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](#)

The Relation of the Resolved Arsis and Resolved Thesis in Plautus to the Prose Accent

Charles Exon

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 01 / February 2006, pp 31 - 36

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993569, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993569

How to cite this article:

Charles Exon (1906). The Relation of the Resolved Arsis and Resolved Thesis in Plautus to the Prose Accent. The Classical Review, 20, pp 31-36 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993569

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

On a small tablet found near the Propylaea¹ in the writing of the latter part of the fifth century we find record of an Athenian ἀπουσία ἐς Ἐρ . . . ; the stone is broken at a tantalising point: the accepted restoration is now ἐς Ἐπεσον and refers the inscription to

¹ C.I.A. 1, 339.

the resettlement of Lesbos after the revolt; but the former opinion that we should restore ἐς Ἐπερίαν might find favour again, if the interpretation of our new document which I have proposed were to be accepted.

LEWIS R. FARNELL.

THE RELATION OF THE RESOLVED ARSIS AND RESOLVED THESIS IN PLAUTUS TO THE PROSE ACCENT.

No satisfactory attempt has ever been made to account for the existence of the strict rules observed by Plautus, and the early Roman dramatists generally, in the use of dactyls, anapaests, and proceleusmatics in dialogue verse. Why, for instance, is a dactylic word not a good substitute for a trochee, seeing that an anapaestic word is a perfectly good substitute for an iambus? Or why is an anapaest divided as in *hōstibus omnibus* forbidden, while a dactyl divided as in *quāe uolēs faciā* *omnia* is perfectly legitimate? It is true that explanations have been suggested of one or two particular rules, but they are far from convincing. Thus the rule forbidding caesura in a resolved thesis in dialogue verse is explained by Prof. Lindsay as due to the desire of the Roman dramatists not to add to the length of the 'irrational' thesis by 'the pause that inevitably attends upon the conclusion of a word.'¹ But it is not the fact that a pause necessarily or usually occurs between words in a spoken sentence, the division of sentences into words being logical, not phonetic. Further, caesura is just as strictly forbidden in the resolved arsis of the same feet, which arsis is not 'irrational.' It is therefore hard to see why such an explanation is offered. All these rules have for their object the determining of the conditions under which certain feet may be admitted to trochaic and iambic verse, and these feet resemble one another in having 'irrational' theses, and resolution of the arsis or of the thesis or of both. What is needed therefore is a comprehensive explanation. The true reason for the existence of any one of these rules will probably be the reason for the existence of all the rest. To show that such a comprehensive explanation is possible is the purpose of the present paper.

Writers on Plautine metric usually recognize some five or six rules regulating the

admission of dactyls, anapaests, and proceleusmatics to the dialogue metres. As these rules serve purposes so very similar, they naturally overlap sometimes; but it will be convenient to consider them in the form in which they are usually stated. It is demonstrable that they are all particular cases, or at least corollaries of a single law, which may be stated thus:—

*Except in the first foot of a colon, a resolved arsis or thesis must, in dialogue metres, begin in a syllable which would bear in prose the primary or secondary word-accent, or a sentence-accent.*²

As regards the proceleusmatic, it has already been shown by A. W. Ahlberg that both the arsis and the thesis of that particular foot must begin in syllables accented in prose (*De Proceleusmaticis*, etc., Lund, 1900, p. 36. Cf. Ritschl, *Prol. Trin.* p. 289). His method was the collection and classification of all the proceleusmatics occurring in the dialogue metres of Plautus and Terence. Such a method would be hardly practicable for the resolved arses and theses generally; but I hope, by a different method, to show that every resolved arsis or resolved thesis found in Plautus is constructed in obedience to the same law. The one seeming exception—the case in which a resolved arsis seems to begin in a short final syllable—will be separately discussed below. It should be observed that, like the proposed law, the particular rules which are deducible from it as corollaries do not apply to the first foot of a colon.³ Also the few iambic and trochaic lines occurring in the *Cantica* should not be

² It need hardly be said that this law did not at first occur to the writer in the form in which it is here presented. It emerged in the course of a minute analysis of many hundreds of lines, undertaken with a view to discovering the exact means by which the dramatists avoided metrical ambiguity. It is here demonstrated in what seems to be the briefest possible form.

