**Semnoths and Dialect Gloss in the Odussia of Livius Andronicus**

John Michael Kearns

# ΣΕΜΝΟΤΗΣ AND DIALECT GLOSS
## IN THE *ODUSSIA* OF LIVIUS ANDRONICUS

The extent to which Livius Andronicus reflects Greek literary traditions and Alexandrian literary theory has been the subject of various studies. The most recent, an article by George A. Sheets entitled "The Dialect Gloss, Hellenistic Poetics and Livius Andronicus," adduces linguistic support for the view that Andronicus' poetry demonstrates unmistakable Alexandrian influence.[1] Sheets maintains that the tragic and epic fragments of Andronicus reveal a number of glosses culled from Italic dialects spoken in the areas surrounding Rome, the presence of which provides ample proof that Andronicus employed the dialect gloss "as a device . . . for enhancing the solemnity of the idiom" much like his Alexandrian counterparts (64). Such attempts to identify Andronicus as an Alexandrian ποιητὴς ἅμα καὶ κριτικός represent an understandable and necessary reaction against the myopic criticism of earlier scholarship.[2] The present study is not intended to question the basic premise that Andronicus was cognizant of the literary practices of his time, but rather to urge caution in equating the use of Italic glosses with artistic sophistication. For if Sheets' analysis proves that the poet included such glosses, especially in his translation of Homer's *Odyssey,* this would indeed be evidence of a high degree of literary awareness; but it would also permit the unfavorable conclusion that Andronicus was unable to adapt theory to the linguistic resources available to him. Roman culture of the 3rd century was far from that of Hellenistic Greece, and the Latin language was part of a widely dissimi-

---

[1] *AJP* 102 (1981) 58–78, hereafter cited by page number. For earlier work, see E. Fraenkel, *RE* Suppl. V (1931) 598–607; H. Fränkel, "Griechische Bildung in altrömischen Epen I," *Hermes* 67 (1932) 303–11; S. Mariotti, *Livio Andronico e la traduzione artistica* (Milan 1952); A. Ronconi, "Sulla Tecnica delle antiche traduzioni latine da Omero," *SIFC* n.s. 34 (1962) 5–20.

[2] Sheets (62) uses κριτικός not in the literal sense, i.e., a scholar actively engaged in Homeric textual criticism, but in the broader sense of a poet aware of Homeric criticism. A survey of older handbooks (in English) is indicative of the earlier criticism of Andronicus, e.g., M. S. Dimsdale, *A History of Latin Literature* (London 1915) 15: "To judge by the fragments which survive . . . the work is that of an unskillful translator . . . and the general effect (though this is in part due to the archaic phraseology and the halting rhythm) is quaint, and even grotesque."

lar linguistic milieu; Italic glosses would only show that the poet mistook Oscan and Umbrian words for analogues to Homer's Aeolicisms. I have purposely isolated the epic from the tragedies because, like Sheets, I believe that Andronicus was sensitive to the distinction between tragic and epic diction (61). However, Sheets does not treat the likelihood of glosses in the two genres as separate issues of poetic style, desirable as this would be in order to avoid trying to establish a stylistic technique of one genre by means of the diction of another. The rare occurrence of glosses in later tragedy is indicative only of a given author's tragic diction.[3] This investigation will therefore focus upon the possible presence of Italic glosses in the *Odussia,* paying particular attention to the nature of glosses, Andronicus' epic diction as revealed in the fragments, and the linguistic state of Early Latin.

