II.—ACCENT A GUIDING PRINCIPLE, NOT MERELY
OF THE OLD COMIC METRES, BUT GENERALLY
OF LATIN POETRY; AND FIRST OF VIRGIL'S
HEXAMETERS. By T. HEWITT KEY, Esq.

IN my former paper, on the Laws of Latin Rhythm, I already stated that "in the dactylic verses of Lucretius, Virgil, Ovid, etc., and in the lyrical writings of Horace also, a true perception of the metre is not to be obtained without regard to the laws of Latin accent" (Trans. 1868-9, p. 314). In the same paper I expressed my regret that, for want of space, I had scarcely touched upon the important subject of enclitics and proclitics; and had said nothing on elision and the influence it exerts at times in the modification of accent (p. 351). It is on these points that I now request your attention.

The usual treatment of Latin metre seems to me very generally to betray something of a pedantic character. But little reference is made to what ought to be the chief judge—the ear. Horace's "*Legitimumque sonum digitis callemus et aure*" has been a somewhat misleading guide, inviting a preference for the fingers over the organ of hearing. It may be excused, if a beginner is taught to scan his hexameters; but this, after all, is but a first step in the subject: and our scholars are sensible of this, when they attempt to supplement their first lessons by the doctrine of caesura; but here again there is more of rule than reason.

But if a consideration of accent is essential for the full comprehension of the Virgilian hexameter, a previous question is, to lay down a code of accentual laws; and here at once a grave difficulty presents itself. We must accept with some serious modifications the doctrines which are usually held on this subject. For the most part scholars have given a slavish assent to what is found in some passages of Latin writers. For example, we are told in some English books on this subject, that all disyllabic words in Latin, whether

trochees, iambs, or pyrrhics in form, are to be accented on the penult. It is true that isolated passages in Latin authors occur where this is broadly put forward; but, as I have shown on a former occasion, this so far unqualified law is subjected by the very writers who especially deal with the subject, viz. the grammarians, to very important exceptions, involving indeed whole classes of words. But even had it been otherwise, I should have felt at liberty to question any of their dogmas, if at variance with first principles; and this, because I dispute their authority as witnesses. I shall not here repeat the arguments of my preceding paper, but do little more than recapitulate the results, as a preamble to the present discussion. My first charge against them is one which applies indeed to all the classical writers of Rome that have had occasion to speak of linguistic subjects, including men of mark, such as Aelius,¹ Cicero, and Varro. In this branch of knowledge even they are very babies. But the grammarians belong to a lower grade of men, not merely devoid of taste, but absolutely ignorant and unintellectual. Above all were they wanting in the first qualification for the treatment of pronunciation, in that they did not know the ordinary rules of prosody.² Lastly I have shown, from internal evidence found in their writings, that they too, like ourselves, were dealing with a language which was already dead; and here, to the arguments adduced in the preceding paper, I may now add yet another, viz. their repeated use of an aorist when speaking of accentual pronunciation, as: *accentum habuit acutum*, Prisc. 667 P.; 1, 181, 19 K. And again: *quae omnia debent secundum analogiam antepaenultimum habere acutum, paenultimum tamen habuerunt*, 1253 P.; 2, 488, 34 K. Of course, had this writer been appealing

¹ For the value to be set on Varro and Aelius as etymologists, note: Volpes, ut Aelius dicebat, quod uolat pedibus (Varr. 11. 5, 20, p. 103, ed. Speng.)

² In the paper on 'Latin Rhythm,' p. 334. I spoke of a grammarian who asserted that the first syllable of *numerus* and *soleo* was long, but was then unable to give the precise reference. The writer in question is Maximus Victorinus (p. 1972). After speaking of verbs which, with a short vowel in the imperfect tenses, as *lāuo, mōueo*, exhibit a long vowel in the perfect, *lāui, mōui*, he adds, that there are others which have the same quantity throughout, as *uoco, doleo*, with a short initial vowel, *numero, soleo, munio*, with a long one. Here the instance of *doleo* upsets my charitable suggestion that the writer might have been thinking of a shortened pronunciation *num'ro, sólyo*.

to the pronunciation of a living language, he would have used the forms *habet* and *habent*.

I have said that the grammarians, after laying down the general law that Latin disyllabics are always accented on the penult, subsequently modify this by admitting whole classes of exceptions. One of these is in the case of words of like form. Thus *pārens* "a parent," and the imperative *lāte* "lie hid," are allowed the special privilege of a final accent for the purpose of distinction from *pārens* and *lāte*. On this ground then we are entitled to claim an iambic pronunciation of *cānō*, in the words: *Arma uirumque cano*, to distinguish it from *cāno*, dat. or abl. of *canus*, "hoary." So in the case of the adjective *nōui* in: *Vt cum prima nōuī ducent examina reges* (Georg. 4, 21); of *fīdes* in Horace: *Iam Fidēs et Pāx et Honos Pudōrque*; seeing that the language possessed *nōui* and *fīdes* with a long penult. Secondly, an exception is granted in favour of certain shortened words which are allowed to retain the accent to which the fuller forms were entitled, as the nom. *Antīds*, from the older nom. *Antīātis*, *illīc*, as standing for *illīce*.¹ Under this law we may read, *Pēr si quā est quae rēstat adhūc mortālibus usquam Intemerāta fidēs* (Aen. 2, 142); also in: *Sanguine adhūc, campique ingentes ossibus albet* (12, 36).

In the preceding paper it was further shown that this last exception justifies us in placing an accent on the finals of whole classes of adjectives, as *fērox*, *fērax*, and on such a word as *pālūs*, etc. Above all it holds good for the *ens* and *ans* of imperfect participles, as growing out of an older *entis* or *antis*—an *i* being due to the suffix. Thus in the 12th book of the Aeneid, I have no hesitation in thus accenting *uolāns* in: *Hasta uolāns ut forte . . .* (v. 270); *repēns* in: *quaeue ista repēns discordia surgit?* (v. 313); *mouēns* in: *Bella mouēns immittit equos* (v. 333); *iacēns* in: *Hesperiam metire iacēns* (v. 360); *fremēns* in: *Stabat acerba fremēns* (v. 398); *gerēns* in: *Cuncta gérens, uocemque et . . .* (v. 472); *legēns* in: *Pabula parua legēns nidisque . . .* (v. 475):—so that we have seven examples in little more than 200 lines.

¹ Precisely as in Ter., *Intērea mulier quādam abhīnc triēnnium*.

There next comes the class of exceptions implied in Diomedes' words (p. 432, 8 K.): *Accentuum legem pronuntiandi ratio saepe conturbat*. This opens a wide field; for strictly taken it amounts to this, that the laws of accentuation hold good—except where actual pronunciation differs from them. I endeavoured in my former paper to limit the application of the exception (perhaps too boldly) by the supposition that, in the case of disyllabic words with a short penult, emphasis at times might justify the lengthening of a first syllable, as in *καλός* (p. 339). At any rate, I gave abundant reason for believing that in the comic writers, and perhaps also in Catullus, under the influence of emphasis a long penult is habitually given to the possessives *meus, tuus, suus* (pp. 340-5). And let me here add yet a few more instances to the series, by which the number of examples is raised to above fifty. In the *Menaechmi* 1, 3, 5, the best MSS. have: *Tuest legio: adiudicato cum utro¹ hanc noctem sies*, with the one exception, that the best of all, viz. B. 2 m., has *tuast*, which is no doubt the right reading. "The choice is yours." Ritschl however, not thinking perhaps that the first syllable of *tua* could be long, with some violence substitutes in the text: *Eum leges: tu iudicato . . .* (but in the notes he adds, very reasonably, "dubitanter"). The restoration of *legio* to its right place is the more interesting, as this appears to be the only passage where the word has its original meaning, being derived from *legere*, "to choose," exactly as *régio*, "direction," from *regere*, "to stretch;" and this agrees with what Varro (l.l. 5, 16, p. 90, Speng.) says of *legio* in its ordinary sense of a legion: *Legio quod leguntur milites in delectu*. Secondly, *Aul.* 2, 2, 55: *Et te utar iniquiore et meus me ordo inrideat*, where Dr. Wagner and others would save the metre by reading *med* for *me*, against all the MSS. Thirdly, *Poen.* 3, 3, 25: *Quia tui honoris causa huc ad te uenimus*. The MSS. have: *Quia nos honoris tui*—a reading which gives to *nos* an emphasis wholly out of place, while it

¹ The hiatus here seen Fleckeisen gets rid of by reading *utrone*. Ritschl would probably now prefer the insertion of his favourite *d*, *utrod*, at the same time not eliding *cum*; or again, he might think it better to read *cum utro*. Either of these readings I should decidedly hold to be superior to the suggestion of Fleckeisen.

robs *tui* of its needed emphasis, and at the same time ruins the metre. Fourthly, Trin. 4, 3, 48: *Méust* (so A., not *meus est*) *hic quidem Stásimus seruus. Nam égo talentum mútuom. . .* Fifthly, Cist. 4, 2, 57: *Quid quáeritabas? Mí homo et mēa múlíer, uos salúto.* And then from Terence, four additional instances: Haut. 2, 3, 92: *adsimulabimus Tūam amicam huiús 'sse amicam. Púlcre: quid faciét sua ?*; 3, 1, 96: *Aliéna ut melius uídeant et diiúdicent Quam sūa ? an eo fit quía in re nostra aut gáudio . . .*; 4, 4, 17: *Quid? Tránseundumst núnc tibi ad Menedémum et tūa pómpa Eo traducendast*; Andr. 1, 1, 126: *Sine núnc me mēo* (so all MSS., edd. *meo me*) *uíuere intereá modo.*

But by far the most important exception to the general laws of accent, as laid down by ancient writers, is what is implied in Quintilian's remarks in 1, 5, 25-27. Here he admits that there are cases, where "*uerbum acuto sono finiunt*;" and he adds, as his own explanation, that: "*mihi uidetur condicionem mutare quod his locis uerba coniungimus.*" One of the examples quoted by him is the line at the beginning of the Aeneid, in which he writes: *Troiáe qui*¹ *primus ab oris*, thus placing an acute accent on the final of *Troiae* and at the same time giving to *qui* a grave, *i.e.* no accent at all, on the theory that *Troiae-qui* constitutes but a single word. This is in itself but reasonable, and indeed, whether the relative occupy as usual the first place in a clause or not, it will be found to be commonly devoid of an accent. In other words, when it comes first, it is degraded to the condition of a proclitic; when postponed, to that of an enclitic. This is thoroughly in accordance with what the grammarians themselves tell us. Thus Priscian (2, 9, 22, K.): *Qui quando pro relatiuo (ponitur), acuitur per se, in lectione uero grauatur.* The same doctrine is repeated in his so-

¹ After this paper was written, I was informed for the first time of the memoir that Mr. H. H. J. Munro published in the Cambridge Phil. Trans. (Feb. 13, 1860). He there speaks of Quintilian lending his sanction to the junction of *quiprimus* at the beginning of the Aeneid (p. 378). But I ought to note that Halm's edition, which gives us as the text of Quintilian: *Troiáe qui primus ab oris*, was not published until 1868, *i.e.* eight years after the date of Mr. Munro's paper. So again (p. 388), he assumes, I think incorrectly, that *cano* in the same line was accented on the penult. See too his paper, p. 389.

called *Partitiones* (2, 467, 29). Hence it is actually written at times as a proclitic in MSS.; for instance, in the first Harleian MS. of Livy, within the compass of the first seventeen chapters of the sixth book, I found *qui* twice so treated, and *quod* four times, *qua* and *quo* each once. But it is as an enclitic that the relative is most degraded; and this is especially seen, when, as in Quintilian's example, it is attached to the final of a preceding word, and constitutes with it the fourth foot, as again in: *Nos tua progenies, caelí-quibus adnuís arcem* (1, 254); *famám-qui terminet astris* (1, 291); *primó-quae prodita somno* (1, 474); *atér-quos aequore turbo* (1, 515); *ingéns-cui lumen ademptum* (3, 658). But the same holds good in other parts of the verse, as: *Pílumnó-quos ípsa decús dedit O'rithýia* (12, 83); *Cuncta tuó-qui bella pater sub numine torques* (12, 180).

But conjunctions have, many of them in form, and nearly all in character and power, something akin to the relative. Like the relative therefore, they commonly occupy the first place in a clause. If they surrender this privilege, it is perhaps always in favour of a word for the time important; and then they are attached to it as a quasi-enclitic, as in: *Tu-ut* umquam te corrigas (Cic. Cat. 1, 22); *Sat fatís Venerique datum, tetigere-quod* arua Fertilis Ausoniae Troes (Aen. 9, 135); *Territat, inuálidás-ut* auis et littora uestra . . . (12, 262); *mixta rubént-ubi* lilia multa Alba rosa (12, 68); *Hæc-ubi dicta dedit* (12, 81), etc. In: *Cesserit Ausonió-si* fors uictoria Turno (12, 183), much force is attached to the hated epithet *Ausonio* by the change of accent due to the appended *si*. Again, although *ad-mórtem* in itself would claim a penultimate accent, yet this is changed by the suffixed *si* in: *Quid cetera dicet Italia ad-mortém-si* té (Fors dicta refutet) *Prodiderim* (12, 41); and again much power is thrown into the all-important adjective, if in 12, 233, we read: *Vix host(em), alterní-si* cóngrediamur habémus. Nay even the particle *nec*, if it yield the place to which it is entitled in favour of another word, will be found at times to modify the accent of the word so preceding, as: *Nec numero inferior, pugnáe-nec* honore recedes (12, 630); *Perpetiar?*

dextrá-nec Drancis dicta refellam (12, 644). Add 7, 115; 9, 218; 11, 343.

But prepositions above all words are to be treated as belonging to the noun to which they are attached. In the position which commonly belongs to them in Latin, and from which indeed their name is derived, they are proclitics; and here we have abundant evidence in inscriptions of the best date that they were actually written as one word with the following noun. See 150 examples in the index grammaticus of the *Corpus Inscriptionum* of Mommsen. Add to these the numerous examples, common alike to prose writers and poets, in which *que* is attached, not to the preposition, but to the combined preposition and noun, as in: *In-medio-que focos et dis communibus aras Gramineas* (12, 118). Again, Donatus ap. Prisc. 2, 27, 20, tells us: *Separatae praepositiones acuntur, coniunctae . . . uim suam saepe commutant*; and Priscian himself in his *Partitiones*, dealing with the passage already referred to, *Troiae qui primus ab oris*, has: *Quo accentu pronuntiatur ab?* with the answer: *Per se acuto*,¹ *in uersu uero graui*; *sicut et aliae omnes praepositiones in suo loco positae. Nam est quando mutato ordine postponuntur et mutant accentum, ut te própter, eundem própter: hic paenultimum acutum habet accentum. Quod si praeponeretur, sine dubio grauaretur.* All this might have been included in the one doctrine that a preposition and its noun constitute one word.

Let me take the word *inter* for special consideration, the more so that it is of frequent occurrence in Virgil (about 150 times) in all combinations; and, to simplify the work, I will limit myself in the first place to those passages where the following noun is a monosyllabic word, as: *Vis ergo inter nos quid possit uterque uicissim* (B. 3, 28); much more frequently: *inter se* (as G. 1, 301; 1, 510; 3, 218; 4, 73: Aen. 2, 454; 4, 193; 4, 443; 5, 433; 5, 766; 6, 829; 8, 359; 8, 639; 9, 457; 10, 358; 10, 437; 11, 861; 11, 907; 12, 212). In all these an accentuation as *intér-nos*, *intér-se*, adds to the desired rhythm. Other examples are: *intér caua saxa* (A. 3,

¹ It may be asked how *ab* can be spoken of as standing per se; and I answer that Priscian's own question is an example.

566); *intér* delphinas (B. 8, 56); *intér* spelaea (10, 52); *intér* nauemque Gyae, (A. 5, 169);—in all of which the accent of *inter* falls on the second syllable, precisely as it ought to do if *inter* and its noun be regarded as forming a single word. On the other hand, *inter* has the accent on the first syllable in such combinations as: *Hic ínter* densas corulos (B. 1, 14); *hic ínter* flumina nota (1, 52), as the same theory would demand. I have reserved two cases of *inter se*, which seem to violate the law, for consideration below. What has just been said fully agrees with the accentual laws which govern the metres of the old comedy.

But at times a preposition is postponed not merely to its noun, but to an adjective, or what is substantially an adjective, a dependent genitive. In such cases, as in Plautus and Terence, so in Virgil, the preposition must be regarded as an enclitic attached to such preceding word, as: *uná cum* gente tot annos (A. 1, 51); *magnó cum* murmure montis (1, 59); *merítis pro* talibus annos (1, 78); *meó sine* numine uenti (1, 137); *quorúm sub* uertice late (1, 167). These from the first book, in the study of which I first satisfied myself as to this accentual law; but I have since found all my views as to the agreement of Virgilian accents with the accentual system of the old comedy in a close examination of the twelfth book. Thus examples of what has just been said are found in vv. 116, 125, 141, 169, 208, 229, 318, 410, 482, etc. Of these I will only quote, *Iuppiter ereptá pro* uirginitate sacrauit (12, 141), where the novel accent of the participle draws attention to the most important word in the clause.

Let me next take into consideration the change of accent which in the old comedy becomes permissible, though not compulsory, when a final syllable is exposed to elision. Thus, although the words *neglexisse*, *antiquom*, *lenóni*, *nescire*, *delítam*, in themselves have the accent on the long penult, Terence in the Phormio takes the liberty of throwing back the accent, when the final vowels are suppressed by elision, as in:

Amo te et non negléxisse habeo gratiam (1, 2, 4).

Ad hospitem ántiquom: *is senem per epistulas* (17).

Ea seruiebat lénoni inpurissimo (33).

Nostér quid ageret, néscire: et illam ducere . . . (67).

Ad portitores esse délatam: hanc petam (100).

At the same time such change of accent was no way imperative, as seen in:

Nihil aderat adiumentí ad pulcritudinem (55),

Set epistolam ab eo adlátam esse audiuí modo et . . . (99).

where *adiumentí* and *adlátam* have retained their original accent even before a vowel.

Similarly Virgil seems to avail himself of the right to modify the accent of *loricam*, *obsedere*, *conceptumque*, in the lines:

Circúadant lóric(am) úmeris; simul aptat habendo (12, 88).

Obséder(e), alii portis sublimibus astant (12, 133).

Aut tu bella cie, concéptumqu(e) excute foedus (12, 158).

On the other hand, he rejects the privilege in:

ferróue haec regna lacessent (12, 186).

tellúrem effundat in undas (12, 204).

caelúmque in Tartara soluat (12, 205).

I come next to what I regard as the most important branch of my present inquiry. I have for some forty years contended that when a verb appears in the middle of a Latin sentence or clause, its position is a signal that the preceding word is emphatic; and so late as my recent paper on Rhythm I dwelt at some length on this topic. This consideration has the most important bearing on accent, if it be true, as I unhesitatingly hold, that a verb so degraded becomes itself an enclitic, as it were, to such preceding word. The first book would supply several passages like: *celsá sedet Aeolus arce*; *rapidús uorat aequore uertex*. But I prefer on the present occasion to draw, as before, chiefly from the last book of the poem.

Olli sédató respondit corde Latinus (18).

Me natam nulli ueterúm sociare procorum Fas erat (27).

nostró dirimamus sanguine bellum;

Illó quaeratur coniunx Lauinia campo (79, 80).

Íncertam et tristí turbatam uolnere mentis (160).

Latinus

Quadriugo uehitur curru . . . bigís it Turnus in albis
(161-4).

In dealing with the phrase *inter se* above, it was stated that two passages were reserved. I now take them in hand, viz. :

Tálibus inter-sé-firmabant fœdera dictis (212).

Inter-sé-coiisse uirós et cernere ferro (709).

and it will be at once seen that by the theory I have been putting forward, the unusual accent is explained.

But a word may be emphatic without having a verb to follow it; and then may still so far tyrannize over an unimportant word or phrase that follows it, as to attach the same enclitically to itself, and in so doing vary its own accent. Our poet, when speaking of Dolon's ill-fated offer to enter the Grecian camp as a spy, on the condition of having for his reward the chariot of Achilles, says: *Illum Tydides alió pro talibus ausis Adfecit pretio* (v. 351). Here no one will doubt that *alió* thus separated from its noun is emphatic, and in my opinion the rhythm gains much by an accent on its final syllable. Again I would for the same reason throw the accent on the final of *Turni*, with an enclitic *nunc* in: *Te Turní nunc dextra gerit* (97). Similarly, much is gained for the ear if *Aenean* be accented as marked in: *simul háec inuisa relinquam Lúmina néc generum Aeneán captíua uidébo* (v. 63), where *captíua* should in reading be affixed to *Aenean*. So with: *Non lacrimís hoc tempus ait Saturnia Iuno* (v. 156).

But the first word in a clause, or at the beginning of an hexameter, is especially entitled to a marked pronunciation, and hence it is that it is apt to be followed by unimportant particles, which logically have little connection with it, as: *Troés te miseri, uentis maria omnia uecti* (1, 528); *Primús se Danaum magná comitante caterua Androgeos offert nobis* (2, 370); *Talís se uastis infert Mezentius armis* (10, 768); *Nostrane euadere, demens, Sperastí-te posse manus* (9, 561); *Nec Romula quondam Ulló-se tantum tellús iactabit alumno* (6, 878). Bentley already felt this when, in the preface to his Terence, after noting the change of accent in *uerúmque*, produced by the enclitic *que*, he adds: *Idem efficiunt ME TE SE: Miserám me, quod uerbum audio? Quippe haec Latinis, ut etiam Rem, Enclitica sunt, ut Graecis ME, ZE. But*

the same applies to the second half of an hexameter, where the line, as so commonly happens, has a break after two and a half feet, and this second half commences with an emphatic word, followed by an enclitic, as : tantó-me impensius æquumst (12, 20) ; uanís-sese occulat umbris (12, 53) ; altó-se gurgite tollunt (12, 114) ; pretiúm-sibi poscere currus (12, 350).

When an English vocative comes not first in a clause, it is usual for printers to inclose it between two commas ; but I am disposed to think that a good reader would do well to dispense with the first of these commas, and treat it as a secondary word, often enclitically added to what precedes, this being generally a word of importance. On this principle I account for the accent in

En agros et quam belló Troiane petisti Hesperiam (12, 359).
dabitúr Troiane quod optas (7, 260).

Inuení germana uiam—gratare sorori (4, 478).

Hoc illúd germana fuit? (4, 675).

neque me indecorém germana uidebis (12, 679).

Thus we have seen to what a vast extent the class of exceptions, which fall under the “conjunctio verborum,” modifies the alleged laws of accentuation. But I have yet to add to this class. In Plautus and Terence it often happens that two words intimately connected with each other are treated much as one word, with the result that the proper accent of the first word is modified in consequence. Thus *melior, iunctis, nummos, puerum* would under ordinary circumstances be accentuated on the first syllable ; yet in the following lines they are attached in meaning to and precede trisyllabic words with a long penult, and consequently for the time transfer their accent to their several finals, as :

Vter ibí meliór-bellator érit inuentus cántharo (Pl. Men.
1, 3, 5).

E'tiam me iunctís-quadrigrís mínitatu's prostérnere (5, 5, 36).

E't mihi des nummós-sescentos quós pro capite illíus pendam
(Pers. 1, 1, 37).

Cérte equidem puerúm-peíorem quám te noui néminem
(2, 2, 34).

Similarly, we find numerous instances of modified accent in Virgil. Thus in the 12th book occur: *crimén-commune* *refellam* (v. 16); *istó-certamine casus* (61); *coniúnx-Lauinia campo* (80); *portís-sublimibus astant* (133); *siquíd-praesentius audes* (152); *siquís-modus, eripe morti* (157); and at the beginning of lines: *Semiuirí-Phrygis* (99); *Magnanimí-Iouis* (144). So far our examples are taken from adjectives; but an attached genitive, as I have already said, plays the part of an adjective: and hence the change of accent in: *Prosequere, in-durí-certamina Martis euntem* (73); *dirí-sacraria Ditis* (199).

Again, when a noun is monosyllabic, it is the habit of the language to attach it to a connected word, as is familiar to all in *res-publica*, *ius-iurandum*, and as Priscian tells us in *uir-illustris*, *uir-spectabilis*, etc., which he says, *sub uno accentu pronuntiatur* (Partib. 2. 465, 31 K. G). It has been less noted that such words are often united with what precedes so as to form a single word. But we see it in *quare* and *quam-obrem*; and again in the comic metres such connection is very generally essential to the rhythm, as for example in the Bacchiac line: *Multás-res simítu in meó corde uórso*, Pl. Trin. 2, 1, 1; and in the trochaic octonarius: *Gráuius tuum erit únum uerbum ad-eám-rem quam centúm mea* (2, 2, 107); and in the simple senarius: *Bonís tuis rebus meás res inridés malas* (2, 4, 45). Add 2, 4, 153; 3, 1, 16; 3, 2, 56 (not to pass the limits of a single play). See Bentley too as quoted above (p. 44). Hence too let us read: *Illi inter sese multá-ui braccia tollunt* (Aen. 8, 452). Add G. 3, 220: Aen. 1, 275; 6, 349; 8, 452; 11, 744; 12, 720; *magná-ui*, G. 1, 169; *quá-ui*, 12, 917; *odora canúm uis*, 4, 132; *opúm ui* 9, 532; 11, 552; and *Quidue tripectora tergeminí-uis Geryonai*, of Lucr.; *subitá-spe feruidus ardet*, 12, 325; *Quid struis aut quá-spe gelidís-in nubibus haeres?* 12, 796; add 4, 271; *uaná-spe lusit amantem*, 1, 356. What is here asserted receives no slight confirmation from the fact that in Livy 6, 9, 10, the first Harleian MS. has *summaui* written as one word, therein agreeing with *summopere*.

Another example of accent modified by the conjunctio ver-

borum occurs where words are closely united by the connecting particles *et* and *que*, as in : turrés et tecta domorum (12, 132); animó manibusque parentem (348); Amycúm fratremque Diorem (509); legés et foedera iungent, (822); hominúm rerumque repertor, (829); morém ritusque sacrorum (836).

There is yet another case that deserves some consideration. Bentley, in the preface already referred to, after speaking of some enclitics, goes on to say: Eadem est et Interrogationis vis; sive cum *Ne* Enclitico, sive absque *Ne*. Then in the body of the work in several passages he claims a final accent for a word in accordance with this theory, adding in the notes: "acuitur ob interrogationem," or some equivalent phrase. For example: Tandém cognosti qui siem? (Andr. 3, 4, 7); Etiám me dictis ducere istis postulas? (4, 1, 20); Quid facerés, si aliúd quid grauius tibi nunc faciundúm foret? (Ph. 1, 4, 29). Again in Eun. 4, 4, 42, where the MSS. have: Etiam nunc non credis indignis nos esse inrisas modis? he would read: Etiam nunc credés indignis nos esse inrisas modis? and Umpfenbach gives us: Etiam non credes, etc.? There seems to be much that is reasonable in Bentley's theory, although the first two of his examples admit of explanation on other grounds, seeing that *tandem* has the verb *cognoui* attached to it, so that we may well write and read *tandém-cognosti*, and this without any necessity for an interrogation; and in the second case, still more clearly the enclitic *me* by itself will affect the accent of the preceding *etiam*. But there is yet a graver objection to Bentley's argument in this case, for Umpfenbach gives as the reading of the MSS.: Quid tandem? Etiam núnc me, etc.? The question therefore is one which calls for closer inquiry; and I will put forward first two consecutive examples from Virgil which seem strongly to support the theory:

Vir-Troiane quibús caeló te laudibus aequem?

Jústitaene priús mirér belline labori m?

and then a second pair:

Cessás in uota precesque

Tros ait Aenea? cessás? neque enim ante dehiscent...

(6, 51).

—an example which reminds one of Horace's (Od. 1, 27, 13):

Cessát uoluntas? non aliá bibam Mercede.

Add too: qua tibi lucem Arte morér? Talín' possúm-me opponere monstro? (Virg. 12, 876).

But in very defiance of the grammarians I contend that generally in words of iambic form the accent fell on the final; and I am inclined to believe that the grammarians may have been led into their erroneous doctrine by the habit, when they thought of the accent of a word, of looking to the nominative of a noun and to the first person of a verb, for then they would very commonly come upon pyrrhic words, as *rosa*, *locus*, *avis*, *manis*, *Cato*, for nouns, *uoco*, *rego*, *scio*, *pleo*, *ruo*, for verbs, and the *o* final of nominatives and verbs in the later language had become short. Yet another argument, which I draw from Mr. Munro's paper. Already in the time of Aurelian, and still more completely in that of the grammarians, disyllabic words, which had a short penult in classical times, had already changed their quantity. Just as the modern Italian lengthens the first vowel in *máno*, *fède*, so Vopiscus gives us as soldier-verses, to adopt Corssen's reading: *Vnus hómo* mille (mille, mille) decollauimus Tantum uini nemo hábet quantum fudit sanguinis.

But setting these considerations aside, I hold it to be a far safer course to deduce the laws of accent and quantity from the writings of the old poets themselves, than from the dogmas of so stupid and ignorant a race as the grammarians, especially when we keep in view the fact that they were really dealing with a dead language.

Let me close this paper with some general remarks on the dactylic hexameter. By its very name we are told that the dactyl is the base of the system, so that a line like: *Νουσον ανα στρατον ωρσε κακην, ολεκοντο δε λαοι*, has the first claim to our attention. But a poem limited to such verses would soon cloy on the ear; and we must not be surprised if a spondee at times was admitted, as a substitute for a dactyl, under the condition that such spondee should have the metrical accent on the first of the two syllables, as: *Οιωνοισι τε πασι Διος δε τελειετο βουλη*; and so on with two or more

such spondees, until we come to lines in which a dactyl is found only in the fifth foot: *Αἰ κεν πως ἀρνῶν κνίσσης αἰγῶν τε λείων*. Nay, even in the fifth foot Homer not very rarely exhibits a spondee, especially with a four syllable word at the close of a line, as *μαντευέσθαι* (1, 107), *αἰχμητῶν* (1, 152), *ἡχηέσσα* (1, 157). But I cannot call to mind¹ a line in Homer made up of six spondees, like Ennius's, *Olli crateris-ex auratis hauserunt*, or *Olli respondit rex Albai longai*.

But even the admission of occasional spondees with the first syllable accented involved a similarity of rhythm, the monotony of which would soon be offensive; and hence a new liberty was tolerated, or rather approved, in what I may call an approach to an iambic rhythm² in the first part of the line, as in *κίλλαν τε ζάβην Τενέδοιο τε Φίφι Φανασσεῖς* (38), *Itáliam fáto prófugus*, *Quam Iuno fértur*, etc., such liberty running over two and a half, sometimes over three and a half feet. Thus two consecutive lines near the beginning of the second act of the *Menaechmi* would with all accuracy fit into the first part of a dactylic hexameter:—

Terram conspiciunt — ;

Si adueniens terram uideas — ;

and let me here note that, as in Plautus, I would read: *conspícyunt*, *aduényens*; so also: *Itályam fátō*, in Virgil. Again we meet with what is something half way between this and the stricter dactylic rhythm, viz. lines beginning with a dactyl or trochaic spondee, so to call it, followed again by an approach to the iambic rhythm, as: *Ἦτοι οἷ' ὥς εἰπων, Ὅστις ἐμὲν ζῶντος, Ὡς ἐφάτ' εὐχομένος*, *Múlta quoque et bello passus, Príma quod ad Tróíam, Tália flammátō sécum*. These latter liberties present themselves far more abundantly in Virgil than in Homer; and to my ear, on which I set no great value, make the *Aeneid* far more agreeable in point of rhythm than the *Iliad*, simply because the variety is greater. Virgil too seems to me not inferior

¹ So too Bentley (*Ter. pr. xvii*).

² See too a paper in our *Transactions* (1862-3, p. 82) by Mr. C. B. Cayley. "In a Latin hexameter," he says, "the accentual and quantitative movements generally cross one another towards the commencement and coalesce towards the desinence of a line." But this doctrine had already been clearly enunciated in Mr. Munro's paper, especially in pp. 388-389.

to the Greek poet in the skill with which he turns this variety to account. Thus there is something well suited to the assumed calmness of Juno when she approaches Aeolus to solicit his aid in the succession of spondees :

Ad quem tum Iúno súplex — his uóibus usat.

So too the line already quoted from the 12th book, Olli sedató respondit córde Latinus, agrees with the quiet resolve of the aged monarch. Contrast too the description of the noisy Tiber with the solid firmness of Turnus, in the consecutive lines—

Rauca sonans, reuocatque pedem Tiberinus ab alto ;

At non audaci Turno fiducia cessit.

It was with a proper respect for the dactylic rhythm that the poet commenced with the line :—

Arma uirumque canó Troíæ-qui primus ab oris ;

and that he closes the poem with three lines, in which every foot commences with an accented syllable ; and the spondees in the first two lines give way to a succession of dactyls in the last, the very exception in *indignata* adding to the strength of the passage :—

“ Hóc dicéns ferrum aduersó-sub péctore condit

Féruidus. Ast illí-soluontur frígore membra

Vítaque¹ cum gemitú-fugit indignata sub umbras.

I have said but little of caesura ; but it will be readily inferred from the above, that in my view it finds no place in the original dactylic verse, and results only from the varieties which introduce an iambic rhythm. To the beauty of the dactylic hexameter variety is of the first moment ; and for one I find a pleasure in the occasional occurrence of lines, where the words have not the slightest trace of what is called caesura—as, for instance, where a verse is bisected or trisected into equal portions ; and first bisected, as :—

Expleri mentém nequit, ardescitque tuendo (1, 713).

¹ I have ventured to place an accent on the first syllable of *Vítaque*, rather than on the second, because I utterly reject the doctrine of the grammarians, who contend for *Vítáque*, and who seem in this respect to have obtained the consent of Mr. Munro, see his words : The enclitics *que*, *ue*, *ne*, attract the accent to the syllable (word ?) immediately preceding, whether long or short : *armáque* as well as *armisáque*. Thus in p. 389 he gives us *Lavináque*, *Tiberináque* ; in p. 390, *templáque méntis*, etc.

Nunc Amyci cassúm gemit, et crudelia secum (1, 221).
 Ignauom fucós pecus, a praesepibus arcent (1, 435).
 His lacrimis uitám damus et miserescimus ultro (2, 145).
 Porticibus longís fugit, et uacua atria lustrat (2, 528).
 Auolsumque umerís caput, et sine nomine corpus (2, 558).
 Quid tantum insanó iuuat, indulgere dolori (2, 776).
 Transeat elapsús prior, ambiguumue relinquat (5, 326).
 Acrior ad pugnám redit, ac uim suscitát ira (5, 454).
 Et senior Glaucí chorus, Inousque Palaemon (5, 823).
 Transportare priusquam sedibus ossa quierunt (6, 328).
 Dissidet, externúm reor, et sic dicere diuos (7, 370).
 Egregium Venerís genus, et rex ipse Latinus (7, 556).
 Abstiniuit tactú pater auersusque refugit (7, 618).
 Puluerulentus equís furit ; omnes arma requirunt (7, 625).
 Armigerumque Remí premit, aurigamque sub ipsis (9, 330).
 Vos o Calliopé precor, adspirate canenti (9, 525).
 Aut rastris terrám domat, aut quatit oppida bello (9, 608).
 Dardanides contrá furit. Anxuris ense sinistram (10, 545).
 Ac uelut ille priusquam tela inimica sequantur (11, 809).
 Quam pro me curám geris, hanc precor, optume, pro me
 (Deponas) (12, 48).
 Sed neque currentém se, nec cognoscit euntem (12, 903).
 Nec currus usquám uidet, aurigamque sororem (12, 918).
 Vitaque cum gemitú fugit, indignata sub umbras (11, 831,
 12, 952).

Secondly the verse equally trisected :

Hic currús fuit ; hoc regnúm dea gentibus esse (1, 21).
 Aut portúm tenet, aut plenó subit ostia uelo (1, 404).
 Aeneás ait et fastigia suspicit urbis (1, 438).
 Obicitúr magis atque improuida pectora turbat (2, 200).
 Ad terrám fugit, et portú se condidit alto (5, 243).
 Post Helymús subit et nunc tertia palma Diores (5, 339).
 Tum quassáns caput haec effundit pectore dicta (7, 292).
 Miscerí putet, aeriám sed gurgite ab alto (7, 704).
 Hanc Ianús pater, hanc Saturnus condidit arcem (8, 357).
 Volcaní domus et Volcania nomine tellus (8, 422).
 In flouíum dedit. Ille súo-cum gurgite flauo (9, 816).
 Artificís scelus et formidine crimen acerbat (11, 407).

Hoc dicéns ferr(um) aduersó sub pectore condit (12, 950).

And to these let me add what, though neither bisected nor trisected, is yet without the usually required caesura :

Hic iaculó bonus, hic longé fallente sagitta (9, 572).

Lastly I offer a few lines, all falling within a single decade, for the consideration of those who are afraid to reject the dogma of the grammarians that iambic words must be accented on the penult, and ask them to ask themselves how on their principle they would explain the rhythm :—

Et furiís agítatus amór et conscia virtus (668),

Túrbidus eque rotís magnám respexit ad urbem (671),

Súbdideratque rotás pontisque instrauerat altos (675),

Quó deus et quo dura uocat Fortuna sequamur (677)—

my own theory claiming the accents as marked.

III.—SI, "SO." BY T. HEWITT KEY, ESQ.

FIVE-AND-TWENTY years ago, in the first edition of my Latin Grammar, I ventured upon the doctrine that *sic* and *si* are identical words, with the one qualification, that *sic* has the demonstrative particle *ce* attached to it, and that the original meaning of the conjunction *si* was "so,"—an adverb that in our own language is also used as a conjunction with the power of "if." Thus Shakspeare (Mids. N.D. 3, 2) has : And now, so you will let me quiet go, To Athens will I bear my folly back ; and again (As you like it, 2, 3) : No matter, so you come not here. In this sense not unfrequently the word *that* is appended (so that . . .). The German also has the same double use of *so*, as in : so ihr bleiben werdet an meiner Rede, so seid ihr meine rechte Jünger (St. John. viii. 31). Following this view, I further contended (*Trans. Ph. Soc.* 1859, p. 136), that in the phrase of such frequent occurrence, *si dis placet*, *si* carries with it the power of "so," not that of "if."

I was no way surprised then to find that Dr. Wagner gave his assent to this view in his edition of Terence in a