# REMARKS ON THE LANGUAGE OF LUCILIUS [*]

By

## JAN SAFAREWICZ

The tradition of Latin epic language created by Ennius lasted until the middle of the 1st century BC. All Roman poets who were writing in hexameter during that time modelled themselves on Ennius in their expression and applied those norms and linguistic conventions that Ennius had sanctioned in his works. Conscious imitation appears primarily within the area of stylistic phenomena. More generally, however, it can be concluded that Latin epic language did not undergo substantial change until the middle of the of the 1st century BC, when a group of poets from Catullus' circle not only brought forth a new poetic programme but also opposed the old language tradition.

Lucilius was not an epic poet. He was the author of satires, which are, however, from the linguistic point of view placed within the frame of epic tradition. On the other hand, the literary genre he practiced permitted him to draw amply from the living language of his day and for this reason, extant fragments of his poetry are doubly valuable in the history of the Latin language. In the first place, they indicate how the previous literary tradition was being continued, and in the second, they familiarize us with the state of spoken language of the cultured classes of Lucilius' day, i.e. the second half of the 2nd century BC.

In the system of language, both in phonetics and in morphology, we do not see significant differences between the language of Lucilius and that of Ennius. The same alternations in the use of optional inflections that constituted a characteristic trait of the *Annales* also appear in the text of the satires of Lucilius. Generally speaking, we can say that the language of Lucilius belongs in its entirety to the archaic tradition of Latin literary language.

The shortening of long vowels in final syllables before *-t* and before *-r* had already taken place almost universally. In Lucilius we find *uolăt* (168), *occupăt*

---

(257), *amputăt* (281), *culpăt* (345), *obiciēbăt* (394), *scāberăt* (333), etc.; *licĕt* (82), *habĕt* (244), *prōtollerĕt* (7), *siĕt* (374), etc.; *redĭt* (122), *conuestĭt* (129), *fĭt* (440), etc.; *patĕr* (413, 418), etc.; *ecferŏr* (158), *pūmicŏr* (264), *praetŏr* (91), *longiŏr* (168), etc. Only in 391 the form *languōr* is found:

> languor, obrepsitque pigror torporque quietis.

This is probably a trace of the older tradition, still that of Ennius, which permits alternation in such cases.

The problem of iambic shortening deserves special consideration. This phonetic phenomenon was active during the 3ʳᵈ century BC (it is frequently found in Plautus), and it left clear traces also in the texts of the 2ⁿᵈ century BC (particularly in the comedies of Terence). In the poems of Lucilius we see that iambic shortening is still active. In some words it led to the generalization of the shortened form, in particular in the adverbs *benĕ* and *malĕ*, which do not appear in iambic form, cf., for example, 268 (hexameter):

> calda siem ac benĕ plena, si olorum atque anseris collus,

or 470 (hexameter):

> non malĕ sit: ille, ut dico, me exenterat unus.

The word *ubi*, e.g., in hexameter 18, has the same pyrrhic form:

> – ◡ ◡ haec ubĭ dicta, dedit pausam ore loquendi.

The length of the adverb *ibi*, which stands before the caesura in hexameter 110, cannot be determined. In other expressions, however, we see an alternation; sometimes the shortened form predominates, such as in dat. sg. *tibĭ*, which occurs 9 times in its pyrrhic form, e.g., in hexameter 1030:

> nolito tibĭ me male dicere posse putare,

but in hexameter 1011 we need to read it in iambic form:

> gratia habetur utrisque, illisque tibīque simitu;

an uncertain *tibī* is found in 564 (hexameter) before the caesura after the seventh half-foot. There are two clear examples of pyrrhic *sibĭ* (678, 988) versus one iambic form in 479. The word *uti* normally assumes a pyrrhic form (e.g., 53, 291, etc.), but it has been used once as two short syllables (in an iambic senarius 765); that this was not just a metrical liberty but a symptom of alternation characteristic of a living language is shown by the constant (three occurrences) use of the word *sīcŭtĭ* with a short final syllable, e.g. in hexameter 198:

> sicuti cum primos ficos propola recentis,

similarly in 1029 and 1298. The word *modo* appears in either of two prosodic forms in the same line 703 (troch. septen.):

