CORPUS PUBLISHERS

Socialsciences and Humanities: Corpus Open Access Journal (SHCOAJ)

Volume 2 Issue 2, 2025

Article Information

Received date : November 14, 2025

Published date: November 28, 2025

*Corresponding author

María Ángeles Robles, Independent Researcher, Spain

DOI: 10.54026/SHCOAJ/1013

Key Words

Colloquialisms; Grammar; Rhetoric; Aristotle; Hofmann; Horace's epodes

Short Communication

Definition of Colloquialism (Sermo Familiaris) and Its Projection in Grammar and Rhetoric: Concretisation of these Aspects in Contributions of Humanists of the Modern Age to Passages of Horace's Epodes

María Ángeles Robles*

Independent researcher, Spain

Abstract

This paper aims to provide an overview of the concept of colloquial language ("*sermo familiaris*") as defined by scholars from different periods, both in the Modern Age and the Contemporary Age. It then establishes the theoretical basis from which one can analyse colloquial expressions, which is why it refers, on the one hand, to rhetoric as the discipline from which colloquialisms are studied and, on the other, to the link between grammar and rhetoric ("*elocutio*"). With regard to this alliance between stylistics and grammar, the contributions of various modern and contemporary scholars are noteworthy. The article then illustrates the uses of colloquial language with quotations from Horace's Epodes. The criteria for classifying colloquialisms come from Hofmann's contributions within the affective phrase constructed exclusively or predominantly with affective exponents. Hofmann's definition connects with Aristotle's *Art of Poetry* (Arist. *Po*. 1456b. 2-7); the Stagirite establishes the interrelationship between language and thought with its different manifestations of feelings. In line with the two previous scholars, Christoforo Landino (1424-1498), Denis Lambin (1520-1572) and Richard Bentley (1662-1742) address colloquialisms found in Horace's Epodes in their annotations.

Definition of Colloquialism (Sermo Familiaris)

I undertake the task of defining the scope of the term colloquialism, understood as the Latin spoken by the upper social classes ("*sermo familiaris*"). Various scholars from different periods, from the Modern Age to the present day, have sought to explain the scope of the term under study and its literary reflections, where one can identify colloquialisms ("*sermo familiaris*"). Obviously, there are discrepancies among the scholars who study the subject, but I intend to highlight the points they all have in common.

Renaissance Authors

I begin with the Renaissance, specifically focusing on Juan Luis Vives and Justus Lipsius. The first humanist cited, Vives, in his treatise *De Consibendis Epistulis,* clarifies that "*sermo familiaris*" (colloquial Latin) is what Cicero would use in different areas of his daily life in the square, in the baths, with his family, etc. In this way, he delimits the expression "*sermo familiaris*" to the Latin spoken by the upper classes, that is, the educated classes, as he quotes Plato, Cicero and Seneca, and also alludes to the fact that colloquial language ("*sermo familiaris*") has literary manifestations, specifically in the epistolary genre:

Hoc epistolis suis comprobant magni omnes viri, qui si eisdem de rebus in epistola loquantur, quibus in oratione, aut iusto libro, stilum protinus mutant et verba, totumque illum rerum et verborum apparatum, demittuntque se ad humilitatem illam epistolarem, quae tamquam frugi puella ac modesta, minimeque loco claro nata, abunde compta est, si absit de formitas et sordes: ergo Cicero aliter ad amicos loquitur de causa Milonis, aut de provinciis consularibus, aut de consolationibus, quam vel apud iudices, vel in senatu, vel in Tusculanis: aliter Augustinus de pietate in lib. de Civitate Dei*, quam ad amicos: alio stilo et inventione Plinius de laudibus Traiani ad amicos, quam in senatu: de philosophia Seneca elaboratius in libris de* Ira*, aut de* Tranquillitate vitae*, aut* Naturalium Quaestionum*, quam ad Lucilium: Plato quoque ad eundem modum: de Hieronymo taceo, qui non epistolas videbatur scribere, sed libros, quamvis ipse de temporis angustia et tarditate notarii haud raro conqueratur; sed ut de Cicerone loquar, eius epistolae adeo sermonem eius domesticum et familiarem exprimunt, ut ego illum non aliter cum uxore, cum liberis, servis, familiaribus, in foro, in campo, in balneo, in cubiculo, in triclinio locutum existimem; iam ordinem ita neglexit, ut unde cunque visum sit exordiatur, et repetat, et addat et recipiat se, et revocet; nihil tale est in orationibus, aut libris philosophicis.*[1]

Justus Lipsius, in his *Epistolica Institutio*, also considers that letters should be written as closely as possible to everyday language. He illustrates this statement with contributions from various authors, first mentioning Demetrius who, in his treatise *On Style,* in the fourth chapter, says that the expression of the letter should resemble a dialogue (*εἶναι γὰρ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν οἷον τὸ ἕτερον μέρος τοῦ διαλόγου*. Demetr., *Eloc*. IV 223); he then quotes an expression from Cicero in one of his letters that alludes to the use of everyday words (Cic., *Fam*. 9, 21, 1); finally, he mentions a passage from a letter from Seneca to Lucilius where he explains that his letters should be written in a style close to spontaneous conversation (Sen., *Ep.* 75. 1). It can be concluded, based on the passages cited by Lipsius, taken from Demetrius (Demetr., *Eloc*. IV 223), Cicero (Cic.,

1Vives (1782: 298).

Fam. IX 21. 1) and Seneca (Sen., *Ep.* 75. 1), all agree in considering *sermo familiaris* to be colloquial language, but of the upper classes. Specifically, this assertion can be verified in the words of Seneca, which uses as an example when referring to the use of colloquial language (Sen., *Ep.* 75, 1).

De Stilo: certum, et veterum exemplo. Testatum est, simplicem eum esse debere, sine cura, sine cultu; similiter cottidiano sermoni. Itaque Demetrius, ut dialogum [=Demetr., Eloc. IV 223] Epistolam scribi vult et ipse Cicero, texi eam quotidianus uerbis [= Cic., *Fam.* IX 21. 1]. *Seneca apposite:* qualis sermo meus esset, si una sederemus aut ambularemus, illaboratus et facilis: tales uolo esse epistolas meas*[=Sen., Ep. 75. 1].*[2]

In light of the above, Vives and Lipsius understand *sermo familiaris* as the Latin or Greek (Vives mentions Plato and Lipsius mentions Demetrius in this regard) of the upper classes, which they use on a daily basis in all areas of their lives, where emotions are present; this colloquial language used by the upper classes is manifested in their letters. It is significant that he associates the literary manifestation of *sermo familiaris* only with epistolary writing,[3] although, as we shall see, 20th and 21st century scholars have broadened the literary framework in which colloquialisms are manifested.

Contemporary Authors

The first systematic and comprehensive work on colloquial language was written in 1926 by Johann Baptist Hofmann in his *Lateinische Umgangssprache,* translated into Spanish as *El latín familiar* (1958). For Hofmann (1958: 2), familiar language in all its aspects (the "*sermo familiaris*" of cultured conversation, the "*sermo vulgaris*" of the common man and the "*sermo plebeius*" of the suburbs) possesses a maximum amount of affective, subjective, graphic and individual elements, and a minimum portion of logically thought-out elements. However, Hofmann recognises that affective and subjective expressions are present in literary language, which come from living speech, specifically the living speech of educated people ("*sermo familiaris*"), and in this way he addresses the literary reflections of Latin colloquial language. This is why Hofmann (1958: 7) states that the decisive factor in determining whether or not an expression belongs to conversational language is not the source where it is found, but whether it presents features characteristic of "*sermo familiaris*". What has been discussed so far assumes that familiar language is affective language and that it can take literary form, that is, it can leave its mark on literary works. In other words, the framework in which Hofmann (1958: 8) presents this study is that of the affective phrase constructed by exponents of affective content as opposed to the intellectual phrase without resonance of emotional factors or sentimental accompaniments. Hofmann published an article (1929: 209-213) in which he emphasised the difference between familiar language ("*sermo familiaris*") and popular language (such as the Latin vulgar), which had been confused until then. The familiar language he describes is not a unitary language, but rather displays, in addition to great skill, certain markedly original features derived, among other things, from social influences and relationships with special languages and dialects, as well as from the heavy use and constant renewal of the turns of phrase and formulas of the spoken language. For Hofmann, colloquial language ("*sermo familiaris*") should be understood as the "living speech of educated people". However, there is no doubt that a popular language, as the language of the lower social classes, and a colloquial or familiar language, as the language of the upper educated social classes, are coordinated members of a spoken language that carries linguistic evolution in general and that differ in the type and degree of subjective-affective participation. Hofmann groups the typical and defining elements of colloquial language for Latin into four sections: the first focuses on the subjective-affective aspect of familiar speech, listing interjections and interrogative particles; mechanised interrogative formulas, affirmations and negations; schematic affective sentences, etc. The second section focuses on the interlocutor's action on the speaker's expression: formulas of supplication and persuasion, linguistic resources at the service of *captatio benevolentiae* (sociative plural, ethical dative, attenuation of meaning with "*fortasse*", "*utique*", diminutives as an expression of affection, etc.); euphemisms and related phenomena; the third part focuses on the tendency of familiar language towards the graphic: phraseology and concrete vocabulary; metaphors, etc.; finally, the last section shows the tendency of familiar language towards triviality and laconicism: ellipsis, special brachylogies, etc. Moving on in the exposition, I quote Walter Porzig (1970: 226) and his work ***El mundo maravilloso del lenguaje***. In it, the author mentions everyday language, whose function is immediate comprehension in practical situations; with regard to colloquial language, he observes the speaker's particular interest in not using precisely the usual words and phrases, as well as a predisposition to express themselves in an unusual, elaborate, joking, parodic and often extravagant way; which leads to the use of idioms and phraseology. What has been said so far brings to mind Hofmann's definition of the affective phrase, which includes a multitude of linguistic resources that reveal emotions, as opposed to the intellectual phrase, with its preponderance of logical elements. On the other hand, it is important to highlight the difference proposed by Porzig (1970: 228 ss.) between everyday language and another form of language, called written language or literary language, but he prefers to call it cultured language; the use of cultured language or everyday language does not depend on the personality of the speaker, but on the purpose and situation in which it is spoken; the same people have both everyday language and cultured language at their disposal, the latter requiring a rich and well-structured lexicon, as it has to expressly name what colloquial language merely indicates. Subsequently, Ernst Pulgram (1950: 459) opts for the differentiation between written Latin and spoken Latin. In contrast to the above, Victor José Herrero Llorente (1976: 126) asserts that there were not two different languages in Rome: a literary language and a spoken language. He adds that one could speak of a literary language, since literature is something more fixed, while the spoken language is subject to variations in space and time. In contrast to this, López Eire and Federico Panchón, explains Luis Unceta (2016: 210), believe that in ancient times the literary could not be separated from the oral aspect of language. Following the theoretical principles of Ernst Pulgram, it would be difficult to study the language of comedy, a hotbed of expressions of living speech. The proposal by Porzig and Herrero Llorente is more appropriate, as they point out that the same speaker can express themselves in two different contexts, one in everyday speech and the other in a literary setting, according to the characteristics of each. The point of contact between Porzig's study and Hofmann's is the special use of language in the context of everyday (colloquial) speech. Furthermore, Porzig's marked separation between spoken and written language is noteworthy; although Hofmann (1958: 3 and 7) is also aware of this differentiation, he points out that the decisive factor in determining whether an expression belongs to conversational language is not its source, but whether it displays the features of "*sermo familiaris*". On the other hand, Veikko Väänänen (1988: 29-30) chooses to censure the tendency to exaggerate the opposition between spoken and written language, due to the interrelationship between popular language and poetic style. In this way, he explains that Cicero liked to use everyday words and popular expressions in his letters[4]. The common ground he shares with Hofmann is the study of the traces of living speech in literary works, a claim that is also supported by other scholars we will discuss. Next, we must highlight the brilliant study carried out by the scholar Philip Theodore Stevens (1931) on colloquial expressions in Greek in an article published in 1931 entitled: "Colloquial expressions in Euripides".[5] In it, he makes clear the presence of colloquialisms in tragedy. However, he considers that these types of expressions do not violate the general tone of the language, and are sometimes used in combination with words peculiar to tragic diction. For him, colloquial expressions include words and phrases used naturally in everyday conversation, which could, on occasion, be present in literary works. He does not include here what might be called vulgarisms, that is, words of a decidedly non-literary nature, with exclusively low and vulgar associations, or irregularities in word forms or syntax. As might be expected, Stevens asserts that the colloquialisms found in tragedy are not of a type that contrasts sharply with the general tone of the language, and are sometimes used, presumably without any incongruity, in combination with words peculiar to tragic diction.[6] Subsequently, taking as his thread the analysis of colloquialisms in dramatic poetry, he published another article entitled "Colloquial expressions in Aeschylus and

2 Lipsius (1591: 18).

3 "*Optimum quotidiani sermonis exemplum dedero epistolas Ciceronis ad Atticum*". Vives (1782: 182). "*Epistolam scribi vult et ipse Cicero, texi eam quotidianus verbis* [= Cic., *Fam.* IX 21. 1]. *Seneca apposite: qualis sermo meus esset, si una sederemus aut ambularemus, illaboratus et facilis: tales volo esse epistolas meas* [=Sen., *Ep.* 75.1]". Lipsius (1591: 18).