Sheets traces a critical awareness of dialect glosses (γλῶτται) to Aristotle's *Poetics:*

> The way in which Aristotle distinguishes between "glosses" and other kinds of poetic and unusual words (e.g., neologisms) makes it clear that he thought of the former as dialect words—i.e., words which were, or once had been, current in dialects other than that of the poet and his audience. (58)

One may wonder how this relates to the situation in Latin, which had neither an *Iliad* or *Odyssey* of its own nor a native tradition of literary exegesis. According to Sheets, Andronicus searched for words "analogous to the ornamental glosses" of the Hellenistic poets among "Etruscan, Sabine and other Italic idioms which are known to have much influenced the pre–literary evolution of the Latin language" (65).[4] Indeed, at a very early time Latin borrowed a number of common words, a good example of which is the noun *bos,* so thoroughly assimilated into Early Latin that it had certainly lost all foreign connotations by An-

---

[3] H. D. Jocelyn, *The Tragedies of Ennius* (Cambrige 1969) 183: "Tragedy admitted few words which obviously originated outside the dialect of Latin spoken by the Roman upper classes." But it should not be surprising that Ennius, whose native tongue was likely Umbrian, would gloss his own language on occasion. This is not analogous to Andronicus' situation.

[4] Sheets cites A. Ernout, *Les éléments dialectaux du vocabulaire latin* (Paris 1939). My discussion is based in part on Ernout's research.

dronicus' time.[5] But this is an example of a gradually assimilated loan–word, and not a gloss used with the intention of achieving a literary effect. Realizing this, Sheets rightly distinguishes "between words which have been thoroughly assimilated in Latin . . . and words which still retain a dialect color" (65); therefore, a word must meet certain criteria before it may be considered a gloss. First, the phenomenon must apparently be foreign to Latin; *bos* is suitable on this account since the Latin reflex of I.E. *$g^w$* in initial position is *u* (I.E. *$g^w\bar{o}us$* "cow" > L. *$u\bar{o}s$*), rather than the *b* of Oscan–Umbrian. Second, the phenomenon must be attested in one or more Italic dialects; again, *bos* fulfills the requirements, **bum,** etc., being attested in Umbrian (e.g., IIa 5).[6] And third, the example(s) in Latin must be restricted to very specific poetic environments (67). Here *bos* proves unacceptable as a gloss because it had been assimilated into the general Latin language and was in no way peculiar to poetry. By their very nature, glosses would have to be unassimilated loan–words, since their desired effect was one of added solemnity, something an assimilated word like *bos* would not be likely to lend.

But any attempt to prove that apparently non–Latin words are intentional glosses of unassimilated foreign words runs the risk of being dismissed because of how difficult it is to know a particular word's degree of assimilation. At issue here is whether a word such as *insece* (*Odussia* frag. 1B),[7] if truly foreign to Latin, would have been recognized as non–Latin and therefore a gloss. Sheets considers this and other examples examined below as part of an abandoned experiment to include dialect glosses in epic poetry, arguing that they fit his definition of a gloss and fall out of use within a generation (78). But the fragments of Andronicus' works contain a number of poetic words that are not suspected of being glosses (since they are not attested in Oscan or Umbrian and have native Latin forms) and which disappeared from the

---

[5] The adjective *brūtus* (< I.E. *$g^w r\bar{u}t$*–) would normally have been *$gr\bar{u}tus$* (cf. *grātus*) by the usual development of labiovelars in Latin. And *rūfus* has intervocalic *f* where Latin would have *$r\bar{u}bus$* (< *reudh*–; cf. variant *ruber* < *rudhro*–). Other examples include *lupus* (< *$luk^w$*–) normally *luquus* and later *lucus;* and *mālus* (< *$m\bar{a}d$*–), which shows the non–Latin confusion of *l* and *d*.

[6] In citing Oscan and Umbrian words, those in boldface have been transliterated from the native alphabets; those in italics are in the Latin alphabet.

