The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Hidden Quantities Again

Carl D. Buck

The Classical Review / Volume 27 / Issue 04 / June 2013, pp 122 - 126

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00005023, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00005023

How to cite this article:

Carl D. Buck (2013). Hidden Quantities Again. The Classical Review, 27, pp 122-126
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00005023

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

HIDDEN QUANTITIES AGAIN.

PROFESSOR SONNENSCHN'S article on 'Hidden Quantities' in the May (1912) number of the *Classical Review* has drawn forth a rejoinder in the November number, with which I am in full accord. But Professor Sloman has chosen to touch upon only one of the various questions of actual quantity raised by Professor Sonnenschein, and it occurs to me that, unless someone takes the trouble to comment on the other points, some readers of the *Classical Review* may be misled as to the situation.

Professor Sonnenschein's first point is that the long vowel of *ēst*, *ēsse*, *ēssēm* from *edō* 'eat' has been discredited by Vollmer (*Glotta*, I. 113 ff.), whose conclusions have been accepted by Skutsch and Niedermann and have likewise convinced him, while no one has stepped forward to defend the long *e*. Shortly after the publication of Vollmer's article I had occasion to express privately the opinion that Vollmer had shown how the statement of the grammarians on the length of vowel, if erroneous, might be accounted for, but had not shown that it actually was an error. I was disposed to hold on to *ēst*, but had no positive evidence to throw to the support of the grammarians. Fortunately such evidence exists, and it is Skutsch (*Glotta*, III. 385 ff.) who, in view of his previous support of Vollmer, has hastened to call attention to two facts 'wodurch Donat und Priscian glänzend gerechtfertigt werden,' namely—(1) *ἡσσε*¹ in a curse written in Greek letters where *η* regularly represents Latin *ē* (*διηβους* = *diēbus*, etc.) and where the context shows beyond question that *ἡσσε* is *ēsse* 'to eat' (*ὅν ποσσιν δορμειρε βουωσα νεκουε ἡσσε* = *non possit dormire Bonosa neque esse*; cf. Osc. *nip putiād edum*); (2) *ēst* Verg. *Aen.* IV. 66 in a fifth-century papyrus. These long vowel forms contain, as long since recognised, the same strengthened grade of the root which appears in the perfect *ēdī* and the

participle *ēsus*.² The employment of this grade in the present also is common to Latin, Lithuanian (Old Lith. *ēdmi*, *ēst(i)*, now *ėdu* or *ėdzu* with thematic inflection), and Slavic (Old Bulg. *jastŭ*), in contrast to Sanskrit (*atti*), and in all three was especially favoured because it furnished a differentiation from the corresponding forms of the verb 'to be' (Lat. *est*, Old Lith. *est(i)*, Old Bulg. *jestŭ*).

The second point concerns the vowels before *ns* or *nf*, and to Professor Sonnenschein's statements the editor of the *Classical Review* added a corrective query, and Professor Sloman has furnished a further comment. Whatever uncertainty exists pertains not to the vowel but to the precise pronunciation of the nasal. That the nasal element was wholly lacking in cultivated Roman pronunciation of such words as *consul* is an untenable view, and to omit the nasal entirely in our practice would be a far greater inaccuracy than to give it the sound

² Not from *edtos*, as stated by Professor Sonnenschein in a footnote, with reference to Niedermann. Cf. *sessum*, *fissus*, etc. [It is true that 'Lachmann's Law' (Lucret. p. 54 ff.), admittedly impossible as originally stated, was revived in a much modified form by Pedersen, *Nord. Tidsskrift f. filol.* III. 5. 35 ff., and is maintained with still further restrictions and modification by Sommer, *Handbuch*, 136, 642, whose view is accepted by Niedermann and by Brugmann, *Kz. vergl. Gram.* 219. It appears in its most attenuated form in the article by Meillet, *Mém. Soc. Ling.* XV. 265 ff., who believes in a lengthening of *a* and *e* in the participles of roots ending in *g*, but not in those of roots ending in *d* (e.g. lengthening in *actus*, *lactus*, but inherited long vowel in *ēsus*). But the assumption of secondary lengthening is wholly superfluous for forms like *lactus*, *rectus*, *tectus*, *ēsus* (cf. *lēgi*, *lēx*, *lēgis*, *rēxi*, *rēx*, *rēgis*, *tēxi*, *ēdī*, with inherited long vowel); and in the case of a few like *actus*, *cāsus*, etc. (the evidence for *ā* in *maximus* is worthless), the undoubted advantage in simplicity over other possible explanations is more than offset by the improbable aspect of the development assumed (*gt* assimilated to *kt* in the parent speech, then *gt*, with *g* restored by analogy of other forms, resulting in lengthening of preceding vowel, then *kt* again), and especially by the exceptions that are still left under Sommer's formulation, as *sessum*, *fissus*, *cessus*, *strictus*, and which disposed of only in the most artificial fashion.

