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I. Introduction

All literary expression depends upon one element,—words. Upon them rests the responsibility of all weight and color in producing literary effects. An intensive study, then, of an author's vocabulary is certainly justified. Above all writers, poets are compelled to select their words the most carefully, and generally their selection is based on two principles: the words must be either simple, or filled with impressive connotations and picturesque. Study of vocabulary, then, enables us to examine the selection by which the style is produced, and to throw light upon marked characteristics that have to do with the prominence of certain ideas in his thought. In this study I shall deal with the tragedies of Seneca, and with all the works of Virgil, pursuing a comparative method throughout.

Virgil's poems contain many themes, such as animate and inanimate nature, native country, family ties, and love. (1) His personal character,—like that of a child, harmless, nature loving, gentle, frank, and peaceful,—may be traced in his works. (2) And so, a majestic sadness, a strange pathos, a true tenderness vibrates through all the passages of splendor and through all the commoner cadences. Surely Virgil must have polished his diction with the care of a true artist and scholar.

So many and varied are the works upon Virgil that one hesitates in beginning any new stylistic investigation. This thesis has, primarily, to do with Seneca's tragedies. Virgil was selected for

(1) Teuffel, W. S., Geschichte der romischen Literatur, Par. 221, 6 Auflage, Leipzig, 1910.
(2) Teuffel, op. cit., p. 427.
comparison because of five main reasons: (1) Vergil is the leading Roman poet, hence his style is an especial norm for comparison; (2) the subjects of the two writers although different are yet in parts similar, and, with the exception of technical words in the Georgics, the ideas are not foreign one to the other; (3) Vergil's works contain about the same bulk as the tragedies of Seneca; (4) the index which was available for vocabulary studies of Vergil; (5) the desire which I had to contrast the style of an Augustan poet with that of one of the Neronian period which was subject to greater rhetorical influence.

Seneca should be studied carefully if for no other reason than this, - his works are the only extant Roman tragedies out of a probable original total of about 300.(1) In his plays we find considerable literary skill, fertility and vivacity of feeling, although these often degenerate into tiresome verbosity, offences against good taste, and absurdities. There are present, of course, the general rhetorical characteristics of the literary age to which Seneca belonged: long, set speeches, a tendency to philosophize, fondness for epigram, and a self-conscious pride in mythological lore. But we find in addition characteristically individual features, such as, the love for sinister, bloody themes developed to all extremes so that they may be terrifying and yet seldom move us.

In view, however, of the obvious difficulties in reducing to a definite form the study of written style, not a little help may at times be derived from an investigation of various features in the author's vocabulary and a comparison of the results with those ob-

ained from the similar study of some other author who may be properly chosen as a criterion. Characteristic features of style which may be discovered from such a comparison of vocabularies fall under either thought and content, subjects about which the author writes, or methods of presentation. Since such a brief study as this must be selective, I have included only certain aspects of the subject matter and certain forms of vocabulary which are included in methods of presentation. Great caution must be exercised in drawing conclusions, always considering the influence of subject matter, the literary age, any unintentional peculiarities of the author, and the weakness of numbers as a basis for making inferences when there is a scarcity of data.

It is the purpose, then, of this paper to compare certain aspects of the vocabularies of Seneca and Vergil in order to classify and emphasize the general impression of their style, and if possible, by a statistical demonstration, to discover other characteristic features. The thesis includes inferences which may be drawn from the study, and compares not only individual words, but also groups of words. Because of the necessary selective method not all of the possibilities have been exhausted. Other subjects such as euphemism, treatment of the different times of day, attitude toward nature etc. are deserving of careful study.

As the basis for this work I have used Leo’s edition of Seneca, Ribbeck’s edition of Vergil, M. N. Wetmore’s Index Verborum Vergilianus, and the Index Verborum quae in Senecae Tragoediis nec non in Octavia Praetexta Repertiuntur by Professors Oldfather, Pease, and
Canter which is now in the press. Then, as the lines of Vergil in his Opera Omnia are more numerous than those in Seneca's tragedies, and the average number of words in a line of Vergil is greater than in Seneca who has very many short lines in lyric passages, I have calculated a fractional ratio in order to compare fairly the frequency of words, as follows. First, I obtained the average length of a Vergilian line by getting the average number of words in ten lines from four different selections of Vergil's works. Adding these and dividing by four gives the average number of words in a line of Vergil, namely 6.4. The total number of lines in all Vergil's work is 14,684. Therefore the approximate total number of words is 93,977.

I took the long line of Seneca as substantially equal to the line of Vergil, i.e. 6.4. The total number of lines in Seneca's tragedies is 11,748. The total number of "short lines" (in lyric passages etc.) in Seneca is 3,010. Therefore, the number of long lines is 8,738.

To obtain the average number of words in a short line I went through all the plays and averaged ten short lines together in one place and then ten short lines in another place, until I had done so ten times. I then averaged these averages and obtained 4.2 as the average number.

(1) At first considerable confusion was experienced because of the method which Wetmore uses in listing the total number of times a word occurs. For example: accedo is stated by him to occur 14 times, one of the occurrences being accesserit (G.3.190), where Ribbeck's edition does not read this. Accipio he says occurs 84 times, one of the occurrences being aceperit (G.3.190) which Ribbeck does read. Certainly 2 words should not be counted as occurring in the same place. Many of Wetmore's total counts are wrong because of similar oversight. I have obviated the difficulty by accepting but one text, Ribbeck's, and adjusting Wetmore's totals accordingly. Because of such confusion, probably some of my totals are in slight error.

(2) Of course this an assumption. By some accurate means of measurement a difference in the length might be shown, but I do not believe that it would affect results to any marked degree.
of words in a short line. The total number of words in the short lines of Seneca then would be $3,010 \times 4.2 = 12,642$. Taking the long line of Seneca as equal to the line of Vergil, the total number of words in the long lines is $8,738 \times 6.4 = 55,923$. Hence, the approximate bulk of words in Seneca is 68,565. Therefore, the total bulk in words of Vergil stands to that of Seneca as $\frac{92,277}{68,565}$ or as $1.3 : 1$. In comparison, then, to get a fair ratio I took the Vergil number as my norm and calculated what the same relative frequency would demand in Seneca. For example, consider *cruor*, with actual occurrences of 24 in Vergil and 66 in Seneca. Taking Vergil's 24 as norm by proportion $V. : S :: 1.3 : 1$ or $24 : S. :: 1.3 : 1$. Therefore, $S. = 19.2$ instances expected at the same frequency for Seneca. But Seneca has 66 instances actually occurring, that is more than three and one-third times as great a relative frequency as Vergil. Throughout the investigation a word is considered as occurring in Seneca as often as or more than in Vergil if the actual count in Seneca equals or is more than the calculated relative frequency. I do not take into account fractions when comparing, nor do I set down the relative frequency demanded in Seneca when the word occurs but once in Vergil, e.g. *delicatus* $V. 1$; relative frequency in Seneca .76.
Chapter I.

Content of the Vocabulary, (i.e. the subjects about which the writes), with a Comparison of Vergil and Seneca.

A. Sensations. Throughout such a comparative vocabulary study as this we must remember that not one factor nor one group of factors make up an author's style, but that many individually and in groups combine to effect the ultimate result. The use which a writer makes of the appeals to the senses certainly contributes much. The sensations are so cogent and effective upon the human mind that it is difficult to separate the primary meaning of a word denoting a sensation from the secondary meaning or effect. In this study I am dealing only with the terms used, the words, and in the first place I shall inquire how Vergil and Seneca appeal to the sense of sight, investigating the subjects of color, form, and size.

We expect the "Augenmensch", Vergil, to use colors extensively because his descriptions demand such words of appeal. And so among the 114 words for colors which I examined 73 occur more frequently in Vergil than in Seneca. Moreover, while Vergil uses 108 of the words, Seneca uses only 78. I have classified the words and then totalled the occurrences under each division for the respective authors as follows. The totals were obtained by adding the number of occurrences of each word listed. Of course, here and in all other such cases, one must remember that each word does not at every time it is used refer to some color because transferred meanings often enter in.
Only in the class "shining or glittering" does Seneca have a larger total than Vergil. But such words are seldom actual bona fide color words, so that from the above rather quantitative evidence we may say that Vergil far more than Seneca utilizes color words in his style. Five words for color Seneca uses as favorites, lux (67), ater (41), fulgeo (28), lumen (28), aurum (26). We see at a glance that ater is the one real color word in that group and one full of meaning for tragic themes. Compare, also, niger which Seneca uses 12 times, but contrast albus which he uses only once (H.C. 1640). In suggestive meaning albus is full; for instance, compare Aeneid 3.391; 8.45; 8.82. Aneneas is directed to found a city where a white sow with white pigs lies, and then later he names his city Alba Longa. Such significance of white is commonly accepted, but of the two colors, dark, which Seneca uses so often, has been more effective in its workings upon the human thought. From such phrases as atrum frigus, atra hiems, nigra nox we understand the sinister connotation of the color dark. Very often in Seneca the day of death is called atra dies. Of course the other color words are sometimes used more often in Seneca than in Vergil, but in many cases the usage can be explained. Take for instance, canus; this is used frequently by Seneca of old men of whom a large number are present in the plays. The word flammo in Seneca does not denote any color appeal, but is connected with destruction. Although the different connotations of color all depend
on personal taste, yet from our data we may say that Vergil consciously or unconsciously used the color appeals to enhance the beautiful and pleasant. But in Seneca the comparative infrequency of words for color, and the type used emphasize the somber and the sinister.

The second division of sight, form, even Vergil has made little of, and Seneca less. As in the case of colors I have classified the total occurrences in each author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curved</th>
<th>Hollowed</th>
<th>Flat, Level</th>
<th>Solid or not Hollow</th>
<th>Formless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. 86</td>
<td>V. 59</td>
<td>V. 2</td>
<td>V. 15</td>
<td>V. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 70</td>
<td>S. 7</td>
<td>S. 4</td>
<td>S. 4</td>
<td>S. 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data show that the total occurrences of words for form are far greater in Vergil than in Seneca. In fact, of the 18 words examined only 4, namely planus, recurvo, sinusus, sinus, occur in Seneca more often than in Vergil. One expects the general term, sinus, to be used more frequently in Seneca than other terms for form, but in Vergil a closer distinction is drawn. He uses curvus 28 times and other cognate words very frequently. Such appeals to curves are to a form that art has always considered the most beautiful, and consequently pleasing to Vergil and the effects he desired.

Size and form are generally connected as similar divisions of the sense of sight and so might be examined by a like method. Of the 15 words listed 8 occur more frequently in Vergil than in Seneca. I have classified the total occurrences as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. 1297</td>
<td>V. 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 577</td>
<td>S. 90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Obviously, Vergil favored the words for large, but Seneca those for small. Compare ingen’s, actual occurrences in Vergil are 200, but in Seneca 55; then note narvus, actual occurrences in Vergil are 63, but in Seneca 83, altho the calculated relative frequency would be only 48. Largeness whether literally or figuratively in the sense of extraordinary etc. is very frequently of more pleasant connotation than smallness. Perhaps, then, Vergil consciously or unconsciously used the words denoting largeness more frequently than those meaning smallness as more appropriate for his purposes, but Seneca, on the other hand, preferred the opposite.