4 "*Verum tamen quid tibi ego videor in epistulis? none plebeio sermone agere tecum? Nec enim semper eodem modo* [...] *Epistulas vero cotidianis verbis texere solemus*". (Cic. *Fam.* IX 21. 1). The source of the text is: Cicero (2001: 186).

5 Stevens's exact words are as follows: "The category of the colloquial is intended to cover such words and phrasesas might naturally be used in everyday conversation, but are avoided in distinctly poetic writing and in formal and dignified prose. It does not here include what may be called vulgarisms, i.e. words of a definitely non-literary character, with exclusively low and vulgar associations, or irregularities in forms of words or in syntax. As might be expected, the colloquialisms found in Tragedy are not of a kind to contrast violently with the general tone of the language, and are sometimes used, presumably without any incongruity, in combination with words peculiar to tragic diction". See Stevens (1931: 182).

6 On this same aspect, see Stevens (1976: 2-4).

Sophocles".[7] Herman Van Looy (1977: 617-618) refers to the work published by Stevens in 1976, which has the same title as the article. In his review of this work, he indicates that Stevens attempts to offer an outline of different colloquialisms found not only in Euripides but also in a cast of authors such as Aristophanes, Herodotus, Lysias, Xenophon, Plato, and Menander. It should be noted that Stevens (1976: 8, 13, 20, 52) developed the first major systematic classification of colloquial elements in Ancient Greek, which he illustrates mainly with examples from ancient theatre. These elements are as follows: exaggeration or emphasis, pleonastic or elongated forms of expression, incomplete exposition or irony, brevity or ellipsis, interjections and expressions used to attract attention, particles, metaphorical expressions and syntactic colloquialisms. Hofmann had already carried out the first systematic classification of colloquialisms in the Latin language. Although Stevens' study focuses on the Greek language and Hofmann's on Latin, there are many points of contact, as both perceive colloquial expressions in literary works as characteristic of a social class that avoids low and vulgar expressions. Following the path marked out by Hofmann, Porzig, Väänänen and Stevens, Rolf Hiersche (1970: 163) in his *Grundzüge* distinguishes between literary language and colloquial language. He identifies the language of Aristophanic comedy with spoken Attic, so to speak, which was the Attic spoken daily in the homes of cultured Athens, in the square, in the people's assembly and in the courts. On the other hand, Hiersche (1970: 76) considers literary languages such as the Homeric epics to be artificial languages. According to Marcos Martínez Hernández (1998-1999: 373-374), colloquial language would be for him a compromise between literary language and spoken language, but for the upper classes. It should be noted that Hiersche does not refer to the language of the lower classes, as one might expect, but to the elevated colloquial language of the Attic bourgeoisie, as in Plato's dialogues, where slaves also speak in a colloquial manner.[8] Based on Hiersche's argument (1970: 169), one can conclude that Athenians of all social classes speak pure (or almost pure) colloquial Greek, because Aristophanes has Athenians of all social classes speak pure (or almost pure) Greek.[9] Hiersche's concept of colloquial language as the speech of the upper social classes, which is clearly reflected in literary works, coincides with that of Hofmann. What has been said so far assumes that there is hardly a Greek writer who does not use colloquial expressions; this assertion, regarding the use of colloquialisms by different authors, is highlighted by Martínez Hernández (1998-1999: 377-378). This philologist mentions a large number of Greek authors who use colloquialisms in their works, belonging to different literary genres. Thus, he says, in a genre such as Homeric epic, we sometimes find words that can be considered colloquial, especially particles, which according to Denniston (1962) are those of everyday speech, as in Attic comedy. We find examples in Hesiod and other genres not prone to colloquialism. Likewise, there are colloquial expressions in the lyrics of authors such as Theognis, Pindar, and the historian Thucydides, especially in the discursive parts as opposed to the narrative ones. They are also found in Herodotus, especially in the dialogue passages. However, Marcos Martínez Hernández argues that the clearest examples of colloquialisms are to be found in the 5th century in inscriptions and comic authors, as well as in satirical drama and tragedy, and in the 4th century in Plato and Attic orators. Finally, he refers to the epistolary genre, where colloquial expressions abound. Luis Unceta Gómez (2006: 209-212) prefers the term register to refer to the specific characteristics of speaking or writing, in certain circumstances of an individual or group, derived from creative impulse. Using this terminology as a field of analysis, he refers to two contemporary scholars and their respective works: Antonio López Eire and his article: "Registros lingüísticos en la Comedia aristofánica" and Federico Panchón Cabañeros and his work: "Algunos rasgos de oralidad en Plauto". The approach taken by both authors, according to Unceta, is to provide a more general overview, where elements at any level illustrate the mastery with which the two great comedians Aristophanes and Plautus display the characteristics of oral, colloquial and even vulgar registers. According to López Eire and Federico Panchón, Unceta explains, writing in general in antiquity was inseparable from orality. Alan H. Somerstein does something similar in his contribution, he says, in attempting to determine the existence of comic elements in the language of tragedy. With regard to Somerstein (2004: 335-354), it is worth dwelling on his article entitled: "Elementos cómicos en la lengua de la tragedia: el caso de "Orestía" de Esquilo". In this work, Somerstein draws on the decontextualisation of the festive and humorous atmosphere of comedy to emphasise certain tragic values. I use the term colloquial language ("*sermo familiaris*") as understood by Hofmann, Hiersche, and Stevens, as they all consider colloquialisms to be characteristic of the oral expression of the most educated strata of society, where vulgarisms, understood as incorrectness typical of the lower social strata, are avoided. On the other hand, the vast majority of the scholars I have mentioned agree on the presence of colloquialisms in literary works. I would like to point out that the association of colloquialisms with the educated social class can already be found in Quintilian, as a precursor to the scholars of our time; the rhetorician from La Rioja refers to the conversational language of the educated social class, which is capable of making appropriate use of language where intelligent humour ("*urbanitas*") has its place. His words are as follows:

Pluribus autem nominibus in eadem re vulgo utimur: quae tamen si diducas, suam quandam propriam vim ostendent. Nam et urbanitas dicitur, qua quidem significari video sermonem prae se ferentem in verbis et sono et usu proprium quemdam gustum Urbis et sumptam ex conversatione doctorum tacitam eruditionem, denique cui contraria sit rusticitas.[10] (Quint., *Inst.* VI 3. 17). "Because the note on what is 'funny' is called urbanitas, in which I truly see that it seeks to designate a way of speaking that, in its words, in its sound and in its use, gives prevalence to a certain peculiar taste of our city (of Rome, *urbs*), and a tacit erudition received from the conversational manner of educated men, in short, the opposite of provincialism (*rusticitas*)".[11]

Perspective of the Analysis of Colloquialisms: Grammar and *Elocutio*

Aristotle, in his *Poetics,* establishes the interrelationship between language and thought, that is, between *elocutio* and grammar, saying: *λέγω* […] *λέξις εἶναι τὴν διὰ τῆς ὀνομασίας ἑρμηνείαν.* (Arist., *Po.* 1450B. 13, 14). "I say that elocution is communication through words".[12] He insists on this idea of the dependence of elocution and language in the following words: *ἔστι δέ κατὰ τὴν διάνοιαν ταῦτα, ὅσα ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου δεῖ παρασκευασθῆναι.* (Arist., *Po.* 1456a. 36, 37). "It is proper to thought whatever needs to be prepared by language".[13] The Stagirite is aware of the link between the emotions expressed by the speaker and the power of language, that is, language is the vehicle that conveys different moods and thoughts:

Δῆλον δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν ἰδεῶν δεῖ χρῆσθαι ὅταν ἢ ἐλεεινὰ ἢ δεινὰ ἢ μεγορ eikōta dēῃ paraskeuázei; plēn tosōtōn diaphērēi, ὅτι τὰ men deī phainesthai ἄνευ διδασκαλίας, but those in speech must be prepared by the speaker and come from the speech. (Arist., *Po.* 1456b. 2-7). "And it is evident that in deeds too one must make use of things that have their origin in the same forms when it is necessary to achieve things that inspire pity, or fear, or greatness, or verisimilitude; they differ in that here it is necessary for some deeds to be shown without teaching, but others in speech must be prepared by the speaker and produced by means of what he says".[14]

Aristotle's association of moods with the form of expression leads us to point to the Stagirite as the precedent for the differentiation, given by Hofmann (1958: 1-2), between intellectual and affective phrases; the former is constructed exclusively, for the most part, with logical and intellectual elements, without resonance from emotional factors or sentimental accompaniments, while the affective phrase would be constructed exclusively or predominantly with affective exponents and pronounced with affective intonation. Although it is clear that the objective of the grammarian is the sentence and that of the rhetorician is *elocution,* María Azucena Penas (2009: 164 and 191) is aware of the connection between grammar and *elocution.* Previously, Tomás Albaladejo Mayordomo (1989, 117) established a connection between grammar and *elocution;* he bases this assertion on a passage from *Quintilian's Institutio*[15] (Quint., *Inst.* VIII 1. 1). In the aforementioned passage, the rhetorician from La Rioja says that what the Greeks called φράσις, the Romans called *elocutio.* This elocution is taken into consideration in words alone or in combination. (Quint., *Inst.* VIII 1. 1). Albaladejo considers that it is in *compositio* where grammar most closely approximates *elocutio.* He defined *elocutio* as the verbalisation of the semantic-intentional structure of discourse,

7 See Stevens (1945: 95-105).

8 Hiersche says: "This is not the language of the lower classes, as one might expect given the traditional coarseness of comedy, but rather the elevated colloquial language of the full citizens of Athens, as in Plato's dialogues, which even the slaves on stage speak". See Hiersche (1970: 163-164).

9 His exact words are as follows: "Lässt also Aristophanes in den Dialogen Athener jeder sozialen Schicht reines (oder fast reines) Umgangsattisch reden". See Hiersche (1970: 169).

