup>29)</sup> Other examples from Petronius: *ambitiosus, animosus, contumeliosus, copiosus, curiosus, fabulosus, famosus, fastidiosus, furiosus, generosus, gloriosus, gratiosus, ignominiosus, imperiosus, ingeniosus, inuidiosus, laboriosus, libidinosus, noxiosus, periculosus, pretiosus, rabiosus, religiosus, speciosus, superstitiosus*. From Cicero's letters: *ambitiosus, calamitosus, exitiosus, flagitiosus, iniuriosus, mendosus, officiosus, periculosus, perofficiosus, quaestuosus, seditiosus, suspiciosus, uerbosus*.

<sup>30)</sup> Ross (above, n. 5), 54–55.

<sup>31)</sup> Ross (above, n. 5), 56–57.

<sup>32)</sup> *CRF* fr. 80 *non mammosa, non annosa, non bibosa, non procax*.

appearances in prose until late antiquity.<sup>33)</sup> But it becomes poetic only by reason of the use poets made of it.<sup>34)</sup> But this case is exceptional. Vergil uses only two other such adjectives in the *Aeneid*: *animosus*, 12. 277; *religiosus*, 2. 365.<sup>35)</sup> Valerius Flaccus has only *annosus*, *numerosus*, and *spatiosus*; Silius *animosus*, *annosus*, *generosus* and *numerosus*. But those poets who deliberately cultivated colloquial forms use these adjectives in great numbers. Horace, for example, in the *Satires* and *Epistles*:

*ambitiosus, annosus, damnosus, dolosus, famosus, fastidiosus, formosus, fumosus, furiosus, generosus, ignominiosus, insidiosus, iocosus, litigiosus, mendosus, morosus, officiosus, perniciosus, rabiosus, speciosus, stomachosus, studiosus, uitiosus*

And similar distributions are found in the other satirists and Martial.<sup>36)</sup>

An apparent exception to this pattern is Ovid's hexameter verse. In the mixed style of the *Metamorphoses* Ovid often includes elements of everyday speech for vivid or emotional effect.<sup>37)</sup> In his hexameter poem Ovid uses almost twice as many adjectives in *-osus* (53) as Vergil in the *Aeneid* (28):

*ambitiosus, animosus, annosus, aquosus, cretosus, damnosus, dolosus, dumosus, formosus, fragosus, frondosus, fruticosus, furiosus, generosus, harenosus, herbosus, inambitiosus, ingeniosus, insidiosus, inuidiosus, iocosus, iuncosus, lacertosus,*

<sup>33)</sup> Cf. *TLL* II. 114. 30–65.

<sup>34)</sup> The Greek equivalent *πολυετής* is not common and cannot appear in hexameters. Cf. Brink on Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.26: "The word [annosus] however is favored by different Augustans for quite different reasons. To Horace it may have sounded realistic and somewhat colloquial, to Virgil, on the contrary, elevated, and to the elegists different again."

<sup>35)</sup> *animosus* is also found at *Geo.* 2. 441, 3. 81.

<sup>36)</sup> Juvenal: *ambitiosus, clamosus, damnosus, formosus, furiosus, generosus, inuidiosus, luxuriosus, numerosus, pretiosus, prodigiosus, ruinosus, uerbosus* from a total of 25 adjectives in *-osus*. Persius: *aerumnosus, generosus, mendosus, morosus, rabiosus* from a total of 13. Martial: *ambitiosus, animosus, annosus, clamosus, contumeliosus, curiosus, damnosus, desidiosus, dolosus, exitiosus, famosus, furiosus, generosus, gloriosus, imperiosus, ingeniosus, insidiosus, inuidiosus, iocosus, libidinosus, luxuriosus, morosus, negotiosus, numerosus, odiosus, officiosus, otiosus, perniciosus, religiosus, studiosus, sumptuosus, uitiosus* from a total of 58.

<sup>37)</sup> Cf. F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen: Kommentar I–III* (Heidelberg 1969), 7: "Die Metamorphosen kennen die hohe epische Sprache, sie kennen ebenso Wortfolgen von verblüffender, klingender rhetorischer Kühnheit und ein Latein, das in eigenartiger Weise der Prosa nahesteht."

*lacrimosus, lapidosus, limosus, maculosus, mendosus, nemorosus, nervosus, nimbosus, niuosus, nodosus, onerosus, operosus, paludosus, piscosus, pretiosus, prodigiosus, pruinosis, ramosus, rugosus, sinuosus, spatiosus, speciosus, spinosus, spumosis, squamosus, studiosus, tenebrosus, torosus, umbrosus, villosus*

In admitting 21 colloquial forms from abstract nouns (underlined above), Ovid differs strikingly from Vergil. In this he is followed to some extent by both Lucan and Statius.<sup>38</sup>) But in his use of one such adjective Ovid is unique among the Roman epic poets, the adjective with which this discussion began, *formosus*. The facts in this case are clear: *formosus* does not occur in the *Aeneid* or in any of the Silver epics.<sup>39</sup>) Vergil does, however, use the word 16 times in the *Eclogues* and once in the *Georgics*. It is also a favorite of the elegists. Propertius has it 35 times, Tibullus 6, and Ovid in the *Amores* 21. In the *Metamorphoses* it is found in contexts in which Ovid is consciously playing against the background of elegiac and neoteric poetry. A typical example is found in the Ninth Book:

paulatim declinat amor, uisuraque fratrem  
culta uenit, nimiumque cupit *formosa* uideri  
et si qua est illic *formosior*, inuidet illi.