³ See O. Seyffert in *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1891, p. 926.

¹ Introduction to *Captivi*, 1900, p. 68.

included in the dialogue metres. I take the rules seriatim.

1. A dactylic or tribrach word or word-ending cannot receive the ictus on the middle syllable.¹

This follows directly from the general law. For the tribrach word this rule is not relaxed for the first foot or for anapaestic metre.

2. A dactylic word or word-ending cannot be a substitute for a trochee or an iambus.

As a substitute for a trochee, a dactylic word would contain a resolved thesis whose first syllable would not be accented in prose. As a substitute for an iambus, it would receive the ictus on the middle syllable, which is forbidden by the first corollary, and therefore by the general law. It is significant that a word that becomes dactylic by elision is admissible as a substitute for either a trochee or an iambus (*ēriper(e) oculos*, or *ērtper(e) omnes*).² Such a word so placed obviously fulfils the requirements of the law.

3. The first two syllables of an anapaest may not be the ending of a polysyllable.

Two such syllables must constitute either a resolved arsis or a resolved thesis—*pectōra mulcēt*, or *pectōra mūlcent*—the law being broken in either case.

4. The first syllable of an anapaest may not be the last syllable of a word of more than one syllable.³

A syllable so placed would be the first of a resolved arsis or of a resolved thesis—*magṇā uolūptas*, or *māgna uolūptas*. The law is obviously broken in either case.

5. The first two syllables of a dactyl may not form one word, or the ending of a word.

A dactyl so formed must be rising—*cārūs*

¹ As these rules are generally recognized, it is not, perhaps, necessary to refer to places where they may be verified. The rules are given in Prof. Lindsay's *Captivi*², Intro. iii. Most of them are also to be found in Klotz's *Altrömische Metrik*. In some cases Klotz was driven by the exigencies of his theories to deny generally admitted, and indeed obvious facts. Thus he states (p. 274) that the accentuation — ˘ ˘ (of a dactylic word) is permissible in any part of the line; but of the fifty-two instances there adduced, forty-five are in the first foot, and the remaining seven are in *Cantica*. Maurenbrecher also questions some of these rules (*Hiatus u. Verschleifung*, pp. 25 ff.); but succeeds in proving nothing more than that in the text, as we have it, there are some exceptions. Which was to be expected.

² Cf. Lindsay, *l.c.* p. 74.

³ Klotz, to suit his theory, allows ... | ˘, ˘ — |. But all his instances are of the type of *Pers.* 653: *mēus patēr ubi me sciet*, where he unnecessarily scans *ubi* (p. 257 ff.).

amicus — or falling — *cārūs amicus*: in either case the law would be broken.⁴

6. A long syllable accented in prose may not be shortened in dialogue verse under the law of *Breues Breuiantes*.

In order that such a syllable might be shortened, it would be necessary that it should be preceded by a short syllable, and that an *ictus metricus* (cancelling the word accent) should fall either on the preceding short syllable, *mōlēstus*, or on the following syllable, *mōlēstus*. In the first case a resolved arsis, in the second case a resolved thesis would offend against the proposed law. This rule, like the others, is suspended in the first foot of a colon and in anapaestic metre, as has been proved by the careful studies of A. W. Ahlberg.⁵

As has been already remarked, there is one case of resolution of the arsis which seems to contradict the proposed law, the case in which the resolved arsis (not thesis) seems to begin in a short final syllable. If this case be reserved for the present, the above demonstration proves the law not for every instance of resolved arsis or thesis in Plautus, but for every instance falling within the scope of these six generally recognized rules—that is to say, for the overwhelming majority of instances. We are quite justified therefore in entertaining the presumption that the law is general, and in seeking to prove that it is so. To be more precise, these six rules prove that the law is observed whenever the resolved arsis or thesis begins in one of the last three syllables of a word of more than one syllable. There are three cases in which they fail to prove that the law is observed:

1. When the resolved arsis or thesis begins in that part of a polysyllable that precedes the chief accent—*calamitatē, sapientia*; 2. when it begins in the first syllable of a word, or word-ending, of the measure of *muliere*; 3. when it begins in a monosyllable—*quid agis, quid id est*.

