

QUANTITATIVE IMPLICATIONS
OF THE
PYRRHIC STRESS

ESPECIALLY IN
PLAUTUS AND TERENCE

BY
LINWOOD LEHMAN

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED
TO THE FACULTY OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

1924

U Va

U. Va. Doctoral
Dissertation

75

436014

U Va

Contents

	page
PART I	7-22
Introduction	9
The Tripudic Theory	11
Introductory Remarks	11
The Tripudic Accentual System	12
Further Remarks on the Tripudic Accentual System	13
The Beginning of the Penultimate Law	14
The Tripudium	15
The Pyrrhic Stress	20
Necessary Alternation and Coincidence of Accent and Ictus	20
PART II	23-68
Explanation of Division of Examples	25
Textual Restoration, etc.	28
Manifestations of the Pyrrhic Stress	30
<i>Amphitruo</i>	32
<i>Aulularia</i>	33
<i>Bacchides</i>	35
<i>Captivi</i>	37
<i>Menaechmi</i>	39
<i>Miles Gloriosus</i>	41
<i>Mostellaria</i>	44
<i>Pseudolus</i>	46
<i>Rudens</i>	48
<i>Trinummus</i>	50
<i>Adelphoe</i>	53
<i>Andria</i>	54
<i>Eunuchus</i>	56
<i>Heauton Timorumenos</i>	57
<i>Hecyra</i>	59
<i>Phormio</i>	61
<i>Plautina Addenda</i>	63
<i>Miscellanea</i>	67
PART III	69-75
The Iambic Law	69
Synizesis	70
Lengthening	71
Shortening	72
Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.	74
Final S	75
A Mute plus L or R	75
PART IV	77-81
Conclusion	79

Bibliography.

- Bücheler, F.— Riese, A: *Anthologia Latina*. Two volumes. Leipsig, 1895.
- Duff, J. W: *A Literary History of Rome*. London, 1910.
- FitzHugh, T: *The Sacred Tripudium*, Bulletin of the Philosophical Society. University of Virginia, 1910.
- FitzHugh, T: *The Indoeuropean Superstress and the Evolution of Verse*. University of Virginia, 1917.
- FitzHugh, T.: *The Old-Latin and the Old-Irish Monuments of Verse*. University of Virginia, 1919.
- FitzHugh, T.: *Letters of Thomas Jefferson Concerning Philology and the Classics*. University of Virginia, 1919.
- Giles, P.: *A Short Manual of Comparative Philology*. 2nd ed. London and New York, 1901.
- Keil, H.: *Grammatici Latini*. Leipzig, 1857-1880.
- Lindsay, W. M.: *The Latin Language. An Historical Account of Latin Sounds, Stems, and Flexions*. Oxford, 1894.
- Lindsay, W. M.: *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae*. Oxford, 1903.
- Lindsay, W. M.: *Early Latin Verse*. Oxford, 1922.
- McLemore, J. S.: *The Tradition of the Latin Accent*. University of Virginia, 1917.
- Merry, W. W.: *Fragments of Roman Poetry*. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1898.
- Müller, C. F. W.: *Plautinische Prosodie*. Berlin, 1869.
- Ribbeck, O.: *Comicorum Romanorum praeter Plautum et Terentium Fragmenta*. Leipzig, 1873.
- Ribbeck, O.: *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*. Leipzig, 1871.
- Skutsch, F.: *Studien zur Plautinischen Prosodie*. Leipzig, 1892.
- Tyrrell, R. Y.: *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae*. Oxford, 1902.
- Vahlen, I.: *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae*. Leipzig, 1903.
- Vendryes, J.: *Recherches sur l'Histoire et les Effets de l'Intensité Initiale en Latin*. Paris, 1902.

Corrigenda

Page 10, line 22.	<i>Read</i>	attempts	for	attempts.
" " " 25.	"	mystery	"	mystety.
" 15, " 8.	"	J.	"	J; .
" 18, " 17.	"	óratór	or as	orátor for orator or as orator.
" 20, " 27.	"	Saturnius	for	Santurnius.
" " 3rd note.	"	Abhandl.	"	Abhanol.
" 22, line 5.	"	tránsíbit	"	tránsíbít.
" 30, " 35.	"	Asinaria	"	Asinara.
" 31, " 20.	"	Pyrrhic	"	Pyrric.
" 50, 4th note.	"	consists	"	consist.
" 74, 2nd note.	"	*See Skutsch	for	See Skutsch.

PART I

THE NATURE OF THE LATIN ACCENT

. ulla putatis
dona carere dolis Danaum?
Aeneid II, 43-4

Quantitative Implications of the Pyrrhic Stress in Plautus and Terence

I

Introduction

Much has been said and written in comparatively recent years concerning the prosody of early Latin poetry. Many hypotheses have been advanced by one investigator only to be rejected by others, who in their turn have offered alternative hypotheses. However, as it appears, with the exception of one theory, that of Professor Thomas FitzHugh of the University of Virginia, all theories have consistently ignored the fundamental facts of early Latin prosody as we actually find them, and apply their rules and regulations to the manuscript reading *only when it agrees with their views*. Otherwise the fathers of these theories have one of two courses remaining open to them: either they "emend" the text and thus arbitrarily obtain the needed conformity, or simply state that in certain cases certain words are "apparently" scanned contrary to established usage. These exceptions (only "apparent" though, mind you) are grouped under various heads and no basic or fundamental explanation is offered for them. The mere fact that attention is called to the phenomenon appears to be sufficient explanation *per se*!

Professor FitzHugh, in opposition to these uncertain theories, has advanced and, as it seems to me, definitively proved the existence in Latin of an accent of such nature that the entire mass of early prosodic phenomena is explained thereby.* Accordingly, every case as mentioned above is part and parcel of the theory of the Pyrrhic Stress or Double Accent. They are not exceptions. The theory is indeed the "key that will unlock all doors." For the original statement and subsequent development of the new doctrine, see the *University of Virginia Bulletin of the School of Latin*, Nos. 1-10 (1908-1919).