> modŏ sursum, modō deorsum, tamquam collus cernui;

cf. also *eodem... modō* in 887 (troch. septen.). That iambic shortening was still a living process in Lucilius' language is shown by *ad hoc* shortenings in isolated words and groups of words with iambic structure, such as *uidĕ* (603), *meŏ* (abl. sg., 913; dat. sg. 965), *domŭm* (815, next to *domum* with the final syllable not shortened, in the caesura of hexameter 1142; *domī* 562), *capŭt* (883); also *misĕrrimum* (733, but *miserque* without shortening 332), *diŭtius* (907), *nec ĕsse* (662), *quod ĭllī* (722), *sine ăd mē* (731), *et ĭn malā* (699), and perhaps also *Arĭstippum* (742, troch. septen.), if we read *mīsisse* following the manuscripts of Nonius:

> Socraticum quidam tyranno misisse Aristippum autumant

(Marx corrects to *mīsse*, in order to avoid the shortening in the next word).

Pertaining to the shortening of a long vowel in position before another vowel, the language of Lucilius in general represents the same state as we already find in Ennius: in some morphological forms, shortening is universal, in particular in the inflection of verbs in stems in *-ē-* or *-ī-*; we read, therefore, *nocĕō* (280), *habĕam* (181), *manĕat* (175), *indigĕāmus* (308), *pollicĕātur* (270), etc.; *uenĭō* (282; *peruenĭō* 127); *aduenĭentibus* (50), *ēsurĭente* (286), etc. Similarly in the declension of the noun *grūs*: nom. *grūs* but abl. *grŭe* (both in 168). In some cases, however, alternation can be seen, particularly in the inflection of the verb *fiō*: as a rule, the long quantity of the vowel *-ī-* is preserved, as in *fīō* (670), *fīunt* (1214), *fīam* (671), *fīat* (232, 361, 370, 1065, 1130), *fīant* (365), *fīet* (366, 749); but in the infinitive *fierī* the vowel in the initial syllable is always short, not only in dactylic verse (26, 1214), but also in trochaic (654, 698, 704). In the perfect *fuī*, however, the extant verses of Lucilius show only forms with a shortened *-u-*: *fŭisti* (30), *fŭit* (132, 149, 152, 289, 419, 468), *fŭimus* (740), *fŭērunt* (110), *fŭēre* (111), *fŭisset* (427), *fŭerint* (1098), *fŭisse* (395, 542). It can be seen that the short vowel has spread here in the living language of Lucilius' time. This shortening was such a durable element that it could also cause iambic shortening in the next syllable, as we see in v. 468 (hexameter):

> in terra fŭĭt, lucifugus, nebulo, id genus sane,

similarly in hexameter 542:

> conpernem aut uaram fŭĭsse Amphitryonis acoetin.

This interpretation seems more likely than reading the relevant verses with monosyllabic *-ui-*, as is proposed by MARX (vol. II, p. 203). In the text of Lucilius, in the declension of nouns we infrequently come across forms of the gen. sg. in *-āī* that has not been shortened: *ferāī* (164; manuscripts of Nonius have here *ferat*), *patriāī* (1337; manuscripts of Lactantius give the reading *patriae*), *rūtāī* (135; transmitted as *rutia*), *Tīresiāī* (226; in the manuscripts of Nonius *Tiresiam*), *uiāī* (993; in the mansucripts of Nonius *ui*). Forms in *-ae* are the norm, however, e.g., *terrae* (1), similarly *Diānae* (104), *Minervae* (125), etc. Pronouns and numerals appear in Lucilius very rarely in the gen. sg.; we find *illĭus* once (158), *ūnĭus* also once (366). The lack of forms in *-īus* may be coincidental.

As a result of anaptyxis in the consonant cluster *-cl-* there arose alternate forms of the noun ending in *-clum* or *-culum*. On the other hand, as a result of the loss of a short vowel in an interior syllable (i.e. syncope), forms such as *caldus* were produced alongside the earlier *calĭdus*. Similarly in compound forms of the verb *pōnere*, alongside of the regular *posĭtus* shortened variants *compostus*, *dēpostus* came into use. In Lucilius' time these alternate forms, differing as to their origin, constitued unstable elements of spoken language and the poet exploited the existing alternation in his literary works. The shortened variants were certainly used more frequently in the everyday speech, thus they preponderate in Lucilius. In many cases, the shortened form is confirmed by metrical analysis, as, e.g. in the following verses:

> 14. – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – mīrācla ciet tylyphantas

(the manuscripts of Nonius, who quotes this fragment, have here *miracula*, which is incompatible with the metre);

> 303. cum poclo bibo eodem, amplector, labra labellis...

cf. *dēpōclāssere* in 682;

> 905. cuius si in perīclo feceris perīculum

(iamb. senar.); in the same line we find *perīclo* alongside *perīculum*, similarly in 913 we read *perīclō*. In the same way we have to explain the alternation in *āridum* (354) alongside *ārdum* (733), *caldus* appears twice (268; probably also 291) alongside the classical *calidus*, *lārdum* (79) alongside of the *lāridum* known from Plautus, *frīgdāria* (317) alongside the classical *frīgidus*, and maybe also *uirde* (945) alongside the classical *uiridis*. Metrics imposes the reading *compostae* (84), *dēpostus* (105), although in both cases the longer forms, e.g. *compositae*, *dēpositus* have been transmitted. Finally, we also have to mention the acc. pl. form *dītiās* (717), with is transmitted in the manuscripts as *diuitias*, but also known from Plautus (*Capt.* 170): the alternation here is based on the coalescing of the element *-īui-* into one syllable. All these shortened forms are certainly variants used in everyday speech.

In the case of two adjacent vowels of the same timbre, contraction would ensue in the living spoken language, which could cause a lack of transparency in the morphological structure of the relevant form. This applied in particular to the inflection of names with stems in -*io*- or -*iā*-, if the final element began in -*i*-. Resulting from this were alternations in the use of the forms of the gen. sg. and nom. pl. in -*ī* or in -*iī*, in the dat. and abl. pl. in -*īs* or in -*iīs*. Lucilius attempted to standardize these variants, using in gen. sg. only the monosyllabyic ending -*ī*, most probably according tho the common pronunciation (particularly since the contraction of vowel in this case occurred much earlier). In his text, we find forms of the gen. sg. such as *dupundī* (1318), *ōtī*, (1140), *trīclīnī* (1107), and in personal names *Calpurnī* (573), *Caelī* (1295), *Cornēlī* (363, 621), *Lūcīlī* (366, 580, 774), etc. On the other hand, the gen. sg. *uentī Emathiī* (41; i.e., Greek Ἠμάθιος) indicates that forms with a reconstituted two-syllable ending were not lacking in the Latin of those times. In other occurrences, however, the poet employs the construction in -*iī, -iīs*, probably following the usage of everyday language. We find nom. pl. *aliī* (424), *propitiī* (929), *sociī* (1089, 1323), and similarly *Pompiliī* (484); also *dēliciīs* (277, 705, 896, 1140), *praecordiīs* (590), *cōpiīs* (665), etc. He also tried to standardize the perfect of the type *periī* (*periimus* 710, 843, *periisse* 184, 958, *abiit* 1093, *rediisse* 677), probably forming on this model an aritifical form *repperiī* (665). It would seem that Lucilius' efforts did not influence the state of the literary language, in which, variants of this sort were found. For us, all these forms provide evidence of an alternation which existed during Lucilius' times.

Alternations in the pronunciation of the everyday language were also reflected in the consonantal or vocalic use of the resonants *i* and *u* adjacent to a vowel. Standing at the end of the hexameter, *omnia* (438) must surely be read as a bisyllabic word. i.e. *omni̯a*, if the name *Pācīlius* contained in the second syllable a vocalic long *i* (which is indicated by *Paceilius* in inscriptions, *CIL* VI 36029, cf. MARX vol. II, p. 217), then in v. 581 it should be read as a three-syllable word, i.e. *Pācīli̯us*; this recalls the reading *Servīli̯us* found in Ennius and Horace. Also read as a three-syllable word is the twice-occurring 2 sg. perf. *māluistī*, 91 f.:

> maluisti dici. Graece ego praetor Athenis,
> id quod maluisti, te, cum ad me accedis, saluto,

thus *mālu̯istī*; less likely here is the hypothesis that we have iambic shortening here (*mālŭ̆istī*), which, however, is not altogether impossible because this is probably how we should explain the metre of 438:

> – ◡ ◡ – primum dŏmĭni̯a atque sodalicia omni̯a

with a three-syllable form of the word *domini̯a*.