10 The text is taken from Burman (1720: 531).

11 The translations of the Latin and Greek texts were done by me.

12 For the Greek text, see Aristotle and Horace (1998: 105).

13 For the Greek text, see Aristotle and Horace (1998: 115).

14 For the Greek text, see Aristotle and Horace (1998: 116).

15 "*Igitur quam Graeci phrasin vocant, Latine dicimus elocutionem. Ea spectatur verbis aut singulis aut coniunctis. In singulis intuendum est ut sint Latina, perspicua, ornata, ad id quod efficere volumus accommodata: in coniunctis ut emendata, ut apte conlocata, ut figurata*". (Quint., *Inst.* VIII 1. 1). The text comes from Quintilianus (2002: 324).

with the intention of making it understandable to the receiver (1989, 117). Albaladejo recalls the passage from Quintilian (Quint., *Inst.* VIII *Proem.* 15) who considers that elocution is expressing everything one has conceived in one's mind and conveying it to the listeners.[16] Francisco Chico Rico (2002: 182) highlights the relationship between rhetoric and syntax in his article "La *elocutio* retórica en la construcción del discurso público de Emilio Castelar". The most notable aspect of this contemporary scholar's contribution is his mention of *puritas, perspicuitas, ornatus, and urbanitas* as qualities not only of *elocutio* but also as general qualities of rhetorical discourse, centred on the syntactic-semantic sphere of words, which affect the rhetorical operations of *inventio, dispositio* and *elocutio*. He cites as an example a passage from Quintilian who highlights how style constitutes the core of the qualities of *elocutio* (Quint., Inst. VI 3. 17, 18). María del Carmen Díaz Bautista clearly highlights the relationship between grammar and rhetoric, offering a broad view of the issue under debate. She considers that the metaphors are constructed on the basis of grammatical categories, nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs, which are the categories that carry referential meaning. Therefore, the grammatical view of metaphor refers to nominal, verbal, adjectival and adverbial metaphors, depending on the part of the sentence that carries metaphorical values (1990: 163).

In light of the above, Díaz Bautista (1990: 165) concludes that the grammatical model that considers all linguistic levels is the one that can offer the best results in the study of metaphor and other tropes. In line with linking language and rhetorical figures, Salvador Mas (2015: 452) goes one step further, emphasising the identification of the proper use of penetrating and ironic humour as a "social representation of identity through aesthetic means". The starting point for this assertion is an example cited from Cicero (Cic., *De Orat.* II 236).[17] In this passage, the Roman rhetorician instructs on how to use *"sales"* ("humour") in speech, arguing that elegance and good taste must prevail and be a symbol of erudition, otherwise the speaker's bad taste humour, even if it achieves its objective, turns him into a scurra, causing him to lose credibility. It is precisely in the study of interjections that various scholars from different periods raise the duality between grammatical and stylistic analysis. Guadalupe Morcillo (2007: 89) states that Latin grammarians recognise a grammatical category called interjection, which expresses an emotional reaction on the part of the speaker. Priscian makes this grammatical category clear in book 15 of his work *Institutiones Grammaticae* (Prisc., *G. L.* III 90. 6-24).[18] He considers it a word that expresses different moods such as pain, joy, happiness, etc., while classifying it among the parts of speech. In the same book of his *Institutiones Grammaticae,* Priscian discusses the differentiation between the interjectional grammatical category ("*interiectio*") and interjectional uses ("*pro interiectione*") of other categories or phrases, which later became the traditional distinction between primary and secondary interjections.[19] Toivo Viljamaa argues that in dramatic poetry, the mere pause ("breath") between short elliptical phrases can act as an interjection.[20] Grammarians, in fact, claim that the sigh or aspiration itself is a sign of an affected mind and is therefore an essential formal property of the interjection. This contemporary author describes the function of interiectiones as causing interruptions in the text or discourse.Viljamaa (2019: 223) refers to the value of the Latin word *interiectio*, classifying it as a rhetorical term meaning any type of insertion in the course of language; finally, he calls the short interjection, considered a part of speech by traditional grammar, an *"exclamatio"*, whose purpose is to increase emotion. Viljamaa (2019: 229-230) gives two examples, one from Quintilian (Quint., *Inst.* IX 2. 26, 27) and another from Cicero (Cic., *Or.* 135), both authors linking "*exclamatio*" to "*elocutio*". In line with the aforementioned contemporary scholar, Unceta (2016: 214-216) considers interjections to be an expression of a state of mind rather than a grammatical category. They function as a manifestation of expressive content derived from the attitude of the speaker. In light of the above, interjections can be studied from a grammatical point of view (part of speech) or as a rhetorical term, which, as a part of speech (interjection), forms part of elocutio ("*exclamatio*"). I will now contextualise the Latin term "*exclamatio*" as belonging to the tradition of rhetorical terminology in Latin; it was coined by the author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (*Rhet. Her.* IV 15. 22) and later used by Cicero (Cic., *Orat.* 135) and Quintilian (Quint., *Inst.* IX 3. 26). "*Exclamatio*" is classified as a figure of thought, specifically one of the affective figures. A treatise from late Latin,[21] entitled: *De figuris vel schematibus Versus Heroici* by an unknown author, discusses the "*exclamatio*", understood as something one utters suddenly, as if disturbed.[22] Carlo Renaldini (1681: 963) discusses rhetorical figures in one of the sections of his work *Philosophia Rationalis.* This Italian scholar, originally from Siena, refers to the "*exclamatio*" from a rhetorical point of view; he explains the Greek name given to this stylistic figure, *ἐπεκφώνησις*, and the different meanings it has in Latin, such as "*pronunciatio*", "*enunciatio*" and "*exclamatio*". He indicates that the purpose of this figure is to move the recipient through emotions. He then uses the grammatical term "*interiectio*", whose function is to externalise feelings, and identifies it with "*exclamatio*", which would be the stylistic device representing interjection. However, "*exclamatio*" can present an explicit or implicit interjection. He gives an example, where he establishes the equivalence between the expression with interjection and the one without, since both expressions manifest emotion. Carlo Renaldini's contribution (1681: 963) raises the question of the relationship between grammar and rhetoric, since the scholar uses a grammatical element ("*interiectio*") to analyse a figure belonging to "*elocutio*".

Identification and Analysis of Some Colloquialisms Used by Horace in the Epodes

The purpose of this section is to point out some colloquialisms used by Horace in

16 "*Quod eum merito fecisse etiam ipso rei de qua loquimur nomine palam declaratur. Eloqui enim [hoc] est omnia quae mente conceperis promere atque ad audientis perferre, sine quo supervacua sunt priora et similia gladio condito atque intra vaginam suam haerenti*". (Quint., *Inst.* VII *Proem.* 15). The text comes from Quintilianus (2002: 316).

17 "*Locus autem et regio quasi ridiculi (nam id proxime quaeritur) turpitudine et deformitate quadam continetur; haec enim ridentur vel sola vel maxime, quae notant et designant turpitudinem aliquam non turpiter. Est autem, ut ad illud tertium veniam, est plane oratoris movere risum; vel quod ipsa hilaritas benevolentiam conciliat ei, per quem excitata est; vel quod admirantur omnes acumen uno saepe in verbo positum maxime respondentis, non numquam etiam lacessentis; vel quod frangit adversarium, quod impedit, quod elevat, quod deterret, quod refutat; vel quod ipsum oratorem politum esse hominem significat, quod eruditum, quod urbanum, maxime quod tristitiam ac severitatem mitigat et relaxat odiosasque res saepe, quas argumentis dilui non facile est, ioco risuque dissolvi*". (Cic., *De Orat.* II 236). See Cicero (1838: 28).

18 "*Interiectionem Graeci inter aduerbia ponunt, quoniam haec quoque uel adiungitur uerbis uel uerba ei subaudiuntur, ut si dicam papae, quid uideo? uel per se papae, etiamsi non addatur miror, habet in se ipsius uerbi significationem. quae res maxime fecit, Romanarum artium scriptores separatim hanc partem ab aduerbiis accipere, quia uidetur affectum habere in se uerbi et plenam motus animi significationem, etiamsi non addatur uerbum, demonstrare. interiectio tamen non solum quem dicunt Graeci σχετλιασμόν significat, sed etiam uoces, quae cuiuscumque passionis animi pulsu per exclamationem intericiuntur. habent igitur diuersas significationes: gaudii, ut euax; doloris, ut ei. Virgilius in II Aeneidos:* ei mihi qualis erat, quantum mutatus ab illo / Hectore, et: o dolor atque decus magnum rediture parenti, *Virgilius in X; et in bucolico doloris*: a silice in nuda conixa reliquit. idem in eodem: a tibi ne teneras glacies secet aspera plantas". (Prisc., *G. L.* III 90. 5-24). See Priscianus (1858: 90).

19 "*Aliae tamen quoque partes orationis singulae uel plures solent interiectiue proferri, ut Virgilius* […] infandum *pro interiectione protulit. Proprie tamen uoces interiectionum primitiuae sunt, ut papae*, euax, ei, heu, euhoe, ohe". (Prisc., *G. L.* III 91. 23-27). See Priscianus *(1858:* 91).

20 His words are as follows: "In dramatic poetry, the mere break (breath, sigh) between short elliptical phrases may act as the interjection. Grammarians, in fact, state that sighing or aspiration in itself is a sign of an affected mind and is therefore an essential formal property of the interjection. Consequently, emphatic aspiration caused inconsistencies and irregularities in the written forms of interjections (in marking the letter h)". See Viljamaa (2019: 241).

21 Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo states that the treatise *Carmen De figuris* discovered by Quicherat is not as old as previously believed. See Menéndez Pelayo (2018: 100).

22 *"Επεκφώνησις / Exclamatio ea est, quam ut motus reddo repente. / "Ah, postquam victum video me, tu improba et amens, / Fortuna, es, quos sublimas mox ipsa premendo!"* (*Carm. de fig.* 77-79). The text is taken from Schneidewin (1841: 7).

his *Epodes*. I analyse these linguistic uses from a stylistic point of view ("*elocutio*"). The nomenclature used to classify colloquial expressions is taken from Hofmann.[23] I have taken into account the comments of humanists of the Modern Age such as Landino,[24] Lambin[25] and Bentley,[26] who annotate passages to which I will refer. The aim is to assess the extent to which they rely on grammatical and syntactical elements when discussing Horace's style or, in other words, whether these humanists constitute the antecedent of the link between grammar and stylistics for contemporary scholars who deal with this aspect. Next, as a preliminary step, I offer a schematic overview of the colloquialisms I have identified in Horace's *Epodes*. The list of passages will be developed in each of the sections where they have been classified: interjections: "*At, o deorum quidquid in caelo regit*". (Hor., *Epod.* V 1); O *ego non felix* (Hor., *Epod.* XII 25); "O *ego non felix, quam tu fugis, ut pavet acris / agna lupos capreaeque leones!*". (Hor., *Epod.* XII 30, 31); "O *mare et terra*". (Hor., *Epod.* XVII 30). Schematic affective sentences: "*ureris ipse miser: quodsi non pulchrior ignis / accendit obsessam Ilion*". (Hor., *Epod.* XIV 13, 14); "*nefas videre*". (Hor., *Epod.* XVI 14). Exaggerations and redundancies: "*Quid inmerentis hospites vexas, canis / ignavus adversum lupos?*". (Hor., *Epod.* VI 1, 2). Euphemisms and related phenomena (irony): "*amata nautis multum et institoribus*". (Hor., *Epod.* XVII 20); "*voles sonari: tu pudica, tu proba*". (Hor., *Epod.* XVII 40); "*infamis Helenae Castor offensus vice / fraterque magni Castoris, victi prece*". (Hor., *Epod.* XVII 42, 43).