The examination of the use of words for the sense of hearing gives very interesting results. Out of the 72 words listed only 25 occur in Seneca more often than in Vergil, and furthermore Seneca uses a total of only 47 words for sound while Vergil uses 67. As a basis for judging the quality of the words used by each author I have classified the total occurrences as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Echo</th>
<th>Onomatopoetic</th>
<th>Singing or other music terms</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. 26</td>
<td>V. 200</td>
<td>V. 149</td>
<td>V. 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 16</td>
<td>S. 75</td>
<td>S. 61</td>
<td>S. 179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A more minute classification might yield more and better results, but even the above method shows that Vergil used both more words for sound, and words well fitted for his purposes. Seneca on the other hand used fewer words and was less particular in his choice. It is to be noted that the four words, namely cauo (22), cantus (23), sono (46), sonus (24), which Seneca used the most frequently of the words for sounds are of a general rather than any particular meaning.
The frequent usage of words for echo in Vergil is noticeable. Seneca has 16 total occurrences of which 15 are for the word resono, a general term. The onomatopoetic group is expected to occur often in Vergil since they heighten to such a large degree the grace and polish of his appeals to the sense of hearing.

Altho little experience comes through the sense of taste in comparison with the experience that comes through the senses of sight or hearing, yet a comparison of the use of words for taste in Seneca and Vergil is profitable. Here, as in all the study of the sensations, the difficulty of distinction between the subjective and objective elements, and the large use of transferred meanings have such an importance that a close examination is necessary to distinguish whether an expression should or should not be classified as a taste word.

I have listed only 11 words and of these Seneca uses but 3 as often as the calculated relative frequency would demand. Vergil uses all the words, but Seneca only 6, namely amarus (1), asper (15), dulcis (17), mitis (18), salsus (2). The kind of words expressing taste used by each author is set off in the following table of the total occurrences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bitter</th>
<th>Mellow</th>
<th>Sweet</th>
<th>Sour</th>
<th>Salt</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. 63</td>
<td>V. 7</td>
<td>V. 90</td>
<td>V. 1</td>
<td>V. 11</td>
<td>V. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 16</td>
<td>S. 18</td>
<td>S. 17</td>
<td>S. 0</td>
<td>S. 2</td>
<td>S. 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand total for each author V. 180; S. 53.

The quantitative evidence certainly shows that Vergil by the use of words for taste appealed to that sense far more frequently than did
Seneca. And as qualitative evidence it is interesting to note how Vergil dwells on the appeals to the pleasant and agreeable. True it is that also Seneca used the word *mitis* as one of his favorites but the transferred meaning enters into that word too frequently to make very many direct appeals to the sense of taste.

Man's sense of smell has deteriorated to such a degree that he can only with a serious handicap analyze and group appeals made to it. So it is with like difficulty that the use of words for smell can be compared and classified in Seneca and Vergil. Of the 17 words listed Vergil uses 14 more frequently than Seneca, so the former did realize, at least more than the latter, the effectiveness of such words. The words *odoratus, olientes* and others are used generally with the idea of scented, and in both Seneca and Vergil only from the context can we obtain a concrete experience. Occasionally the formation of a definite perception in the reader's mind is aided when *male, bene, grave, or non* are used limiting the idea of *odoratus, olientes* etc. In Vergil there is a total of 10 occurrences for the instances of distinctly unpleasant words used, and 69 occurrences for the general group. Of course, I have not examined the adverbs connected with the individual words, so that many of the general terms may be used in a distinctly pleasant sense, and vice versa. Seneca uses only 6 of the words listed, namely, *odor* (3), *odorus* (1), *paedor* (4), *putris* (2), *tus* (9). *Paedor* and *putris* make a total of 6 unpleasant appeals, *tus, odor, and odorus* make a total of 13 in the general group. Obviously, then, Seneca's vocabulary for smell is even more meager than Vergil's altho the latter's is small.

For the next sensation to be considered, touch, I have listed 29 words. Many of them, of course, only in their literal sense
suggest any appeal to touch. Only 11 occur in Seneca more often than in Vergil, and while the latter uses all the words, Seneca uses but 17. As a basis for considering the kind of words used I have classified the total occurrences as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hard</th>
<th>Soft</th>
<th>Wet</th>
<th>Dry</th>
<th>Smooth</th>
<th>Rough</th>
<th>Blunt</th>
<th>Sharp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. 124</td>
<td>V. 44</td>
<td>V. 42</td>
<td>V. 18</td>
<td>V. 65</td>
<td>V. 150</td>
<td>V. 0</td>
<td>V. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 58</td>
<td>S. 27</td>
<td>S. 11</td>
<td>S. .13</td>
<td>S. 48</td>
<td>S. 108</td>
<td>S. 0</td>
<td>S. 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand total for each author....V. 471; S. 270.

Note that in respect to quantity the grand total for the occurrences in Seneca is only about three-fifths of what it is in Vergil. Obviously, then the appeals to the sense of touch are far more numerous in Vergil. It is interesting to note that in both Seneca and Vergil there are more references to the rough than to the smooth, more to the hard than to the soft, and that in Vergil there are more references to the wet than to the dry but in Seneca more to the dry than to the wet. Humidus is an interesting word in this connection, since it is used 17 times in Vergil but only once in Seneca.

As in the case of the other sensations, in temperature Vergil seems to have more appeals if we judge by the words he used. It is not to such a marked degree, however, as in the other senses because of the 36 words listed, Seneca uses 30 and Vergil 32. Fourteen occur in Seneca as often as the calculated relative frequency demands. To represent the kind of words for temperature used I have put down the following table.
Heat

V. 353
S. 274

Cold

V. 293
S. 179

Grand total of occurrences for each author...V. 646; S. 453.

It is striking that both authors refer to heat more often than to cold; possibly this is due to the occurrence of such words as *ardeo, ardor, torreo* so frequently in their transferred meanings. Another point to notice is the smallness of the vocabulary of both poets to express cold. Seneca uses a total of 12 words, namely, *frigidus, frigus, gelidus, gelo, glacialis, glacies, hibernus, hiems, nivalis, niveus, nivosus, nix*. Vergil also uses a total of 12 words, he does not use *gelo, or nivosus*, but does use *frigeo, and frigidulus*. *Frigus, gelidus, and nix* are the favorite words of both poets to express cold.

(B) External physical nature. Although the ancient naturalists do not add much to our knowledge, yet it is interesting to observe how they and other writers used external physical nature to produce effects. I shall investigate, first, the words for animals in Vergil, and Seneca. Ninety-one words were listed and only 24 occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Further, Vergil uses 85 of the words, while Seneca uses but 52. The subject matter, of course, especially in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* greatly influences the large use of such words by Vergil. But it is interesting to note that just as in many other phenomena of physical nature certain animals connote pleasant and others unpleasant ideas.
Some are associated with ideas of strength, or weakness, some with cruelty or kindness. The results show that Seneca’s animals are few and terrible, while Vergil’s are comparatively numerous and generally of an innocent nature. The lion, for example, fits the tragedian’s theme and so the name of this vigorous animal is used 32 times in Seneca. The bear’s sturdiness, and growling ferocity also add grimness to the scenes, and consequently the name of this animal occurs 10 times in Seneca altho the calculated relative frequency is only one. Two other words used often by Seneca are lupus and canis. In general, of course, the domesticated animals are spoken of more frequently by Vergil; compare sus: actual occurrences in Vergil 15, in Seneca 2, also porcus which is not mentioned by Seneca. By the nature of their connotations such words as vacca, bos, equus, caper, agna, and agnus fill the theme of the Eclogues and Georgics with the living touch of tenderness and peace. The lamb, as also the deer, would generally be out of place in tragedy and only occasionally adds a forceful dramatic touch to a vivid scene, so accordingly the statistics for the occurrences of these animals in Vergil and Seneca are: agna V. 3; S. 0; agnus V. 11; S. 0; cervus V. 16; S. 4.

Birds also play their part. With his usual subtle observation of physical nature, Vergil has mentioned many and various birds. Of the 33 words examined, 23 occur more frequently in Vergil than in Seneca. As to the total number of words used, Seneca has only 14, while Vergil has 31. Obviously, mention of birds is not a characteristic of tragic style! The word ales is used 19 times, because as one might expect, Seneca, the moralist poet prefers the more general rather than the specific word as the nature poet does. The vultur, bird of carrion and cruelty, and the owl, bird of gloom, are appro-
appropriate terms for tragedy and so \textit{vultur} in point of relative frequency is used by Seneca over 3.9 times as often as by Vergil, and \textit{bubo} over 2.6 times as often. The birds that are mentioned most frequently in Vergil are \textit{columba}, \textit{cygnus}, \textit{anser}, \textit{coturnis}, and \textit{grus}. \textit{Avis}, as a general word, was preferred by him to \textit{alea}. The dove, \textit{columba}, seems to have loved the poetical haunts of Vergil; he uses the word 8 times, but Seneca not once. The dove, of course, as sacred to Venus was peculiarly appropriate to love and so well adapted to Vergil's poetry. Probably the astronomical \textit{loro}, and myths concerning metamorphoses account to some extent for the exalted position which the swan held among all the ancient poets. (1) Even Seneca refers to it 6 times, using \textit{cygnus} four times, and \textit{olor} twice. As to birds in general in that they are usually connected with an idea of gentleness and kindliness, and since Vergil so often mentions them, we may surmise that he probably referred to them by necessity where subject matter demanded and by choice where their influence might be felt.

But even more interesting than birds is the use of words for trees in Vergil and Seneca. Here again the influence of subject matter in Vergil is strong, especially in the second \textit{Georgic}. But, allowing for that, certainly the fact that out of 105 words listed all are used by Vergil except \textit{frondifer} indicates that the trees did bring some distinctive influence to bear upon the general effects produced. Only 10 of the words occur as often in Seneca as the calculated relative frequency demands and only a total of 40 are used. The oak tree is the favorite with both poets, as probably with almost all such writers. \textit{Quercus} is Vergil's regular word for this tree, while Seneca generally uses \textit{robur}. The variation is significant.

(1) Martin, E.W., \textit{Birds Of The Latin Poets}, P. 82, Stanford University, 1914.
because the vigor and strength of the oak designated by \textit{robur} harmonized with the vehemence and violence of tragedy. The general infrequency of the mention of trees in Seneca goes to show that consciously or unconsciously he realized that trees, as many other objects of nature, do not usually add to a sinister scene, unless one thinks of the twisted, misshapen kind of Dante, or specific varieties like the cypress. Seneca was a moralist, but not a naturalist. Vergil has many more kinds of trees in his works, i.e. he looks more carefully and discriminates; where Seneca had to mention "tree", he said just \textit{arbor}, or \textit{arbores} and did not know or care much of what kind it was.