[7] For Andronicus' fragments I have used Büchner's *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum* (Leipzig 1982).

language within a generation or two, e.g., *noegeum* (frag. 17B), or *top-per* (frag. 18B etc.). Others underwent a change by the time of the Classical period: *dextrabus* (frag. 29B), *gavisi* (frag. 22B), *fitum est* (frag. 32B), and *nequinont* (frag. 11B) for, respectively, *dexteris, gavisus sum, factum est,* and *nequeunt.* The fragments attest to the instability of the language in the mid–third century.[8] Thus, any word claimed to be a gloss invites other interpretations. Because Latin had a history of as-similation from other dialects, it is quite possible that Sheets' glosses already existed in the language (like *bos*) and were, like *topper,* re-stricted to poetry and later fell out of use. This of course assumes the evidence in favor of identifying these words as glosses is unassailable. If not, and if it is unreasonable to suspect them as glosses, they should be viewed as archaisms, the very thing Sheets rejects (67). With these caveats in mind, it is appropriate to turn now to an examination of the evidence.

Sheets begins his treatment of dialect glosses with *insece* (*Odussia* frag. 1B), which he considers to be an Italic gloss because the Latin form would normally show –*qu*– rather than –*c*–, as in the related word *sequor* (68).

> The root–final velar in place of labiovelar in *insece* < \**en–sek*ʷ– is phono-logically anomalous in Latin. We might have expected to find *inseque* in its place. . . . It is surely not coincidental that root–final velar has been generalized throughout the inflectional system of the Umbrian cognate of this same verb . . . (68)

Sheets cites the Umbrian verbs **sukatu** (IV 16) 'let him proclaim' and **prusikurent** (Va 26, 28) 'they shall have declared' to show how the velar has supplanted the labio–velar (68). The expected Umbrian forms would have been \***supatu** and \***prusipurent** since I.E. \**k*ʷ usually be-comes *p* in both Oscan and Umbrian, e.g., Latin *quis,* O.–U. *pis.* But Umbrian's generalization of the velar is analogous to a similar phenom-enon in Latin. The variation *sequor : secutus* (< \**sequutus*) shows that such a generalization did take place when the labio–velar preceded *u.* It is quite possible that the Latin form of the verb also lost the labiality of

the consonant. In addition, forms like *insectio,* in which *-u-* was lost before the following consonant, may have exerted a significant analogical influence.[9] In this environment, it is very likely that *insece* coexisted for a time with forms ending in the labio–velar. Furthermore, *insece* is not restricted to "specific poetic environments" (67); Gellius (18.9.5) cites the form *insecenda* in Cato the Censor.

Sheets turns next to *homōnes,* C. O. Mueller's emendation for mss. *homines* (*Odussia* frag. 25B):[10]

> The peculiarity of the word consists in the predesinential vowel of the stem: *-ō-* instead of *-i-,* a feature which Fraenkel . . . called an archaism. But the linguistic history of Latin rules out the possibility that this word is an archaism. A phonological change of *homōnes* to *homines* cannot be paralleled elsewhere in the language. Nor is there any clear morphological proportion which could account for the change analogically. Indeed the reverse is true. If *homo/homōnis* were the Old Latin inflection, we should expect it to have been supported by, and preserved along with, the inflection of formally similar nouns like *tiro, leno, baro* and *caupo.* (69)

The likelihood that *homōnes* is a gloss is greatly diminished by the realization that the form is not the one which Festus reads (532.4) but an emendation that the most recent editions of Andronicus' fragments do not accept.[11] Sheets accepts the emendation on the grounds that the stem *homōn–* is attested in archaic poetry, and "precesural *homines* would be rhythmically unique in Livius, being the only example of a trisyllabic anapest in this position" (68 n. 40). Although he concedes that Naevius has *homines* in this position, Sheets does not trust him because his "Saturnian technique is at least 40 years later than that of Livius and noticeably more tolerant of resolution" (68 n. 40). But this is a generalization based on very meagre evidence and may be less significant than the fact that *homines* is the form attested in the manuscripts.[12] Moreover, the fragment's survival is due not to Festus' interest in a

---

[9] C. D. Buck, *Oscan and Umbrian Grammar* (Boston 1928) 95.

[10] Sheets incorrectly identifies the author of this emendation as L. Müller rather than C. O. Mueller. L. Müller suggested *homōnes* for *homines* in Andronicus' tragedies, but not in the *Odussia.*

[11] E.g., Morel (1927), Büchner (1982).