The purpose of this thesis, then, is not to advance any new ideas concerning Latin versification. On the contrary, rather, I have attempted to gather together here, with impartial mind, the various phenomena, the so-called exceptions to classical or Augustan verse, of the Romans' earlier poetry and to let them speak for themselves; then after a careful analysis of the examples, an

* This theory will be discussed and examined below.

attempt has been made to systematize and unify the results, and thus determine just exactly what was the true nature of the Latin accent. As will be seen, only one theory of accent is acceptable; that is to say, the theory of the Pyrrhic or Bi-syllabic Stress. For I have been careful to restore the manuscript reading in every case possible, and this important result has been obtained often only if the Double Accent of Pyrrhic Intensity is accepted as the basis of verse: cf. *Indoeuropean Rhythm* 21 ff.

Keeping this all important fact steadily in view, I have adopted for the title of this *opusculum* *Quantitative Implications of the Pyrrhic Stress*; for the more one examines the phenomena of this earlier versification, the more one will be struck by the fact that they, when quantitatively viewed, imply the utter unfamiliarity on the part of the Roman with the quantitative metric which the Hellenizing frauds of later times attempted to foist upon the people. In short, every case collected here can be explained only on the assumption of the existence of Professor FitzHugh's Pyrrhic Stress. In every instance the facts will show that the accentual principle is the fundamental basis of the verse, and not the quantitative measures employed in Greek: all Latin verse from first to last is a *dinumeratio temporum*, or double stress count, and differs only from English in being thus doubly rhythmical.*

C. E. Bennett would have us believe otherwise: for he says: "Is Latin metrical or accentual? It cannot be both."† And to this question he attempts to make reply: "If the stresses are apprehended in consciousness as the basis of the rhythm, we then get an accentual poetry, and why such a poetry should have been constructed on the severe quantitative principles of classical verse would be an inexplicable mystery."§ To this I would reply that Latin poetry, the early mass of it at any rate, is not constructed on "severe quantitative principles" in a thorough going fashion. Proof of this in abundance will be found below. And should anyone object to the offering of Plautus and Terence, and their predecessors and contemporaries, as proof, I would remind them that Vergil too, when he finds it expedient, disregards mere quantity.‖ For in the final analysis we discover these quantitative measures to be a mere sophistication, a disguise, a camouflage, only laboriously and artificially elaborated and conventionalized by successive ages of Hellenizing imitation, and serving no other conceivable purpose than that of a false-face in mimicry of Greek verse and in dissimulation of the real underlying truth of the accentual *dinumeratio temporum*, or rhythm of the double accent: cf. *Prolegomena to the History of Italico-Romanic Rhythm*, University of Virginia, 1908, and subsequent *Bulletins of the School of Latin* (2-10); *Glotta* VIII. 248; *The Old-Latin and Old-Irish Monuments*, Introduction (pp. 1-16).

* Cf. *The Old-Latin & Old-Irish Monuments of Verse*, Introduction (University of Va., 1919).

† *American Journal of Philology* (XX), page 413.

§ *op. cit.* p. 417.

‖ Vergil: *Obstipui steteruntque comae uox faucibus haesit.*

Horace: *Nullius addictus iurare in uerba magistri; and many others.*

II

The Tripudic Theory

Introductory Remarks. The earliest remains of Roman literature are composed in the Saturnian metre, which indubitably rests upon an accentual basis. For the Greek-loving Roman, however, this native metre in all the beauty of its virile and thunderous rhythm was considered to be too "barbaric", purely, no doubt, because it was indigenously Roman and unlike anything that their gods, the Greeks, possessed. Hence, the Romano-Hellenes, with a carefully worked out piece of propaganda, attempted to foist upon the Roman people the quantitative measures employed by the Greeks, and endeavored to effect a substitution of emasculated Greek quantities and measures for the very masculine accentual principles that really underlay all Roman speech. As a result, they were only partially successful—at least at first. The hundreds of verses gathered here from the works of the early Roman poets show us only too well that quantities have in every instance been disregarded. To read, however, a book of Vergil or of any of the so-called Augustan poets, it would seem at first glance that we would be forced to admit that they were meticulously careful of quantities. But this is true only at the first glance. To deny the fact that the Augustan poets had an artificial standard (apparently) of literary form would be hypocrisy. Surely it must be confessed that they differed materially from the earlier poets.

Wherein does this difference consist? The answer may be given in almost a word. Vergil and his crowd were a deal more sophisticated in Greek metrics than were Plautus and his crowd. Hence the difference—Vergil knew how carefully to conceal the real accentual basis of his poetry under a system of irrelevant longs and shorts, while Plautus was not so well practiced in the art of quantitative camouflage. And even Vergil was not always equal to the strain; for there are numbers and numbers of his verses which show a calm disregard for quantity.* Some of these are explained as "retaining the original quantity" of the vowel in question; others are merely "lengthened or shortened arbitrarily". The whole truth of the matter is, however, that the native double accent of every word of sufficient length is receiving its full due. For this accent embraced two short syllables, so-called, or one long syllable. Hence it could shorten a long syllable, in order to obtain the needed two shorts, if necessary; or it could lengthen a short syllable simply by expending its normal durational strength upon it. Either case was perfectly normal and natural to the Roman. Cf. *The Sacred Tripudium* 19, *Indoeurop. Rhythm* 30ff, *Glotta* VIII: 241 ff., *Old-Latin and Old-Irish Monuments*, p. 24.