Already in Lucilius' time, final *-d* after a long vowel was not pronounced. Even monosyllabic forms of the pronouns *mē*, *tē*, *sē*, which earlier ended in *-d* undergo elision in his poems, cf.:

> 470.  non male sit: ille, ut dico, me extenterat unus,
>  32.  stulte saltatum te inter uenisse cinaedos,
> 202.  Laeuius pauperem ait se ingentia munera fungi.

Only in a few isolated cases can we suspect the preservation of the old forms, passed on by literary tradition:

> 781.  utrum ánno an horno té abstuleris á uiro

(iamb. senar.), where the editors complete as *tētē* (L. Müller), *tū tē* (Leo) or *tēcum* (Marx); this was, perhaps, *tēd*. Similarly:

> 601.  súspendatne sé an in gladium incúmbat, ne caelúm bibat

(troch. septen.); possible, although unnecessary, is the reading *sēd ǎn ǐn gládium*, with iambic shortening (*ǐn*). But these are doubtful cases and they certainly do not reflect the state of the living language.

On the other hand, final *-s* following a short syllable was still, as in Ennius' time, an optional element. It was omitted before a word beginnning in a consonant, e.g., in 2:

> irritata canes quam homo quam planiǔs dicit.

Frequently, however, the consonant *-s* in this conmbination formed a closed syllable, not only before an enclitic as in *Postumiusque* (60) or *genusque* (152), *iocusque* (111), but in various contexts, e.g., in 243:

> cui neque iumentum est nec seruus nec comes ullus,

where the noun *seruus* takes the place of a spondee. The cases where *-s* is omitted are much more frequent than cases where it is retained. Before a word beginning in a vowel, however, the fricative *-s* was always consonantal, e.g., 4:

> consilium summis hominum de rebǔs hǎbebant,

thus preventing the elision of vowels.

In syllabification, the language of Lucilius does not differ from what can be seen in Ennius. The only case where alternation was possibly found pertains to the two possible ways of dividing the consonant cluster *muta cum liquida*. In Lucilius, this cluster is as a rule not divided, i.e. its use with a preceding open syllable. This can be seen in 164 (hexameter):

> concursaret ăgros, catulos fetumque ferai,

cf. also *celĕbri* (992), *cerĕbrō* (224), *cerĕbrōsum* (514), *fĕbris* (494), *lăbra* (1004), *lăcrimās* (206, 307), *lăcrimōsae* (194), *ŭtrīque* and the like (419, 584, 1011, 1119). There are, however, quite numerous examples of the division of the consonant cluster between two syllables, e.g. in hexameter 575:

> iam disrumpetur, medius iam, ut Marsus colubras,

where the word *colubrās* contains a long medial syllable; similarly *febris* (923, iamb. senar; with the prosodic value of a trochee), *fibrās* (1201, spondee), *labra* (303, trochee), *retrō* (1012, spondee), *sacra* (1219, spondee), *utrōque* (358, with the first syllable long), also *mitrae* (71, spondee). In particular, the variation in the length of the first syllable of the words *febris*, *labra* indicates that, in this case, the alternation was the charateristic of the living spoken language.

The linguistic principles of Lucilius' versification were the same as in Ennius' time. The hexameter of satires consists of two elements, each permitting variations in quantity in the final value, and thus, before a masculine caesura, not only a long syllable but also a short (anceps) can be found, as in hexameter 550:

> cetera contemnit ‖ et in usura omnia ponit.

The final syllable of *contemnĭt*, before a word beginning in a vowel, takes the place of a long syllable. This characteristic of the caesura, not as a linguistic, but as a metrical trait (i.e. as a principle of versification), was also exploited by Lucilius with other types of caesuras, namely after the third half-foot of the hexameter:

> 330. crisabit ‖ ut si frumentum clunibus uannat,
> 361. quae iacimus, ‖ addes e 'peila' ut plenius fiat,

and probably also in 1094:

> praestringat ‖ oculorum aciem splendore micanti,

because shortening of the vowel before final *-t* occurs throughout in Lucilius, it was probably read as *praestingăt*.