[12] O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (Oxford 1985) 278 considers *homōnes* "probable" but believes that "there is no need to consider the Latin *ō* forms dialectal."

variant form of *homines* but in the word *topper;* Festus makes no mention of anything odd about the vocalism of the form in question.

However, from a linguistic standpoint as well, it is unreasonable to accept the word as a gloss. Sheets believes that *homines* goes back to earlier *\*homnes,* with the zero grade stem *\*homne–* in the oblique cases, and that the classical form shows the insertion of an anaptyctic vowel between the nasals; therefore, *homines* would be the earlier form, "the normal reflex of an Indo–European inheritance" (69). However, *\*homne–* was not the usual oblique stem and therefore anaptyxis is not the reason for its formation. A word like *homo : hominis* shows ablaut variation, the alternation of *o/e* as in Latin *genus : generis* (< *\*genos : \*geneses,* Greek γένος : γένεος (< *\*γένεσος*).[13] In n–stems like *homo, ordo,* and *virgo,* the ablaut variation is still present; but by analogy to the nominative, nouns like *tiro : tironis* have lost the ablaut alternations. Thus *homines* always had an *–i–* and so it is wrong to speak of anaptyxis in this situation.[14] Like *nequinont* for *nequeunt, homones* may have been one of the many variant forms of Classical words attested in Early Latin. The evidence of Lithuanian *žmónes* 'men' and Gothic *guma* (gen. *gumins*) 'man' reveals the possibility that both stems represent I.E. variants, or that Umbrian, Latin, and Lithuanian developed the stem quite independently.[15]

Sheets' examination continues with the archaic first declension genitive in *–ās.* Andronicus uses this ending for the names *Monetas* (frag. 21B) and *Latonas* (frag. 19B), and for a single noun *escas* (frag. 31B).

> This a–stem genitive ending has traditionally been considered an archaism. There is no doubt, of course, that the ending is archaic in the sense

[13] Cf. other examples of ablaut φρήν : φρενός, ἀρήν : ἀρνός, ἡγεμών : ἡγεμόνος, ἀγών : ἀγῶνος.

[14] L. R. Palmer, *The Latin Language* (London 1954) 247. According to Palmer, the situation for neuter n–stems is different: for neuter n–stems like *nōmen,* "Skt. *nāma, nāmnas* points to an original declension *\*nōmn̥ : \*nōmn–e/os,* which in Latin would yield *nōmen : \*nōmnis. nōmin–is* etc., represent *\*nōmenis* with the *–en* carried throughout the declension."

[15] M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut– und Formenlehre* (1977) 364 traces the form *homōn–* back to I.E. "'starken' Kasus" nominative and accusative. Cf. C. D. Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (1933) 189: "In L. *homō, hominis* . . . the *in* may represent either *en* or *on,* with regular weakening in medial syllables."

that it preserves an Indo–European inheritance. Latin, however, aban-
doned this ending in favor of $-\bar{a}\bar{\imath}$ (later > $-ae$) which was formed on the
model of the corresponding o–stem ending in $-\bar{\imath}$. The new ending was
better integrated into the Latin declensional system than the inherited
one, and it quickly and completely supplanted the latter. The surrounding
Italic dialects did not possess the o–stem ending in $-\bar{\imath}$ nor, consequently,
did they participate in the a–stem innovation. Instead they preserve and
uniformly attest the inherited ending $-\bar{a}s$. (70–71)