In case 1 the assumption that the syllable under the ictus would have borne the secondary accent in prose is obvious, and it is strengthened almost to the point of certainty when we find that Plautus and Terence observe strict rules in their metrical treatment of such words. Thus words of the measure of *calamitatem* normally receive the ictus on the first and fourth

⁴ Klotz (p. 263) seems to admit — ˘, ˘ ...; but all his examples are in the first foot, except *Aul.* 139, which is in a *Canticum*.

⁵ *De Correptione Iambica Plaut.*, Lund, 1901, p. 77 f.

syllables, not on the second and fifth—*cālamitātem*, but not *calāmitatētem*. According to Prof. R. S. Radford,¹ words of that measure occur nearly 200 times in Plautus alone; but there are only four or five places in all Plautus and Terence where they seem to be stressed otherwise than on the first and fourth syllables. The offending instances are *Cist.* 3 *āpēriūstis* (in a bacchiac line), where we should restore *aperiūstis*; *Heaut.* 906 *ōpēriūere*, where restore *operiūere* (cf. *Men.* 550); *Andr.* 941 *rēligiōne*, where scan *relligiōne*; *Mil.* 562 *nōn mālitiōse tamen*, where the right order is possibly *mālitiōse nōn tamen*. The stressing *cālamitātem* may therefore be said to be invariable. The accent of *cālamitas*, and words and word-endings of that measure, in republican Latin, seems to have become the secondary accent of *cālamitātem*; and it seems to be generally true that, where the position of the accent varied in the different parts of an inflexional system, a syllable which lost the principal accent acquired a secondary accent. This is further indicated by the metrical treatment in Plautus of words of the measure of *commoditātem*. In such words the ictus falls either on the second and fifth syllables, *commōditātem* (e.g. *Poen.* 916, *Ter. Andr.* 569), or on the first and fourth syllables, *cōmmoditātem* (e.g. *Men.* 140, *Mil.* 1383). This double stressing is explained if we suppose the (principal) accent of *commōditas* to have become the secondary accent of *commōditātem*. When the ictus fell as in *commōditātem*, the syllable that bore the secondary accent began a resolved arsis: when it fell as in *cōmmoditātem*, the same syllable began a resolved thesis. Similarly, the accent of *aliquis* became the secondary accent of *aliquidntum*, which explains the stressing *præterea aliquantum animi caussa*, *Trin.* 334. In this way inflexion would cause a minimum of accentual disturbance; thus *detinui*, *detinuitsti* (probably not, in prose, *detinuitsti*). This conclusion is further supported by the evidence of the Romance languages. Thus the doubling of *l* in the Italian *scellerato* (beside *scelsto*) is an effect of the secondary accent of Latin *scēlērātus*, which had the same position as the (principal) accent of *scēlērāt*, *scēlere*, etc.² It is, at the very least, a significant fact that we do find in Plautus the stressing *commōditātem*, but do not (normally) find a stressing *calāmitatētem*.

Case 2 offers no difficulty. It is now generally admitted that words ending in four short syllables were accented on the fourth syllable from the end in the time of Plautus, *mūliere*, *puēritia*. The accentuation *mūliere* is normal in Plautus, *mūliere* occurring only in arguments (e.g. *Pseud.* Arg. I. 7), prologues, or in lines otherwise suspect.³