¹ Quoted also by Heraeus, *Archiv für lat. Lex.* XIV. 412, in an article to which Professor Sonnenschein refers in another connection.

that is natural to us in such cases, which is rather light anyway and probably is as near an approach to the Roman practice as we attain in many other matters.

The history of *ns*, which now seems to me the most probable, is the following: Under certain conditions, including especially original final *ns*, as in the accusative plural forms, the *n* was lost, with lengthening of the preceding vowel, in prehistoric times, finally and irrevocably. But in the historical *ns* the *n* must of course have been pronounced when the language was first reduced to writing. At an early period this *n* also came to be very slightly sounded, or, very likely, wholly lost in the ordinary pronunciation, the preceding vowel being lengthened or having previously been lengthened—whether nasalised or not we cannot say. Consequently the *n* was very frequently omitted in the writing. But the spelling with *n* was not ousted, rather it remained the more usual one and gained ground until it was completely rehabilitated as the normal spelling. This retention of *n* in the spelling reacted on the pronunciation, causing the retention or the restoration of the sound in careful speech. No one will find any difficulty in such an assumption who is aware of the rôle played by ‘spelling-pronunciations,’ nowhere more evident than in our own language (the word *language* itself being a well-known example).¹ It is not necessary to suppose that this *n* was any weaker than *n* before consonants in general.

Under (3) Professor Sonnenschein groups a number of points in regard to which ‘recent authorities differ.’ The fact that the Hale and Buck *Latin Grammar* is taken as one of the representatives of recent views does not reconcile me to this method of counting noses, without appreciation of the real character of the problem and the evidence. No one will wish to deny that there is still, and always will be, a deal of uncertainty regarding hidden quantities, that there are many cases

where the evidence is so meagre or so conflicting that our conclusion is scarcely more than arbitrary. Indeed, some matters about which our books agree are nothing like so certain as would appear from this agreement.² On the other hand there are cases about which there is no reasonable doubt, even if recent books do differ. Of the divergences noted by Professor Sonnenschein, some are in matters about which competent opinion may differ, while others are due to nothing more than the fact that certain untenable views have not yet been eradicated. For the quantities given in the Hale and Buck *Grammar* no infallibility is claimed, but it is fair to state that they rest upon a serious and independent weighing of the evidence, though nearly all discussion of it had to be omitted as out of place in a school-book, and only the result given. I should be almost ashamed to confess the amount of time devoted to this subject, so great that I have been loath to touch it again, even after a long interval. So far as the quantities in Stowasser’s *Lat. Schul und Handwörterbuch* reflect the deliberate judgment of the late Professor Skutsch, they are, of course, deserving of the greatest respect. But I am convinced that his part in this was sporadically corrective rather than systematically creative. Nothing short of a direct statement from him, which unfortunately is no longer possible, would make me believe that he was responsible for some of the quantities given. As for Heinichen’s *Kleines Lat. Schulwörterbuch*, while it gives what was supposed to be the last word on the forms of *edo* discussed above, it often ignores recent opinion and perpetuates views of Marx, which no one who has a right to an opinion holds to-day. It would be more satisfactory if Professor Sonnenschein had chosen in place of this some one of the works which reflect competent individual opinion, such as those of

¹ Cf. Koepfel, *Spelling Pronunciations (Quellen und Forschungen, 89)*; Jespersen, *Modern English Grammar* (see index under ‘Spelling Pronunciations’).