Interjections

Hofmann (1958: 12-14) discusses exclamatory expressions, whether interjections or exclamatory words in the broad sense. He points out that syntactically they function as a complete sentence and are a means of expressing feelings, whether positive or negative. I would like to emphasise the abundance of these linguistic elements, which bring these literary compositions closer to everyday speech in Horace's *Epodes*. I will now comment on some passages, where we will analyse the poet's intention when using different interjections. I will begin with a verse by Horace in which the interjection o appears. It reads as follows: "*At, o deorum quidquid in caelo regit*". (Hor., *Epod. V* 1). "But, by all the gods who rule from heaven!". The form "*o*" indicates surprise, either joyful or painful, as well as desire, externalising emotions, as Hofmann (1958: 27-28) clarifies. In the iambic senarius below, the reader perceives the pain of the young man, victim of witchcraft. Landino[27] makes it clear that the expression under discussion (Hor., *Epod. V* 1) expresses a complaint by the terrified boy at the cruelty of Canidia and her colleagues towards him. However, at no point does he mention the interjectional particle o as a mark indicating the boy's complaint, nor does he allude to any other element of the sentence that would have led him to deduce the boy's attitude. Lambin[28] in his annotation uses grammar to discuss style ("*elocutio*"), attributing to the form *at* the value of an interjection (not a conjunction) to express the pain of the terrified young man, that is, he uses a grammatical element to discuss style, *elocutio*. However, Lambin never refers to the value of the interjection that follows *at: "At, o deorum quidquid in caelo regit*". (Hor., *Epod. V* 1). In his gloss, the humanist mentions two grammarians who have dealt with "*at*", one being Priscian and the other Servius. With regard to the former, the scholar acknowledges his work in explaining the uses of *at* as a conjunction[29], that is, he does not link grammatical use to stylistic use; furthermore, Lambin shows his disagreement with the grammarian, since for the humanist "*at*" has an interjectional use ("*pro interiectione*"), not a conjunctive one. In view of this scholia, there are several aspects that need to be clarified. On the one hand, Lambin is mistaken in citing the number of the book in which Priscian discusses the study of the term at, as he says it is 17, when in fact it is book 16. In the aforementioned volume, Priscian[30] groups together within the copulative conjunctions quite a few adversative ones:[31] *et, –que, ac, atque, quidem, quoque, at, ast, sed, autem, vero*. It is true that he does not reflect on the use of *at* as an interjection, but in his book 15, Priscian discusses the differentiation between the grammatical category of interjection ("*interiectio*") and interjectional uses ("*pro interiectione*") of other categories.[32] For example, the grammarian[33] emphasises the double use of the form a, both as a preposition and as an

23 Many scholars consider Hofmann's work, entitled *Lateinische Umgangssprache*, to be the first major treatise devoted to the study of "*sermo familiaris*". Among others, I quote Jorge Páramo Pomareda (1960: 309), who considers Hofmann's work to be a great manual with significant contributions. Unceta Gómez (2006: 209) is of the same opinion. Furthermore, Juan José Moralejo Álvarez (1977: 62), in his article "Dialectos y niveles de lengua en griego antiguo", acknowledges the good work and materials used by Hofmann in his work *Lateinische Umgangssprache*. It is worth noting the contribution of Eleanor Dickey and Anna Chahoud (2010: 45), who mention Hofmann's work as the most representative source for the study of colloquial Latin.

24 I quote from Landino' s volume published in Florence in 1482. See Sandys (1908: 81-82). The scholiast dwells on certain controversial passages, which Lambin will later comment on as well, basing his annotations not only on his own deductions and ancient editions, but also on manuscript sources, which sets him apart from Landinus.

25 With regard to Lambin, it should be noted that Christopher Smart (1916: 313) states that the scholar is one of the best commentators on Horace. It should also be said that I used Lambin's 1605 edition, rather than his "*editio princeps*", due to the criticism received by the 1561 volume.

26 Sandys (1908: 406) considers Bentley memorable, but he is also highly controversial, as he took the process of conjecture to extremes. José Luis Moralejo (2007, 100) speaks highly of Bentley's ingenium; however, Moralejo comments that this humanist is criticised by some, who argue that he should have consulted a greater number of manuscripts before making more than 700 amendments to corrupt passages, basing his corrections on "*emendatio ope ingenii*". In contrast, Gaspar Morcho (2003: 81-82) recalls that the novelty of Bentley's edition of Horace lay in his rejection of the "*recepta lectio*".

27 "At o deorum] *Canidia fuerat neapolitana mulier pessima venefica. Huius ergo necromantiam de puero factam sub nomine Canidiae vituperat. Inducit autem puerum ab illis surreptum. Et ad imolationem paratum suas miserias conqueritur et in Canidiae sociarumque crudelitatem invehitur. Loquitur ergo puer: at expavescenti*". See Landinus (1482: 95v).

28 "At o, deorum quidquid] […] *Iam quod Priscian. Lib. 17 ait, at hoc loco abundare, id mihi mirum est, et paene dicam, incredibile. Est enim interiectio dolorem, aut conquestionem exprimens, non coniuctio. Idem tamen videtur sentire Servius, qui ad illum Virgilii versum lib. 7. Aen.* [=Serv., *Aen.* VII 363] At non sic Phrygius penetrat Lacedaemona pastor, etc. *Haec annotat, legitur et An non, etc. Sed hoc absoltum et planum est. Si autem legeris At, copulativa particula est, ad ornatum solum pertinens. Horat.* At o deorum quicquid in caelo regit, etc. [=Serv., *Aen.* VII 363]. *Idemque fere scribit ad illum locum lib. 9* an non viderunt moenia Troia, etc. *nisi quod ibi scriptum est* regis". See Lambinus (1605: 322).

29 Rosa María Espinosa discusses the numerous coordinating particles, most of which originate from primitive adverbs. She asserts that the most commonly used are *sed, verum* and *at,* the latter (formerly *ast*) being the most marked of the three. See Espinosa Elorza (2007: 3-5).

30 "*Copulativa est, quae copulat tam verba quam sensum, ut* et, que, ac, atque, quidem, quoque *quando pro* que *ponitur,* at, ast, sed, autem, vero *quando pro* autem *accipitur. Haec enim copulant cum confirmatione intellectum. Inveniuntur tamen multae, tam ex supradictis quam ex aliis coniunctionibus, diversas significationes una eademque voce habentes, sicut usibus, ostendemus*". (Prisc. *G. L.* III, 93, 17-22). See Priscianus (1858: 93).

31 Priscian's classification model, transmitted solely by him among all ancient Latin grammarians, is a direct legacy of Apollonius Dyscolus. See Galán Sánchez (2006: 380).

32 See note 19.

33 "*Inter has ponunt etiam sonitum illiteratorum imitationes, ut risus* ha ha hae *et* phy *et* euhoe *et* au *Possunt tamen esse quaedam dubiae inter adverbia et interiectiones, ut o, quando indignationem significat vel dolorem vel admirationem, interiectionem hoc accipiunt, quando vero vocandi est vel optandi, adverbium. Potest tamen etiam nomen esse ipsius literae, tu supra diximus. A quoque et praepositio est et interiectio et nomen: praepositio, ut* a summo ad imum; *interiectio, ut praemonstravimus in bucolico esse positum; nomen, ipsius literae* […] Pro *quoque tam paepositio est quam interiectio [...]*

interjection. On the other hand, the two examples provided by Lambin,[34] taken from Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid,* are correct. Unlike Priscian, Lambin makes it clear that Servius favours stylistic commentary based on grammatical elements. One of the examples is found in book seven (Serv., *Aen.* VII 365), in which he explains that the particle *at* has the function of embellishing and conveying affection. Furthermore, he admits that *at* is the correct reading, as opposed to the alternative *an,* with which the text would have a flat meaning. The other passage from Servius belongs to book 9 (Serv., *Aen.* IX 144); he also insists on the function of embellishment and defines it as a particle that is placed at the beginning. Regarding these passages, if we refer directly to Servius' text, Vergil's commentator does not use the term *interiectio* at any point, but instead alludes to it indirectly when referring to the particle *at* from a functional point of view ("*ad ornatum pertinens*"), that is, when indicating its use to express the "*animi affectus*" or "*animi passiones*".[35] Lambin, on the other hand, uses the term "*interiectio*" directly ly to refer to *at* and adds, as his own contribution, that Servius already dealt with this same idea in the verses of the *Aeneid* (Serv., *Aen.* VII 365 and IX 144), which I have just commented on.[36] Along the same lines of linking grammar and "*elocutio*", Orazio Torsellino deals with the particle *at* as an interjection to express emotions in his treatise on Latin particles.[37] Gerald Sandy (2006: 241) in his article "Two Renaissance readers of Apuleius" refers to a comment by Filippo Beroaldo (1501: b3r) where the humanist alludes to the special use of "*at*" The Latin expression that gives rise to Beroaldo's annotation is: "*At ego tibi sermone isto Milesio varias fabulas conseram*". (Apul., *Met. I* 1. 1).[38] In his scholia, the humanist explains that the particle *at* is used at the beginning of the sentence to embellish the text, as Servius had already proposed. He also adds Donatus' contribution, who points out the first position of the particle under study, the fact that it appears in the initial position making this particle ideal for rebuking.[39] María Cristina Azuela (2005: 416) offers Lisardo Rubio Fernández's translation of Apuleius' passage: "*At ego tibi sermone isto Milesio varias fabulas conseram*". (Apul., *Met. I* 1. 1). The translation is as follows: "Lector, quiero hilvanar para ti, encharla milesia, una serie de variadas historias". It is clear that Rubio is aware of the function of the particle *at* in the field of *elocutio,* which is why, at the beginning of the text, he draws attention by using the term "reader" ("lector"), equivalent to the interjection "Hey, you!". On the other hand, Richard Bentley (1713: 302) bases his commentary on stylistic grounds, indicating that this verse (Hor., *Epod. V* 1) is an exclamatory sentence, and he also asserts that a series of formulas such as the following are also exclamatory: "*Di boni, Di magni, proh Juppiter, pro deum*[40] *atque hominum fidem*".[41] It can be inferred from his words that Bentley focuses on the interjection "*o*", but he proposes other forms such as "*pro*" and "*proh*", which are less authoritative spellings modelled on the variation o alongside "*oh*". The English humanist also discusses the differentiation between the interjectional grammatical category ("*o*") ("*interiectio*") and interjectional uses ("*pro*", "*proh*") ("*pro interiectione*") of other categories or phrases, later forged into the traditional distinction between primary and secondary interjections. Lindsay Watson (2003: 191), a contemporary scholar, draws on elements of grammar to discuss *elocutio* in relation to the verse: "*At* o *deorum quidquid in caelo regit*". (Hor., *Epod.* V 1). She considers the quoted text to be a passionate exclamation and reflects the conventional clause of worship. She then goes on to note that the use of "*at*" is common in highly emotional contexts. Watson concludes her commentary by pointing out the colloquial tone of this verse, as it features a partitive genitive depending on a neuter pronoun.[42]

The following verse, which is commented on in the humanist editions, reads as follows: "*O ego non felix*". (Hor., *Epod.* XII 25). "Woe is me, wretched woman!". Lambin[43] interprets the aforementioned expression (Hor., *Epod.* XII 25) as an exclamatory sentence. He based this interpretation on the contributions of the Roman grammarian Flavius Sosipater Carisius. In his *Ars Grammatica,* in the section on the use of pronouns, the aforementioned author had used this Horatian verse, understandable as an exclamatory sentence, as an example to explain the vocative case of pronouns.[44] It can be inferred that Lambin uses grammatical elements to discuss *elocutio.* Bentley offers the double reading presented by the verse (as Lambin did), on the one hand, a large number of manuscripts opt for "*non infelix*" (Hor., *Epod.* XII 25), while the less ancient ones opt for "*infelix*" (Hor., *Epod.* XII 25).[45] The importance of the adjective noted by Bentley is evident, as both options are a mitigated expression (litotes); the phrase "*non infelix*" (Hor., *Epod.* XII 25) indicates happiness, but due to the context would not be appropriate, it is not metrically viable, and it does not fit the hexameter; the alternative *infelix* (Hor., *Epod.* XII 25) expresses the outrage felt by the lecherous old woman at her lover's rejection, is metrically suited to the hexameter scan, and would be the most appropriate option given the context, which is why I favour it. Following the latter "*lectio*" ("*infelix*"), this adjective accompanies the vocative "*ego*" in contrast to the pronoun *tu,* a manifestation of living language that tends to emphasise the predominant correlation between the two people in the dialogue. Ángela Palacios Marín (1978: 141-142) pauses at the passage under discussion, She says that the mood Horacio conveys in "*non felix*" grows until it becomes tinged with the semantic content of "*pavet*" (that is, "until it reaches a feeling of horror with physical manifestation"). Randall T. Ganiban and Christine Perkell (2012: 313) comment on Vergil's expression: "*Infelicis Ulixi*" (Verg., *Aen.* III 613); these contemporary scholars take different approaches to the adjective "*infelix*" referring to Ulysses. On the one hand, they consider that Vergil, by using the epithet "*infelix*" to refer to Ulysses, suggests experiencing at that moment a generous sympathy for all those who suffer loss; on the other hand, they recall Servius' comment (Serv., *Aen.* III 613) who argues that the aforementioned epithet is used ironically as an insult.[46] The link between grammar and "*elocutio*" is evident in the contributions offered. It is worth highlighting the passage where the expression "*infelicis Ulixi*" (Verg., *Aen.* III 613) appears, given that it is highly poignant. Achaemenes, a Trojan belonging to Ulysses' crew, recounts to Aeneas

interiectio, tu Lucanus in III: pro, si remeasset in urbem, / Gallorum tantum populis Arctoque subacta". (Prisc., *G. L.* III 91. 3-19). See Priscianus (1858: 91).