Flowers, might be expected to be used in a similar way to trees and the data confirm this. I listed 30 words for flowers and related words but only one, \textit{florifer}, occurs more often in Seneca than in Vergil. He uses 29, and Seneca but 7 of the words, namely, \textit{floreo} (V.23; S.4), \textit{florifer} (V.0; S.1), \textit{flos} (V.35; S.10), \textit{lilium} (V.9; S.1) \textit{rosa} (V.8; S.1), \textit{roseus} (V.12; S.1), \textit{thymum} (V.9; S.1). Evidently, the writer of tragedy seems almost to have forgotten the existence of flowers while he was composing. Note that among the words listed in no case does a particular flower name occur more than once, while the general terms are used far more frequently. The themes of blood and passion left little room for the gentle influence of flowers. Vergil on the other hand, altho he wanted the breath of flowers about his works, yet it seems he also cared not so much for a particular species, as for the general term. In very few instances does he use a particular flower name more than 10 times.

In order to examine the treatment of a different aspect of physical nature than that represented by animals, birds, trees, and
flowers I have compared the use of words for sky in Seneca and Vergil. Necessarily the investigation is rather limited because of the many figurative expressions in regard to the sky. For instance, often the adjectives expressing a state of the sky denote the sky itself so that a count of only the actual words for sky in either author may not be a fair method for comparison. I listed 10 words of which Seneca uses 6 more frequently than Vergil. Moreover the former uses all of the 10 words, but the latter 9. For some reason or other which I can not explain Vergil does not use caelestes at all, but Seneca uses it 19 times. That the words for sky should be treated more often in Seneca is somewhat opposed to the use he makes of other words related to external physical nature. Perhaps, the sky often inspired awe and even dread and so was appropriate for Seneca's themes. I suspect, however, that if a thorough study of metaphorical expressions for the sky were made that Vergil would surpass Seneca both in point of number and variety.

Seneca's use of words for the stars is also interesting. Out of the 10 words listed he uses 9, and 5 more frequently than Vergil. Of course the same difficulty is met here as in the consideration of the sky. Judging from the data on the use of the words, Seneca does treat this sphere of physical nature more frequently than Vergil, but I feel that the basis for decision is too weak since the figurative expressions can not be considered here.

(C) Words expressing emotion, affecting the sensibilites by their connotations or otherwise: A study of the words for emotion is difficult because of the constant use of figurative expressions; as in Seneca, Medea, 591, or Vergil, Aeneid 2,575 where ignis is used for anger. Many other instances occur where passions are
connected with fire or terms for fire. I have listed 72 words for the emotions and related terms, such as furor, gaudeo, lacrima, laetor, laetus, ploro, queror, rabidus, rideo, tristis, etc. Forty-seven of them occur more often in Seneca than in Vergil who uses 61 of the words, and the former employs 59. The quantitative data can be interpreted by the following table of the total occurrences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pleasant Connotation</th>
<th>Unpleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. 209</td>
<td>V. 845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 82</td>
<td>S. 1218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand total of occurrences for each author....V. 1054; S. 1300.

It may be noticed, first, that Seneca not only uses more of the unpleasant appeals, but that those occurrences are more than the grand total for Vergil. In sharp contrast Vergil has over twice as many appeals to the pleasant emotions as Seneca. Such data show that Vergil's pathos was heightened and the pleasant aspect of his style was increased, to a very considerable degree by the use of words for emotion, but that Seneca evidently shunned the pleasant emotions in order to make more room for their opposites. Another point of interest is the smallness of both poets' vocabulary expressing the pleasant emotions. Seneca uses gaudeo, gaudium, laetitia, laetor, laetus, and Vergil includes rideo, risus.

Words formed on the stem ama–should properly be considered under form of vocabulary, but the meaning of such words classifies them

(1) Under words for emotion of pleasant connotation, I have listed, for example, gaudeo, gaudium, laetitia, laetor, laetus. Under the unpleasant I have put fleo, fle tus, doleo, rabidus, saevus, tristis, etc.
under those affecting the sensibilities. Seneca is not as much con-
cerned with lovers as with murderers consequently one should expect, then, such words as _amo_ not to occur very frequently in Seneca. And so the data for such words are as follows: _amator_ (V.1; S.0), _amicitia_ (V.2; S.0), _amor_ (V.150; S.70). _Amo_ comes very near reaching the calculated relative frequency (34), but one expects such a common word to be used with comparative frequency. Of course, Seneca had other ways of expressing love. For instance, the use of the word _vapor_ for love (Phaed. 640) is peculiar to Seneca, and shows us how he seized upon the novel and unusual in his style.(1)

Rare artistic sense and religious reflection often combine in Vergil's poetry to produce a vivid effect of ethical and moral associations. But Seneca, also, although more a teacher of practical morals, uses such associations in his poems. In his tragedies he had frequent opportunity to bring forth the result of his ponderings, as is evidenced by the many _sententiae_ prevalent in the plays. To determine which of the two poets made larger use of moral words I have listed 39 words such as _bonus, virtus, pietas, iustus_, and _dignus_. Twenty-seven occur more frequently in Seneca than in Vergil. At first glance many of these moral words appear to have a pleasant connotation but probably the prosy philosophical element lessened the frequency of their occurrence in Vergil's poems. The frequent usage of such words as these by Seneca in his tragedies to some extent explains why critics have considered them moral disquisitions rather than dramas.

Words which affect the feelings far more deeply than those of

love, joy, sorrow, or hate are those which pertain to death and sickness. We expect tragedy to deal with such themes and of the 60 words examined 44 are used more often by Seneca than by Vergil. Fifty-four of the words are used by Seneca and 49 by Vergil. War is the common theme of the 

Aeneid, which accounts for the occurrence of many such words as clades, caedo, and caedes. Undoubtedly tragedy was intensified by the use of these, but there is another point to be kept in mind. To Senecan characters death is nothing, sometimes even a positive good and suicide often a luxury. (1) Even the child Astyanax dies like a Cato with expressed conviction that death is an actual good. True it is that the author was contradicting the common voice of humanity in regard to death, but it must be remembered that Seneca, the dramatist, was the same Seneca as the Stoic teacher in his letters.

By analogy from the data on the words for death one would expect fear to be mentioned more frequently in Seneca than in Vergil. But the statistics do not support very strongly such a conjecture. I have listed 39 words, of which Vergil uses 36 and Seneca 27, (19 more frequently than Vergil). (2) The words occurring most often in Vergil are such as exterreo, horribilis, horreus, terreo, and vereor. The literal meaning of horreo, of course, outweighs the transferred so that probably not much idea of fear was presented by it in Vergil. Terreo was used so often in order to denote the action of creating fear. Vereor is a very weak verb of fearing expressing either rev-

(1) Godley, A.D., Senecan Tragedy, in English Literature and the Classics, Oxford 1912, P. 242.

(2) The words examined were: caveo, conterreo, contremasco, de-
terreo, exterreo, extimesco, formido (vb.), formido (subt.), horreo, horrees-
co, horribilis, horridus, horrifier, horrifico, horrificus, horror, metuo,
pavafacio, raveo, ravidus, navto, ravor, perterreco, pertimeco, pertimesco,
praemactuo, roterreo, reformido, terres, terrifico, terrificus, territo,
terror, timefactus, timeo, timidus, timor, terrido, treridus.
erence or awe. In contrast we have timeo and timor, favorite words of Seneca. Timeo occurs with a relative frequency 8.2 times as great as that in Vergil; timor with a relative frequency 4.8 times as great. Obviously these two words were the terms Seneca affected to represent things fearful, i.e. by the effect on a person. We may conclude, then, that Seneca did use more distinctive words of fearing than Vergil, and that the corresponding effects in his plays were intensified.

As words affecting the sensibilities by their connotations or otherwise there is a large group of words which we may call "pleasant." I have listed 210, examples of which are affabilis, almus, amplector, benignus, carus, complector, concors, coria, formonsus, hospitium, ludo, placidus, pulcher, purus, requies, serenus, solor, suavis, mollis, rideo. Vergil uses 187 and 116 of them more frequently than Seneca who uses only 168. These data are an indication that this "pleasant" quality of Vergil's vocabulary is directly related to certain aspects of his style which were pointed out in the first part of this paper. It is also a negative proof in regard to Seneca, in that it shows how such words were for the most part foreign to his style and themes, and that he did not rely on such to express his tragic thoughts or sentiments. Of course in forming conclusions from such evidence one must allow for the strong influence of subject matter, subjective or objective elements, and the numerous shades of meaning for the different words.

The same caution must be observed in examining the group of "sinister" words of which I have listed 259 different words. Examples are: abominco, afflizo, arcanus, audax, captivus, carcer, cruror, inquino; lacer, nefas, nocce. Seneca uses 223 and 180 of these more frequently than Vergil, who has 216. Here, then, is a negative
proof for Vergil, in that it shows that he avoided those words which would only detract from his union of pathos and feeling, while Seneca might well be expected to use them in his frequent descriptions of every detail of horror.
Chapter II

Form of Vocabulary, (i.e. the forms in which the author writes), with a comparison of Vergil and Seneca.

(A) Use of Greek words (including patronymics). A form very interesting in Latin is the word borrowed from the Greek, and a comparative study of Greek words in Vergil, and Seneca is not without profit. Intensive studies have been made of these words in various writers, but here I intend only to set forth some of the facts in a comparative manner. (1) I have examined 183 words, (exclusive of proper names which I considered, of course, only as to the forms of declension used, and patronymics). The following are the 58 words occurring more often in Seneca than in Vergil. I have underlined twice those not used by Vergil: adamas, aedon, aegis, aetherius, alcyon, arcturus, astrum, carbasus, carchesium, chalyce, chelys, chorda, cista, cleps, cometes, contus, corytus, cumba, diadema, echo, enthaus, erebus, fucus, gaza, hydras, lampas, lyra, magicus, magus, mitra, myrrha, mystes, nebris, oestrus, pelta, petra, pharetra, phaselus, phyteter, pirata, rlectrum, poena, polus, rompa, scorpios, scyphus, strix, syrma, thalamus, thallus, theatrum, thyas, thyrsus, tias, tigris, tympanum, tyrannus, zmaragus, zona. Note that only 15 words are not used by Vergil. The following are those which he

uses more frequently than Seneca; I have underlined twice those not used by the latter: acalanthis, adytum, aer, aerius, aether, aethra, anethum, antrum, caedrus, calathus, canistrum, cantharus, carbasus, castanea, centaureum, cerasus, cetus, charta, chelydrus, chorea, chorus, chrysanthus, cinaedus, circus, cirs, cithara, colocalism, concha, concheus, conus, corymb, crat, croceu, crocota, crocus, crystallum, cupressus, cyaneus, cyathus, cylindrus, cymbalum, cymbium, cyprissus, cytisus, daedalus, delphin, dolo, electrum, épops, euhoe, faqas, fama, fides, glaucus, grype, gyrus, heris, herois, hippomanes, hyalus, hydrus, intibum, labyrinthus, lageos, leanea, lebes, lembus, lotos, lynx, maeander, mamma, melisphyllum, mephitis, merops, metallum, mus, myrica, myrtetum, myrteus, myrtum, myrtes, mysticus, napaeus, narcissus, nauticus, nectar, nectar, nitrum, nothus, nympha, olea, oleum, onager, orgia, orichalcum, ostrum, paean, palaestra, panacea, panthera, phalanx, phalerae, pharestratus, phiomela, phoca, platanus, podagra, poeta, psalterium, psithius, pyra, rhetor, rhus, scholasticus, scoria, sistrum, sophia, spadix, spartum, spelaeum, spelunca, spira, stomachus, storax, strophium, stuppa, stuppeus, taenia, terebinthus, thensaurus, thiasus, tholus, thorax, thymhra, thymus, toria, toreuma, tornus, trapetus, trietericus, tropaeum. (1) Note that Seneca uses only 64 of these Greek words. As to number of words used, then, Vergil far exceeds Seneca.