² Fortunately the pupil need not be troubled by this. Nor is the fact that we teach dogmatically, one way or another, some quantities which are really doubtful, an admission that we should ignore the whole matter, and thus deliberately teach many quantities which we know to be false.

Lindsay or Sommer, to which he refers occasionally, or Bennett's *Latin Language*, which furnishes the most convenient summary of the problems involved and the evidence in specific cases. Let us now consider the several points which Professor Sonnenschein mentions under (3).

(a) The quantity of the vowel before *gn*. The problem is a real one, but the statement of it is confused. 'On the quantity of the *a* in *magnus* depends the pronunciation of the comparative.' Not in the least! No one believes in an etymologically long *a* in either *magnus* or *maior*; the question of the vowel quantity in *magnus*, *dignus*, etc., is one, of that in *maior*, *peior*, *eius*, etc., another. As regards the vowel before *gn* three attitudes are possible: (1) To recognise only etymological length, as in *rēgnum* beside *rēx*, *rēgis*; (2) to admit also secondary lengthening in certain words, as especially *signum* and *dignus*, there being considerable evidence of lengthening in some stratum of the language; (3) to assume universal lengthening before *gn*. The last, the position taken by Marx and followed in Heinichen, is the least likely, in view of the situation in Romance and the total lack of specific evidence (apex) in such common words as *magnus*; it ought, in my opinion, to be definitely rejected. The second position is defensible. But the particular eclecticism represented in Stowasser, e.g. *māgnus* but *dignus*, baffles interpretation. The first view is that preferred in the Hale and Buck Grammar, upon the basis of my discussion of the whole question in the *Classical Review*, XV. (1901), 311 ff.

The view that the pronunciation of *maior* and the like was that which was more adequately exhibited by such spellings as *Maiia*, *eiius*, etc., and that the vowel itself was short (cf. Ital. *peggio* with open *e*) is stated in so many words by some of the Latin grammarians, and has gradually won general recognition among modern scholars. Cf. Seelmann (*Aussprache des Lateins* 107), Lindsay (*Latin Language* 53), Sommer (*Handbuch* 171), Stolz (*Lat. Laut- und Formenlehre*⁴ 31), Exon (*Hermathena* XII. 216). The only excuse for writing *māior*, *ēius*, etc.,

is as a practical expedient to show the length of the syllable, and for that, some other device, if any is thought necessary, should be employed (*ēius*, etc., in the Allen and Greenough *Latin Grammar*).

(b) Compounds of *ad* and *dis*. The survival of Marx's *āscendō*, *dīstō*, *dīstinguō*, etc., in Heinichen need not detain us.

(c) The perfects in *-exī*. All *-ēxī* in Heinichen after Marx, who deduced a general rule from a statement in Priscian, Keil II. 466. Stowasser accepts Priscian's specific examples *rēxī*, *tēxī*, *illēxī*. But the general rule is a doubtful inference from Priscian's words (cf. Bennett's *Latin Language* 66), and further, when one reads in the same passage that in *duxī* (*ū* amply attested by apices) the *u* is shown to be short by the noun from which it is derived, *dux*, *ducis*, one ought to realise that Priscian is mixing fact and fancy, so that even his specific instances of *-ēxī* are of little value unless corroborated by other evidence. Hale-Buck give only *rēxī* and *tēxī*, which are found with the apex (cf. also *rēctus*, *tēctus*), and also *intellēxī* and other compounds of *legō*, on the ground that they contain the same grade of the root as *lēgī* (*neglēxī* also to be inferred from Diomedes, Keil I. 470. 18). That others *may* have *-ēxī* is not denied, but there is no evidence, internal or external. Comparative grammar readily explains such a form as *rēxī* as containing an inherited strengthened grade of the root, which is regularly employed in the Sanskrit s-aorist in the indicative active; and Brugmann's *Kurze vergl. Gram.* 538 gives Lat. *vēxī*, equating it with Skt. *avākṣam* and Slavic *věsŭ*. But in Latin all gradation within the same tense was lost, and now one, now another, grade was generalised. That no one grade is characteristic of the forms of aorist origin, any more than of the other formations making up the Latin perfect, is evident from *gessī*, *ussī*, *concussī*, etc. Either *vēxī* with the *ē* grade or *vexī* with *e* grade (cf. Skt. subj. *vakṣat*) is possible on general grounds, and the question is simply one of specific evidence.