34 "At non sic Phrygius penetrat Lacedaemona pastor, etc. *Haec annotat,* legitur et An non, etc. *Sed hoc absoltum et planum est. Si autem legeris At, copulativa particula est, ad ornatum solum pertinens. Horat.* At o deorum quicquid in caelo regit, etc.". (Serv. *Aen.* VII 365. 1)". See Lambinus (1605: 322).

35 "144 [...] an non uiderunt *legitur et* at non uiderunt: si an non*, absoltum est; si* at non, *inceptiva est particula, ad ornatum pertinens: Horatius (Epod. 5)*: at o deorum quidquid in caelo regit. *Tale est (7, 363):* At non sic Phrygius penetrat Lacedaemona pastor". (Serv., *Aen.* IX 144). The Latin text comes from Servius Honoratus (1826: 514).

36 See note 28.

37 "*Est huius particulae aliquis usus, quo ad interiectionis formam propius accedit, ut admirationem rei antea non cognitae, nunc supervenientis exprimat*". See Torsellino (1829: 458).

38 "144 [...] an non uiderunt *legitur et* at non uiderunt*: si* an non*, absoltum est; si* at non, *inceptiva est particula, ad ornatum pertinens: Horatius (Epod. 5)*: at o deorum quidquid in caelo regit. *Tale est (7, 363):* At non sic Phrygius penetrat Lacedaemona pastor". (Serv., *Aen.* IX 144). The Latin text comes from M. Servius Honoratus (1826: 514).

39 "*At particula. Interdum inceptiua est: Ad ornatum pertinens ut docet Servius in nono commentario. Ait Donatus principium esse increpationi aptum ut Virgilius. At tibi pro scelere excalmat pro talibus ausis: Consimile illud [H]oratianum. At o deorum quicquid in caelo regis*". See Beroaldo (1501: b3r). The translation I offer in English is by Gerald Sandy of Beroaldo's gloss: "The particle *'at'*. It is sometimes inceptive. It pertains to embellishment, as Servius explains in his commentary on Book 9 [of Vergil's Aeneid]. 9 Donatus says that the position [of the particle 'at'] as the first word is appropriate to rebuking, as in Vergil [*Aeneid* 2, 535] […]. The famous Horatian passage [Epodes 5.1] is similar". See Sandy (2006: 241).

40 Hofmann (1958: 27-28) explains the origin of the expressions "*pro deum atque hominum fidem*" and "*pro Juppiter*". All of them, he states, seem to come from the preposition "*pro*" by tmesis, as in "*proclamo*", and are preserved in very ancient legal forms used as cries for help.

41 "*Lego igitur*, At o deorum quicquid in caelo regit. *Neque vero invocatio deorum est; sed exclamatio duntaxat, et obtestatio: qualia ista,* Di boni, Di magni, Proh Juppiter, Pro deum, atque hominum fidem. *Per omnes, ait, deos, per quicquid deorum in caelo est quid tumultus iste sibi vult?*". See Bentley (1713: 302).

42 On this point, see Bassols (1943: 217).

43 "O ego non infelix] *Sic habent nostri libri veteres. Alii tamen se in in suis reperisse dicunt,* O ego infelix. *Et vero ita profert hunc versum Carisius lib. 2. institutionum grammaticarum his verbis,* quia nemo dixit, O ego, *nisi exclamatio sit, ut apud Horatium, O* ego infelix, quem tu fugis, etc.". See Lambinus (1605: 347).

44 See Oesiander (1551: 161-162).

45 "O non infelix] *Codices quidam non tam aliorum quam nostri sed ii non ultimae vetustati,* O ego infelix". See Bentley (1713: 324).

46 "Infelicis Ulixi *quoniam apud hostes loquitur, quaerit favorem eius vituperatione, quem scit odio esse Troianis*". (Serv. *Aen.* III 613). See Servius (1881: 445).

and his companions how Ulysses abandoned them in the cave of the Cyclopes. He also describes with great pathos how the monstrous Cyclops had eaten his companions. Taking into account this context and Servius' contribution regarding its use as oprobio "*infelix*" (Serv., *Aen.* III 613), one can infer that Virgil used this vituperium as an anticlimax, as a turning point in such an atrocious discourse. María Emilia Martínez-Fresneda (1999: 143-150) addresses the rhetorical figure known as climax and its opposite, anticlimax, as a topic that is repeated throughout passages of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. All this seems to confirm that we can transfer this ironic use as an insult to Horace's expression "O *ego infelix*" (Hor., *Epod.* 12, 25) and also to the alternative ("*non felix*")[47] offered by the oldest manuscripts "O *ego non felix*". (Hor., *Epod.* XII 25). In this context, the libidinous old woman expresses her hurt at her lover's lack of interest in her; however, she strove to obtain his attention and make herself attractive to him, taking great care with her clothing, as she covered herself with expensive clothes, specifically mentioning a cloak dyed twice with the colour purple from Tyre, which was very costly. That is why the old woman probably considers herself stupid, believing that her actions would win the attention of her lover, who prefers another woman. In other words, the tone is one of reproach towards herself rather than unhappiness. Next, I tackle the simile that appears in these two hexameters: "O *ego non felix, quam tu fugis, ut pavet acris / agna lupos capreaeque leones!*" (Hor. *Epod.* XII 30, 31).[48] "Woe is me, unhappy one, whom you shun, as the lamb fears the ravenous wolves and the roe deer fears the lions!". I offer the suggestion of Pedro Manual Suárez Martínez (1994: 54-55). This contemporary author qualifies the type of animals with which each character is compared. Canidia is equated with "*lupi*" and "*leones*", while Horace is compared to the term "*agna*" and "*capreae*"; he adds that Canidia, by attributing the aforementioned animals to herself, assigns herself the masculine gender, and Horace, taking into account the animals to which he is assimilated, is assigned the feminine gender. Once again, the grammatical aspect, in this case gender, is associated with "*elocutio*". On the other hand, it is worth dwelling on a commonplace in both tragedy and epic poetry. Paula Cristina Mira Bohórquez (2019: 120, 122, 125) studies the literary topic of the union of the animal and human worlds in suffering, crime and violence, present in both tragedy and epic poetry. In her article "Buitres, águilas y leones en Agamenón de Esquilo", she offers passages from Euripides' play *Agamemnon,* where the simile of vultures appears (A., *Ag.* 47-54). Homer in the *Iliad* compares the fight between Sarpedon and Patroclus to that of two vultures on a high rock (Hom. *Il.* XVI 428-429). In the *Odyssey* (Hom. *Od.* XVI 216-218), he alludes to the weeping of Telemachus and his father, who wept like two vultures whose young had been stolen by farmers before their first flight. The use of expressions typical of tragedy and epic poetry in such a sarcastic and scathing context is what produces the satirical effect as a counterpoint, for we must remember the assignment of each animal to each of the characters and the genre with which they are associated. The connection between style and morphosyntactic aspects is repeated. Once again, we find the interjection o accompanying the vocative, in this case two vocatives: O *mare et terra*" (Hor., *Epod.* XVII 30). Landino annotates the passage: "*O mare et terra*" (Hor., *Epod.* XVII 30) from a stylistic point of view, that is, from the point of view of "*elocutio*".[49] He classifies these vocatives preceded by the interjection o as an "*exclamatio*". He emphasises the function of this literary device, which is to highlight the miserable and evil actions of the sorceress Canidia, who uses magic to cause harm. The commentator takes a pragmatic approach, highlighting the intentionality of the phrase and how to interpret the statement correctly. Along the same lines, Bentley offers two examples wher s a similar expression, one from Terence's play *The Adelphoe* (Ter., *Ad.* 780) and the other from the *Letters* of Pliny the Younger (Plin., *Epist. I* 9. 6). Bentley, in terms of "*elocutio*", notes that the repetition of the interjection "*o*" lends great liveliness to the expression, that is, it makes the style passionate.[50] Like Landino, he focuses on the intentionality of grammatical expressions. With these kinds of observations, both Neo-Latin scholars foreshadow the subject of study of the discipline known as pragmatics. Its objective is the use of language where communicative intention is taken into account.

47 Rubén Bonifaz Nuño says the following in his notes to the text: "25. Non felix =I.e., infelix. Es lítotes". See Bonifaz Nuño (2007: L).

48 The text comes from Lambinus (1605: 345).

49 "O mare] *Oportune interposita exclamatio ad scelus Canidiae et miserias suas augendas*". Landinus (1482: 153 r).

50 "O mare et terra] *Acron et editus, et manuscriptus sic exhibet,* O mare, O terra, ardeo: *quod explicat ex illo Terentiano*, o caelum, o terra, o maria Neptuni. [=Ter., *Ad.* 780]. *Recte: nam longe vehementius quid sonat* O *repetitum. Plinius Epist. I, 9,* O mare, O litus uerum secretum Μουσεῖον[=Plin., *Epist. I* 9. 6]". See Bentley (1713: 340).

Schematic Affective Sentences

Hofmann (1958:73-74) considers ellipsis and explains that it comes from the manifestation of affection, from a desire to reach the end of all linguistic externalisation and mutual understanding. Epode XIV is composed in mirror image; on the one hand, it compares the love the poet feels for his beloved Phryne with that felt by Anacreon for Batylus of Samos. On the other hand, it establishes a similarity between the love story of Maecenas and that of Helen, who caused the burning of Troy (Hor., *Epod.* XIV 13-14). It is precisely in these verses dedicated to Maecenas that further explanation is needed due to the laconic nature of the expression. Landino dedicates a motto to explain the meaning of these two verses: *ureris ipse miser: quodsi non pulchrior ignis / accendit obsessam Ilion* (Hor. *Epod.* XIV 13, 14). "You yourself, unhappy man, are burning; and if a more beautiful fire did not set Ilion ablaze when it was besieged". His words are as follows: Pulchrior ignis.] *Helen: for she shows what she is capable of doing. The sentence is yours, Maecenas, you will burn: and the fire that burned Ilion is not more beautiful than your fire: therefore, she whom you burn is more beautiful, Helen. Optime autem ignem posuit: nam et amori et incendio urbis inservit.* (Ladinus 1482: 151v). "Helen: she showed that she could carry out the most serious things. The idea is: you, Maecenas, burn, and the fire that burned Troy is no more beautiful than yours, for the one you are inflamed by is more beautiful than Helen, yet she caused a fire in the best way, since it served love and the burning of the city".