This study can not investigate thoroughly all the forms of declension used in the words borrowed from the Greek, so I have

(1) Among the Greek words I have listed those which are predominantly Greek in form altho the suffix may be Latin, e.g. aerius, croceus.
limited the comparison to the Greek accusative. (1) Here I have used proper nouns in addition to the words previously cited. In Vergil, according to my data, there are for the common nouns borrowed from the Greek etc. 56 Greek accusatives, 218 for the proper nouns, making a total of 274. Compare with these the 11 Greek accusatives for the common nouns etc. in Seneca, 72 for the proper nouns, making a total of 83. Then, in addition to using more Greek words then Seneca, Vergil also uses the Greek form of declension more, if these data on the accusatives are a criterion for judging.

In reading the Aeneid a person notices the frequent use of patronymics; other writers use them but one feels that Vergil is particularly fond of such expressions. I have accordingly compared his usage with that of Seneca in the investigation of the other Greek words. Forty-four words were examined of which the following 14 occur more often in Seneca, the words underlined twice do not occur in Vergil: Alcides, Atlantides, Atrides, Briseis, Cadmeis, Danais, Labdacides, Minois, Oeneis, Pelides, Phaethontiades, Pylades, Tantalides, Tyndaridas. Note that Vergil fails to use only 6 of the patronymics. He uses the following 30 more often than Seneca; the words underlined twice are those not used by the latter: Achelois, Aenaeides, Aenides, Aeolides, Amphitryoniades, Anchisiades, Antenorides, Ausonidae, Belides, Cecroridae, Cyrselides, Dardanidae, Erytides, Eurytides, Heliades, Hyrotaides, Hyrtacides, Icariotis, Iliades, Imbrasides, Mygdonides, Nereis, Oenides, Pierides, Priamides, Romulidae, Thesides, Tydides, Tyndarides, Tyrhhidae. According to the above data, then, Seneca uses only 16 of the patronymics. That Ver-

(1) In some future study I hope to examine more thoroughly all the forms.
gil uses 37, almost $2\frac{1}{2}$ times as many, may be due either to the influence of subject matter, or because he is imitating the Odyssey and Iliad of Homer.

(B) Nouns of agency. Another feature of vocabulary is the nouns of agency. In this comparison I have listed 88 such words as adiutrix, agitator, arator, auctor, contemtor, creatrix, dator, fossor, meretrix, messor, monstrator, nutrix, ultor. Vergil uses 71 of these and Seneca 51, 43 of which he uses as often as the calculated frequency demands. Such quantitative evidence as that seems to show that Vergil uses more different words of agency, but that both poets are about equal in point of relative frequency. The following table of total occurrences gives some qualitative evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. 340</td>
<td>V. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 250</td>
<td>S. 67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be noticed that both writers favor the masculine nouns of agency, but that Seneca uses the feminine more than Vergil. I believe the explanation lies in the fact that the tragedies contain more women characters than the works of Vergil.

(C) Nouns of the fourth declension. An investigation of the use of the fourth declension nouns is even more restricted to mere form of vocabulary than the preceding comparisons. The facts, however, are interesting in themselves. I have examined 186 words of which 96 occur in Seneca more frequently than in Vergil. Moreover, Vergil uses only 73 of the nouns, but Seneca uses 128. I am unable to explain why the writer of tragedy should use these fourth declen-
sion nouns more frequently than Vergil. To see if either author favored a certain case in the declension I examined the use of the ablative singular in -u. The total occurrences of this form for the words listed are in Vergil 560, in Seneca 569. No conclusion can be drawn from such data. Perhaps, further more intensive study of these nouns might bring more light to bear upon their comparative use in Seneca, and Vergil.

(D) Personified nouns. Before we leave our consideration of substantives, let us examine the personified nouns in the two poets. Personification as a figure of speech, of course, may be effected by more methods than by merely making the form of a word appear animate, but here we can deal only with the words. I have listed 71 and in each case noticed the number of times it was personified by the two writers. Then, I have added the occurrences for each word and found a total of 166 personifications of nouns in Vergil, and 191 in Seneca. The occurrences of personification for such a word as leo I have classified as animate, and for such as amor, or hiems, I have classified as inanimate. The total animate personifications in Vergil is 3, in Seneca 14. The inanimate personification in the former total 163, but in the latter 177. The statistics show, then, that Seneca utilized personification of nouns considerably more than Vergil.

(E) Adjectives in -osus, -eus, -fer, -ger, -ax, -ix, -ox, etc. The adjectives, also, have forms which one author may appropriate, and another may almost disregard. In this comparison of Vergil and Seneca I have considered a few selected groups. First, those with the suffix -osus. Of these I have listed 58 words, such as animosus, frondosus, generosus, montosus, and pisicosus. Pronouncing these
aloud one is struck with the fascinating, almost musical sound produced, and that, I believe, accounts, to some extent, for the fact that 45 of such adjectives occur in Vergil with 34 being used more frequently than in Seneca who uses only 27.

Another group of which Vergil uses far more often than Seneca are the adjectives with the termination -eus. I have listed 51 of these, such as ferreus, frondens, lacteus, niveus, roseus, squameus, and taureus. It is striking that Vergil uses all of the words examined and 42 of them more frequently than Seneca who uses only 21. I believe that here, also, some inherent quality in the suffix itself must have appealed to Vergil's sensitive ear. Of course, such a belief can not be pressed too strongly.

But Seneca, also, had adjectives which he evidently preferred to others. For the class formed on the suffix -fer, such as conifer, florifer, pestifer, and stellifer, I have listed 46 words and he uses 31 of them, all more frequently than Vergil who uses 25. The agency, or action idea expressed by these adjectives, I think, may account for Seneca's preference.

Very similar to them is the group with the suffix -ger, such as aliger, laniger, securiger, and stelliger. They are far fewer in number than the foregoing class; I have listed only 10, of which Seneca uses 8, all more frequently than Vergil who uses 6. The explanation is probably the same as for the adjectives formed on -fer.

But the last group which I have compared is the favorite one of Seneca. These are the adjectives with the endings, -ax, -ix, -ox etc., such as atroc, audax, dicax, pernox, and trux of which I have listed 40 words. Seneca uses 36 of them, 31 more frequently than Vergil who uses 27. Contrast as to sound such a word as montosus
with dicax. I believe the word more harsh in sound had a stronger appeal to Seneca. Of course, the cases other than the nominative might not fit that theory so well; at any rate the conjecture should not be emphasized too strongly.

(F) Prepositional compounds. The development of the preposition from the adverb, the addition of the preposition to strengthen the case suffix, and finally the union of the preposition with the verb or noun or even adjective is an interesting phenomenon. We can see easily, then, that interesting results are likely to lead from a study of Latin compounds. It is clearly known that at one time the Romans had the right to form compounds as freely as the Greeks possessed and as the Germans have in modern times. The Latin language tended more and more to neglect this usage "until barbarous Tertullian indulged his practices toward the opposite extreme."(1) His usage, however, was probably the result of colloquial influence. Quintilian in his "Institutiones Oratoriae" (I.6, pp. 65-70) among other remarks concerning the forming of compounds and the limits thereof in his day makes this interesting remark: "cum Kυρταύξετα μιρατι συμας, incurvicervicum vix a risu defendimus." But the right of forming compounds by prefixing prepositions continued to develop. We know that in comparison with Lucretius Vergil is very sparing in his use of compounds, we also suspect that Seneca is even more niggardly, and one wonders if he uses the prepositional compounds, also less frequently. Such will be the point of attack, then, in this part of my study. I have included words formed on several adverbs in addition to prepositions proper. I have arranged the statistical results as follows. For each group I have placed just after the

(1) Munro, H.A.J., Lucretius, Cambridge, 1891-93, PP. 16-17.
heading the capital letter S, if Seneca uses a greater number, i.e. greater variety, than Vergil, and a capital letter V, if the data are the reverse. Compounds which occur relatively more frequent in Vergil are: A, AB, ABS: Nouns, adjectives etc: (V)

Five words were listed. Four occur more frequently in Vergil than in Seneca, only one occurs as often in Seneca as the calculated relative-frequency demands. Seneca uses three of these compounds, and Vergil four.

AD-verbs: (V).

One hundred and thirty words were listed. Only 55 occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 112 of these compounds, Seneca uses 86. The significance in English of the word "up" often denotes approach, and this in many instances will give the force of ad as a prefix both in its local, and figurative sense, e.g. (1) local: to, toward, afferre; at, by, astare; on, upon, against, accumbo; up, ascendo; (2) figurative: to, adsentior; at or on, admiror, adludo; denoting conformity to, comparison with, adaequ, denoting addition, addocceo; denoting intensity, aduro; denoting the coming to an act or state, hence commencement, addubito, adquiesco.

AD-nouns, adjectives etc: (V).

Twenty-seven words were listed. Only 9 occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil, moreover, uses 21 of these compounds, while Seneca uses but 17.

Bis-nouns, adjectives etc: (V.)

Twenty words were listed. Only 3 occur in Seneca as often as the calculated relative frequency demands. Seneca uses but 7 of these compounds, while Vergil uses 18.
Circum-verbs: (V.)

Seventeen words were listed. Only 2 occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands, these are circumeo (V. 2; S. 3) and circumsono (V. 1; S. 1). Vergil uses all 17 of these compounds, but Seneca uses only 3, i.e. circumeo, circumsono, circumspicio.

Circum-nouns: (V.)

Two words were listed. None occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. In fact he uses neither of these compounds, i.e. circuitus, and circumtextus-a-um.

Con-verbs: (V.).