*Notice, for example, such verses as the following taken from the *Aeneid*: Book 1-2, *Italiam*; 8, *mihi*; 41, *unius*; 65, *tibi*; 67, *mihi*; 114, *ipsius*; 308, *uidet*; 326, *mihi*; 383, *Sychaeus* (cf. 348); 478, *puluīs*; 651, *peteret*; 668, *iactetur*; 724, *crateras*; Book II-735, *nescio*; Book III-602, *scio*; 681, *constiterunt*; Book IV-217, *potitur*; 409, *feruere*; etc., etc.

This fact is amply illustrated in the comedies of Plautus and Terence who modeled their plays more upon the speech of everyday life than did their successors more cultivated in the art of the Greeks. Hence, we find in the writings of the early Roman poets phenomena that do not occur in the works of later authors. The real accent of the word is not so well disguised under a cover of fraudulent quantities; and we do not find such a line in the later poets, as Terence, *Eunuchus* 343, in which the pyrrhic nature of the Latin accent is made manifest:

íllā sēse íntērēā cōmmōdum hūc āduōrtērāt

$\tilde{A} - \tilde{A} \mid \tilde{A} - \tilde{A} \mid G : \tilde{A} \mid G - \tilde{A} \mid \tilde{A} - \tilde{A} \mid G - G =$ The Latin *dinumeratio temporum* where A and G represent acute and grave respectively, the Greek ictus being indicated only in the lower line.

The Tripudic Accentual System. For convenience of statement the following symbols are always utilized in works pertaining to the Tripudium. In addition to the two indicated below, the so-called zero tone, written O, was formerly in use. This latter tone, however, which occurred only medially, has been replaced by the simple grave tone, marked G, because subsequent investigation has shown that the medial grave did not differ from the final grave. In like manner, the circumflex stresses, marked AG and AO respectively, have also been discarded, because such change of stress in the same syllable would occasion syllabic fracture. Such tones are therefore become simple acute stresses, marked A, freshly initiated on the syllable in question; for Professor FitzHugh's latest announcement of the tripudic accentual system, see the Introduction to Bulletin No. 10 on *The Old-Latin and Old-Irish Monuments of Verse*, University of Virginia, 1919:

A=The Latin acute or pyrrhic stress, falling initially and medially. It must necessarily redouble itself on an iambic beginning, in order not to shorten the long syllable. Its medial position is always an exact pyrrhic base of a long or two shorts. If such an exact pyrrhic base occurs before a short penult, it will occupy it in the antepenultimate position, otherwise in the penultimate.

G=The Latin grave or weak stress, falling medially and finally, and requiring only brachysyllabic support.

To illustrate, then, what has just been said we apply our symbols in the following manner:-

$\tilde{A} \tilde{A} \tilde{G}$
triumpe,
 A - A - G

$\tilde{A} \tilde{A} \tilde{G}$
versutum,
 A - A - G

$\tilde{A} \tilde{A} \tilde{G} \tilde{G}$
incurrere,
 A - A - G - G

$\tilde{A} \tilde{A} \tilde{G}$
Semones,
 A - A - G

$\tilde{A} \tilde{A} \tilde{G}$
superare
 A - A - G

$\tilde{A} \tilde{A} \tilde{G} \tilde{A}$
qui primus ab,
 A - A - G - A

$\tilde{A} \tilde{A}$
Lares,
 A - A

$\tilde{A} \tilde{G}$
Marmar,
 A - G

$\tilde{A} \tilde{G}$
facile,
 A - G

subigit,
A - G

neve,
A - G

memorem,
A - G

censor,
A - G

imperator,
A - G - A - G

advocabitis,
A - G - A - G - G

tempestates,
A - G - A - G

Scipio,
A - G - G

omnia,
A - G - G

insece,
A - G - G

facilius,
A - G - G

praeterieris.
A - A - G - G

Accordingly, we see that Tripudic Rhythm is a rhythm of contrasted stress or the double thesis, which has absolutely nothing in common either with the quantitative thesis or the ictusless arsis of Greek. It is a rhythm of the double accent, rhythmical arsis, and continuous ictus. Its sole rhythmic law is the maintaining of the *dinumeratio* or double count of the stresses, which requires that all change of cadence in the main course of the rhythm must be accomplished on the double accent or rhythmical arsis (acute arsis): *Bulletin No 10. (The Old-Latin and Old-Irish Monuments of Verse)*, Introduction, pp. 8-10.

Further Remarks on the Tripudic Accentual System. Impartial and critical examination of the various phenomena of Latin versification reveals to us the indubitable existence of a stress accent for Latin speech, and not a mere musical tone, a raising or lowering of the pitch of the uttered sound, like that of ancient Greek. In addition, the same facts show us that "Latin accent falls rhythmically in Latin speech from the beginning to the end of the word-foot, and not arrhythmically as in Greek." In other words, we find that the so-called Sacred Tripudium, in the various forms in which it manifests itself, is the accentual norm of Latin verse. That is, it is an arsisless measure, in which an initial acute thesis is contrasted with a medial or secondary acute or grave stress in arsis. Thus in every Latin word or word-group of sufficient length we may have two acute stresses and any number of grave stresses, dependent upon the length of the word or word-group in question. There are only two cases in which this is not strictly true. (1) In disyllables which are quantitatively written $\bar{\text{—}}$ we have no grave accent at all but find the scansion of such words as *mari* thus: A-A, in contradistinction to such a word as *mare* which has only one acute stress A, or *frater*, A-G. (2) The second and final exception is to be found in words quantitatively written $\bar{\text{—}} - \text{***} \dots$, that is, in words of more than three syllables, the first two syllables of which form an iambus. Thus, for example, we have *oboedire* which would be scanned A-A-A-G. In all other cases the above statement holds good and the two exceptions are so through necessity. No human lungs could naturally pronounce the words otherwise. Cf. *Old-Latin and Old-Irish Mon.* 6f.