From his words, it can be inferred that the term "*ignis*" has a double meaning: one is 'burning love' in a figurative sense, and the other has a literal meaning, 'the fire that causes fires and destruction'. Indeed, this brevity or conciseness in expression is capable of stirring the intellect, for that is the function of good poetry. Landino analyses the text from the point of view of "*elocutio*", drawing on elements of syntax. Lambin, on the other hand, first pauses to explain the value of "*ureris*" in the phrase: "*ureris ipse miser*". (Hor., *Epod.* XIV 13). "You yourself, unhappy man, are burning". In this case, Lambin points out the figurative meaning of the verb urere. The entry reads: "Ureris ipse] *Tu quoque Maecenas amore flagras, miser*".[51] "*Ureris ipse]* You too, Maecenas, are burning with love, unhappy man!"). In line with the above, Lambin first explains the meaning of "*ureris*" in the phrase: "*ureris ipse miser*" (Hor., *Epod.* XIV 13). "You yourself, unhappy man, are burning". In this regard, Lambin points out the figurative meaning of the verb urere. The entry reads: "Ureris ipse] *Tu quoque Maecenas amore flagras, miser*".[52] "*Ureris ipse*] You too, Maecenas, burn with love, unhappy man!". Lambin then dedicates a motto to the verses: "*quodsi non pulchrior ignis / accendit obsessam Ilion* (Hor., *Epod.* XIV 13-14)". "And if a more beautiful fire did not set Ilion ablaze when it was besieged". His scholia points out the values of "*ignis*", as Landino did before him. Lambino's words are as follows:

Quod si non pulchr. ign.] *Id est, quod si Helena, quae Paridem amore incendit: vel quae Troiani incendii causa fuit, non fuit tua puella formosior: tuo te bono oblecta, eoque fruere: vel eo contentus esto. Ambiguum inest in voce ignis. Nam Helena et incendii Troiani causam attulit, et Paridem amore inflammavit: quod utrumque ignis appellatione declaratur. Virgil[ius] Palaem[onis* Ecloga III] meus ignis Amyntas. *[*=Verg., *Ecl.* III 66]. Idem Aeneid 3 […] Phryiique penates / quos mecum a Troia, mediisque ex ignibus urbis / extuleram. [=Verg., *Aen.* III 148-150].[53] "*Quod si non pulchr. Ign.*] If Helen, who set Paris ablaze with her love: or she who was the cause of the burning of Troy, was not more beautiful than your beloved: delight in your delights and enjoy them: or be content with that".

There is ambiguity in the word *ignis,* for Helen was not only the cause of the burning of Troy, but also set Paris ablaze with her love: but both things are referred to by the term ignis. Vergil in the third eclogue, where Palemon is the arbiter of the contest: "*meus ignis Amyntas*". (Verg., *Ecl.* III 66). Vergil himself in the *Aeneid:* "*Phryiique penates / quos mecum a Troia, mediisque ex ignibus urbis / extuleram*". (Verg., *Aen.* III 148-150). The conclusion reached after examining the comments of Landino and Lambin is the uniformity of the stylistic criteria they follow, where it is evident that they use morphology and syntax to elucidate stylistic figures. The following expression, the subject of commentary, is an abbreviated phrase "*nefas videre*" (Hor., *Epod.* XVI 14). It is immersed in the middle of a passage where the poet rebukes the Roman people who are prepared to plunge into civil war. It is in this context that the poet proposes abandoning Rome and reminds them that once they leave, a barbarian will desecrate the bones of the founder of Rome. The scene

51 See Lambinus (1605: 352).

52 See Lambinus (1605: 352).

53 See Lambinus (1605: 352).

he describes is a sacrilegious spectacle, which is why the poet says *nefas videre* (Hor., *Epod.* XVI 14). In line with the aforementioned expression "*nefas videre*" (Hor., *Epod.* XVI 14), Landino (1482: 151r) considers that it is not lawful to see the bones of Romulus buried in the tomb; this statement leads him to discuss respect for the dead and their customs; For, he affirms, not only is it not legitimate to desecrate the tomb of Romulus, since he was the ruler of the Roman people, but it is also not permitted to violate the tombs of all mortals.[54] It follows from the above that the humanist is aware of the brevity of the syntactic expression, which is why he expands its meaning. Along the same lines is Lambin's scholia (1605: 357), in which the scholar attempts to elucidate the passage by establishing syntactic parallels with Greek texts dealing with the subject of sacred rituals belonging to the world of the dead; this is why he indicates that it is not appropriate to see Romulus' ashes scattered. He then offers a passage from Phocylides of Miletus (Pseudo-Phocylides); first he paraphrases the passage from the Greek text in Latin and then offers the Greek version.[55] The poet's words mean that the peace of the tombs should not be disturbed. Furthermore, to avoid divine wrath, he suggests not exposing to the sun what should be hidden:[56] "*Μὴ τύμβον φθιμένων ἀνορύξῃς, μηδ΄ ἀθέατα /δείξῃς ἠελίῳ καὶ δαιμόνιον χόλον ὄρσῃς*". (Phoc. 100, 101). "Beware, , lest you open the tomb of those who are buried, what is not visible, beware lest you show it to the sun and awaken the wrath of the gods". Finally, Lambin alludes to another possible reading to understand the verse, adding that the reading "*nefas videri*" (Hor. *Epod.* 16, 14) does not disapprove of it, this reading is correct, according to two manuscripts, one of which belongs to the group of five[57] *Codices Vaticani* to which he had access and the other is a very old manuscript provided to him by the typographer Joannes Tornesius from Leiden[58] (University Library-Public Library, 28, 9th century). Bentley (1713: 322) opts for "*nefas videre*" (Hor. *Epod.* 16, 14), which is the option of the best manuscripts; from a metrical point of view, the only possible choice is the active infinitive *nefas videre* (Hor., *Epod.* XVI 14), because the verse is a pure iambic dimeter, i.e. it has no substitutions for the odd syllables of the iamb[59]. If the passive infinitive "*-eri*" is chosen, the ending "*-i*" counts as a long syllable[60] , as opposed to the ending -e of the active infinitive *-e,* which is a short syllable[61] . Johann Caspar von Orelli[62] already noted this, while assigning to some of the manuscripts the reading "*nefas videre*" as opposed to "*nefas videri*", which was the "*lectio*" of other manuscripts[63], among which he cites a very old one, the *Codex Blandinianus Vetustissimus*[64], burned in 1566 by the Protestant rebels of Flanders. the readings of the aforementioned manuscript are collected by the 16th-century Flemish philologist Jacob van Cruyck in his 1565 edition; another manuscript that opts for *videri* is the Codex Sueco-Vaticanum[65] 9th-10th century, which currently corresponds to the *Codex Vaticanus*[66] Reg. Lat. 1703. In conclusion, the importance given by scholars to textual criticism is evident. In this case, humanists link "*elocutio*" to textual criticism, where they have debated morphological aspects in order to interpret the meaning of the text.

Exaggerations and Redundancies

According to Hofmann (1958: 101), in everyday language, the affective renewal of terms to intensify or negate is evident, hence the tendency to exaggerate according to one's mood, not only positive but also ironic or sarcastic. The most emblematic representatives of the exaggeration of feelings are insulting words, where feelings are given free rein (1958: 125-132). The epigrammatist displayed a barrage of insults throughout his poetic compositions. Epode VI was a mocking attack on a poet. On the one hand, Landino (1482: 146v) believes that it may have been Mevio or Bavio, both enemies of Horace and Vergil;[67] on the other hand, Lambin (1605: 330) suspects that it could be Cassius Severus.[68] The poet opened the poem by asking the target of his invective why he attacks passers-by and identifies him with a dog. Horace says: "*Quid inmerentis hospites vexas, canis / ignavus adversum lupos?*".[69] (Hor., *Epod.* VI 1, 2). "Why do you bother innocent passers-by, you cowardly dog in the face of wolves?". Here he compares the poet to a "*canis*", a term used as an insult. Lambin[70] first establishes the meaning of the term "*canis*" in the passage "*Quid inmerentis hospites vexas, canis, / ignavus adversum lupos?*". (Hor., *Epod.* VI 1-2).[71] He considers it to have the following meanings: "he who shouts" and "he who insults". He then goes on to list the different meanings in various examples. He cites some phrases from Cicero's *Pro Roscio Amerino,* but gives his own version of the Latin text. In the example cited, the orator considers those who defame and insult others with all kinds of opprobrium to be "*canes*" (Cic., *S. Rosc.* 57). He then gives an example from Plautus (Plaut., *Men.* 714) in which Hecuba is considered a dog because of her behaviour, that is, because of her ferocity. Celia Lozano (2016: 95) in her article "La Hecuba de Eurípides" refers to the character Polymestor as the one who refers to this ferocity on the part of the Trojan

54 "Nefas uideri] *Vel quod non sit fas videre ossa Romuli in sepulchro recondita. Nam apud apriscos non solum Romuli quod romanae gentis auctor esset sed omnium mortalium sepulchra violare nefas erat. Vel dicit dissipabit ossa quod spectaculum nefas sit cernere*". See Landinus (1482: 151r).

55 "*Nefas uidere] Videre Romuli cineres dispersos. [Non debent enim sepulchra violari, nec ossa mortuorum condita aperiri, et oculis hominum exponi. Phocyl[ides] μὴ τύμβον φθιμένων ἀνορύξῃς, μηδ΄ ἀθέατα/δείξῃς ἠελίῳ καὶ δαιμόνιον χόλον ὄρσῃς.* [=Phoc. 100-101] *Cod[ex] unus Vatic[anus] et Tor[nesianus] habent nefas videri quam scripturam non improbo*". See Lambinus (1605: 357).

56 With this example, Lambinus seeks to show respect for the dead throughout ancient tradition. On this point, contemporary scholar Javier del Hoyo (2014: 810) states that graves were considered "*res religiosae*", and the place of burial a "*locus religiosus*". Roman private law punished those who violated a grave ("*actio de sepulchro violato*"). However, this legislation did not prevent the violation of tombs, as evidenced by the large number of epitaphs found in different parts of the Empire in which we can still read pleas not to desecrate the graves, warnings about the evil that may befall transgressors, and even wishes for revenge against offenders.

57 Lambinus cites five Vatican codices in his preface: "*In bibliotheca Pontificis Rom.[ae] Vaticana, quae mihi beneficio Gulielmi Sirleti, et Hieronymi cuius fratris, et Federici Brutii, quoties mihi commodum erat, patebat, quinque libros antiquissimos, manuscriptos reperi*". See Lambinus (1605: *4v).

58 *Codex Leidensis, Leiden, University Library-Public Library, 28, 9th century.* See Horacio (2007: 94).

59 See Horace (2007: 515).

60 See Monteil (1992: 404).

61 See Monteil (1992: 405).

62 "Scire nefas.] *Improbandum est igitur, quod boni codices habent videri, praesertim cum ceteris locis omnibus puros iambos Horatius hoc in carmine* adhibuerit". See Orellius (1886: 691).

63 "Videre *ABMSc Paris. Λ prob. Bentl. Mein, L. Müller, Keller, Vahlen, Kiessling;* Videri *codices plerique, in his Blandinianii*". See Orellius (1886: 690).

64 Horace (2007: 96).

65 See Orellius (1886: VII).

66 The *Codex Vaticanus* is currently held in the Vatican Library under the call number Reg. Lat. 1703. It must be a manuscript dating from before 849, based on the notes identified by Bischoff as belonging to the Carolingian poet Walafrid Strabo; as its initials indicate, it comes from the collection of codices bequeathed to the Vatican Library at the end of the 17th century by Queen Christina of Sweden. Furthermore, it appears to come from the monastery of St Peter and St Paul in Wissemburg (Alsace). See Horace (2007: 95).

67 Quid immerentes hospites vexas canis] *In poetam maledictum invehitur sive Mevius sit: sive Bavius sit: quod Horatio Virgilioque adversi erant.* See Landinus, *Quintus*, 146v.

68 Immerenteis.] *immeritos, nihil commeritos. Aiunt quidam, Horatium invehi in quemdam Cassium Severum, poetam maledictum et petulantem.* See Lambinus (1605: 330).

69 The Latin text comes from Lambinus (1605: 330).

70 "Canis] *Latrator, maledice. M. Tull[ius] in his speech for Roscius Amerinus, compares accusers to geese and dogs:* some can only cry out, but cannot harm; others can bark and bite [= Cic., *S. Rosc.* 57]. *Illos anseribus: hos canibus esse simileis. eadem ratione maledictos homines, canes appelare licet. Thus Menaechmus in Plautus [=* Non tu scis, mulier, Hecubam quapropter canem (Plaut., *Men.* 714)] *says that Hecuba began to be called a dog because she would inflict all kinds of evil on anyone she looked at. Furthermore, dogs are said to be shameless. Hom[erus]* Ἰλ. Λ Εξ αὖ νῦν ἔφυγες θάνατον κύον[=Hom., *Il.* XI 362], *id est, nunc quidem mortem effugisti canis. Ex quo* κυνώπης, *who is canine-eyed, impudentibus, vox eidem usitatissma*". See Lambinus (1605: 330).