One hundred and twenty-nine words were listed. Only 54 occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 106 of these compounds while Seneca uses 93. The force of con (com) as a prefix designates a bringing together of several objects, e.g. coeo, colloquor, convivor, etc. (2) completeness, a perfecting, and so intensity, e.g. commaculo, concito, concido etc.

CON-nouns, adjectives etc: (V.).

Fifty-four words were listed. Seneca uses 25 as often as the calculated frequency demands. Fourty-seven of these compounds occur in Vergil, and 34 in Seneca.

DE-verbs: (V.).

One hundred and twenty-five words were listed, of which only 60 occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 106 of these compounds, but Seneca uses only 79. In composition this preposition has 5 meanings: (1) separation, removal, departure, e.g. decedo, deflecto, decumbo etc.; (2) cessation, removal of, e.g. dearmo, dedisco, deasum; (3) with reference to the terminus of an action, e.g. defero, demitto; (4) giving a bad sense to the word, e.g.
delinquo, derideo; (5) rarely, - contraction from a broad into a narrower space, e.g. deligo, devincio.

DE-nouns, adjectives etc: (V.).

Twenty-six words were listed, of which 12 in Seneca occur as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 23 of these compounds, but Seneca only uses 16.

DIS-verbs: (V.).

Sixty-one words were listed. Seneca uses only 26 of them as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 55 of these compounds, but Seneca 34. The prefix usually signifies four groups of meanings: (1) in most cases = asunder, e.g. diffundo; (2) less frequently = English un-, reversing or negativing the primitive meaning, e.g. discingo; (3) in a few words it acquires an intensive force, e.g. disperio; (4) equals between, among, e.g. dinosco, diligo.

DIS-nouns, adjectives etc: (V.).

Sixteen words were listed, of which only 3 are used by Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 15 of these compounds, while Seneca only uses 5.

EX-verbs: (V.).

One hundred and seventy-three words were listed, of which Seneca only uses 80 as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 147, but Seneca only 53 of these compounds. The signification of this prefix is: (1) primarily and most frequently of place, cut or forth, e.g. exec, educo; (2) throughout, to the end, e.g. effervescor, hence utterly, thoroly, e.g. enecare, evincere. In many compounds of the post-Augustan and post-Classical period this force of ex is no longer felt; so in color appellations, e.g. exalbidus.
EX-nouns, adjectives etc: (V.).

Sixty words were listed. Seneca uses 24 as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 54 of these compounds, while Seneca uses 38.

IN-verbs: (V.).

One hundred and eighty-three words were listed, of which 69 occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 164 of these compounds, but Seneca uses only 117. The meaning or significance of in, the preposition, in compound is usually the idea of existence in a place or thing, or of motion, direction, or inclination into or to a place or thing, e.g. inesse, inferre, inhibere. The significance of in, the inseparable particle, is that it usually negatives the meaning of the original noun or participle, e.g. intolerabilis, immitis.

IN-nouns, adjectives etc: (V.).

Two hundred and thirty-seven words were listed, of which 99 are used in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 204 of these compounds while Seneca uses only 138.

INTER-verbs: (V.).

Eighteen words were listed, of which Seneca uses only 4 as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 17, but Seneca uses only 4 of these compounds. Interea in compound usually signifies: (1) between, e.g. interponere; (2) at intervals, e.g. intermittere; (3) under, down, to the bottom, e.g. interire, interficere.

INTER-nouns, adjectives etc: (V.).

Seven words were listed. Only one occurs in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 6 of these words; Seneca uses 4.
OB- verbs: (V.).

Seventy words were listed. Seneca uses 32 as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 58 of these compounds, but Seneca 36. In compound ob signifies towards, or existence at or before a thing, and likewise the accessory notion of against, e.g. obicere, opponere.

OB- nouns, adjectives etc: (V.).

Twenty-one words were listed of which 10 occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 16, Seneca uses 12 of these compounds.

POST- verbs: (V.).

Only one word (rosthabeo) was listed which Seneca does not use at all. Vergil uses it twice.

POST- adverb: (V.).

One word (rosthac) was listed which Seneca uses one, Vergil twice.

PRAE- verbs: (V.).

Forty-seven words were listed. Seneca uses 18 as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 37, Seneca uses 24 of these compounds. In composition prae generally signifies (1) before, e.g. praedico; (2) enhancing the main idea, e.g. praecaltus, praeclarus.

PRAE- nouns, adjectives etc: (V.).

Twelve words were listed of which only 12 occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 24, but Seneca only 16 of these compounds.

PRAETER- verbs: (V.).

Four words were listed but none occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 4, but Seneca uses only
one (praeterea) of these compounds. In compound praeter signifies past, by, beyond, or besides, e.g. praeterducere, praeterea.
PRAETER- adverb: (V.).

Praeterea was the only word listed; Vergil uses it 27 times, but Seneca not at all!

PRO- verbs: (V.).

Sixty-one words were listed. Seneca uses 27 as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 56, Seneca uses 36 of these compounds. Pro in compound has a signification with reference to place, before, forwards; or to protection, for, e.g. prodeo, pro-tega, prophanus.

PRO- nouns, adjectives etc: (V.).

Thirty-five words were listed of which only 15 occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 31, Seneca uses 23 of these compounds.

RE- verbs: (V.).

One hundred and forty-three words were listed of which Seneca uses 69 as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 122, but Seneca uses only 100 of these compounds. In compound re in fundamental significance answers to our English again and against, thus it denotes either (1) a turning backward, e.g. recedo, remitto, or (2) an opposition, e.g. repugno.

RE- nouns, adjectives etc: (V.).

Thirty-three words were listed. Seneca uses but 14 as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 26, Seneca 22 of these compounds.

SEMI- nouns, adjectives etc: (V.).

Eight words were listed. Seneca uses only 2 of them as often
as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses all 2, but Seneca only 3 of these compounds. The prefix signifies half, and hence, also, small, thin etc.

**SUB- verbs: (V.).**

Sixty-one words were listed of which 24 occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 53, Seneca 40 of these compounds. In composition sub signifies a situation under, a going under, e.g. subdo, subaeratus; then, also, it denotes a concealing under, or behind something, e.g. suborno, surripic.

**SUB- nouns, adjectives etc: (V.).**

Fifteen words were listed. Seneca uses 7 as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 11, Seneca 10 of these compounds.

**SUBTER- verbs: (V.).**

Only one word (subterlabor V. 1: S. 0) was listed. The significance of subter like sub is generally that of underneath etc.

**SUPER- verbs: (V.).**

Ten words were listed, but only 2 occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 9, Seneca 2, (superfundo, and supersum), of these compounds. The prefix denotes above, over, of place, e.g. superdo, superfluo; and less frequently, over and above, besides, in addition, e.g. supersum, superstes, superaddo.

**TRANS- verbs: (V.).**

Twenty-five words were listed of which Vergil uses 13 more often than Seneca. Vergil uses 22, Seneca 15 of these compounds. Trans in compound usually signifies over, across, e.g. trado, transcurro, or through, e.g. transigo, tracio.
Compounds which occur relatively more frequent in Seneca are:

**A, AB, ABS- verbs** (V.).

Thirty-five words were listed. Nineteen occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 31 of these compounds, Seneca uses 29. In compound the preposition usually retains its original significance, e.g. *abducere* = to take away, or carry from a place, and also downward, e.g. *abicere* = to throw down. Denoting a departure from the idea of the simple uncompounded word the effect is sometimes prative, e.g. *absimilis, abnormis*, and more rarely denotes completeness, e.g. *absorbere, abutor.*

**AMB- verbs**: (V.).

Seven words were listed. Seneca uses 4 of these as often as the calculated relative frequency demands. Vergil used 6 of these compounds, as does Seneca also. This is the Greek ἀμ and the German um. It is used only in composition.

**AMB- nouns, adjectives etc**: (V.).

Eleven words were listed. Six occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. However, Vergil uses 9 of these compounds, and Seneca uses 8.

**ANTE- verbs**: (V.).

Three words were listed. Two occur as often in Seneca as the calculated frequency demands. Seneca and Vergil each use two of these compounds. In composition it has 4 meanings: (1) Of space, in front of; (2) figuratively, of reference, before, above; (3) of degree before, above; (4) in time designations only with adjectives and adverbs. (No compounds on nouns et. cetera were formed in Seneca or Vergil to be listed.)
**CO- verbs:** (V.).

Six words were listed. Four occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. But Vergil uses 6 of these compounds, while Seneca uses 5. The original difference of CO from cum (com) is not certain.

**CO- nouns, adjectives etc:** (V.).

Seven words were listed. Seneca uses 4 as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses 6 of these compounds, as does Seneca.

**INTRO- verbs:** (V.).

Two words were listed. One occurs in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses both of the words, but Seneca uses only one. (See Turs.)

**INTRO- nouns, adjectives:** (S.).

Two words were listed, and both of them occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses neither one of these compounds.

**NE- verbs:** (V.).

Four words were listed, such as nequeo, nescio, all of which occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Both Seneca and Vergil use 4 of these compounds.

**NE- nouns, adjectives etc:** (V.).

Eight words were listed such as nefastus, nefandus, 5 of which occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Both authors use 7 of these compounds.

**PER- verbs:** (S.).

Sixty-eight words were listed, of which 45 occur in Seneca as often as the calculated relative frequency demands. Seneca uses 54,
and Vergil uses 49 of these compounds. In compound _per_ usually adds intensity to the significance of thoroughly, perfectly, completely, very much etc.

**PER- nouns, adjectives etc: (S.).**

Seventeen words were listed. Seneca uses 15 as often as the calculated frequency demands. Seneca uses 16, Vergil uses 11 of these compounds.

**SE- verbs: (S.).**

Five words were listed of which Seneca uses 3 as often as the calculated frequency demands. Seneca uses 4, Vergil 3 of these compounds. This inseparable prefix signifies without, e.g. _securus_, or aside, by itself, e.g. _serono_.

**SE- nouns, adjectives etc: (S.).**

Four words were listed and all occur in Seneca as often as the calculated frequency demands. Vergil uses only 2 of these compounds.

**SUPER- nouns, adjectives etc: (V.).**

Three words were listed, 2 of which Seneca uses as often as the calculated frequency demands. Both authors use all 3 of these compounds.

**TRANS- nouns: (S.).**

Only one word (_transitus_ V. 0; S. 1) was listed.

The data prove rather conclusively that Vergil uses the prepositional compounds more frequently than Seneca, and also that he uses more of them as regards number. For in 36 groups the occurrence is more frequent in Vergil, and only in 16 is it more frequent in Seneca. Moreover, in only 7 groups is there a greater number of words used in Seneca than in Vergil.
(G) **Superlatives.** The third degree of comparison generally denotes intensity and so might easily add some particular characteristic to an author's style if he uses superlatives abundantly. In view of that, then, the following data are interesting. I have listed 35 words which I noticed were used in the superlative by either of the two poets. I then obtained the total occurrences for each writer by adding the number of times each word is used in the superlative degree. For Seneca the total of occurrences was only 234, but for Vergil 494. The latter, then, used words over twice as often as Seneca, in the third degree of comparison.