The Beginning of the Penultimate Law. Before proceeding further, it seems best to say a few words concerning this double acute accent so universally prevalent in all Latin speech. Latin accent, so far at any rate as its off-spring, the Romanic languages, bear witness, was an accent of intensity. It is just this which has weakened the medial and final syllables, at times to their total extinction, and was the most powerful of all agents in the formation of the Romanic tongues. This accent of intensity, it is maintained, hit the long penultimate of each word and hit the antepenultimate, long or short, if the penultimate was short. It was thus, as is further maintained, influenced by quantity and could never recede further back than the third syllable before the last. Whence arose our so-called Penultimate Law of Latin Accentuation.

However, this medial acute accent did not exist alone. Of this fact there can be no doubt. M. Vendryes, in his very excellent work on Latin accent, has this to say (*Recherches* etc. p. 15): Plusieurs faits semblent prouver que cet accent n'existait pas seul et qu'il était accompagné d'un contre-accent au commencement du mot (cf. V. Henry, *Précis*, 5^e éd., p. 103). On observe une intensité particulière de l'initiale en roumain (cf. Philippide, *Forsch. zur roman. Philologie, Festgabe für H. Suchier*, p. 44) et surtout en italien où la consonne qui termine la première syllabe est fréquemment redoublée, par exemple dans *rettorica, seppelire, pellegrino, scellerato*, etc. (cf. Schuchardt, *Romania*, VI, 593 et Meyer-Lübke, *Italienische Grammatik*, p. 154, § 267). Ce redoublement de la consonne tient sans doute à la "prononciation en staccato" qui est propre à l'italien (cf. Gröber, *Commentationes Wolfflinianae*, p. 171), mais il est dû en dernière analyse au caractère intensif de la syllabe initiale.

Une autre preuve, plus importante, de l'intensité relative des syllabes initiales est fournie par le traitement des voyelles. Bien que l'initiale n'ait jamais été traitée comme la syllabe accentuée (cf. ce qui se passe dans la flexion ancienne du verbe français *laver* de *lauare*: *je lef, tu leves, il leve, nous lavons, vous lavez, ils levent*; d'après Darmesteter, *Gramm. histor.*, I, p. 42), toutefois elle semble jouir de prérogatives spéciales par rapport aux syllabes inaccentuées (cf. pour le français, Darmesteter, *op. cit.*, I, 95); elle semble porter un contre-accent d'autant plus fort que le mot est plus long. Ce fait a été très bien observé par M. Meyer-Lübke (*Gramm. des langues rom.*, I, §§ 341 et 610), qui en fournit des exemples typiques: italien *Firenze* de *Floréntia*, mais *Fiórentíno* de *Flórentínus*; *burrásca*, mais *bórrascóso*, français *chalit* de *cátaléctum*, mais *chevestre* de *capístrum*. Thus Romance, and in particular the Gallic-Romance, possessed a contre-accent attested by numerous examples. Also according to the testimony of the Indo-European tongues, this intense accent tended to occupy spontaneously only two positions in the word: the initial and a medial. Cf. *Bulletin No 10 (Old-Latin and Old-Irish, etc.)* p. 21f.

Latin is no exception to this rule. It had, and always did have from its beginning to its downfall, both of these accents and both too simultaneously.

Our so-called Penultimate Law of Latin Accentuation, then, is only a half truth. But for that very reason it is all the more able to deceive and all the more pernicious in its deception: *Indoeuropean Rhythm* 52 ff.

The Tripudium. To continue now our study of the evidences of this accent in Latin, it is extremely interesting to note what conclusions were arrived at, regarding Latin accent in speech and verse, as early as 1789 (?) and by no less a person than Thomas Jefferson. In a letter to M. F. J. de Chastellux he has the following remarks to make (*Letters of Thomas J; conc. Philol. and the Classics* 8):

Among the topics of conversation which stole off like so many minutes the few hours I had the happiness of possessing you at Monticello, the measures of English verse was one. I thought it depended like Greek and Latin verse, on long and short syllables arranged into regular feet. You were of a different opinion. I did not pursue this subject after your departure, because it always presented itself with the painful recollection of a pleasure which in all human probability I was never to enjoy again. This probability like other human calculations has been set aside by events; and we have again discussed on this side the Atlantic a subject which had occupied us during some pleasing moments on the other. A daily habit of walking in the Bois de Boulogne gave me an opportunity of turning this subject in my mind and I determined to present you my thoughts on it in the form of a letter. I for some time parried the difficulties which assailed, but at length I found that they were not to be opposed, and their triumph was complete. Error is the stuff of which the web of life is woven, and he who lives longest and wisest is only able to weave out the more of it. I began with the design of converting you to my opinion that the arrangement of long and short syllables into regular feet constituted the harmony of English verse. I ended by discovering that you were right in denying that proposition. The next object was to find out the real circumstance which gives harmony to English poetry and laws to those who make it. I present you with the result. It is a tribute due to your friendship. It is due you also as having recalled me from an error in my native tongue and that, too, in a point the most difficult of all others to a foreigner, the law of its poetical numbers.*

At this point follows Jefferson's essay which he called *Thoughts on English Prosody*. It will not be necessary to quote the essay in its entirety, as the conclusions at which Jefferson arrived may be gathered from the former part of it. The first few paragraphs will suffice to show the results:

Every one knows the difference between verse and prose in his native language; nor does he need the aid of prosody to enable him to read or to repeat verse according to its just rhythm. It is the business of the poet so

**Memorial Edition*, Vol. XVIII, p. 414.

to arrange his words as that, repeated in their accustomed measures, they shall strike the ear with that regular rhythm which constitutes verse.