71 This reading is taken from Lambinus (1605: 330).

women (E., *Hec.* 1072). In line with the above, from the verses that follow in Plautus' work, one can conclude that the playwright compared Hecuba, whom the Greeks called a bitch because of her behaviour, to the wife of Menecmo I, who deserved the same name because of her attitude. Finally, Lambino presents another meaning of the term "*canis*", which is "shameless". In this case, he provides a hexameter from Homer's *Iliad*, where Diomedes referred to Hector with the vocative "*κύων*". His words are as follows: "*Εξ αὖ νῦν ἔφυγες θάνατον κύον*". (Hom., *Il.* XI 362). "Once again, shameless one, you have escaped death!".[72] The last sentences of the lemma are devoted to clarifying this latter meaning of the Latin form *canis,* which is why he equates "*canis*" with the adjective "κυνώπης", understandable as "one who looks with dog's eyes", that is, "with shameless looks". A synonym for this adjective can be found in Aeschylus' Coephorae, where the chorus describes Scylla, the daughter of Nisus, as "*κυνόφρων*" (A., *Ch.* 619) 'shameless bitch', because, seduced by Minos' gifts, she deprived her father Nisus of the hair that made him immortal while he slept. Lambin's intention to present the use of "*canis*" in different literary genres and the negative meaning it has in each of them is evident, for example, in oratory (Cic., *S. Rosc.* 57), in comedy, referring to Hecuba, a tragic character (Plaut., *Men.* 714) and finally in epic poetry (Hom., *Il.* XI 362). The fact that he mentions examples from each of the genres cited highlights the effect of colloquialisms: in tragedy, they enhance the tragic value when Lambin mentions Hecuba in the passage from Plautus.[73] In the *Iliad,* the colloquialism "*canis*" occurs in the midst of a situation of great tension, in the battle between the Achaeans and the Trojans, and its purpose is to produce a turning point. Luis M. Macía Aparicio (2011: 229) alludes to the use of elements typical of epic poetry for comic purposes. This contemporary scholar believes that Aristophanes' comedies offer numerous epithets which, in terms of their formation and meaning, are similar to those that characterise the language of epic poetry. In his view, this fact demonstrates the relevance of epic poetry in Aristophanes' time and the audience's ability to grasp allusions to this genre, which allows the comedian to provoke laughter at their expense. Regarding the use of insults as rhetorical devices in speech, Salvador Mas (2015: 53) alludes to the importance Cicero attaches to the use of "*sales*" ("humour"), as these encourage the audience's good disposition and are a weapon to combat the adversary in the face of an unexpected expression that provokes laughter. Cicero discusses this in his work *De Oratore,* using terms such as "*lepos*", "*facietiae*", "*subtilis venesta*" and "*urbanitas*" (Cic., *De Orat.* I 17), all of which have in common the indication of what provokes laughter in speech.

Euphemisms and Related Phenomena (Irony)

Hofmann (1958: 223) points to sarcasm, along with mockery and scorn, as being responsible for turning the kindest expressions into their diametric opposites. This fact is evident in the following examples I present. The first part of epode XVII is a palinode addressed to Canidia, similar to the one Stesichorus had to address to Helen; thanks to the palinode he composed to praise the defamed Helen, her brothers, Castor and Pollux, restored his sight, which had previously been taken away as punishment for presenting Helen as an adulteress. The ironic and sarcastic tone can be perceived in these verses (Hor., *Epod.* XVII 1-52). Landino[74] (1482: 153r) and Lambin[75] (1605: 365) address the iambic senarius "*amata nautis multum et institoribus*". (Hor., *Epod.* XVII 20). "She who is so loved by peddlers and sailors". Both consider the verse to be ambiguous, as it could seem that Canidia was loved by many; however, given the context, both humanists assert that it was understood that she was desired only by the "*nautae*" and "*institores*". The two humanists analyse the text from the point of view of "*elocutio*", but rely on the syntactic structure. Bentley (1713: 338-339) makes a contribution regarding the verse, which is the subject of a different commentary. He proposes as an amendment to the text in his comments the interjection or at the beginning of the verse "*O amata nautis multum et institoribus*". (Hor., *Epod.* XVII 20);[76] however, in the central text of the edition (1713: 339), the interjection he proposes in his note does not appear. In his scholia, the humanist considers that adding the interjection gives the style strength and new nuances, whereas omitting it makes the style more languid and dull. Finally, he adds that editors often omit the interjection, as it does not affect the metre. In this case, Bentley resorts to textual criticism for his stylistic commentary, where one reading or another (grammatical elements) determines the style. It should be remembered that if it is decided to include it, the participle in the vocative "*amata*" would be elided before , which is why it does not affect the metre, whether it is included or omitted. In fact, Lambin[77] (1605: 365) makes it clear that the interjection should be included in the translation, although it is true that it does not amend the text. Regarding the expression "*Voles sonari: tu pudica, tu proba*". (Hor., *Epod.* XVII 40). "You, honest woman, you, honourable woman", Lambin explains that it was to be understood in the opposite sense, that is, that she was immodest and dishonourable.[78] In this ironic context, we read the iambic senarii "*infamis Helenae Castor offensus vice / fraterque magni Castoris, victi prece*". (Hor., *Epod.* XVII 42-43). "Castor and the brother of the great Castor, though offended on behalf of the defamed Helen, were overcome by her pleas". Here Horace compares the "*infamis*" Helen with the defamed Canidia, from whom he asks forgiveness. Lambin[79] recalls that the Greek lyric poet Stesichorus (Stesich. *PMG* 223) had spoken ill of Helen.[80] In these verses, Horace's intention to justify his praise of Canidia is evident, which is none other than to obtain her forgiveness, as he believes that by praising her, her attacks will cease, just as happened to the poet Stesichorus. As a side note, it deals with the reading "*infamis*" versus the option "*infimis*". Lambin says that he found the reading "*infimis*" in a *Codex Vaticanus*,[81] but does not comment on it. The relationship between textual criticism, where different adjectives (grammar) are chosen, and stylistic commentary is evident. However, Lambin warns that when choosing the option "*infimis*" over "*infamis*", one should not extend the contributions of Hermolaus Barbarus[82], who considers that "*inficetus*" should be written instead of "*infacetus*", on the basis of the expression "*inquit ostendens in tabula pictum inficetissime Gallum exserentem linguam*".[83] (Plin., *Nat.* XXXV 25); however, it should be noted that in poetry, the scanning of vowels must be observed. For metrical purposes, the syllable "*-fa*" in "*infacetus*" and the syllable "*-fi*" in "*inficetus*" are short and would be interchangeable metrically; on the other hand, the syllable "*-fa*" in *infamis* is long, while the syllable "*-fi*" in "*infimis*" is short, as it comes from the adjective *infimus-a-um.* Metrically, it is not possible to accept the reading "*infimis*", as the place that corresponds to the half-foot in the rhythmic

72 I have translated the verse, taking into account the meaning given by Lambinus in this context.

73 Stevens' exact words are as follows: "The category of the colloquial is intended to cover such words and phrases as might naturally be used in everyday conversation, but are avoided in distinctly poetic writing and in formal and dignified prose. It does not here include what may be called vulgarisms, i.e. words of a definitely non-literary character, with exclusively low and vulgar associations, or irregularities in forms of words or in syntax. As might be expected, the colloquialisms found in Tragedy are not of a kind to contrast violently with the general tone of the language, and are sometimes used, presumably without any incongruity, in combination with words peculiar to tragic diction". See Stevens (1931: 182).

74 "Amata] *Enim ironia est per ambiguetatem: nam dum videtur ostendere illam a multis amari intellegit avarissimam mulierem sordidis hominibus lucri eam subcubuisse*". See Landinus (1482: 153r).

75 "Amata nautis multum] *O tu, quam nautae, et institores multum amant. Cum videri velit eam honorifice appellare, eique blandiri, revera tamen contumeliose insectatur. Qui sint institores, dixi sup[ra] ad Od. 6. lib. 3*". See Lambinus (1605: 365).

76 "Satis superque poenarum tibi.] *I read*: Dedi satis superque poenarum tibi, O beloved, much sought after by sailors. *Thus the sentence, which was previously languid and dull, acquires new vigour and a new connection. Similarly, in verse 46*, Et tu, potes nam, solve me dementia; O nec paternis obsoleta sordibus. Ideo autem (ut solent) omiserunt id Librarii; quia sine eo mensura versus plena et integra est". See Bentley (1713: 338-339).

77 See note 75.

78 "Tu pudica, tu proba] *Significat eam esse impudicam, et improbam, sic Catull[us] in quandam.* Pudica et proba, redde codicillos[=Catull. 42. 24]". See Lambinus (1605: 367).

79 "Infamis Helenae] *Quam infamarat Stesichorus: dedecore et infamia notatae a Stesichoro[=Stesich. PMG 223)]. Non dissimulabo me reperisse in uno Vatic[ano] libr[o],* infimis. *De qua scriptura equidem nihil pronuntio. Tantum admonitum lectorem velim, ut consideret, idem ne sit sentiendum de nomine infamis, quod de infacetus censuit Hermolaus Barbarus, nempe scribendum esse inficetus*". Véase Lambinus (1605: 368). ". See Lambinus (1605: 368).

80 Alsina highlights some anti-Homeric features of Stesichorus in his analysis of two poems by the poet, which he considers key: *Helen* and *Palinode.* See Alsina (1957: 157-175).

81 See note 78.

82 "*Item: Infacetissime.*] *Cum inficetus, non infacetus dicatur, authore uel Catullo: scribendum est, inficetissime*". See Barbarus (1534: 391).

83 The text is taken from the edition by K. I. Sillig. See Sillig (1851: 221).

structure is a long syllable.[84] Bentley[85] in this passage does not allude to the sarcasm of these verses, but only corrects a reading, the form "*vice*" for "*vicem*"; since if "*vice*" were accepted, it would produce a cacophony due to the homoeoteleuton, that is, the repetition of the final sounds "*-ce*" of the words that close consecutive statements: *vice* and *prece*.[86]Bentley does not consider this homoteleuton to be characteristic of Horace, so he bases his correction on the reading offered by Torrentio's edition "*vicem*", an option he takes from a manuscript he cites as *Codex Mechliniensis*. From a metrical point of view, this verse is a trimeter[87] "*κατὰ στίχον*", so the choice of "*vice*" and "*vicem*" is metrically possible, as the last vowel of both is short.[88] Bentley links his stylistic commentary to textual criticism, since the choice of grammatical term will determine the syntactic structure, which in turn will determine the stylistic figure.

Conclusion

Firstly, I have highlighted the scope of the term colloquial language ("*sermo familiaris*"), understood as the Latin spoken by the upper social classes. I have outlined the different authors and their contributions in this regard, as various scholars from the Renaissance to the contemporary era have devoted themselves to the study of *sermo familiaris* and its literary reflections. Next, I have provided a list of authors from different periods who establish a link between stylistics and grammar. The starting point is Aristotle, who recognised the need to give form to thought through language as a manifestation of emotions. Finally, by way of "*exemplum*", I have provided several examples from Horace's *Epodes*, as the poet uses his pen to craft emotional sentences that turn the kindest expressions into their diametric opposites. Similarly, the Venusian poet shows in his work the tendency of colloquial language towards laconism, as a result of which he attributes the most extensive clarifications to the external situation and state of mind. Another defining feature of the epodes is the presence of characters from different social classes, with noble characters such as Maecenas and a poet named Mevio appearing alongside characters from the lower classes such as the sorceress Canidia. It should also be noted that epode XVII is a good example for studying colloquialisms and observing the social classes with which Horace associates them. The poem is divided into two parts, the first (Hor., *Epod*. XVII 1-52) spoken by the poet and the second (Hor., *Epod*. XVII 53-81) by Canidia. In reality, there is no difference between the expressions used by Horace and those used by Canidia in this poem, as we have already analysed. This leads us to reaffirm Hiersche's theory, which states that characters from both the lower and upper classes express themselves in this case in the comedy in the same Attic Greek, as is the case in Plato's dialogues with the slaves who speak on stage. It should be noted that in our case we are talking about the genre of lyric poetry, the literary genre to which the *Epodes* belong. What has been said so far assumes that the use of colloquialisms ("*sermo familiaris*") by the different characters is employed in accordance with the guidelines of his theory of decorum (Hor., *Ars*. 157). The contributions of the humanists of the Modern Age are worth noting. Their annotations aim to highlight the externalisation of the expansion of the self and the breakdown of the grammatical structure of language; in other words, their comments use grammatical concepts to explain rhetorical figures; on occasions, they refer to textual criticism to determine a grammatical choice that involves a syntactic and stylistic interpretation. They are therefore the precedent for current studies, which focus on this aspect.