(*Met.* 9.461–63)

The story of Byblis draws heavily on the themes and narrative devices of neoteric epyllion. Ovid's poetic vocabulary is an eclectic selection from the entire range of Latin traditions, in conscious distinction to the high style of Vergilian epic.

Vergil's avoidance of *formosus* in the *Aeneid* has been explained by Ernout as due to the absence of strictly physical beauty as a consideration in his descriptions there.<sup>40</sup>) A more important consideration may be the colloquial ring of adjectives in *-osus* derived from abstract nouns. Ovid's usage in the *Metamorphoses* is consistent with the blending of styles observable throughout the poem. *Formosus* is used 23 times in the *Metamorphoses*, only slightly less often than the preferred epic word *pulcher* (26). The adjectives in *-osus* employed

<sup>38</sup>) Statius in the *Thebaid* has 12: *ambitiosus, animosus, annosus, dolosus, generosus, imperiosus, insidiosus, inuidiosus, numerosus, operosus, prodigiosus, spatiosus*; Lucan, likewise 12: *ambitiosus, annosus, clamosus, damnosus, famosus, formosus, generosus, imperiosus, inuidiosus, luxuriosus, numerosus, pretiosus*.

<sup>39</sup>) An exception is the single occurrence at Luc. 10.366.

<sup>40</sup>) Ernout (above, n. 1), 65. So, too, Brink on Hor. *AP* 87–88.

by the Roman poets represent a broad range of associations. On occasion it is clear that they intended specific reminiscence of Greek forms. But more often than not the poetic purpose of each word is discoverable only by isolating its range of reference in the traditions of Roman poetry.

## Lateinisch *lūcēre*

VON ALFRED BAMMESBERGER, Eichstätt

Daß *lūcēre* 'leuchten, hell sein' im Altlateinischen auch die klar kausative Bedeutung 'ein Licht leuchten lassen' hatte, ist wohlbekannt. Abgesehen von dem bei einem Kausativum des Typs *monēre* unerwarteten sigmatischen Perfekt *lūxī*, ist das transitive Verb problemlos als Reflex einer durch ai. *rocáyati* und av. *raočayeiti* erweisbaren Ausgangsform idg. *\*louk-éye-* (Wurzel *\*leuk-*), die wahrscheinlich auch in heth. *lukkizzi* vorliegt<sup>1)</sup>, erklärbar.

Für das „Zustandsverb“ setzt Watkins, Hittite and Indo-European studies: The denominative statives in *-ē-*. Transactions of the Philological Society 1971, 51–93 die Vorform als idg. *\*leuk-ē-* (69) an. Auf diesem Weg ist der Lautstand von *lūcēre* (intr.) tatsächlich gut erklärbar. Aber wie aus Watkins's reichhaltiger Sammlung hervorgeht, ist die postulierte Form idg. *\*leuk-ē-* morphologisch durchaus unregelmäßig, da die *-ē-*-Verben generell die schwundstufige Wurzel vor dem Bildungselement aufweisen. Während *\*leuk-ē-* isoliert steht, findet ein Ansatz idg. *\*luk-ē-* bei zahlreichen ähnlich geformten *ē-*-Verben wie etwa idg. *\*rudh-ē-* (> lat. *rubēre*, air. *ruidi*, ahd. *rotēn*, aksl. *rŭděti sę*, lit. *rudėti*)<sup>2)</sup> Anschluß.

<sup>1)</sup> Karl Hoffmann, KZ 82 (1968) 214 ff. (= Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik 251 ff.) hatte dagegen heth. *lukkizzi* < *\*leuk-e-ti* (vgl. ai. *rocate*) als thematisches Verb eingestuft; doch siehe noch Warren Cowgill, More evidence for Indo-Hittite: The tense-aspect systems. Proceedings of the eleventh international congress of linguists (1975), S. 563 und Stephanie W. Jamison, Function and Form in the *-áya-*Formations of the Rig Veda and Atharva Veda (1983), S. 132.

<sup>2)</sup> Heinrich Wagner, Zur Herkunft der *ē-*-Verba in den indogermanischen Sprachen (Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der germanischen Bildungen) (Diss. Zürich 1950) S. 6 weist darauf hin, daß es sich bei idg. *\*rudh-ē-* nicht um ein De-