(H) **Inchoative verbs.** Up to this point we have restricted, for the most part, our examination of the forms of vocabulary to nouns and adjectives. But certain verb forms, as for instance the inchoatives demand scrutiny. I have listed 137 of these words, such as abolisco, aresco, condisco, exhorresco, lucesco, obliviscor, and pasco. It is interesting to note that Vergil uses 116 of such verbs and 90 of them more frequently than Seneca who uses only 75.

(I) **Adverbial phrases.** Professor Shorey in his discussion "A Greek Analogue Of The Romance Adverb" (Class. Phil., 1910) speaks of the familiar origin of that part of speech in the instrumental ablative with an adjective, as for example of mens; compare "laeta mente", (Catull. 64. 237) with lietamente, constanti mente, (Catull. 64. 210,239) with constamment. Catullus is very fond of the idiom. All Romance grammars mention the analogy, and most scholars can see how important this construction is for later developments. Similar adverbial phrase usages with corde, animo, ratione, pede, manu, modo, modis etc. should be sought in the several Latin authors. The Greek has a similar usage in the modal dative; that of ἐπτῶν was almost a
formula. One notices that in such a phrase the noun is merely a conveyer to carry the more predominant part, the adjective or participle. The modifier then is virtually converted into an adverb. The periphrastic diction of Greek tragedy particularly affects this adverbial phrase usage, and since Seneca used the Greek plays as models we should expect to find many examples in the Seneca tragedies. I have used a selective method in regard to the words for examination and have carefully noted the occurrences in Vergil, and Seneca, respectively. The data listed, of course, are based on my judgment, others might not have selected such as I have. The subjective and objective elements have such a strong influence, and the difficulty very often of deciding between an ablative of means and one of manner combine to make it hard to choose absolutely the adverbial phrase usages.

Animus

Seneca: H. F. 350 impotenti.....animo abtulit
H. F. 412 animo.....capis magno
Pho. 392 animo pari.....subit
M. 152 paciente et aequo.....animo pertulit
A. 127 tumido.....animo geris
H. 0. 232 animo qui tulit aequo

The ablative case occurs 29 times, 24 singular, 5 plural. Hence, the adverbial phrase usage occurs .2 of the time.

Vergil: A. 5. 462 saevire animis .....acerbis
A.5. 529 attonitis haesere animis
A.7. 216 animisque volentibus.....adferimur.
A.7. 814 attonitis inhians animis.
A.10. 7 animis certatis inquis.
A.10. 357 tollunt animis.....aequis.
A. 11. 715 animis elate superbis.
A. 12. 574 animis....certantibus....dant.
The ablative case occurs 62 times, 23 in singular, 39 in plural. Hence, the adverbial phrase usage occurs .12 of the time.

Cor
Seneca: H. F. 1083 feroci corde volutat.
A. 958 corde tumefacto geris.
H. O. 1339 corde anhelante aestuat.
The ablative case occurs 5 times, all in the singular. Hence, the adverbial phrase usage occurs .6 of the time.
Vergil: A. 1. 50 flammato....corde volutans.
A. 6. 185 tristi cum corde volutat
A. 8. 522 tristi cum corde putabant.
A. 12. 18 sedato respondit corde.
The ablative case occurs 14 times, all singular, Hence, the adverbial phrase usage occurs .35 of the time.

IuS.
Vergil: Ciris 335 pro cum iure licebit.
The ablative case occurs 3 times, all singular. Hence, the adverbial phrase usage occurs .33 of the time.

Manus.
Seneca : H. F. 58 superbifica manu....ducit.
H. F. 102 luctifica manu....corripiat.
H. F. 272 iusta....confringit manu.
H. F. 341 trepida manu....obtinentur.
H. F. 473 manu molli....vibrare.
H. F. 1103 pulsent victrice manu.
H. F. 1128 certa librare manu.
H. F. 1203 vindica sera manu.
Tr. 885 docta.....distinguui manu.
Pho. 659 languida regnat manu.
M. 347 labente manu misit.
M. 534 delicenti.....librentur manu.
M. 771 cruenta.....texuntur manu.
Pha. 62 figis.....leviore manu.
Pha. 111 molli.....iaculari manu.
Pha. 156 vibrans corusca.....manu.
Pha. 200 tenera.....molitur manu.
Pha. 533 saeva.....aptabat manu.
Pha. 673 saeva.....emittes manu.
Pha. 979 sparsitque manu.....caeca
Oe. 77 letali manu contacta.
Oe. 441 venit.....vibrante manu.
Oe. 628 enthea.....manu lacerate.
Oe. 1029 saeva.....iaculetur manu.
A. 10 superba.....gestantur manu.
A. 82 sequitur tristis sanguinolenta.....manu.
A. 330 manu pulsa citata.
A. 380 libant manu trementi.
A. 568 manu nefanda.....efferens.
Th. 739 infesta manu exegit.
H. C. 373 feroci.....intorquens manu.
H. O. 429 saeva manu intendat.
H. O. 522 saeva.....avolsam manu.
H. O. 540 tenera tela dimittit manu.
H. O. 544 intende certa.....manu.
H. O. 654 non trepida tenet...manu.
H. O. 769 trepida...manu proiecit.
H. O. 810 complexus...tremibunda manu.
H. O. 905 figens...furibunda manu.
Oc. 483 dedit...facili manu
Oc. 854 violare...incesta manu.
Oc. 954 funesta violata manu.
Pho. 42 manibus infestis petit.
Oe. 965 scrutatur...manibus uncia.
Th. 558 manibusque iunctis ducet.
Oc. 435 avaris manibus...rapit.
The ablative case occurs 141 times, 123 singular, 18 plural. Hence, the adverbial phrase usage occurs .32 of the time.
Vergil: A. 7. 114 violare manu malisque audacibus.
A. 16. 620 larga...manu oneravit.
A. 12. 98 manu valida lacerare.
A. 12. 402 manu medica...trepidat.
A. 12. 901 manu trepida torquebat.
M. 6 sollicitaque manu...explorat.
A. 4. 205 manibus...orasse supinis.
A. 4. 517 manibusque piis...testatur.
A. 6 883 manibus date...plenis.
The ablative case occurs 136 times, 96 singular, 40 plural. Hence, the adverbial phrase usage occurs .06 of the time.

Mens.

Seneca: H. F. 311 meliora mente concipe
Tr. 1064 mente generosa tulit.
Pho. 97 peccas honesta mente.
Pho. 183 mente placata audias.
M. 123 vaesana mente feror.
Pha. 386 mente non sana abruit.
Pha. 1082 pavida,...mente exciti.
Oe. 578 mente non aequa tulit.
Oc. 713 mente turbata feror.

The ablative case occurs 18 times, all in singular. Hence, the adverbial phrase usage occurs .5 of the time.

Vergil: A. 2. 407 non tulit.....furiata mente
A. 2. 588 furiata mente ferebar.
A. 4. 100 tota.....mente petisti.
A. 4. 105 simulata mente locutam.
A. 9. 292 percussa mente dedere.
A.10. 640 sine mente dat.
Cu. 80 mente pura adgnovit.
Cu. 309 funderet.....inimica mente
Ci. 327 nulla mente sequaris.
A.9. 234 audite mentibus aequis.

The ablative case occurs 21 times, 20 singular, 1 plural. Hence the adverbial phrase usage occurs .47 of the time.

Modus.

Seneca: H. F. 746 taxantur modo maiore.
Tr. 1134 tali nubat.....modo.
Pha. 816 modo spargere Parthico.
Oe. 92 caecis verba nectentem modis.
Pho. 132 caecis verba committens modis.
A. 332 modis intonet altis.
H. 0. 1091 flebilibus modis.....cecinit.
The ablative case occurs 15 times, 11 singular, 4 plural. Hence, the adverbial phrase usage occurs .4 of the time.

Vergil: G.1. 477 modis pallentia miris.
G.4. 309 visenda modis....miris.
A.1. 354 modis.....pallida miris.
A.6. 748 modis inoslescere miris.
A.7. 89 modis.....volitantia miris.
A.1C 822 modis.....pallentia miris.

Note that all the 6 cases are phrase modis miris, and that 3 are connected with pallesc. The ablative case occurs 18 times, 10 singular, 6 plural. Hence, the adverbial phrase usage occurs .37 of the time.

Mos.

Seneca: Oe. 384 more solito positus

Ablative case occurs 13 times, all in the singular. Hence, the adverbial phrase usage occurs .07 of the time.

N. B. more with the accompanying genitive occurs often, both in Seneca and Vergil, e.g. more turbatis maris, H. F. 320; theatri more, Tr. 1125. This is an adverbial usage but can hardly be included here.

Pes.

Seneca: Tr. 783 mobile.....pede.....saltatu coles
M. 253 superbo.....calcem pede.
M. 753 nudo pede lustrare
Pha. 234 agili.....calcantem pede.
Pha. 374 vadit incerto pede.
Pha. 763 celeri pede laberis.
Pha. 902 concitum celeri pede.
Oe. 225 suprlici intravi pede.
Oe. 433 Edono pede pulsavit.
Oe. 757 agili.....pede.....metuit.
H. 0. 740 ardentii pede ferentem pressus.
Oc. 161 funesto pede intravit.
The ablative case occurs 16 times, 14 singular, 2 plural. Hence, the
adverbial phrase usage occurs .75 of the time.
Vergil: A.8. 302 adi pede secundo.
A.10. 736 nixus posito pede.
A.12. 356 pede impresso.....extorquet.
A.12. 465 pede aequo inequitur.
Cu. 35 tenui pede currere.
Ci. 20 molli pede claudere.
A.3. 233 pedibus circumvolat uncis.
The ablative case occurs 43 times, 15 singular, 28 plural. Hence, the
adverbial phrase usage occurs .68 of the time.

Robur.
Seneca: Oe. 363 valido robore insurgit.
Oc. 318 resoluto robore labens (falling with strength lost).
The ablative case occurs 5 times, all in the singular. Hence, the
adverbial phrase usage occurs .4 of the time.

That Seneca uses these adverbial phrases more than Vergil is
clearly shown by the data, because of the 9 words considered, in 8
cases he has the usage the more often. In ius, Vergil has more than
Seneca. The reason for such a frequent occurrence in the tragedies
is due, I believe, to the later time in which Seneca wrote, and to
the fact that he was imitating the Greek tragedies, as I suggested
previously. A point of general value results from such a study as
this; the reader should be aware of such phrases and in translation
should use adverbs in interpreting; for instance, do not construe
Adi pede secundo by the phrase "advance with favoring foot", but rather by "favorably" or some such single word.