Also present in Lucilius, however, are certain characteristics which are not found in the language of Ennius. This pertains primarily to the use of elision. It already appears in Ennius, e.g. in *Ann.* 11 f.:

> non animam: et post inde uenit diuinitus pullis
> ipsa anima,

but is an infrequent phenomenon. The poet clearly tried to avoid word combinations in which elision had to occur. In a longer section of 17 hexameters (*Ann.*

35–51) only one example of elision occurs: *uestigare et* (42), and in another 20-line section (*Ann.* 77–96) there are only two examples: *auspicio augurioque* (78) and *atque ore timebat* (87). In Lucilius, however, elision is extremely frequent.

This phenomenon obviously stems from the living spoken language. This can be inferred from the fact that in Latin there exist side by side words with or without a final vowel, e.g., *neque* alongside *nec*, *atque* alongside *ac*, *nēue* alongside *neu*. The disappearance of the final vowel was probably initially dependent on its position in the sentence: it would occur when the next word began in a vowel. But very early on (in a pre-literal period, in any case), in certain morphological formations or in specific words, shortened variants became generalized, with the result that in some cases no or very few traces remained of the alternate longer variants. In this way, in the historical period, for example, there remains no sign of the word *\*eti*, from which the conjunction *et* arose. We can reconstruct the early form on the basis of its correlation with the Greek adverb ἔτι. In versification, this linguistic alternation of shorter and longer forms of a word was utilized in a somewhat artificial manner, employing elision every time two vowels met across word boundaries. The artificiality of this system was probably due to the fact that, while in living everyday language elision took place perhaps only in groups of words that were related contextually, elision could be utilized in verse at will at the boundary between two words, even when a pause was expected. We can imagine, therefore, that the expression *populum atque urbem* could have been pronounced in the living language of prose as *popul(um) atqu(e) urbem*. If so, then the phonetic form of Lucilius' line (5):

> quo populo atque urbem pacto servare potisset

agreed with the pronunciation of the everyday speech. But already in, e.g., 9:

> o curas hominum! o quantum est in rebus inane!

the elision *homin(um) ō* cannot be justified in the living language, in which there surely must have been a pause before the exclamatory *ō*. This line illustrates the transfer of phonetic characteristics of the sentence to the verse element: the verse was treated as if it comprised one continuous sentence.

The frequency of elision, therefore, is linguistically justifiable: in the conventions of versification, the verse comprises the phonetic equivalent of the sentence. Nevertheless, an overly frequent use of this device led to the unnatural enhancement of its use and thus to the unnatural flow of speech, i.e. to a clear discrepancy between poetic language and the everyday speech. Later writers (as Ennius before Lucilius) avoided this type of artificiality by arranging their words so that elision was not frequent. Lucilius did not avoid the use of elision which appears very often in his work, e.g., in lines:

> 49. ad cenam adducam, et primum hisce abdomina tunni...
> 61. ceteri item, in capulo hunc non esse aliumque cubare

and in many other places.

The consequences of using elision in the everyday language was the appearance of shorter variants in some frequently used words. Some of these shortened variants permanently entered general Latin usage, e.g., imperative *dīc* (Lucil. 208), *dūc* (884, also probably 1145), also *fac* (in Lucilius still *face*, 890), while others remained as optional forms, existing in the shortened form only in everyday speech and only exceptionally entering literary language. One such non-literary form was probably *ill*, the shortened variant of the pronoun *illĕ* (nom. sg. masc.). In the fragments of Lucilius, this form appears once, in 720 (troch. septen.):

> ille contra omnia inter plures sensim et pedetemtim foris,

where the metre demands the reading of the form *ill*.

The conventions of versification which phonetically treat the verse as one complete sentence employed, at the boundary between individual words, inter-word phonetic processes of which elision is one manifestation. Given the conventions of considering the language content enclosed within one verse, it was therefore possible to treat certain groups of words as homogeneous elements. In this case, it was possible to employ intra-word rather than inter-word phonetic processes. Thus elision did not occur when two vowels were adjacent in the middle of the word, but correption, the principle of shortening a long vowel before another vowel (*vocalis ante vocalem corripitur*) did. The manifestion of hiatus in certain cases, associated with the shortening with the first of the adjacent vowels arises most probably from this. Here are some examples from Lucilius:

> 2. irritata canes quăm hŏmo quam planius dicit (hexameter),
> 661. tuorum, quăm ĭn album indidit a dextera, conficis ibi (troch. septen.),
> 774. Lucili, sī ĭn amore inritarit suo (iamb. senar.),
> 787. priuabit, igni cŭm ĕt aqua interdixerit  (iamb. senar.).