(d) The principal parts of *emō*, *iubeō*, and *sancio*.

ēemptum (H-B, Hn.), *emptum* (St.).

No reason for not accepting the evidence of *ē* (*coēnto, redēmta, ρεδημττα*) occurs to me. This participle is a new formation, as shown by the *mpt* instead of *nt*, and is based upon *ēmī* (cf. Sommer 642, Stolz 94). The Thesaurus gives *coēmtum*, but *adēmtum*, an unjustifiable and probably unintentional differentiation.

iussī, iussum (H-B, Hn.), *iūssī, iussum* (St.), *iūssī, iūssum* (Postgate). The evidence and its most probable interpretation is well stated by Bennett, *Latin Language* 69 ff. It is possible to defend *iūssī* as the old *ious(s)ei, iūssī* (which would normally have become *iūssī*, when *clausī* became *clausi*), with *ss* retained under the influence of *iussum*, but a complete substitution of *iussī*, often *iussum*, is more probable, and is the generally accepted view.

sānxī, sānctum (H-B, Hn.) *sanxī, sanctum* (St., Postgate). A long vowel before *nct* is attested for *ūnctus* by the words of Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* IX. 6, and by apices or *I* longa for *sānctum, cinctum, -stīnctum, fūnctum, iūnctum, cūnctus* (cf. also *Queinctus, Quīnctius, Quīntius*, etc.). This is ample justification for assuming that vowels were as regularly lengthened before *nct* as before *ns*. For lengthening before *nx* the specific evidence is nothing like as strong, merely *iūnxī* and *coniūnx* with apices. But in these the long vowel cannot be original, and, unless one wishes to see here a special case due to the influence of *iūnctum*, indicates, what is in itself probable, that *ncs* (*nx*) has the same effect on a preceding vowel as *nct*. Similarly Sommer, *Handbuch*, p. 135, assumes lengthening before '*nc* and consonant.' The meagreness of the specific evidence in the case of *nx* may be explained by the relative infrequency of the perfects *sanxi*, etc., as compared with the participles.

(e) The verbs in *-scō*. "H-B recognise three exceptions to the rule that the vowel before *-sco* was long, viz., *disco, posco, and compesco*." To those who are not familiar with their source and development and the various grounds for assuming a long vowel in the great mass of Latin 'inchoatives,' the burden of proof will doubtless seem to rest upon those who make such

'exceptions.' But the source of the three verbs in question is such that the assumption of a long vowel rests only upon a view of vowel lengthening which is impossible and discredited by all students of Latin phonology, but which unfortunately still continues to be repeated. Thus Heraeus (*Archiv für lat. Lex.* XIV. 418) remarks 'von denen übrigens nur *disco* und *posco* wenigstens in der besseren Zeit vermutlich naturalängen vokal hatten auf Grund ihrer Entstehung aus *di-de-sco, posc-sco*, s. Marx.' And he is so under the ban of this superstition that even when he has unearthed an interesting bit of specific evidence for *pōsco* he feels obliged to speak of 'späteres *pōsco*.'

(f) "H-B explains the length of *hic* and *hoc*, where they are long, by loss of a final *c* (*hic=hicc*)." This view goes back to Skutsch (*Forschungen* I. 60 ff., *Bezz. Beitr.* XXI. 85 ff.), and is generally accepted. Professor Postgate's *hic* or *hic* and *hōc* are probably intended merely as an expedient to make the syllabic length evident to the pupil (similarly Stolz, *Lat. Gram.* 222, '*hōc* eigentlich *hocc*').