However, because the $-ae$ genitive is likely to have been formed by
analogy to the second declension genitive $-\bar{\imath}$, it could only have arisen
after the I.E. genitive ending *$-osyo$ (Hom. Gr. $-o\iota o$) was supplanted by
$-\bar{\imath}$. The *Lapis Satricanus* shows the forms *Popliosio Valesiosio* (for Clas-
sical *Publiī Valeriī*), evidence that, as late as the 5th century, Latin main-
tained the inherited genitive.[16] Because this form is attested in Early
Latin, the $-\bar{a}\bar{\imath}$ genitive that replaced I.E. *$-\bar{a}s$ by analogy to the second
declension $-\bar{\imath}$ must have been a relatively late innovation (i.e., much
later than Sheets suggests) contingent upon $-\bar{\imath}$ having supplanted $-osio$.
Therefore, there is every expectation that the $-\bar{a}s$ genitive would have
been considered archaic rather than of foreign origin, so that Androni-
cus' *Monetas* and other $-\bar{a}s$ genitives need not be considered glosses but
should be retained among the archaisms of Early Latin.

 Sheets concludes his linguistic analyses with the statement that
"[t]hese . . . examples and perhaps others provide evidence that Livius
did indeed import dialect glosses into the poetic idiom he was craft-
ing . . ." (77). Of these "others" Sheets mentions in a footnote (77 n. 62)
only *amploctens* (*Od.* frag. 14B).

> E.g., *amploctens* (*O*.19 W), an apophonic variant of *amplectens*, contains
> a root vowel which Ernout–Meillet call "obscur" (*Dictionnaire*[4], s.v.
> plecto). Manu Leumann (*Lat. Laut– und Formenlehre* [Munich 1977] 47) is
> more specific: "Eine Vokalstufe *plok* wie in gr. πλόκαμος neben πλέκω ist
> im Verbum unverständlich; aber ein Lautwandel e > o is [sic] hier auch
> unwahrscheinlich." A primary present stem with o–grade ablaut is indeed
> an anomaly in Latin, but not in Umbrian where the phenomenon is not
> infrequent—e.g., **sukatu** 'let him proclaim,' the obscure verb *holtu,* and
> perhaps *purdovitu* 'let him present.' This comparative evidence suggests
> that Livius' *amploctens* may be an Umbrianism.

---

[16]C. M. Stibbe et al., *Lapis Satricanus:* Archeologische Studiën van het Neder-
lands Instituut te Rome, Scripta Minora v (The Hague 1980).

First of all, Umbrian **sukatu** may not be a primary present stem at all, but a denominative verb formed from an a–grade noun *sok$^w$ā–. Second, Sheets admits that *holtu* is obscure, and it is therefore questionable whether the obscure should be used to explain the equally obscure. Third, there is nothing odd about *purdovitu,* as the root *do–* is cognate with Gr. δίδωμι < *dō–, where Latin has favored a secondary *dā–* root for the verb (vs. the nominal form *dō–num*). Consequently, this is not a case of o–grade ablaut. And finally, Latin has other examples of vowel variation in the noun forms *prex : procus* and the verbs *precātum : procitum* (*Od.* frag. 8B). Such forms are parallel to *amplectens : amploctens* so that the latter may be seen simply as a variant stem.

From a linguistic standpoint, then, there is no reason to consider *insece, homōnes, amploctens,* or the *–ās* genitives as glosses. Whether regarded as archaisms or as variant forms that did not survive into the Classical period, all lend themselves to other more likely explanations. But extra–linguistic evidence also suggests that Andronicus did not employ glosses in the *Odussia.* The poet's choice of Latin Saturnians over hexameters is the most apparent indication of an attempt to Romanize the epic.[17] Another is his avoidance of Grecisms (i.e., Greek glosses). This affects every aspect of the language, but none so directly as personal names, especially those of deities. Andronicus addresses not Μοῦσα but the Italian goddess *Camena* (frag. 1B) or, less directly, *diva Monetas filia* (frag. 21B); the king of the gods is *Saturni filie* (frag. 2B) rather than Κρονίδη; and *Morta* (frag. 23B) distributes lots in place of Μοῖρα. Names accompanied by epithets may appear without the epithet, as with *Mercurius* (frag. 19B) for ἐριούνης Ἑρμείας (*Od.* 8.322–23), though *filius Latonas* (frag. 19B) for ἑκάεργος Ἀπόλλων shows that both name and epithet may be rendered by a periphrasis. But when the poet describes Odysseus' arrival at the home of Circe (*ad aedis . . . Circae,* frag. 24B), Circe's name is simply transliterated and, more significantly, the form of the genitive is not the archaic Latin *–ās* genitive but the later colloquial form in *–ae;* the archaic ending is reserved for native characters.