Each example involves the joining of a monosyllabic word closely associated with the word that follows. There existed, therefore, specific conditions which facilitated the joining of word association indicated into one word and which explain the application of intra-word phonetics rather that the expected and normally applicable inter-word phonetics leading to elision. Such cases are exceptional, as they constitute a somewhat artificial departure from the normal conventions of versification.

In the poetic technique of Lucilius we can see another characteristic that is particularly specific to this writer: Lucilius did not make an effort to use alliteration in his poetry. This was probably due to his tendency to Hellenize the Latin

language. The earlier native Latin tendencies to introduce compatible sounds of the intial elements of words left only faint echoes in his works, although the poet could find copious models in the poems of Ennius. Several times in Lucilius we can come across alliterating groups of words which are closely bound together and form consistent associations, e.g., *pestem permitiemque* (77), *mancus miserque* (332), *plurima et plenissima* (739), *nil parui ac pensi* (765), *populusque patresque* (1229) and the like. Whole lines with obvious alliteration occur at times, such as:

> 199. protulit et pretio ingenti dat primitus paucos,
> 1337. commoda praeterea patriai prima putare,
> 1340. uis est uita, uides, uis nos facere omnia cogit,

but these are exceptional cases, either traces of an earlier tradition of versification or else occasional ornaments of the verse which are based on earlier models but no longer form a constant compositional element. In this sense, Lucilius broke with the tradition of Ennius.

In terms of vocabulary, the most conspicuous characteristic of the fragments of Lucilius is their saturation with Greek terms. These words are very numerous; their number approaches 8% of the total lexical content (it exceeds 180). Admittedly, the frequency of Lucilius' use of Greek terms is less than the use of native words, but the reader is immediately struck by their presence. In some verses, whole Greek-sounding expressions or even sentences are introduced, as occurs, e.g., in 231 (including a quote from Homer, *Il*. XX 443):

> <nil> ut discrepet ac τὸν δὲ ἐξήρπαξεν Ἀπόλλων,

or in 462 f. (cf. Hom. *Od*. XI 491):

> non paucis malle ac sapientibus esse probatum
> ἢ πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν.

Servius, in the commentary to the *Georgics* of Vergil (II 98), quotes an expression from Lucilius: Χῖός τε δυνάστης (1131). Lucilius often uses individual Greek words, either in the Greek alphabet, as in lines:

> 342 f.               tota Ilias una
>        est, una ut θέσις annales Enni,
> 923. at cui? quem febris una atque una ἀπεψία,
> 961. ὠμοτριβὲς oleum Casinas,

or else partly in the Greek and partly in the Latin alphabet, cf. 786–790 (iamb. senar.):

> non aderit: ἀρχαῖς hominem et stoechiis simul
> priuabit, igni cum et aqua interdixerit.
> duo habet stoechia, adfuerit anima et corpore

(γῆ corpus, anima est πνεῦμα): posterioribus
stoechiis, si id maluerit, priuabit tamen,

or else written in a Latinized form, e.g., nom. sg. *sophos* (1236), *tacoglyphos* (497), *Atticon* (1199), or acc. sg. *disyllabon* (544), *cacosyntheton* (377), *cercopithecon* (1321), *pareutacton* (752), *poeeticon* (495); acc. sg. fem. *empleuron* (1251), *calliplocamon* (540), *callisphyron* (540), *scolen* (756), *acoetin* (542); gen. sg. *alochoeo* (25); nom. pl. *amphitapoe* (252), *pareutactoe* (321), *chirodytoe* (71), or else verb formations *diallaxon* (306), *chaere* (93, 94), etc. For the most part, how-ever, words of Greek origin have in Lucilius the form which is entirely adapted to Latin grammar, e.g., *agelastus* (1300), *asparagi* (133, 945), *emblemate* (abl., 85), *hexametro uersu* (299) and others. This wide range of the use of Greek words that the author inserts here and there in his work is clear evidence that the knowledge of the Greek language in the literary circles of Rome was widespread and also that the use of Greek was fashionable. This is reminiscent of the use of French in 18th century Poland. In this way, Lucilius' language is testimony to how far the Hellenization of Latin had progressed over the century which sepa-rates this poet from the time of Ennius.