In case 3, when the resolved arsis or thesis begins in a monosyllable—*quid agis*, *quid hōc quod*—it is evident that the law was obeyed if the monosyllable was accented in prose more prominently than the word or words that followed it, that is to say, if it bore what is called a sentence-accent. The question of sentence-accent arises whenever two or more words occurring in a sentence are grouped together for the purposes of accentuation, with the result that the proper accent of one or both or all the words forming the group is modified. For example, if in the spoken sentence *quid agis?* the two words of which it is composed were grouped together, so that either the proper accent on the first syllable of *agis* was suppressed or some other modification of the proper accent of one or both words followed, then the accent (or accents) of the group might be called a sentence-accent (or accents).⁴

We have little certain knowledge of sentence-accents in Latin, but we have some; and if, where we have certain knowledge of a sentence-accent, we find that Plautus has regard to it in forming resolved arses and theses, that fact will increase the probability that in some other cases also, where its existence is less certain, such an accent was heard and played its part in Plautine metric. It is known, for instance, that a preposition and a following noun 'governed' by it were accented, and sometimes written, as one word (*Quint.* i. 5. 27). This *inforo*, *inūrbe*, *antēpedes*, *antededis*, *antelimen*, *prōpediem*, *ergapātem*, *ergamātem*, *proptēreos*, and so forth. In such cases the proposed law is obeyed by Plautus and Terence. Thus we find such stressing as *ante pedēs*, *Mer.* 780 (where the first syllable of the resolved thesis would bear the chief accent in prose, *antēpedes*: cf. the metrical stressing *diuitias* beside the prose pronunciation *diuitias*); *inter eos*, *Trin.* 623; *inter eōs*, *Cas.* 561; *propter amōrem*, *Mil.* 1284 (where the first syllable of the

³ Cf. Lindsay, *op. cit.* iii. 5 (2), p. 158.

¹ 'The Latin Monosyllables in Relation to Accent and Quantity,' *Trans. Amer. Phil. Association*, vol. xxxiv. 1903, p. 66 ff.

² Cf. Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* iii. 7, p. 160.

NO. CLXXIV. VOL. XX.

⁴ I should perhaps apologize for defining a term so generally used; but if it is an error, it is an error on the safe side, and the term is not always used strictly.

resolved thesis would bear the secondary accent in prose, *proptèramorem*, the secondary accent in this case occupying the position of the principal accent in *proptèreos*, etc. : cf. *commoditas* : *commoditatem*) ; *per ànnónam caram*, Stich. 179 (in prose *pèr ànnónam*). It is certain, again, that interrogative pronouns and adverbs were prominently accented.¹ When therefore we find that such stressings as *quis homo*, *quid agis*, *quid agám* are normal in Plautus and Terence (invariable, I think, at least in those parts of the line to which the proposed law applies), we are entitled to claim that here too regard was had to a sentence-accent. Of all the monosyllables found beginning a resolved arsis or thesis, *quid* is by far the commonest ; but there remain a number of instances in which other monosyllables, such as *et*, *ut*, *hic*, *si*, occur in that position. That those monosyllables bore a sentence-accent is less certain than that interrogatives did so ; but seeing that in other cases, where we have certain knowledge of a sentence-accent, we find resolved arses and theses beginning in syllables that bore it, it is at least extremely probable that in the comparatively small number of resolved arses and theses beginning in such words as *et*, *ut*, *hic*, *si*, the proposed law holds good.² This disposes of the three cases in which the preceding demonstration fails definitely to prove that the law was observed.

Nothing remains therefore but to consider the one apparent exception, the case in which a resolved arsis seems to begin in a short final syllable, e. g. *Most.* 402 *támquam si íntus nátus némo in aedibus habitét*.—licét.³ If the final syllable of *aedibus* remained short in this verse, the proposed law was broken : if it was metrically lengthened, the law was not broken. It is tempting to a theorist to assert anything which supports his own theory ; but he must be on his guard to make no assertion that is not supported by evidence independent of the theory he is advocating. Consequently, though there is nothing incredible or even unusual in the lengthening of a short final syllable by the power of the ictus, it will

not be proper for me to assert that *aedibus* has its final syllable metrically lengthened in this verse, unless there is independent evidence for that view. I am aware that Ritschl, with, it must be confessed, more of emphasis than of argument, pronounced against this metrical lengthening in Plautus,⁴ and that he has been followed by other scholars ; but the question is to be decided solely by an appeal to facts.