(J) Interjections. As forms full of meaning interjections should be studied in an examination of an author's style. They are natural exclamations of feeling and by the number of their occurrence or the kind used may often characterize an entire passage. I have examined the following 11 interjections in Vergil and Seneca: Ā (Ah) ecce, sheu, ei, en, euhoe, eis, heu, Ĉ.pro, vae. Vergil uses all these and 6 of them more frequently than Seneca who uses 8. I have classified the total occurrences as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Astonishment</th>
<th>Joy</th>
<th>Attestation (e.g. pro pudor!)</th>
<th>Sorrow</th>
<th>Praise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. 281</td>
<td>V. 1</td>
<td>V. 1</td>
<td>V. 55</td>
<td>V. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 274</td>
<td>S. 0</td>
<td>S. 23</td>
<td>S. 20</td>
<td>S. 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of course, an arbitrary classification can not always be a perfectly correct one. Interjections often connote different feelings, for example compare Ā (Ah!) which sometimes signifies astonishment, sometimes grief, and sometimes entreaty to avert some evil. But at any rate, from the above data, we may say that Vergil uses interjections more frequently than Seneca. As to the kind used it is interesting to note that Seneca uses the interjection of attestation, such as Ĉ.pro (pro pudor! etc.), far more often than Vergil.
Appendix.

(A) Words occurring ten or more times in one author and absent from the other. In the course of my investigation I have noticed several words which occur frequently in one of the authors, but are absent from the other. In this part of my thesis I have listed those words which are used 10 or more times by the one and not by the other, (excluding, of course, proper nouns). In some places attempts at explanations have been made, but, of course, much intensive examination would be necessary to perfect such a study. The lists are interesting both for the data on individual words, and for the conclusions to be drawn as to the two authors' respective vocabularies.

Words occurring ten or more times in Vergil and absent from Seneca:

acervus

V. 12; S. C. (Cf. Forcellini in a note on difference between acervus and cumulus: "ut acervus sit minutarum, ut frumenti, leguminum, pomorum, aut numorum; cumulus vero ingens vis rerum compositarum." Of course, there are exceptions, but V.'s usage of acervus fits in well with the above note. Seneca has cumulus 2 times (Th. 974; Pha. 1119); in both cases used of intangible or weightier objects than grain etc. Probably this is the explanation of acervus so often in Vergil where grain etc. is treated, but not treated in S.).

adfor

V. 30; S. C. (In general only poetical. N. B. such derivatives from it as affabilis, affabilitas, affamen etc., such are expected to bear out the "pleasant" in V.)

admoneo

V. 10; S. C. (Usually = to admonish, advise in a
friendly manner, but often in poets and in later Latin = to urge, or incite to action, e.g. liberos verberibus, Sen. Clem. 1.14. Both meanings V. could and did use.)

adnuo
V. 10; S. C.

adrigo
V. 23; S. O. (Primarily = to set up, erect so in A. 10. 726 leo comas arrexit, also A. 2. 303 (translated from pecudibus); then = to arouse encourage, e.g. G. 3. 105 cum spes arrectae iuvenum).

adspiro
V. 10; S. O (The meanings "breath upon", then "inspire" fit in well with V.'s nature subjects and also his pleasant strains, e.g. A. 2. 385 adspirat primo Fortuna labori.)

aeratus (vb. aero) V. 11; S. O (Often = armed, e.g. A. 9. 463 aeratas acies. It is interesting to note that 9 out of the 11 occurrences in V. are in last bks. of Aen. where most of the fighting occurs. Of course such a meaning S. did not have much occasion to use).

aereus
V. 11; S. O. (perchance the materialistic subjects of which V. has occasions to speak, tho in a poetical manner, account for this and aeratus to some degree, e.g., bronze shield, bronze door posts etc.).

aerius
V. 22; S. O (A Greek word. Besides is a very poetical word. Cicero uses it only in high flights of speech. Cf. lofty trees, towers etc. in V. which lend to poetical charm).

agnus
V. 11; S. O (vid. Animals.)

alvus
V. 11; S. O (Obviously more where animals are treated. Then I believe S. if stomach had to be mentioned would use the more general term i.e., venter. Cf. Probus in fragm. de nomine N. 46. Endl. "Venter totus dicitur qui oculis sub-
jectus est; alvus interior pars, qua cibus commean; uterum autem
quo mulier baiulat partum.")

aris V. 22; S. C (Obvious.)

aridus V. 16; S. C (Here again a word for the physical,
material side in V. Only 2 occurrences in Aeneid, one of dry
tinder (Bk. 1. 175) and other of parched mouths (Bk. 5. 200).
Other occurrences are in Georgics and Catalepton, particularly
for parched fields etc.)

aro V. 10; S. C (Obvious)
augurium V. 12; S. C (Commonly = divination of future but
proprie from flying of birds, lightnings, signs taken from other
animals etc. So here also the "physical" in V. offers an ex-
planation. Particularly a Roman word, whereas Seneca's subject
matter is chiefly Greek).

avena V. 11; S. C (Obviously suited to agricultural poet-
ry.)
capella V. 24; S. C (Vid. animals.)
cavo V. 10; S. O ($ense of hollow, excavated, so rather
physical; cf. alnos cavatas, Verg. Georg. 1. 136. Hence S.
could not use very often if at all.)
certatim V. 16; S. O (Seemingly a Vergilian mannerism.)
circumdo V. 28; S. O
cognomen V. 14; S. O (V. uses it often for nomen, e.g. A.
1. 530; 3. 133; 3. 163; 3. 334; 3. 350; 8. 48; 8. 331. This
accounts for many occurrences.)

commisceo V. 11; S. C

compello (1) V. 11; S. C
concilium V. 11; S. O (Concilium = an assembly, consultation,
council in concreto; consilium = counsel in abstracto. S. uses consilium 20 times, V. 13 times. Here is, then another contrast between concrete in V. and abstract in S.)

concreaco  V. 13; S. 0  (All material meaning, aside from abstract. So often in Vergil.)

conicio  V. 21; S. 0

continuo (adv)  V. 28; S. 0  (Needed by V. in his epic, and exposition, not so with S. in his tragic dialogue.)

cortex  V. 15; S. 0  (Obvious where nature and trees are treated.)

crater  V. 14; S. 0  (Vid. Greek words.)

decedo  V. 15; S. 0  (Poetically often to mean avoid, shun, escape from, so e.g. Ec.8. 88; G.3. 467; G.4. 23. The more prosy word decedo S. uses 11 times, V. 14.)

discordia  V. 12; S. 0  (A term for mere disagreement, perhaps was too tame for S.'s tragic themes. He uses discord 6 times. Cf. also the data on the words compounded on dis which V. uses so much more often than S.)

discrimen  V. 19; S. 0  (Cf. data on dis compounds.)

divinus  V. 18; S. 0  (Needed by V. to intensify poetic strains. Cf. such phrases as "divine speech," "in a godlike manner," "divinely" etc.)

extemplo  V. 16; S. 0  (Probably a handy transitional word for V. in narration. In Plautus occurs more than 60 times, once in Cicero, none in Caesar or Quintilian, so evidently a word used greatly by some writers, and neglected by others.)

fiducia  V. 12; S. 0  (Trust, confidence expected in V. especially in Aeneid where it occurs 11 times. Expresses a strong
er quality than sper habere.)

formido (subst.) V. 23; S. 0 (Prop. the fear that makes rigid. Appropriate for V. Seneca uses the vb. only once in sense to shiver before.)

fortunatus V. 13; S. 0 (S. uses fortuna, the substantive, often as it is mere fortune, luck, fate etc. But this word denotes the actual state of being fortunate, prosperous, happy so fitting and full of meaning for V.'s effects.)

fossa V. 12; S. 0 (Rather materialistic. Would expect more in the Georgics but it occurs there only twice and = ditch. But 10 times in last 6 books of Aeneid in sense of moat. Obviously S. had no great need for either meaning.)

frondeo V. 12; S. 0 (Obviously appropriate for nature poetry. Vid. trees.)

glaucus V. 10; S. 0 (Vid. colors, and Greek words.)

heros V. 33; S. 0 (Demigods, heroes, the heroic all poetical, high sounding and suited to epic, so in the Aeneid it occurs 28 times. Vid. Grk. words also.)

incendium V. 10; S. 0 (Materialistic as contrasted with more abstract. V. found of words for burn, heat etc. Cf. uro, in- flammo, incendo etc.)

insecto V. 10; S. 0 (To tie, or bind, usually material things have not much place in S.)

instauro V. 10; S. 0

interaum V. 12; S. 0 (Vid. compounds on inter. This a fine transitional word for V. in narration and exposition.)

intexo V. 12; S. 0 (Cf. note on insecto)

iuxtra (adv.) V. 14; S. 0
limus     V. 10; S. O  (9 times in Ec. and Georg., 2 times in
          Culex. Slime, mire, hardly to be expected in tragedy.)
liquidus  V. 27; S. O  (Rather poetical. Cf. liquidum iter,
          pure founts etc. Of material things usually.)
longaevos (vus) V. 14; S. O  (Poetical, cf. longaeus parens A. 3.
          169, A. 2. 525: senes 5. 715.)
lorica    V. 13; S. O  (Expected in war poetry, so occurs 11
          times in last 6 books of Aeneid.)
mel       V. 19; S. O  (Obvious; 15 times in Ec. and Georg.)
mirabilis V. 17; S. O  (A favorite word of V. Classical, and
          then used often in Vulgate in sense of glorious.)
mirus     V. 12; S. O  (Cf. mirabilis and adverbial phrases
          under modus. V. uses miris 6 times with miris modis = in won-
          drous wise.
nequiquam V. 46; S. O  (Why S. did not use it I can not say.)
nympha    V. 41; S. O  (Demi-goddesses, inhabitants of sea,
          rivers, groves, etc. particularly appropriate for V. vid. also
          Greek words.)
obstipeaco V. 15; S. O  (Properly used in regard to corporeal,
          or material things. Cf. A. 2. 774; A. 3. 48, indentically the
          same lines. The phrase, "I was appalled" had a fast hold upon
          V.'s termimology.)
oliva     V. 17; S. O  (Obvious. Vid. trees.)
omnipotens V. 23; S. O  (A poetical word, and a favorite of V.
          Cf. the phrase "pater omnipotens," A. 1. 60; 3. 251; 4. 25;
          6. 592. (Possibly an imitation of Ennius, for similar phrases
          occur in Lucretius and in Cicero's poetry.
origo     V. 17; S. O  (Very much needed by V. Cf. A. 10. 612,
and "Aeneas, Romanae stirpisorigo", A.12. 166; also of animals cf. G.3. 473.)

**ovis** V. 24. S. O (Obvious. Vid. animals.)

**patera** V. 13; S. O (Cf. A.1. 729 et 739. Such a phrase as "foaming cup" highly poetical. Also in sacrificing, oft. occurring in v., such a word V. needed.)