The avoidance of Grecisms also affects syntax, as Greek constructions which later find acceptance in Latin yield to native ones. A good example of this is the translation of the aorist middle participle

---

[17] See Leo (note 8 above) 59–60 on the Romanization of Greek literature and use of Saturnians.

ὀμορξάμενος (*Od.* 8.88) by means of *simul . . . detersit* (frag. 17B), a temporal clause where Latin poetry from Catullus onwards allows the perfect passive participle with an accusative of respect.[18] Andronicus avoids Greek syntax which Roman comedy employs, notably the particle νή with pronouns (e.g., *egone*). Indeed, Greek forms or turns of phrase perhaps considered too familiar are replaced by less vivid and more archaic substitutes. Rather than using the present imperative *age(dum) dic,* also common in comedy (e.g., Plautus *Am.* 783), to translate Homer's ἄγε . . . εἰπὲ (*Od.* 1.169), Andronicus favors a pronoun followed by the future imperative (*tuque . . . narrato,* frag. 7B). Similarly, Patroclus is described as *summus adprimus Patroclus* (frag. 10B) in place of θεόφιν μήστωρ (*Od.* 3.110), an idea that may have been considered too irreverent.[19] This suggests that the use of such forms, contrary to their effect in Homer, would have weakened that very σεμνότης which the poet strived so hard to achieve in Latin. These examples show that wherever possible Andronicus transforms the customs, sentiments, and language of Greece into a Roman heroic poem.[20]

But if, as it appears from the extant fragments, the poet avoided Grecisms (certainly the most logical and immediate source through which to differentiate the language of the epic from that of everyday speech), it is reasonable to question whether he would have made use of Oscan and Umbrian words. Sheets makes no mention of Andronicus' avoidance of Greek, but insists that identifying forms such as *insece* as archaisms "significantly distort[s] our understanding of the method and aesthetics of this poetry" (67):[21]

> . . . the prevailing opinion that dialect glosses are not common in Latin poetry, [is] a preconception which ultimately derives from the puristic prescriptions of *urbanitas,* the stylistic canon of oratorical prose in the Ciceronian age. (67)

Sheets is quite right in pointing out that *urbanitas* found its fullest expression towards the end of the Republic, especially in the rhetorical

---

[18] Catullus provides two early examples in poem 64 (64–65): *non contecta levi velatum pectus amictu, / non tereti strophio lactentis vincta papillas.*

[19] See also Leo (note 8 above) 73–74.

[20] K. Büchner, "Livius Andronicus und die erste künstlerische Übersetzung der europäischen Kultur" *SO* 54 (1979) 45.

[21] Fraenkel (note 1 above) esp. 604.49–607.3 on archaisms.

treatises of Cicero. Of primary concern here is Cicero's disdain for the
speech of orators not originally from Rome. In his article "Cicero on
Extra–Roman Speech," E. S. Ramage synthesizes the evidence for
Cicero's sentiments on non–Roman speech (expressed primarily in *De
Oratore* and *Brutus*).[22] At *Brutus* 169–72, Cicero lists a number of ora-
tors from various parts of Italy: Q. Vettius Vettianus and T. Betucius
Barrus of Asculum (originally Oscan–speaking areas), the Valerii of
Sosa and L. Papirius of Fregellae (Volscians from an area that once
spoke an Umbrian type of language), and C. Rusticelius of Bononia (an
area that spoke Celtic until 196 B.C.). Regardless of the success of any
of these orators, none is capable, in Cicero's judgement, of surpassing
the Roman orator in his manner of speaking.[23] Of lesser merit than the
Italian orators, however, are those whose speech betrays rustic ele-
ments (*rustica vox et agrestis* in *De Oratore* 3.42). With this group Cicero
lists Cotta, and his description of Cotta's speech reveals a tendency to
pronounce *i* as *ē*, a phenomenon considered characteristic of rustic
speech.[24]