The most striking fact in connexion with the occurrence of short syllables in arsis in Plautus is that, by a rule strictly observed, the succeeding syllables must be of such a kind that lengthening of the short syllable in arsis shall be at least possible. First, the next following syllable may be long ; as in *As.* 250 *fíngeré falláciam*, *Pseud.* 355 *prómeré possúm domó*, *Men.* 842 *lámpadibus ardéntibus* : cf. *Men.* 327, 506, 900 ; *Most.* 402, 849, 1118 ; etc. In these cases the lengthening of the short syllable in arsis must be admitted, unless the text be declared unsound. But far more significant than such instances is the fact that, wherever a syllable can be said to remain short in arsis, it must be followed not merely by one, but by two short syllables, capable of forming a resolved thesis. The rule is, that, when the final short syllable in arsis is followed by a word beginning with a short syllable, that short syllable must bear the primary or secondary prose accent (Klotz, *l.c.* p. 255 f.) ; from which it follows that the next following syllable must be either short, or shortened under the law of Breues Breuiantes. Thus, *diceré volui tibi* would be a good verse-ending ; but *diceré modéstó modó* would be impossible. Even *filíus in exercítium* (cf. *Am.* 102), though uncommon, is quite possible, because the scansion *inexercítium* is not excluded (*in-* having a secondary accent) ; but *quam filíus amābat tamén* is not possible. There are many hundreds of instances in Plautus of the placing of a short final syllable in the arsis ; but there is not one exception to this rule.⁵ I do not see how it is possible to resist the conclusion that in all these cases the poet intended the syllable placed in arsis to be metrically lengthened, so that the two following short syllables could form a resolved thesis. Klotz perceives to what conclusion the facts point ; nevertheless he rejects it on the *a priori* grounds that such lengthening is not proper

¹ For the testimony of the grammarians on this point, see Lindsay, *op. cit.* iii. 12a (5).

² Cf. Radford, *op. cit.*, who, using an entirely different method from that here followed, comes to the conclusion that, wherever a short monosyllable causes shortening of a succeeding syllable by the law of Breues Breuiantes, *sed ápstulisti, et á me*, the metrically stressed monosyllable would have borne a sentence-accent in prose.

³ For a large number of instances, see Klotz, *Altr. Metr.* p. 257 ff.

⁴ *Prol. Trin.* p. 185.

⁵ For *Poen.* 1194, *Stich.* 55, 737, see Klotz, p. 265. The last-mentioned occurs in a scene which is really a *Canticum* : observe the abnormal ictus *amabilis*, causing abnormal shortening of the preceding *a*.

('eigen') to drama, and does not occur in Greek drama (*l.c.* p. 265).

Another significant fact is this, that a final short syllable so placed is allowed in any foot of the line, except the last but one in verses requiring an iambic close. Thus *satis agitāt* or *dicerē uolūt* are impossible verse-endings where an iambic close is required. Why? Apparently because they would have been recited *satis* | *agitāt*, etc., with an anapaest in the last place.¹

We have another means of testing the question whether Plautus regarded a short final syllable placed in arsis as metrically long, in the special case in which the phenomenon is associated with an apparent breach of Luchs's well-known law. That law, not always rightly stated, forbids an iambus in the penultimate foot of verses requiring an iambic close, when the end of that foot coincides with the end of a word.

If, in the line, uolt te nōuos erus operām dare | tuo ueteri domino, the final syllable of *erus* was short, the penultimate foot was an iambus, and the law was broken; if, however, it was metrically lengthened, the penultimate foot was an anapaest, and the law was not broken. It has been said that Plautus tolerates the line-ending *uolt te nōuos erus operām dare*. If that can be proved, then lengthening of the final syllable of *erus* in the line-ending *erus operām dare* is neither proved nor disproved; but if it can be shown that in no other case he tolerated that ending, then that fact is very strong evidence for the postulated lengthening.

Excluding verse-endings of the type *erus operām dare*, all other seeming breaches of Luchs's law are divisible into three types²: (a) *reueniunt domūm*, (b) *in aliūm diēm*, (c) *dab(o) operām tibi*. At first sight, the instances of type (a) seem to prove conclusively that Plautus did tolerate the verse-ending *reueniunt domūm*. There are five instances of this type in Plautus, and one in Terence: *Am.* 188 *reueniunt domūm*, *Poen.* 27 *reueniant domūm*, *Most.* 57

¹ I have maintained, in *Hermathena* xxx. (1904), p. 140 f., that an anapaest is occasionally found for an iambus in the verse-close. That opinion I still hold; but I had not then observed the restriction to which that licence is subject. It is allowed only when the verse ends with a quadrisyllable of the measure of *perueniant*: e.g. *auguriā* (Acc. *Trag.* 624 R), *diuitiās*, *euēniant*, *sarrupuit*. *Veniant* would be impossible in place of the final iambus; and those editors who postulate *peruenant*, and the like, give no instances of verse-closes in which the simple verb is required in a form **uenant*.

² See A. Luchs in *Studemunds Studien*, i. p. 13 ff.

reueniāt senēx, *Curc.* 86 *reicipiāt marē*, *Phor.* 507 *retinedām sciō*, *Men.* 550 *operuit forēs*. It cannot be an accident that in five of these instances we have a verb compounded with *re(d)*-. Such verbs had variable scansion of the initial syllable in republican Latin. We have *reuertimini* in *Am.* 689, *recludo* in *Cap.* 918, *redducem*, *ibid.* 923, *Rud.* 909, *reducem* in *Cap.* 931. Where the metre decides the quantity, *redduco* is normal in Plautus and Lucretius (Munro on *Lucr.* i. 228; Sonnenschein on *Rud.* 909). It is needless to multiply instances, which are well known. In each of the above cases we may scan the first syllable long. There remains the solitary *operuit forēs*. This is one of several places in which irregularities are associated with the perfect of *operio* or *aperio*. In *Cist.* 3 *aperuistis*, in *Heaut.* 906 *operuere* are abnormally stressed, as has been noticed above. These various irregularities disappear if we restore the archaic perfects *operiuit*, *aperiuit*: cf. *posiuit*, *saluiuit*, etc. Thus these six instances, so far from proving that Plautus tolerated the ending *uolt te nōuos erus operām dare*, afford very strong evidence indeed that he did not. The dramatists never write such verse-endings as *mulierēs domūm*, *fidicinē dedit*, *facilius tibi*. How convenient it would have been to do so, if it had been metrically possible, is proved by the comparative frequency with which modern editors have introduced such endings into the text (e.g. *Rud.* 1247: cf. Luchs, *l.c.* p. 14).

In type (b), *in aliūm diēm*, lengthening of a monosyllabic preposition in arsis is not to be thought of, *inaliūm* being as much one word as *ineo*. But it is a necessary condition in this type of verse-ending that the preposition shall be preceded by synaloepha. There are only seven certain instances (including those in which *ut* or *at* takes the place of the preposition). They are all of the type of *milit(i) in aliūm diēm* (*Aul.* 530: other instances in Luchs, *l.c.* p. 16, where, however, some correction is necessary). That this never absent synaloepha is not accidental, but has a prosodic effect, is shown by the conditions found in the remaining case in which Luchs's law seems to be broken, namely, in endings of the type (c), *dab(o) operām tibi*. Omitting one or two places where the text is not certain, there are nineteen instances of this ending in Plautus, and three in Terence (Luchs, pp. 13, 15). The necessary conditions are that there shall be synaloepha before the anapaestic word, and that either a pause (e.g. at change of speakers) or a long syllable

shall precede the entire sequence—*fāctūmst, dāb(o) operām tibi*. The presence of this long syllable (an 'inner' thesis), or of the pause that may take its place, indicates that the need was felt of some sort of signal when this ending was used: it breaks the pace of recitation, and allows the actor a moment's pause. The synaloepha always found here evidently had the same prosodic effect as the differently placed synaloepha in type (b): it gives (at this particular place in the line) weight to the properly short syllable which it either precedes (b) or follows (c), and allows a pronunciation *fāctūmst, dābō | operām | tibi* or *mīlītē in | alīum | diēm*, though the hiatus need not have been so pronounced as it is here represented. All that was necessary was, that the short syllable in arsis should be in each case weighted a little, to allow a momentary pause. It is not to be supposed that so abnormal a hiatus, or, rather, synaloepha with such abnormal effects, could be used in any part of the line. It has long been suspected that the point in the line that immediately precedes the final iambic dipody had some special characteristics.¹ Nor should it be forgotten that these types of verse-ending are exceptional and comparatively infrequent. I hesitate to claim that the prosodic effect of synaloepha at this point in the line is definitely proved; but there is always one unanswerable argument in its favour. If Plautus really tolerated a verse-ending $\cup \cup | \cup \cup, | \cup \cup$, why does he never once, in all his 19,300 lines of dialogue verse, end a line with such a collocation as *mūlierēs domum*? Or why do we never find such an ending as *sātis adēst tibi*? Those would be really conclusive instances. But they are wanting. I conclude therefore that in those seeming breaches of Luchs's law which come under the types *rēuētiunt domūm, milit(i) in alīum diēm, dāb(o) operām tibi*, we have no certain evidence that Plautus tolerated the ending $\cup \cup | \cup \cup, | \cup \cup$. It follows that it is highly improbable that he tolerated it in lines ending like *erūs operām darē*. If he did not, the final syllable of *erūs* must have been lengthened in arsis.

To sum up the evidence in favour of the view that a short final syllable under the ictus was treated as metrically long by Plautus: we find that such syllables are so

introduced by Plautus that *they can always be scanned long, but cannot always be scanned short*; further, the scanning of such syllables as long involves no metrical difficulties, but the scanning of them as short involves a number of exceptions to Luchs's law. If therefore we accept the guidance of the facts, accept, that is, the inductive method, we are indisputably led to the conclusion that short final syllables so placed were lengthened, probably by a pause of one mora. The acceptance of that conclusion would even enable us to introduce a little order into the scanning of Saturnians. For example: *facilē factēs superdēs; Gnaiūd patrē prognātus; insece uorsūtum*. Incidentally, it would also remove the one stumbling-block in the way of Klotz's law that the *syllaba breuians* and the *breuiata* must both belong to the same arsis or thesis (in cases like *patrē ubi*, where Klotz was compelled by his theory to scan *ūbi*).

If the lengthening of short final syllables under the ictus be admitted, the sole seeming exception to the law proposed in the earlier part of this paper disappears. There is, of course, a further step to be taken—to enquire the *raison d'être* of the law itself. I hope to consider that question on a future occasion. Meanwhile, thus much may be said. We do not find its *raison d'être* in the supposed, the oft-asserted preference of Plautus for coincidence of the verse-accent (ictus) with the prose-accent. For three reasons: 1. the law requires the first syllable of a resolved thesis, which has the weakest metrical stress, to be a syllable that would be accented in prose (*cōnsiliūm, intered*); 2. the law does not apply to the first foot of a colon, or to anapaestic metre; 3. except in resolved arses and theses, and in those cases that come under the dipody-law, there is no evidence in the dramatists of any effort to avoid clashing of the verse-accent and the prose-accent. In the limitations of the applicability of the law we, naturally, have a clue to its *raison d'être*. The law does not apply to that metre (the anapaestic), or to that part of the dialogue metres (the first foot) which is exempt from metrical ambiguity. In the necessity of avoiding metrical ambiguity, of providing a sure verse-clue—a necessity in every form of verse, and in every language—we shall find, I believe, the *raison d'être* of the proposed law.

CHARLES EXON.

¹ Cf. Jacobsohn, *Quaestiones Plautinae*: Göttingen, 1904.