**paulatim.** V. 13; S.O

**post (adv.)** V. 32; S. O (Seneca does, however, use the prero-

**praesaene(praeseppe) V. 10; S.O (6 occurrences in the Ec. and Georg., naturally.)**

**praeterea** V. 27; S. O (A convenient word for Vergil's narrative).

**procumbé** V. 19; S. O (A rather poetical word; cf. "bend to the oars," etc.).

**propinquu** V. 14; S. O (Poetical, equal to our "come nigh").

**rastrum** V. 10; S. O (8 occurrences in the Ec. and Georg.).

**religio** V. 11; S. O (10 occurrences in the Aeneid where such a word as piety, reverence for the gods is peculiarly appropriate.)

**rideo** V. 10; S. O (Laughing is foreign to tragedy. Cf. pleasant words).

**salix** V. 13; S. O (Vid. trees.).

**secus (adv.)** V. 18; S. O (V. uses the synonym aliter17 times, S. 5 times. Evidently the meaning otherwise etc. was one favor-
ed by Vergil.

**sententia** V. 19; S. O

**suavis** V. 10; S. O (A word of direct appeal to the senses.
Used by V. generally in the original meaning "sweet." Cf. Ec. 2. 55; 2. 49; G. 4. 200).

- **sulcus**
  - V. 20; S. 0 (13 times in the Ec. and Georg.).
- **ulmus**
  - V. 17; S. 0 (vid. trees).
- **uva**
  - V. 16; S. 0 (Obvious).
- **verro**
  - V. 11; S. 0
- **versus**
  - V. 24; S. 0
- **victus**
  - V. 10; S. 0
- **vimen**
  - V. 13; S. 0 (Obvious).
- **viresco**
  - V. 12; S. 0 (Obvious. Vid. colors).

II. Words occurring ten or more times in Seneca but absent from Vergil:

- **capax**
  - V. 0; S. 13 (Vid. words in -ax etc. More frequent in poets and especially post-Augustan).
- **caelestis**
  - V. 0; S. 19 (Not found in nominative singular. And in oblique cases excluded from Vergil by the meter).
- **arbiter**
  - V. 0; S. 14
- **expeto**
  - V. 0; S. 14 (A strong word containing much idea of demand to know a thing, or a demand to obtain it. Stronger than cupio, volo.)
- **flebiles**
  - V. 0; S. 21 (A strong word handy for S. to use in such a phrase as flebilis crur etc. Naturally, actual weeping and things causing weeping occur often in S.'s plays).
- **innoctes**
  - V. 0; S. 21 (Metre).
- **innocens**
  - V. 0; S. 19 (Metre).
- **intrepidus**
  - V. 0; S. 10 (Mostly post-Augustan.)
- **liberi**
  - V. 0; S. 32 (Due to metre. V. uses nati, filii,
pseri et cet. for substitutes, which are more poetical.)

misera V. O; S. 10 (Meter).
paelex V. O; S. 26 (Post-Augustan).
paveo V. O; S. 15 (Vid. fear words).
planctus V. O; S. 21 (Post-Augustan. Appropriate to tragic themes).
possideo V. O; S. 12 (Prosaic word).
profugio V. O; S. 15 (Post-Augustan).
quotus V. O; S. 10 (V. uses quot 19 times, S. 10).
rietus V. O; S. 11 (Lewis and Short say rictus is especially used of laughing, but not so in Seneca. Nine occurrences are used as relating to the jaws particularly when bloody or gaping, e.g. A. 847; Th. 734; Oe. 94. Other 2 cases are used of the opening of the eyes, e. g. H. O. 1274, 1168).
statim V. O; S. 10 (Evidently a favorite of S. V. used the synonyms extemplo, continuo very often. Probably metre was against its use by V.).
stuprum V. O; S. 15 (Vid. miscellaneous sinister words).
vindex V. O; S. 18 (Appropriate for Seneca, especially in sense of avenger.)

(B) Miscellaneous words interesting because of their comparative frequent occurrence in one or the other of the two authors.

Those occurring more frequently in Vergil:
apud V. 7; S. 0
ergo V. 61; S. 4
foedo V. 11; S. 1
humidus V. 17; S. 1
ibi V. 14; S. 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>V.</th>
<th>S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inde</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is-ea-id</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Note the prevalence of this in V. in contrast to <em>iste</em>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luna</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>memini</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mensis</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moenia</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monumentum</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mox</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musco</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nam</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>namque</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nuper</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nusquam</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ob</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>olim</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oppidum</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordior</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ostento</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ostium</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>posterus</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praecipito</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praecipuus</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pubes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quattuor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
quia V. 11; S. 1
quippe V. 10; S. 2
quomodo V. 7; S. 0
sal V. 16; S. 1
scilicet V. 15; S. 3
scutum V. 13; S. 1
singuli V. 10; S. 1
sinister V. 18; S. 1
studium V. 25; S. 1
super (adv.) V. 55; S. 8
super (prepos.) V. 51; S. 4
uncus V. 12; S. 1
usque V. 15; S. 2
usus V. 19; S. 2
velut V. 36; S. 2
vitis V. 29; S. 2
voluto V. 11; S. 1

Those occurring more frequently in Seneca:

facinus V. 1; s. 46
intueor(intuor) V. 1; s. 18
invoco V. 1; s. 12
iste V. 54; S. 108 (Compare the note on is-ea-id).
memoria V. 0; S. 9
nemo V. 4; S. 38
nempe V. 1; S. 22
ninis V. 2; S. 24 (Prosaic).
nisi V. 8; S. 29
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nubo</td>
<td>V. 1; S. 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paene</td>
<td>V. 1; S. 10</td>
<td>(Prosaic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parum</td>
<td>V. 1; S. 20</td>
<td>(Prosaic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quilibet</td>
<td>V. 1; S. 9</td>
<td>(Prosaic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status (subst.)</td>
<td>V. 1; S. 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unicus</td>
<td>V. 2; S. 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viduus</td>
<td>V. 1; S. 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

I. Content of vocabulary.
   A. Sensations--In his appeals to the different senses, Vergil is varied, concrete, more numerous than Seneca, and the choice of words more exact and appropriate to his themes.

   1. Sight
      a. Colors--Vergil uses 108 words and 73 more frequently than Seneca who uses 78. The former chooses terms to enhance the beautiful and pleasant.

      b. Form--Vergil makes little of form and Seneca far less. Of the 13 words considered 14 occur more often in Vergil, the curved form appeals to Vergil as a pleasant conception.

      c. Size--Of the 15 words listed, 8 occur more often in Vergil. The use of parvus by Seneca is noteworthy as compared with that of ingens by Vergil.

   2. Hearing--Here again the love for the pleasant is illustrated by the frequent use of onomapoetic terms, and words for echo by Vergil.

   3. Taste--Of the 11 words considered, 8 occur more often in Vergil.

   4. Smell--Both poets have a small vocabulary of words for smell. Seneca uses only 6 words. Fourteen out of the 17 words listed occur more often in Vergil.

   5. Touch--Eighteen of the 29 words occur more often in Vergil. It is interesting to note that in Seneca there are more references to the dry than in Vergil.
6. **Temperature**—Here, there is not such a marked difference in the usage by the 2 authors. Vergil, however, does have more appeals to this sense; of the 36 words listed Vergil uses 32 and 22 more often than Seneca.

**B. External physical nature.**

1. **Animals**—Of the 91 words listed, Vergil uses 85 and 67 more often than Seneca who uses 52. Vergil's animals are numerous and generally of an innocent nature, but Seneca's are few and terrible.

2. **Birds**—Of 33 words listed, Vergil uses 31, and 23 more often than Seneca who uses only 14. Birds in general are usually connected with an idea of gentleness and kindliness, and so Vergil probably referred to them by necessity where subject matter demanded and by choice where their influence might be felt.

3. **Trees**—Of the 105 words considered, Vergil uses all except frondifer, and 95 more frequently than Seneca who uses only 40.

4. **Flowers**—These are used in a similar way to trees. Of the 30 words listed, Vergil uses 29 and all 29 more often than Seneca who uses only 7 words for flowers. Vergil, then, realized very strongly the ability of flowers to instill the pleasant atmosphere into his works.

5. **Sky**—Of the 10 words listed, Seneca uses all and 6 more frequently than Vergil. It is noteworthy that this usage by Seneca is somewhat opposed to the use he makes of other words related to external physical nature.

6. **Stars**—Of the 10 words listed, Seneca uses 9 and 5 more frequently than Vergil.
C. Words expressing emotion, affecting the sensibilities by their connotation or otherwise. In this class of words Vergil chooses terms which appeal to the pleasant; laughing is referred to more often than weeping, the beautiful more often than the ugly. He avoids those words which would only detract from his union of pathos and feeling. But Seneca appeals to the sinister; the word for laughing is almost foreign to his vocabulary, but terms like blood and gore are fit expressions for his descriptions of every detail of horror.

II. Form of vocabulary.

A. Greek words—Of 183 words listed, Vergil uses 168 and 125 of them more often than Seneca who uses only 64. In Vergil there are for the common nouns borrowed from the Greek 56 Greek accusatives, 218 for the proper nouns, making a total of 274. Compare to total in Seneca of only 83. Of the 44 patronymics examined Vergil uses 38 and 24 of them more often than Seneca.

B. Nouns of agency—Of the 88 words listed, Vergil uses 72, and 45 of them more often than Seneca who uses 51.

C. Nouns of the fourth declension—Of the 186 words examined, Seneca uses 128 and 96 more often than Vergil who uses only 73. The total occurrences of the ablative singular in -u are in Vergil 560, in Seneca 569.

D. Personified nouns—For the 71 words listed there are 166 personifications in Vergil, and 191 in Seneca.

E. Adjectives in -eus, -eus, -er, -ger, -ax, -ix, -ox, etc. The data show that Seneca prefers the adjectives in -er, -ger, -ax, -ix, -ox etc. Probably, the connotation produced by the sound of the different adjectives may account for the different usages of the 2 authors.
F. Prepositional compounds—In 36 groups the occurrence is more frequent in Vergil, and only in 16 is it more frequent in Seneca. Moreover, in only 7 groups is there a greater number of words used in Seneca than in Vergil.

G. Superlatives—For the 35 words listed, the total of occurrences in the superlative degree for Seneca was only 234, but for Vergil 494.

H. Inchoative verbs—Of the 137 words examined, Vergil uses 116 and 90 of them more frequently than Seneca who uses only 75.

I. Adverbial phrases—That Seneca uses these phrases more than Vergil is clearly shown by the data, because of the 9 words considered, in 8 cases he has the usage the more often.

J. Interjections—Of the 11 words considered Vergil uses all and 6 of them more frequently than Seneca who uses 8. It is noteworthy that Seneca uses the interjection of attestation, such as pro (pro pudor! etc.), far more often than Vergil.

Appendix—From the lists included in the appendix interesting data may be had on individual words, and conclusions may be drawn as to the two author’s respective vocabularies. The large number of words occurring 10 or more times in Vergil but absent from Seneca is noteworthy when compared with the small number used 10 or more times in Seneca but absent from Vergil.