   But Ciceronian *urbanitas* is well–documented. Not so easily char-
acterized is an Early Roman prejudice against non–Roman speech. In
an earlier article, "Early Roman Urbanity," Ramage has attempted to
document, although the sources are scanty and his conclusions not
completely convincing, a much earlier negative contrast between what
is Roman and what is non–Roman in lifestyle as well as in speech.[25]
Ramage shows that the term *urbanus* had gained more than "topograph-
ical connotations" as early as Cato, who described the *urbanus homo* as
an inhabitant of the city:

> *Urbanus homo [non] erit cuius multa bene dicta responsaque erunt, et qui
> in sermonibus circulis conuiuiis, item in contionibus, omni denique loco
> ridicule commodeque dicet. Risus erit, quicumque haec faciet orator.*
> (Cato in Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* 6.3.105)

---

[22] E. S. Ramage, "Cicero on Extra–Roman Speech" *TAPA* 92 (1961) 481–94.

[23] Cicero is here in the tradition of Theophrastus and his ἀρεταὶ τῆς λέξεως, chief
among which was Ἑλληνισμός. See Ioannes Stroux, *De Theophrasti Virtutibus Dicendi*
(Leipzig 1912) 9–15.

[24] Ramage (note 22 above) 485 n. 6 quotes Sturtevant, *The Pronunciation of Greek
and Latin* (Philadelphia 1940) 114, who discusses "a long vowel intermediate between *ē*
and *i*." This is similar to the development in Umbrian.

[25] E. S. Ramage, "Early Roman Urbanity," *AJP* 81 (1960) 65–72.

While this is the earliest statement connecting the city dweller with a certain manner of speaking, Ramage cites early indications of a negative attitude towards non–Roman customs and speech. Quintilian (1.5.56) preserves a fragment of Lucilius in which Vettius is scorned for his use of Etruscan, Sabine, and Praenestine speech.[26] Ramage connects another, *Cecilius pretor ne rusticus fiat,* with Caecilius' way of speaking: "[Lucilius] is pointing to the fact that he regarded the flat pronunciation of *ae,* that is, long *e* as rustic."[27] The comedies of Plautus provide a number of indications of the Roman distaste for non–Roman speech, especially in numerous comments about the inhabitants of Praeneste (cf. above Vettius' Praenestinisms). In the *Trinummus* (608–9), Plautus satirizes the Praenestine use of *tammodo* for Roman *modo.* Similarly, in the *Truculentus* (687–91), the title character finds himself under attack for saying *rabonem* instead of *arrabonem,* and *conia* instead of *ciconia,* apparently the result of heavy aphaeresis in Praenestine Latin.[28] Earlier even than Plautus, however, is a fragment from Naevius' *Ariolus* in which the eating habits of Praenestines and Lanuvians are satirized.[29] Although not directly criticizing Praenestine or Lanuvian speech, the fragment reveals a very early negative contrast between the Roman and the non–Roman.

    And yet it should be stressed that, in all instances, what is being criticized is not Italic dialect speech, but Latin dialect speech. Although Cicero's Italian orators were from non–Latin speaking cities (in Cicero's time or earlier), they gave their orations in Latin. The language of Praeneste was Latin, albeit a different variety. And when Lucilius mentions the language of the Sabines, surely he means the dialect of Latin spoken by inhabitants of former Sabine territory, not speakers of an Oscan dialect. The crucial distinction here is that the Italic dialects were not dialects at all, but rather separate languages of the Italic branch of Indo–European. As A. R. Dyck clarifies in a footnote to Sheets' article (78 n. 65): "Oscan, Umbrian, etc. do *not* stand in the

---

    [26]Ramage (note 25 above) 71.