References

1. Albaladejo T (1989), Retórica, Madrid, Síntesis.
2. Alsina J (1957) "La "Helena" y La "Palidonia" de Estesícoro". Estudios Clásicos 22: 157-175.
3. Aristoteles, Horacio (1998) Artes Poéticas, González, A. (ed.), Madrid, Taurus.
4. Azuela MC (2005), "Imágenes Textiles de la Creación Literaria Medieval", en Textos medievales: recursos, pensamiento e influencia: trabajos de las IX Jornadas Medievales, Company Company C., González A., Von der Walde, A. L. (eds.), Méjico, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Méjico, 401- 425.
5. Barbarus H (1534) In C. Plinii Naturalis Historiae Libros Castigationes, Basileae, apud Ioannem Valderum.
6. Bassols M (1943), Sintaxis Histórica de la Lengua Latina, Barcelona, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
7. Bentley R (1713) Quintus Horatius Flaccus, Amstelaedami, apud Johannem Rodolphum et Gerhardum Wetsenios.
8. Beroaldus PH (1501) Lucius Apuleius Madaurensis, Venetiis, per Simonem Papiensem, dictum Biuilaquam.
9. Bonifaz Nuño R (2007) Epodos, Odas y Carmen Secular, México, Universidad Autónoma de México.
10. Burmanus P (1720) M Fabii Quinctiliani De Institutione Oratoriae Libri Duodecim, Lugduni Batavarum, apud Joannem de Vivie.
11. Chico Rico F (2002) "la elocutio retórica en la construcción del discurso público de Emilio Castelar", en Política y Oratoria: El lenguaje de los políticos: actas del II seminario Emilio Castelar, Cádiz, diciembre de 2001, Hernández Guerrero, J. A. y García Tejera M. C. (eds,), Cádiz, Universidad de Cádiz, 177-202.
12. Cicero MT (2001) Letters to Friends, Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (ed.) (trad.), Cambidge, Harvard University Press, vol. 2.
13. Diaz Bautista MC (1990) "Gramática y Estilística de los tropos", E.L.U.A., 6: 153-182.
14. Dickey E, Chahoud A (2010) Latin coloquial y literario, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
15. Denniston JD (1962) The Greek Particles, Oxford, University Press.
16. Espinosa Elorza RM (2007) "Aspectos generales de la evolución de las expresiones adversativas cambios en cadena". Medievalia 39: 1-30.
17. Galan Sanchez PJ (2006) La clasificación de la conjunción en las gramáticas latinas del Renacimiento», Evphrosyne 34: 379-402.
18. Herrero VJ (1976) Introducción al estudio de la Filología Latina, Madrid, Gredos.
19. Hiersche R (1970) Grundzüge dergriechischen Sprachgeschichte, Wiesbaden, Reichert.
20. Hofmann JB (19513) Lateinische Umgangssprache, Heidelberg, Winter, (trad. De Corominas, J. Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1958).
21. Hofmann JB (1929) "Der Begriff Umgangssprache", Indogermanische Forschun 47: 209-213.
22. Horacio (2007) Odas, Epodos y Canto Secular, en Moralejo, J. L. (intr., trad., y notas), Madrid, Gredos.
23. Del Hoyo J (2014) "Ne velis violare. Imprecaciones contra los profanadores de tumbas", en El mundo de los difuntos: culto, cofradías y tradiciones, Campos, F. J. y Fernández de Sevilla, L. (eds.), Madrid, Ediciones Escurialenses 809-824.
24. Lambinus D (16052) Quintus Horatius Flaccus, Parisiis, apud Bartholomeum Macaeum.
25. Landinus CHR (1482) Horatius Quintus Flaccus, Florentiae, Antonio di Bartolommeo Miscomini.
26. Lipsius J (1591) Epistolica Institutio, Lugduni Batavorum, ex officina Plantiniana, apud Franciscum Raphelengium.
27. Van Looy H (1977) Review of Stevens, Philip Theodore, Colloquial Expressions in Euripides. In: L'antiquité classique, Tome 46, fasc. 2, 1977 617-618.
28. Lozano Garcia C (2016) "La Hécuba de Eurípides". Tycho 4: 91-108.
29. Macia Aparicio LM (2011) "Epítetos y expresiones de apariencia épica en las comedias de Aristófanes". Emerita 89 2: 229-250.
30. Martinez Hernandez M (1998-1999) "Generalidades sobre el griego coloquial". Philologica canariensia 4-5: 369-392.
31. Martinez-Fresneda ME (1999) "Inextingligle como el asbesto", en Tēs philiēs tade dōra: miscelánea léxica en memoria de Conchita Serrano, Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas 143-150.
32. Mas S (2015) "Verecundia, risa y decoro: Cicerón y el arte de insultar". Isegoría 53: 445-473.
33. Menendez Pelayo M (2018) Obras Completas: Historia de las ideas estéticas en España, en Bolado, G. (ed.), Santander, Universidad de Cantabria.

84 Horace (2007: 96).

85 "Offensus uice] *Odiosa est cacophonia in clausulis horum versuun*, Infamis Helenae Castor offensus uice, / fraterque magni Castoris, uicti prece, *quod homoeoteleuton, si bene eum novi, numquam auctor admisit. And indeed, a codex by Torrentii opportunely absolves him of this fault, presenting the passage as* Infamous Helenae Castor offensus VICEM. *Do not doubt that this reading is genuine*". Bentley (1713: 342-343).

86 "Infamis Helenae Castor offensus uice] *Mechliniensis* uicem *habet*". See Torrentius (1608: 514).

87 See Horace (2007: 96).

88 See Monteil (1992: 231 and 215).

34. Mira Bohorquez PC (2019) "Buires, águilas y Leones en Agamenón de Esquilo". Revista de Estudios Clásicos 46: 119-137.

35. Monteil P (1992) Elementos de Fonética y Morfología del Latín, Sevilla, Universidad de Sevilla.

36. Moralejo Álvarez JJ (1977) "Dialectos y niveles de lengua en griego antiguo". Revista Española De Lingüística 7(1): 57-86.

37. Morcillo G (2007) "La interjección. Estudio diacrónico". Humanitas 59: 83-98.

38. Morocho G (2003) Estudios de crítica textual, Murcia, Universidad de Murcia.

39. Oesiander IL (1551) Flavii Charisii Artis Grammaticae Libri Quinque, Basileae, Apud Hieronimum Frobenium et Nicolaum Episcopum.

40. Orellius IO G (1886) Odae, Carmen Saeculare, Epodi, Berolini, Calvary.

41. Palacios Marin A (1978) "Consideraciones acerca de los "adynata" de Horacio". AEF 1: 135-148.

42. Paramo Pomareda P (1960) Reseña a Hofmann, J. B. (1958): El latín familiar, en José Corominas (ed.) (trad.), Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, en Thesaurus 15(1-3): 309.

43. Penas MA (2009) Cambio semántico y competencia gramatical, Madrid, Vervuert.

44. Porzig W (1970) El mundo maravilloso del lenguaje, Madrid, Gredos.

45. Pulgram E (1950) "Spoken and Written Latin". Language 26: 458-466.

46. Priscianus Caesariensis (1858) Prisciani Institutionum Grammaticarum Libri XIII-XVIII, ex recensione Martini Hertzii, Lipsiae, in aededibus BG Teubneri 3.

47. Quintilianus MF (2002) The Orator´s Education, vol. 3-5, en Russel, D. A. (ed.), Cambidge, Harvard University Press.

48. Renaldinius C (1681) Rationalem Philosophiam distributam in Dialecticam, Rhetoricam, atque Poeticam complectens, Patavii, Petrus Maria Frambottus.

49. Sandys JE (1908) A History of Classical Scholarship, vol. 2, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

50. Sandy G (2006) "Two Renaissance readers of Apuleius», in Authors, Authority, and Interpreters in the Ancient Novel, Essays in Honor of Gareth L. Schmeling, Byrne, Sh. N., Cueva, E. P. (eds.), Groningen, Barkhuis 239-273.

51. Schneidewin FW (1841) Incerti auctoris de figuris vel schematibus versus heroici, Gottingae, G. Kuebler.

52. Servius Honoratus M (1881) Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii Aeneidos libros I-III, en Thilo, G. y Hagen H (eds), Leipzig, Teubner.

53. Sillig KI (1851) C Plini Secundi Naturalis historiae libri XXXVII, Hamburgi, sumptibus Friderici et Andreae Perthes.

54. Smart C (1916) The works of Horace, en Smart, C. (trad.), Buckley, Th. A. W. (ed.), New York, American Book Company.

55. Somerstein AH (2004) "Elementos cómicos en la lengua de la tragedia el caso de "Orestía" de Esquilo", en Registros lingüísticos en las lenguas clásicas, Ramos Guerreira, A. y López Eire, A. (eds.), Salamanca, Universidad de Salamanca 335-354.

56. Stevens PT (1931) "Colloquial expressions in Euripides". The Classical Quarterly 31(3-4): 182-191.

57. Stevens PH TH (1945) "Colloquial expressions in Aeschylus and Sophocles". The Classical Quarterly 39(3/4): 95-105.

58. Stevens PH TH (1976) Colloquial Expressions in Eurípides, Wiesbaden, Steiner.

59. Suarez Martinez PM (1994) "Horacio y las viejas libidinosas", Estudios Clásicos 105: 49-62.

60. Torrentius L (1608) Quintus Horatius Flaccus, Antuerpiae, ex officina Plantiniana apud Ioannem Moretum.

61. Unceta L (2006) Rseña a López Eire, A. y Ramos Guerreira, A. (eds.) (2004): Registros lingüísticos en las lenguas clásicas, Salamanca, Universidad de Salamanca. Faventia 28(1-2): 209-236.

62. Unceta L (2016) "Cuando los sentimientos irrumpen: análisis de las interjecciones secundarias en las comedias de Plauto", en Semántica latina y románica: unidades de significado conceptual y procedimental, García Hernández, B. y Penas Ibáñez, MA (eds,), Bern, Peter Lang 213-242.

63. Väänanen V (1967) Introductin au Latin Vulgaire, Paris, Klincksieck, (trad. De Carrión, M. Madrid, Gredos, 19883).

64. Viljamaa T (2019) "Words or Sounds? Ancient Grammarians on Interjections", en Acta Philologica Fennica Vol. LIII, Martti Leiwo, M. y Jakola, L. (eds.), Helsinki, Advisory Board 219-2461.

65. Virgilio (2012) Vergil, Aeneid Books 1-6.‎en Ganiban, R. T. y ‎Christine Perkell C. (eds), Indianápolis, Hackett.

66. Vives JL (1782) Opera Omnia, Valentiae, in officina Benedicti Monfort.

67. Watson L (2003) A comentary on Hore´s Epodes,Oxford, Oxford University Press.

68. Wilhelm Schneidewin F (1841) Incerti auctoris de figuris vel schematibus versus heroici, Gottingae, G Kuebler.

69. Wordsworth C (1842) The Correspondence of Richard Bentley, London, John Murray.