(g) The *ā* in *Mānlius* and the other words mentioned rests upon their occurrence, once or more, with *ā*. I confess to no great confidence in the evidence, though accepting it in the absence of definite grounds for suspicion. On *nārro* cf. Sommer 292, footnote. *Lectus* 'bed' has no etymological connection with *lēctus*, the participle of *lego*, and there is no reason to suppose that it contains *ē*.

usque, not *ūsque*. Although this word is not among those mentioned in Professor Sonnenschein's article, I take this opportunity to state that its absence from the list of hidden quantities in the Hale-Buck Grammar is intentional, although *ūsque* is given almost universally. So for example Lindsay (*Latin Language* 595), Bennett (*Latin Language*), and most recently Walde (*Lat. etym. Wörterbuch*), who remarks: 'wegen des durch die roman. Sprachen geforderten *ū* nicht mit dem *us-* von *us-piam, -quam* identisch.' It is a curious fact, but one which I feel justified in asserting, that the etymological connection which Walde declares impossible on account of the *ū* is itself the ultimate cause of *ū*

being assumed. That is, Marx connected *usque*, as well as *uspiam*, *usquam*, with *ut*, Oscan *puz*, etc. (the etymology given by Walde under *uspiam*), and with his peculiar notions of vowel lengthening this meant to him a long vowel in all three. (Moreover Oscan *pous*, now recognised as a mere error in spelling due to the word following it, and Paelignian *puus*, which is rather *pōs* 'qui,' were cited by him and doubtless regarded as supporting the long vowel.) That in the case of *usque* this seemed to be confirmed by Romance was a minor matter. Subsequent scholars from the Latin side have of course rejected all but the Romance evidence, which Romance scholars seemed to accept, and discarded Marx's *uspiam* and *usquam*. But the Romance scholars in starting from *ūsque*, e.g. Gröber (*Archiv für lat. Lex.* VI. 148), and Meyer-Lübke (*Gram. der roman - sprachen* I. 72), were, I believe, at least unconsciously influenced by Marx's *ūsque*, not fully realising that there was no evidence for *ū* except what the Romance development might furnish, and that the burden of proof rested exclusively upon this. The evidence in question comes entirely from the French, the only one of the Romance languages which contains derivatives of *usque*, and here the one form which has survived in the modern language, namely *jusque*, would seem, on account of its *u*, to point to *ūsque*. But in Old French the derivatives from various combinations of *usque* show a bewildering variety, some fifty different spellings, which reduce themselves to some six or eight different forms whose relations to each

other offer a complicated problem. It will be sufficient for my purpose here to quote the following comments of Suchier, *Altfranzösische Grammatik* I. 1 (*Die betonten Vocale*), p. 12: '*usque* Pass. Als., wohl entlehnt aus dem Lat. (hat lat. *usque* *ū* oder *ū*?)'—'*enjosque* inde *usque* (+*que* quod) → *josque* Rol.,'—'*jusque* CPs. 238, aus *josque* wohl durch Einwirkung von *jus* (herab auf= bis,'—'*jus* deō(r)sum au *sus* sūsum angelehnt.'" According to this view, *usque* being regarded as borrowed and *jusque* as analogical, there is nothing which points to Latin *ūsque*, while on the other hand the development of *josque* is most easily understood if we start from *ūsque*. Other views are possible as to the details of the relations between some of the various forms (cf., e.g., E. Richter, *Zeitschrift f. rom. Phil.* XXXII. 712). But no one can claim that the material as a whole requires or is even favourable to a Latin *ūsque*. And, with this support for *ū* removed, we shall return to *usque* and the obvious connection with *uspiam* and *usquam*. With the meanings 'everywhere,' 'all the time,' 'every way,' it stands in the same relation to *uspiam* 'somewhere' and *usquam* 'anywhere,' 'in any way' as *quisque* to *quispiam* and *quisquam*. It came to be used primarily with phrases meaning from or to a certain place or time, where its meaning would necessarily be 'everywhere' or 'all the time' within certain limits, namely 'all the way' or 'all the time' from or to; its wider use surviving then only with an added *quāque*.

CARL D. BUCK.

The University of Chicago.

PICTURES OF CAESAR'S TRIUMPHS IN A BOOK OF HORAE.

IN the work of translating and editing for early publication a representative edition of Francis Regnault's *Horae B.V.M. ad usum Sarum* (A.D. 1526), probably the most complete of this class of devotional book, we have recognised a singular feature likely to be of some interest to classical students.

The *Hours*, according to the use of *Sarum*, printed at Paris and adorned with 'goodly pycures' by Francis Regnault, were preceded by those of various other printers from 1491 onwards. Whether printed on vellum or paper they are alike remarkable in regard both to contents and engravings.