    [27]Ramage (note 25 above) 71 follows F. Marx, *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae* (Leipzig 1904) I, p. 76, line 1130 in combining two lines of Lucilius, one quoted by Varro (*De Lingua Latina* 7.96) *Cecilius ne rusticus fiat* and a similar one quoted by Diomedes (*GLK* I, p. 452) *pretor ne rusticus fiat* so that they read *Cecilius pretor ne rusticus fiat.*

    [28]Ramage (note 25 above) 69.

    [29]O. Ribbeck, ed., *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta:* vol 2, *Comicorum Romanorum Fragmenta* (Hildesheim, 1962: reprint of 1871 ed.) 9–10.

same relation to Latin as Aeolic and Ionic to Attic." Even an educated
Roman would have understood very little Oscan or Umbrian; although,
as seen above, the languages made certain prehistoric inroads on Latin,
they would have struck him not as strange varieties of his own language,
but as something quite foreign.

It remains, however, that as far back as Naevius, Plautus, and
Lucilius there is a thread of ridicule towards non–Roman Latin that
culminated in the Ciceronian period. Thus it would be very surprising to
find Praenestine or rustic glosses in the *Odussia,* even though these
were the very dialects that stood in the same relation to Latin as Aeolic
and Ionic to Attic. And although no mention of Italic speech is extant
before Varro, it is not difficult to imagine that Oscan and Umbrian
speakers of Italy were seen in a similar light, since they did not achieve
the same degree of sophistication from their contacts with Greek cul-
ture as did the Romans. But even if non–Latin speakers in the mid–
third century were not considered the cultural and linguistic inferiors of
the Romans, it would make little sense for Andronicus to employ
glosses from a foreign language nearly as remote as Greek, while at the
same time avoiding glosses from the very language that he is translat-
ing.

Two Classical references to the *Odussia* require a certain amount
of speculation, but they may reveal something about the language of the
poem, especially whether it included Italic glosses. Horace may be
referring to the *Odussia* when he reminisces about Orbilius and the
*carmina* of Livius (*Epistles* 2.1 69–71). If so, this would indicate that the
poem was used as a textbook down to the end of the Republic, and that
Horace was not fond of the epic. But as no concrete reasons are given
for his disfavor, this should perhaps be dismissed as a youthful dislike of
old texts (or perhaps of Orbilius).

At *Brutus* 71 Cicero compares the *Odussia* to a work of Daedalus.
Although it is likely that he was merely using Daedalus as the archetypi-
cal archaic craftsman whose works had grown obsolete, Leo's conten-
tion that he had in mind a comparison not with beautiful works of art
but with the tragic failure of Daedalus' craftsmanship (i.e., the wings of
Icarus) should not be rashly rejected.[30] And yet if the poem contained
too many examples of non–Roman speech or the barbarism Aristotle
warned against (*Poetics* 1458A 22), one would naturally expect Cicero to

[30]Cf. Leo (note 8 above) 75: "Daedalus ist ein zukunftschwerer Name."

condemn it outright. For if Sheets could find four Italic glosses in forty
fragments (and no Greek ones except for a name), how many must there
have been in the entire poem?

The evidence, then, points away from the conclusion that An-
dronicus employed the gloss as a device for increasing the poem's sol-
emn diction. Were Sheets correct, it would mean Andronicus blindly
followed theory while not comprehending the innate differences be-
tween the Greek dialects and the Italic languages. However, the linguis-
tic evidence is inconclusive, and less controversial analyses are avail-
able for some of the peculiarities of the forms; the Romanizing tone, the
avoidance of Greek, and, perhaps, Andronicus' *Nachleben* suggest the
poet understood that translating the *Odyssey* into Latin meant more
than simply substituting words, and that the Alexandrian practice of
increasing σεμνότης with the gloss was unsuitable in its original form in
Rome.[31]

JOHN MICHAEL KEARNS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES