The Classical Quarterly

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

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Adnotanda in Latin Prosody

J. P. Postgate

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 11 / Issue 04 / October 2017, pp 169 - 178

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800011137, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800011137

How to cite this article:

J. P. Postgate (2017). Adnotanda in Latin Prosody. The Classical Quarterly, 11, pp 169-178
doi:10.1017/S0009838800011137

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

OCTOBER, 1917.

ADNOTANDA IN LATIN PROSODY.

I. *diutius*.

THE statement in the second-and-third edition of Sommer's excellent *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (1914), p. 462, that the oldest scansion is *diūtius*, to say nothing of the unqualified assertion in our current grammars and dictionaries¹ that the *u* in it and in *diutissime* is long or the regrettable silence of the principal editors of Plautus upon the subject, is of itself sufficient warrant for a brief discussion. The relevant facts are these:

1. Though *diu* is common enough in verse of all kinds, the comparative is not attested for any but writers in iambs, while the superlative appears to be confined to prose.

2. *diutius* is found

(a) (i.) At the end of an iambic or trochaic line in the following passages :
Plautus *Trin.* 685

sicut dixi faciam ; nolo te iactari *diutius*

Terence *Haut.* 102

cottidie accusabam : 'hem tibine haec *diutius*'

Similarly in Ter. *Haut.* 424 ; 834 ; *Phorm.* 569 ; *Hec.* 148. Pacuvius *fr.* 181 ; Afranius *fr.* 49.

Phaedrus 1. 2. 16

hoc mersum limo cum iaceret *diutius*

(ii.) In other places of the line :

Ter. *Phorm.* 182

nam non potest celari nostra *diutius* iam audacia

Pomponius *fr.* 21

'non esuribis *diutius*.' 'qua re?' rogas

Laberius *fr.* 62

dum *diutius* retinetur, nostri oblitus est

Phaedrus 3 *epilog.* 14

fruar *diutius* si celerius cepero

¹ Including the new edition of Georges (1913) read 'diūturnus.'
'*diūtius* bei ältern Dichtern' in which we also

The remaining example known to me is Turpilius *fr.* 62 *ap. Non.* 215. 26 (Lindsay):

set néqueo ferre hunc *diūtius*
errāre et conquērī nec esse suāe parum obsequēllae.

(b) Plautus *Rudens* 93 in the traditional text, which with its context is as follows:

PLESIDIPPVS. et uos a uostris abduxi negotiis,
neque id processit qua uos duxi gratia, 90
neque quiui ad portum lenonemprehendere.
sed mea desidia spem deserere nolui.
eo uos, amici, detinui *diūtius*.
nunc huc ad Veneris fanum uenio uisere
ubi rem diuinam se facturum dixerat.

3. Of minor importance are the quantities of certain related words, to wit (a) *diū* (b) *diūtius* (c) *diūtūrnus*.

The lines cited under 2 (a) cannot be scanned if the word had the quantity which it appears to have in 2 (b). They can be scanned if the *u* is short, or again, if, supposing it to be long, the *i* is got rid of by the hypothesis that it is consonantized or absorbed. The latter trisyllabic scansion, though advocated by Ritschl on *Trin.* 685 citing Fleckeisen *Jahrb.* 101 (1870) 69 sqq., has been rightly condemned by L. Mueller *de re metrica* 431 and Havet *Phaedr.* p. 214. It lies exposed to two grave objections. It assumes a change at the threshold of a word without example or analogy in historic Latin; and it provides no explanation of the avoidance of the word in dactylic metres, for which it would have been as convenient as *longius* or *saeptius*.

The conclusion to which we are forced is that in the long list of passages which I have cited the scansion is *diūtius*. This brings Plautus *Rudens* 93 into sharp conflict with *Trinummus* 685. As a lengthening of *diūtius* to *diūtius* is out of the question, the difficulty can only be resolved by supposing that *Rudens* 93 is corrupt. Dziatzko proposed *detiniui*, the grammarian Charisius having told us that the *ueteres* used *teniui* for *tenui* 3. 1 p. 220 (*Gramm. Lat.* I. 248 2 Keil). We might also insert *tum* after *amici*, which would improve the passage by providing an antithesis to *nunc* in the following line.

Too much has been made of the discrepancies in the related words. *diūtius* by the side of *diū* need not trouble us more than *maledīcentior* by the side of *maledīcus* and a stem *dīūt-* is attested also for *dīūt-urnus*, a formation like *noct-urnus*, *tacit-urnus*. It may be observed in passing that *diuturnus* 'long lasting,' applicable to persons as well as things, is not a simple synonym of *diutinus* which means rather 'long extended' 'lengthy,' and this latter adjective can be derived without offence from *diū*, as *cras-tinus* from *cras*, *pris-tinus* from **prīs* (= *prius*, cf. *pris-cus*) and the late *serō-tinus* from *sero*.

II. *attodisse* or *attudisse*?

In the Appendix Vergiliana lines 6 sqq. of *Catalepton* 10 appear in recent editions as follows:

et hoc negat Tryphonis aemuli domum
negare nobilem insulamue Caeruli
ubi iste post Sabinus ante Quintio
bidente dicet *attodisse* forfice (edd. forcipe)
comata colla ne Cytorio iugo 10
premente dura uulnus ederet iuba.

attodisse is the reading of all the MSS. except the oldest. It is incompatible, it is true, with the metre; but it is at least a Latin perfect and it gives the required sense. What are we to say of *attodisse* which the recommendation of Buecheler and the spell of the Bruxellensis have imported into the text? This: that *attodisse*, if it were a Latin form at all, should have a long vowel, as *odi fodi* and so forth have, and would therefore be no better for the verse than its discredited rival; and that *attodi* will be the perfect of *attondeo* when *respodi* is the perfect of *respondeo*.

Now it is the case that *tondeo* was confused with *tundo* in popular speech as is shown by a rustic calendar in *C.I.L.* I. p. 28 (2nd ed.) OVES TVNDVNT LANA LAVATVR and W. Heraeus on the Appendix Probi *Archiv* XI. p. 325 (cf. Sommer *Handbuch* p. 66). So it seems possible that we should write *attudisse*. But there is another possibility. *atto(n)disse* may be a gloss on the original word which a passage of the younger Pliny may then help us to restore *Ep.* 7. 27. 12 'Is uisus sibi cernere quendam in toro residentem admouentemque capiti suo cultros atque etiam ex ipso uertice *amputantem* capillos. ubi inluxit, ipse circa uerticem tonsus, capilli iacentes reperiuntur.' *amputasse* with *colla* only would have a different sense, Seneca *Thyestes* 727; but '*comata colla*' is the equivalent of *capillos* which the metre would not admit. I may explain in concluding that I have preferred the *forfice* of Heyne to the *forcipe* of the MSS. and the editors, since it is more likely that the nags were clipped with a pair of shears than with a pair of tongs.

III. *natrix* 'watersnake.'

A recent paper in *Classical Philology* in which much pains and ingenuity are spent on recommending a double false quantity in Plautus¹ may well serve as a warning not to put too much trust in dictionaries.

In spite of Quicherat and Lewis neither of the vowels of this word is long, as can be seen from Lucilius *ap. Non.* 65. 29 'si natibus *natricem* impressit crassam et capitatam' and, as I shall presently show, inferred from Lucan 9. 720 'et *natrix* uiolator aquae,' the only two places where it occurs in Latin verse, while the shortness of the first vowel is vouched for by its congeners in

¹ *natricis* for *nūtrīcis* Bacch. 434.

other Indo-European languages, e.g. English 'adder' formerly *nadder* and in Scotch and other dialects *nadder* still.

In the improper use of *natrīx* by Lucilius the gender is feminine,¹ but masculine in the proper use of Lucan. Other passages are indecisive; Cicero *Acad.* 2. 120 'tantam uim *natricum* uiperarumque,' Columella 1. 5. 6 '*natricum* serpentiumque pestes,' Seneca *Dial.* 4. 31. 8 'ne uiperas quidem et *natrices*,' Suetonius *Calig.* 11 where it is applied to Caligula, nor can we infer anything from its transference to denote a plant Pliny *N.H.* 27. 107 '*natrīx* uocatur herba cuius' e.q.s. The only other occurrence of it that I know is in a collection of glosses on Juvenal, Corp. Gl. V. p. 656. 32 'Natricem explodit serpentem excludit et expellit.' This glossary, while mainly drawn from the extant *Satires*, includes accretions from other sources, and one of such must the present gloss be. 'natricem explodit' might be a fragment of a hexameter; and, since *explodere* in the sense of *expellere* (cf. Seneca *Dial.* 6. 10. 6 'fortuna luctatos cum fluctibus ne in harenam quidem aut litus *explodet* sed in alicuius immensae uentrem beluae decondet') seems to belong to familiar speech possibly also from Lucilius.²

We cannot of course argue from Lucan's use that the masculine gender of *natrīx* was the common or exclusive one in his time; but we may feel confident that he would not have coupled 'uiolator aquae' with a noun which, like 'nātrīx,' could not have failed to suggest to his ear and to his readers' ears a feminine verbal substantive.

When precisely arose the mispronunciation to which we owe the confusion that still obsesses our lexicographers it is not possible to say; but we find it established in Priscian (II. p. 165. 11 sq. Keil) 'In *ix*, si paenultima brevis est masculina sunt: "hic calix," "hic uarix," excipitur "haec salix" et haec filix . . . alia uero feminina sunt haec "mātrix," "cōrnix," "lōdix" et omnia uerbalia ut "uictrix," "nutrix," "meretrix," "natrīx," quod tamen cum speciem anguis significat masculini quoque inuenitur': Lucanus in VIII 'et natrīx uiolator aquae'; and so Phocas (*Gramm. Lat.* V. 421. 15 Keil).

IV. *abies*, etc. : *abiit*, etc. : *Anien*, *lien*, *rien*.

1. *abiēs*, *ariēs*, *pariēs*.

I do not suppose I am the first to wonder why these three nominatives, all of the form *u u* -, have dissociated themselves in the quantity of their final syllable from the rest of the class with genitives ending in *-etis* or *-itis*. But I imagine that the fiction of the 'Vowel Lengthened in *arsi*,' reinforced perhaps by the fact that in their oblique cases they were assisted into verse by means of another 'poetic licence,' has stifled the desire for further inquiry. It may

¹ The gender may be due to the sense intended, as in the *mea* of Catullus 56. 7 or the *haec* of Petronius 24 fin.

² Professor Lindsay, whose attention I drew to this gloss, thinks it may be a contamination

of two glosses 'natricem serpentem' and 'explodit excludit et expellit' or, if a single gloss perhaps a scrap from a Christian poet's hexameter.

be as well to say plainly at the outset that, if the original quantity had been *abiēs*, *ariēs*, *pariēs*, there is not the slightest reason why that quantity should have been changed. The poorest writer of dactyls would have had no difficulty in finding them a place in his verse.

Since M. Havet published his paper on *L'S latin caduc* in the *Études romanes* dedicated to Gaston Paris, pp. 303 sqq., it has been generally recognized that in Early Latin the *s* which arose from the concurrence of two final consonants, as *ts*, *ds*, *ss*, had a different value from the simple *s* shown by the occasional length of the last syllable, as in 'miles inpransus' *Aul.* 528, the beginning of an iambic trimeter and *es* from *sum*¹ which always forms a long syllable in Plautus, and the fact that in this case the consonant is never suppressed at the end of a word like an originally single *s* as in *bonu' sum* (ib. pp. 320 sq.). This double *s* was soon simplified first before consonants and later before vowels and the stages may be marked as follows: *equēs*, *equēss*, *equēs*. Why did not *abiess*, *ariess*, *pariess* take the same route? The answer seems to be that they were attracted to the numerous words with similar ending and scansion such as *ūcēs*, *fācēs*, *spēcēs*, in which the *e* of the last syllable was long.

2. *abiūt*, *adiūt*, *coiūt*, *iniūt*, *obiūt*, *periūt*, *rediūt*, *subiūt*; *petiūt*.

To the shortening of final syllables closed by any consonant but *s* which had been consummated by the classical period, the anapaestic perfects cited above are a sole and singular exception. Actual proof of the length of the vowel cannot be produced for *coiūt*, *iniūt* and *obiūt* as these do not happen to occur before an initial vowel in verse; but it would be perverse to maintain that they were in disaccord with the other compounds of *iūt*. We should add *interiūt* and *praeteriūt*, compounds ending in an anapaest, for both of which we have the authority of Ovid: *Met.* 3. 546, *Ars Am.* 3. 63, 64, *Met.* 14. 101.

In sharp contrast to these stand perfects in which the preposition is long and the final syllable short: to wit *exiūt*, and *trānsiūt* to which but for the deficiencies of the record *prōdiūt* would presumably be added. Lachmann, whose note on *Lucr.* 3. 1042 is for all its arbitrary theorizing still indispensable, would not tolerate either *exiūt* or *iūt* being of a quantity different from *abiūt*, just as he refused to Lucretius the liberty of placing the contracted *obiūt* before a consonant, although in the very same note he cites five examples (Manilius and Martial) of *desiūt*, the contraction of *desiūt*, which is never found except in this position. Lachmann imposed upon L. Mueller, *de re metrica* p. 399; but he did not impose on Munro (*Lucr. l.c.*), who writes of Lachmann's attempts to foist *exiūt* and *trānsiūt* upon Vergil: 'Taking then into account the poet's usual rhythm it seems almost incredible that he should five times have written *éxit*, *éxit*, *trānsiūt*, *trānsiūt*, *trānsiūt*' [*G.* 2. 81, *A.* 2. 497 'non sic aggeribus ruptis cum spumeus amnis | *exiūt*, oppositasque euicit gurgite moles | fertur in

¹ For the form *ess* compare Mr. A. W. Hodgman's collection in *Classical Quarterly* I. 1907, p. 107.

arua furens cumulo;’ *A.* 5. 274, 10. 785, 817 ‘*transiit* et parmam mucro, leuia arma minacis’]; ‘never once divided the word between two feet, *exiit*, etc.; nor used it in the sixth foot.’ Lachmann’s treatment of Silius 13. 166 and Tibullus 1. 4. 27 is hardly less perverse. In the first passage ‘*mediam tunc transiit* ictu | parmam sed grato fraudatast sanguine cuspis’ he rejects *transiit*, supported though it is by the Vergilian parallel and another from Silius himself 10. 251 sq. ‘*conixus in hastam | ilia cornipedis subrecta cuspide transit*’ and vouched for by the Coloniensis, for the facile *transigit* of inferior MSS. The passage of Tibullus I dealt with in connexion with Horace *carm.* 4. 4. 65 ‘*merses profundo pulcrior euenit*,’ where for the corrupt *euenit* I suggested¹ *exiit* which would account both for it and the *exiet* of some inferior MSS. The hexameter of the distich ‘at si tardus eris, errabis; transiet aetas | quam cito! non segnis stat remeatque (-ue) dies,’ in addition to a rare and here a seemingly motiveless lengthening, presents a form of the future without warrant or parallel in classical Latinity. But Lachmann sooner than accept the *transiit* of the ‘deteriores’ has thrust a solecism² upon Tibullus a hundred and fifty years at least before its time, and a solecism moreover which appears as a corruption in one of the passages *Aen.* 10. 785 [*transiit* PR, *transiet* (with *e* corrected to *i*) M] that he cites himself. Sommer’s acceptance of his predecessor’s error³ may perhaps serve as an excuse for dealing with a reading and a form so generally discredited. The instances alleged by Neue-Wagener *Formenlehre* 3. 326 sq. have disappeared from our texts, and the *rediet* which Haupt foisted on Germanicus *Phaen.* 716 has gone the way of *exiet* in Seneca *Epist.* 17. 9, 113. 20, *Apoc.* 3. 1, of *iniet* in *Benef.* 2. 1. 2 and *transiet* in *N.Q.* 3. 10. 3.

As to the quantity of the perfect the facts are clear and easily stated. While in *abiit* and its like there is abundant evidence of the scansion ∪ ∪ – and none of the scansion ∪ ∪ ∪, in the case of *exiit* and its like there is none of the scansion – ∪ – and plenty of the scansion – ∪ ∪.

The anomaly which nonplussed L. Mueller ‘huius usus satis mirifici’ p. 399 is no longer a mystery. The so-called ‘law of iambic shortening’ which made *sciō* and *modō* from *sciō* and *modō* produced *iit* out of *iit* (Ter. *Phorm.* 706, Verg. *Aen.* 9. 418, Val. Fl. 6. 685). *ābīit* stands in the same relation to *iit* as *rēpūtō* does to *putō* or *ālībī* to *ibī* and *exiit* in the same relation to *iit* as *nesciō* does to *sciō* or *sīcībī* to *ibī*.

A word in conclusion as to the *-ī*. The perfect *iit* (*iit*) has been discussed by Sommer *Handbuch* pp. 566 sq. and *Kritische Erläuterungen* p. 166. It seems clear that the *ī* arises from a diphthong; and the Sanskrit perfect (1 sing.) *iy-āy-a*, quoted from Brugmann’s discussion, offers an instructive

¹ *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society*, vol. 3, p. 178 (1890).

² Pompei *commentum artis Donati* (Gramm. Lat. V. 225 Keil) ‘si autem *i* non habeat ante *o* sed *e* habeat, futurum tempus in *-bo* mittit, *exeo*, *exibo*; *exiam non dicimus*; *soloecismus* est.’

³ *Handbuch*, p. 537. ‘das entsprechende Futurum hat schon Tibull. I. 4, 27 einmal unter dem Zwang des Metrums gebildet.’ The ‘stress of metre’ then stopped Tibullus from using *transibit* in a hexameter; but Propertius (2. 11. 5) was presumably more fortunate.

parallel. The *ei* appears then to have been preserved in *redieit C.I.L.* I. 541 and Plautus *Merc.* 530 in the Ambrosianus, and *ūt* will have come from *īēit*.¹

3. *Anien* : *lien*, *rien*.

An undisputed rule of Classical Latin quantity is that a native word ending in *unaccented en* has the *e* of its ultimate short whatever the original quantity. Thus *flāmēn* masc. and neut., *pectēn* masc., in contrast to *attagēn ἀτταγην*, *Sirēn*, *rēn*, *splēn*. To this rule *Anien* and *lien* alone are said to constitute exceptions.²

Aniēn, an old variant of *Aniō*³ (a Latin name according to Conway *Italian Dialects* 334), is proved not only by the analogy of the other cases, but by the actual scansion in Statius *Silu.* I. 5. 25.

lien. Some four hundred years after the first appearance of *lien* in literature a long *en* is found in its stem. Serenus Sammonicus *Liber Medicinalis* 414 'nonnulli memorant consumi posse *liēnem*,' *ib.* 425 'dulcia Plautus ait grandi minus apta *liēni*,' the nominative which may be presumed to have the same quantity occurs in v. 402 'quando *lien* tumido circumligat ilia uinco.' The earlier medical writer Celsus uses the word frequently, but there is no clue to its quantity unless his nominative *lienīs* (see below) be supposed to be such.

We must now go back to Plautus, the examples from whom I will now transcribe :

sed quid tibi est? CA. *lien* enicat, renes dolent

Curc. 236.

perii. seditionem facit *lien*, occupat praecordia

Merc. 124 (Iamb. Octonarius).

lien dierecst. PA. ambula, id *lieni* optimumst

Curc. 244.

nam iam quasi sona *liene* cinctus ambulo

Curc. 220.

(the source of Sammonicus 402 *l.c.* above)

perii. cor *lienosum*, opinor, habeo. iam dudum salit

Cas. 414 (Troch. Septenarius).

Unfortunately we have lost the passage to which Sammonicus refers in 425.

¹ *ei* for later *i* is well attested in this for early Latin; cf. Lindsay *Latin Language* p. 456 and A. W. Hodgman *Classical Quarterly* I. p. 122, who says there are thirty-three instances in Plautus.

² The nominative of *Nerienem* given as the name of the wife of Mars, Gellius *Noct. Att.* 13. 23 (22) with the passages there cited, including Plaut. *Truc.* 515, is not known for certain, Gellius suggesting 'Nerio' or 'Nerienes.' But as the balance of authority is clearly in favour of the quantity *Nēriēnem* or *Nēriēnem*, not for the

Nēriēnem which a number of scholars adopt, the word does not in any case help us here.

³ Its Latin origin is doubted by some on the ground that the inflexion -ō, -ōnis postulates an Ablaut without example in Indo-European, Sommer *op. cit.* p. 360 with the references given there. The original declension seems to have been *Aniō*, *Aniōnis*, but *Anien* is as old as Cato, and it is clear from the examples in the *Thesaurus* s.u. that both forms were in use. A later inflexion was *Aniō*, *Aniōnis* after the normal pattern of *legiō*, *legiōnis*.

Consonantization or absorption of the *i* in *lien* being out of the question, the word must in all these places be a disyllable, and careful consideration of them without respect to the later scansion of the word irresistibly suggests that in the time of Plautus the *e* of at least its stem and oblique cases was short: *liēni*, *liēne*, *liēnosum*.¹ It is possible that Martianus Capella, 3. 296, was aware of this quantity as, after speaking of 'masculina ut *flamen pecten*,' 'communia duobus generibus ut *tibicen fidicen*,' 'neutra ut *nomen flumen*,' he goes on 'altera species est generis masculini quae E litteram ante extremam N seruat ut *lien rien*, quae tamen ipsa quoque in ceteris ut superiora declinantur.' For if the quantity of the vowel is different, the only point of resemblance 'in ceteris' is the *n*.

If the stem *lien-* was short in the time of Plautus, it must have changed its quantity by the time of Sammonicus. Can we discern a reason for the change? I think we can. The close associations of *lienes* with *rēnes* (cf. *Curc.* 236 supra) and of *lien* with *splēn* seem sufficient for the purpose. The existence of *rien*, a bye-form of *ren*, is particularly significant; see Festus p. 277a 'rienes antiqui uocabant nefrundines quia Graeci eos νεφρούς dicunt;' Plautus 'glaber erat tamquam *rien*.' And Charisius, *Gramm. Lat.* I. 28. 13 Keil and elsewhere, Marius Plotius Sacerdos, *ib.* VI. 474. 10 Probus *Catholica*, *ib.* IV. 9. 7, and Priscian II. 149. 7, all couple *lien* and *rien*.

To pass to the nominative, *liēn* in Plautus would involve less of a strain on the 'iambic shortening law' than *liēn*; and a *liēnis* in Celsus would have the countenance of *iūuēnis*² instead of the splendid isolation of *liēnis*.

rien. The quantity of the nominative singular *ren* may be considered established though it does not occur in literature; the plural *rēnes* has already been quoted from Plautus, and Horace has *rēnes* and Grattius *rēnibus*. For *rien*, *rienis* there is nothing so tangible. The indications both as regards its relations to *ren* and its correspondences to *lien* are ambiguous or conflicting; and the cognates of both words are unknown.³

Before we can complete our investigation, we must consider our two words in relation to other masculines with stems ending in *-n*, premising only that the appearance of *e* after *i* is due to the arresting force of dissimilation, such as we find in *pietas*, *uarietas* and so forth by the side of *castitas*, *cupiditas* and the like. The confusion of these stems in Latin, contrasting sharply with the distinctness of Greek (-ων, -ωνος; -ων, -ονος; -ην, -ηνος; -ην, -ενος), is the result of two tendencies, the weakening of all unaccented vowels to *i* (*e* when *i* has

¹ With this would agree the Sanskrit *pīhan-* (*pīhan-*), the only one of its Indo-European congeners that stands very near to it.

² The stem of this word, as the gen. plur. *iūuenum* (Ennius) and the cognates *iūuen-tus*, *iūuen-cus* indicate, was originally consonantal. The singular appears to be later than the plural, the nominative first appearing in Catullus, 64. 58 (Sommer *op. cit.* p. 370). The word and its relations to *senex*, *senis* have been discussed by Brugmann *Archiv* 15. pp. 1 sqq. He considers

that the *e* was preserved through its associations with *senex* (these are we may observe especially strong in the plural where *iūuenes*, earlier *iūuiores*, and *senes*, earlier *seniores*, is a standing military distinction). But inasmuch as *ui* and a nasal is not found in Latin except where the *i* is original as in *uinco*, *uincio*, neither *iūuenis* nor *iūuencus* stand in need of apology.

³ Cf. Walde *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* s.u. *ren*. He says 'Formell ist Kreuzung mit *Lien* zu erwägen.'

preceded) and the sweeping of an analogical *ō* through territory in which it had no original rights. *hemō* (*homō*), G. *hemōnis*, *homīnis* may serve as our example. Speaking broadly, the flexion redistributed itself on two lines, (a) *-ō*, *-ōnis* after a vowel *legiō*, *legiōnis*, (b) *-ō*, *-ōnis* after a consonant *ordō*, *ordīnis*; and the declension *-n*, *-nis* all but disappeared. There remained however the following; *flāmen* (cf. Greek *ποι-μῆν*), *pecten* (cf. *κτεῖς*, *κτενός*), *termen*, *turben*, and the compounds in *-cen* as *tibi-cen*. It is moreover not improbable that we should add, for an earlier period, *sanguen* (cf. *sanguinem*) and *inguen* (= Greek *ἀδῆν* m.), these having changed their gender through the attraction of *ungen* and the numerous other neuters in *-ēn*. *termen* and *turben* have a special interest for us. *termen*, Varro *L.L.* 5. 21 (speaking of *terminus*) 'in Latio aliquot locis dicitur ut apud Accium, non "terminus" sed *termen*, hoc Graeci quod *τέρμωνα*, pote uel illinc. Euander enim qui uenit in Palatium e Graecia Arcas,' had a rival in *termo*, Festus p. 263 'termonem Ennius Graeca consuetudine dixit quem nos nunc terminum hoc modo "ingenti uadit cursu qua redditus *termo* est" et "hortatore bono prius quem finibus *termo*," a passage which has been curiously misunderstood. It does not show that Ennius used *termōnem* for the accusative of *termo*, nor that Festus found this form in his works. *termonem* is the inflexion of Festus; and I imagine that by his 'hoc modo' the grammarian is guarding himself against the misapprehension that the accusative is anything more than the grammatical device by which words that in our non-inflexional writing would be placed between inverted commas are in Latin made to conform to the syntactical requirements of the sentence. Proof of this is surely not needed; but, as an example, 'uox uoluptatis' (Cicero) does not mean 'the voice of pleasure' but 'the word *pleasure*.' There is then nothing here against the hypothesis that Ennius inflected *termen terminis*, as he would inflect *flamen flaminis*. *terminus*, the predominant form, bears the same relation to the masculine *termen* as *glutinum* (Scaurus and Sallust) does to the neuter *gluten*. As to *turben* which has been preserved to Tibullus 1. 5. 3 'namque agor ut per plana *citus* sola uerbere *turben*' (MSS. *turbo*) by the witness of Charisius, I cannot understand why Professor Buck should call it, *Classical Philology* 12 (1917), p. 27 n. 4, a 'late and obviously secondary' formation. By the time of Tibullus *-ō* had established itself as the masculine and feminine nominative and *-ēn* as the neuter nominative for nouns whose genitive ended with *-ōnis*. Why should a formation after an ordinary type of masculines have been remodelled on another that had almost become extinct? And if it was on the neuters that it was remodelled, why did it cling to its gender?

The doublet *pollis* and *pollen* we know from the grammarians, who had access to much that has now disappeared. It is clear, if only from the acc. *pollinem* (Cato Terence), that it was either a masculine or a feminine noun; and as some report it as feminine others as masculine and others again as neuter, cf. Priscian 6. 12. 66 (II. 250. 17 Keil) 'haec *pollis pollinis*¹ sic

¹ It is worth noting that according to Marius Plotius Sacerdos (*Gramm. Lat.* V. 474. 25 Keil) there were no Latin feminine substantives that ended in *-n*.

Charisius; Probus autem et Caesar¹ hoc pollen pollinis declinauerunt,' while Phocas says 'hic cinis cineris, *hic pollis pollinis*, hic pubis puberis,' *Gramm. Lat.* (Keil) V. 418. 10, it would seem that here too we have a masculine *-en* which has been attracted by the neuters in *-en*.

To the doublet *pollis pollen* the doublet *sanguis sanguen* appears to be a close parallel; and since the *i* of *sanguis* for *sanguin-s* was originally long, it is a plausible assumption that the *i* of *pollis* for *pollin-s* was long too. Taking these two words by themselves it would seem probable that when the ending *en* had become predominately neuter and proportion required a masculine nominative for the accusatives *pollinem*, *sanguinem* a new one was formed by means of the suffix *s* while the old nominatives *pollen sanguen* went over to the neuters. In the case of *sanguis* still further irregularities were caused through its entanglement with *anguis*, which produced on the one side the shortened *sanguis* and the compound *exsanguis* and on the other side *anguen*, *anguineus*, this latter a later form for the correct *angu-inus*.

'Mais revenons à nos moutons.' It will not have escaped an attentive reader's notice that the words in the three foregoing groups have certain features in common. They all form exceptions to a well-known rule of Latin sound-lore, that final syllables closed by a consonant are short; and in all the penultimate vowel is *i*, and this *i* is followed by a long *e* or a diphthong whose first element is *e*. If the final syllable of *lien* and *rien* be *-ên*, there is no further bond in the group as a whole; but its remaining members show yet another similarity. They either constitute or conclude with an *anapaest*.

It is tempting to speak of a Law of the Anapaest. But at present I will refrain.

J. P. POSTGATE.

LIVERPOOL,
June 13, 1917.

¹ In his treatise *De Analogia*.