It is for foreigners principally that Prosody is necessary; not knowing the accustomed measures of words, they require the aid of rules to teach them those measures and to enable them to read verse so as to make themselves or others sensible of its music. I suppose that the system of rules or exceptions which constitutes Greek and Latin prosody, as shown with us, was unknown to those nations, and that it has been invented by the moderns to whom those languages were foreign. I do not mean to affirm this, however, because you have not searched into the history of this art, nor am I at present in a situation which admits of that search. By industrious examination of the Greek and Latin verse it has been found that by pronouncing certain combinations of vowels and consonants long and certain others short, the actual arrangement of those long and short syllables, as found in their verse, constitutes a rhythm which is regular and pleasing to the ear, and that pronouncing them with any other measures, the run is unpleasing, and ceases to produce the effect of verse. Hence it is concluded and rationally enough that the Greeks and Romans pronounced those syllables long or short in reading their verse; and as we observe in modern languages that the syllables of words have the same measure both in verse and prose, we ought to conclude also that they had the same also in those ancient languages, and that we must lengthen or shorten in their prose the same syllables which we lengthen or shorten in their verse. Thus, if I meet with the word *praeteritos* in Latin prose and want to know how the Romans pronounced it, I search for it in some poet and find it in the line of Vergil :

O mihi praeteritos referat si Jupiter annos!

where it is evident that *prae* is long and *u* short in direct opposition to the pronunciation which we often hear. The length allowed to a syllable is called its quantity, and hence we say that the Greek and Latin languages are to be pronounced according to quantity.

Those who have undertaken to frame a prosody for the English language have taken quantity for their basis and have mounted the English poetry on Greek and Latin feet. If this foundation admits of no question the prosody of Doctor Johnson, built upon it, is perhaps the best. He comprehends under three different feet every combination of long and short syllables which he supposes can be found in English verse, to wit: 1. a long and a short, which is the trochee of the Greeks and Romans; 2. a short and a long, which is their iambus; and 3. two shorts and a long, which is their anapest. And he thinks that all English verse may be resolved into these feet.

It is true that in the English language some one syllable of a word is always sensibly distinguished from the others by an emphasis of pronunciation or by an accent as we call it. But I am not satisfied whether this

accented syllable be pronounced longer, louder, or harder, and the others shorter, lower, or softer. I have found the nicest ears divided on the question. Thus in the word *calenture*, nobody will deny that the first syllable is pronounced more emphatically than the others; but many will deny that it is longer in pronunciation. In the second of the following verses of Pope, I think there are but two short syllables:

"Oh! be thou bless'd with all that Heaven can send,
Long health, long youth, long pleasure, and a friend."

Innumerable instances like this might be produced. It seems, therefore, too much to take for the basis of a system a postulatum which one half of man-kind will deny. But the superstructure of Doctor Johnson's prosody may still be supported by substituting for its basis accent instead of quantity; and nobody will deny us the existence of accent.

In every word of more than one syllable there is some one syllable strongly distinguishable in pronunciation by its emphasis or accent.*

FitzHugh who has so admirably edited the *Letters of Thomas Jefferson Concerning Philology and the Classics* takes occasion to show the remarkable coincidence of relationship between the results of Jefferson and his own, and has a *propos* of this essay, so clearly and concisely summarized the Tripudic doctrine that it would be presumption on my part to attempt a summary more brief or more exact. Hence, I quote at length.†

"It is well worth while to point out in detail how fruitful of results the application of Jefferson's method of examining the phenomena of ancient verse has been in revealing the secrets of ancient pronunciation, accent, and rhythm. Applying it, for example, to the Greek field—when we examine the rhythm of Greek verse, say Homer's first line:

Μῆνιν ἄειδε θεὰ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος,

we observe that the *rhythm* of the language, which is marked by the beat of the six ictuses on the long syllables, is entirely independent of the *accent*, with which it may or may not coincide in any word or foot. It follows, therefore, inevitably, that the rhythm of classical Greek must have been a mere rhythm of structure, in which the rhythmic beat of the language was determined by the long or heavy syllables, and that the accent of classical Greek could have had no emphasis on it, since if it had been an energetic accent like ours, and indeed like the Latin accent, it could not possibly have been so independent of, and indifferent to, the beat of Greek rhythm, but, on the contrary, must necessarily have coincided with it; otherwise the beat of the accent would often have jangled with the beat of the rhythm. In other words, a syllable-counting rhythm of structure, as in early Greek, Persian, and Indian, is only compatible with a musical, not with a stress, accent.

*Memorial Edition, Vol. XVIII, p. 415.

†*Letters of Thomas Jefferson Concerning Philology and the Classics*, p. 11 et seqq.

"On the other hand, an examination of the facts of Latin versification reveals an utterly different situation. The quantitative element proves to be only an unnecessary conformity to Greek usage, and not to be as in Greek in any way independent of the accent of the words. In Latin verse, for example, a word of two or three short syllables never has the rhythmical beat on the second syllable, which is perfectly legitimate in Greek, and must necessarily occur in Latin if its rhythm is a *bona fide* rhythm of quantity.* It follows, therefore, inevitably, that Latin rhythm can only be a rhythm of stress accent, and not of syllable-counting, as in ancient Greek, Indian, and Persian, and that its apparent quantitative structure is only an artificial and superfluous garb, put on in imitation of Greek poetry.

"If, then, Latin rhythm is really accentual as in English and modern speech generally, and not quantitative as in Greek, we may further apply Jefferson's method of inquiry to determine how the Romans stressed their words, since the stressing of poetry must necessarily accord with the accent of prose. Now a word like *praeteritos* is not only stressed in Latin verse on the first and last syllables, but also on the second alone, never on the third; and a word like *orator* is found in poetry either as *orator* or as *orator*. It follows inevitably from all these facts that every Latin word had an initial accent: and when of sufficient length a medial accent besides, and that this accent was so energetic as to require a long or two short syllables for its uninterrupted support:

Ó míhi práetérítós réferát sí Júpiter ánnos!
(A - A A - A - G A - G A - A - G - G A - G)

Latin rhythm is therefore the rhythm of the *double* accent, and the Latin accent was what we may call a superstress, because it was of two fold or pyrrhic intensity.

"Jefferson's philological insight was far in advance of his generation, and the scientific results achieved along these lines since his day have rested solidly upon the foundations unerringly posited a century ago in his own thinking. In the midst of scientific error and darkness, he saw where the light was clearest, and moored his bark accordingly. Two baleful errors have beset the pathway of philological inquiry for two millennia. The first has been the unsuspecting acceptance of the Latin tradition of accent and rhythm as *bona fide* and genuine: we have now discovered that the whole business goes back to a Greek forgery, the object of which was to falsify the true nature of Latin accent and versification and represent the former as musical instead of stressful, and the latter as quantitative instead of accentual. The second source of error and confusion has been ignorance of the real nature of accent and therefore of the fundamental difference between the musical accent, with its elevation of tone, and the stress accent, with its strength of tone: we have discovered only within the last half-

*The italics are my own. Relative to this point, it may be remarked that Leo's *subigit* in the second Scipionic inscription is a tonic impossibility. The Latin thesis cannot be divided against itself, but must be all thesis or all arsis: *Sacred Tripudium* 55.

century that only the latter involves that throb of the breath which determines the measured beat or count of rhythm, whereas the former, the musical accent, being without energy, cannot enter as an element into the rhythmic count of human speech.

"Jefferson recognized the limitations of the contemporary knowledge of accent, and therefore waited for more light, while meantime holding fast to the sure and safe anchor of rhythm as clearly revealed in the quantitative garb of classic verse. 'Of the origin of accentuation,' he writes to John Adams in 1819 from Monticello, 'I have never seen satisfactory proofs. But I have generally supposed the accents were intended to direct the inflections and modulations of the voice, but not to affect the quantity of syllables' (Memorial Edition, Vol. XV, p. 185).

"Letter to John Adams: Monticello, 1819.

Against reading Greek by accent, instead of quantity, as Mr. Ciceitira proposes, I raise both my hands. What becomes of the sublime measure of Homer, the full sounding rhythm of Demosthenes, if, abandoning quantity, you chop it up by accent? What ear can hesitate in its choice between the two following rhythms?

Τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς

and

Τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς

the latter noted according to prosody, the former by accent, and dislocating our teeth in its utterance; every syllable of it, except the first and last, being pronounced against quantity. And what becomes of the art of prosody? Is that perfect coincidence of its rules with the structure of their verse, merely accidental? or was it of design, and yet for no use? (Memorial Edition, Vol. XV, p. 184).

"Jefferson the philologist was right: he clung to the known truth of rhythm against the unknown truth of accent, and we have since discovered that the latter is in perfect accord with the former. The Latin accent is stressful and determines Latin rhythm, while quantity in Latin is a mere superfluous dress in slavish imitation of Greek usage. The Greek classic accent is musical and therefore does not clash with Greek rhythm, which is structural and quantitative and therefore quite independent of the musical tone of the Greek accent. Consequently, in Homer's line:

Τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς

the rhythmic beat of the ictus is not violated by the musical cadence of the accents, any more than the rhythm of music is violated by its particular melody or tune."

The Pyrrhic Stress. From what has just been said concerning the accentuation of such words as *praeteritos* and *orator*, it is clear that Latin rhythm is the rhythm of the *double* accent, and that the Latin accent was a so-called superstress because it was of twofold or pyrrhic intensity. Classic verse everywhere bears testimony to the historical persistence of this pyrrhic superstress. As has been said, such pyrrhic combinations are confined entirely to thesis or entirely to arsis, because they represent a single unified acute breath-throb which being uninterrupted cannot be divided between thesis and arsis. Consequently, the two syllables that happen to fall within the scope of the superstress, be they initial or medial, are connected inseparably in one and the same count. That is, they must be *all* thesis or *all* arsis. Hence: *mare*, never *ma-re*; *praeterita* or *praeterita*, never *praeterita*. This last, however, is unimpeachable in a purely quantitative rhythm like the ancient Greek.* Cf. *Bulletin* No. 10, p. 24f.

Thus the Latin superstress solves every problem of Latin quantitative structure and places it on a normal basis. Wherever and whenever popular usage in rapid utterance permitted two successive syllables to be pronounced in one single acute stress, both syllables immediately became short, and this regardless of their usual quantity. In this way are explained all such examples as will be found in Part II: *esses*, *nempe*, *me*, *mille*, etc. Thus the pyrrhic stress, whenever in popular usage insufficient time was given to its normal strength to expand itself, readily tended to overflow to the succeeding syllable which discarded the remainder of its tone and became short if it had previously been long: *Indo-european Rhythm* 21.

Necessary Alternation and Coincidence of Accent and Ictus. Latin rhythm may be characterized as an arsisless rhythm of contrasted theses. It has no arsis in the Greek sense; it is indeed well called "thesis-mad."† Thus Diomedes (Keil I, 479): "... est palinbaccius, Latius, qui et Santurnius, ultimibrevi, quem quidam propompicon, alii theseleon vocant." With true Attic wit the secret is out; that is, *thesis* and *thesis*. In other words, every stress element in the word is thesis if necessary, and if not, a *rhythmical* arsis; that is, the arsis has its own rhythm and therefore its own ictus as well as the thesis, and consequently real conflict of rhythmical ictus and word accent is an impossibility.§ Cf. *Adelphoe* 690:

quid fieret? qua fieret? si te mi ipsum pudit proloqui.

*It is interesting to note that FitzHugh has conclusively proven that in iambic and trochaic verse at least one of the two theses in every μέτρον, or dipody, must be acutely accentual: *Indoeur. Rhy.* 21 ff. Cf. McLemore, *The Tradition of the Latin Accent*, p. 91.

†Cf. *The Sacred Tripudium*, p. 23.

§Thus K. Meyer's triumphant assault (Berlin Acad. Abhandl. 1913, No. 6, p. 4) becomes triumphant nonsense, as everyone who understands what Professor FitzHugh has written will see at a glance: *Old-Lat. & Old-Ir. Mon.*, p. 13.

Here is an excellent illustration of the above statement. In the one instance we find *fierét*; in the other, *fiéret*, thus showing that either part of the word may be considered as thesis. Innumerable examples of such phenomena are to be found throughout both Plautus and Terence.

From such phenomena the peculiarity of this rhythm of the double accent is self-evident; that is to say, it readily involves a rhythmical alternation, as well as coincidence, of word accent and metrical ictus in the harmony of the verse. Thus the rhythm of *uisceribus* in Vergil, *Aeneid* III, 622 (say) is

Uíscéríbùs míserórum ét sánguínè uéscítur átrò.
 Á - Á | Ġ - Á | Á : Á | Á - Ġ | Ġ - Á | Ġ - Ġ | Á - Ġ

Here it is readily seen that the first ictus coincides with the word accent, but according to what has just been said the second ictus necessarily and naturally in Latin alternates with it.* It is further to be noted that this phenomenon is an artistic impossibility in any of our modern rhythms, which are rhythms of the single accent. And in the next word-foot we find that we have once again the coincidence of accent and thesis-ictus, and, as it happens, this continues throughout the verse. Cf. the Introduction to Bulletin No. 10 (*Old-Latin and Old-Irish Monuments*, p. 8), which furnishes the text of Professor FitzHugh's paper announced in December 1918 (A. P. A. iii), *The Necessary and Natural Conflict, as well as Harmony, of Accent and Ictus in Italic and Celtic Rhythm of the Double Accent*.

Hence, as Professor FitzHugh has shown, we find that the old Christian hymns are rhythmically perfect, as we should have expected them to be, and not monstrous and barbarous, as the great Greek lie would have had us believe. Like the Saturnian poetry itself, the non-quantitative Late Latin verse is the

*My attention has been called to a recent article (1919) in one of our numerous "Transactions of the Philological Zunft," which attempts to assert, with statistics (!), that "we find a strong and nearly consistent effort to place the verse ictus upon accented syllables." Only ignorance on the part of editor and contributor can be urged in excuse for such effusions now fully a dozen years after Professor FitzHugh has published to the world his *Prolegomena*. From what has just been said it will be clear to every sincere scholar that all this twaddle about a "tendency toward harmony of accent and ictus" in Plautus and Terence or any other competent Latin verse is mere empty vaporizing; for real conflict of accent and ictus is a physical impossibility in the rhythm of the double accent. Conflict is as necessary, natural, and purposive as harmony, and is intended to emphasize the rhythm of arsis, precisely as harmony does that of thesis. Our investigator ludicrously shows that the structure of Plautine iambs and trochaics "tends to place the ictus upon the penult of the syllabic group" 58 per cent of the time," and thus triumphantly hoists himself with his own petard. On the inherent absurdity of such make-believe philology as *Class. Phil.* XIV, 234 and the like, cf. FitzHugh, *Prolegomena to the History of Italic-Romanic Rhythm*, 1908, and *The Old-Latin and Old-Irish Monuments of Verse*, 10, 1919 (Bulletins Nos. 1 and 10 respectively).

pure and native *dinumeratio*, or rhythm of the double accent, and passed as such into the versification of the Romanic world (*Letters of Thomas Jefferson concerning Philology and the Classics*, p. 13, note):

Amávit Chrístus Cómgillùm. A-A G-A G-A A-G

Múndus ístè tránsíbít. A-G A-G A-A G

Fidè fúndátà cértà. A-G A-A G-A G

Grégísquè Chrísti cáulà. A-A G-A G-A G

PART II

MANIFESTATIONS OF THE LATIN ACCENT

Part II.

I

Explanation of Division of Examples

We are now prepared to produce the examples gathered from our authors, which indubitably prove to us that the quantitative system of metrics used in writing Latin verse is not the fundamental basis upon which Latin poetry rested. Before exhibiting this evidence, however, a word of explanation will be necessary to justify the present division of our illustrations, and to make clearer our *modus operandi*.

I have, on the whole, with a few modifications of my own, followed the traditional division of all editors who attempt to explain the apparent irregularities of the earlier Roman poets. Upon examination we find the following to be an approximate statement of the various phenomena as they occur:

(a) *Manifestations of the so-called Iambic Law.* This exceedingly important principle will be discussed in detail in Part III, section I, of this work. In our detailed selection of examples we have not attempted to gather a single case of this phenomenon, unless it be of an importance not to be overlooked. Our reasons for this and a full discussion, however, will be found in the proper place.

(b) *Final S.* The part played by an *s* final in making position is of an extremely variable nature. Up to the time of Cicero, final *s* was faintly pronounced. Even in Cicero's early poetry this *s* was disregarded, but later he informs us* that the neglect of *s* final was considered *iam subrusticum, olim autem politius*. In Plautus, Terence, etc., accordingly, syllables ending in *s* preceded by a short vowel, often remain short even before a following consonant.

(c) *A Mute plus L or R.* Contrary to what has been said in the preceding paragraph, a syllable ending in a short vowel before a mute followed by *L* or *R*, is not *syllaba anceps*, but remains short. This is of such common occurrence that, like the two preceding cases, no examples have been gathered; but illustrations and discussion have been reserved for Part III, section VII, where they will be taken up in detail.

**Orator*, 48, 161.

(d) *Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.* Editors inform us that even in places where the Iambic Law does not apply, the pronoun *ille* sometimes shows the "apparent" scansion *ille*. But, say they, the correct explanation is probably that the final *e* is treated as a silent letter. Similarly, too, is to be explained the "apparent" *quippe, unde, iste, nempe, inde, etc.* And, since we have proceeded thus far we may as well continue, perhaps *immo*, in *immo uero*, may also be thus accounted for!

Every such case as just mentioned has been carefully gathered and listed; for it is in just such words as these that we may best expect our Tripudic principle to be at work. All such examples have been carefully listed under the general head of "*Nempe, Ille, Quippe, Etc.*" With regard to the above hypothesis, I have nothing to say in this place. A full discussion will be found in Part III, section V.

(e) *Word-combinations with Quidem.* In word-combinations of *quando, si, tu, te, and me* with *quidem*, the long vowel of the first element is often shortened. Editors write *hic quidem* when the word-group is to be scanned ---, but if the scansion --- is found to be necessary the device (so pleasing to the eye!) of writing *hicquidem* as one word is hit upon. The objections to such a theory, aside from the absurdity of stating that any one particular word is able to shorten one of a group of other words which precedes it, seem to me to be two-fold. 1) If the reader will only examine the examples which are to follow, he will find numerous cases of *hic, me, tu, etc.*, which must be scanned as short and furthermore they are not followed by *quidem*. 2) With barely a half dozen exceptions we may always retain the first element of the word-combination as a long syllable and scan *quidem* as two shorts, according to the Iambic Law. This is perfectly legitimate and does the work very nicely. But, it must be remembered, if we resort to such a device we will simply be removing the phenomenon from one category and placing it in another. In other words, no matter from which angle we may view it, we will have to admit that something out of the ordinary has occurred in that particular word-combination.

However, all such word-combinations have been collected and are to be found among those cases listed under the general head of Shortening. The heading, Shortening, however, includes other phenomena besides that just mentioned. Every case of unusual shortening (such as *esses*, for example, not mentioned by editors) has been included therein, as well as

(f) *Partial- or non-Elision.* Here we find that accented monosyllables, ending in a long vowel, are often merely shortened before a following short vowel or *h*. Similarly, monosyllables bearing the accent, when ending in *m*, are often not elided.

This is really a case of so-called semi-hiatus and will be found discussed in Part III, section IV, 2). All such cases have been collected and included along with those mentioned above under the general term Shortening.

(g) *Synizesis*. The settling together or blending of adjacent vowels of a word into one is frequent in the works of the earlier poets, occurring mainly, of course, in certain words in common use. To be noted also is the special case of words compounded from simple ones, originally distinct and separate.

In the detailed selection of examples to follow, I have not attempted to gather cases of this phenomenon, unless they be of an importance that would brook no omission. In my opinion, this phenomenon is merely an extension of the so-called Iambic Law and hence is closely connected with it. A discussion, however, will be found in the third part of this work, where each of these divisions will be considered in detail.

(h) *Lengthening*. Here we have two kinds of unusual lengthening: original quantity retained, and arbitrary. All these cases have been gathered and collected under the general term Lengthening. At this point I have nothing to say regarding that theory which maintains that the original quantity of certain vowels was long and that the early poets (and the Augustan poets too) often availed themselves of this fact. It is enough here to hint that it is hardly consistent for one and the same poet to make use of this device in one part of the verse and then in the same verse use the same word again but with the then contemporary pronunciation. And this is frequently the case. All such cases of undue lengthening will be found below, but a discussion of the phenomenon has been reserved for a later portion of the work, Part III, section III.

The above, then, are the usual variations from standard usage recognized by scholars. For some cases, it may be observed, more or less rational explanations are offered; but for certain others, the explanations set forth are, at their best, merely wild and far-fetched conjectures. But this fact must be noted: for each variation it has been found necessary to advance a separate explanation, concocted—it seems thus in some instances—to fit the case at hand.

From our illustrations two facts stand forth. In the first place, it is only too plainly seen that quantities were strange and unfamiliar things to the Romans. And secondly, if we apply our Tripudic principle to any one of the above variations from the standard norm, with the possible exception of (b), we note at once that every case resolves itself to a normal and rational explanation, having a single, basic, certain principle at bottom, and not a multitude of uncertain conjectures.

It may be well to add at this point, however, that if any other explanation than unusual shortening, either by semi-hiatus or otherwise, can be offered in scanning any verse, I have not hesitated to adopt this other explanation. The reason is obvious: I do not wish to *create* phenomena in order simply to be able to explain them away. For this reason then many lines that might have been included otherwise, have been omitted. Thus, to cite a definite example, *Bacchides* 1022 may be scanned thus:

ūt t(e) ēī | hābērē grātiam aequōm sīt bōnām
 A - - A A-A-G A-G A-G A - A-A

with hiatus between *ei* and *habere*, or thus:

ūt tē ē(i) hābērē grātiam aequōm sīt bōnām
 A - A A-A-G A-G A-G A - A-A

with so-called semi-hiatus and, therefore, to be included in our list of Shortening. As stated above, I have adopted the former scansion and have thus not cited the verse in my examples, though the latter is free from criticism.

Conversely, I have lengthened vowels usually short only when there can be no other possible explanation. Thus, *Aulularia* 724a must surely be

sēdūlō? | ēgōmēt mē dēfrūdāui
 A-G-G A-G A A-G-A-G

with complete hiatus, as indicated, and not with elision and *egōmet*, as Leo indicates arbitrarily. The objections to such procedures are obvious.

II

Textual Restoration, Etc.

In making these studies with reference to the divergence of the early poets from the usually considered classic norm, I have searched about for the latest work done by scholars in this sphere. As a result, I have used as the basis of my work the edition of Plautus edited by W. M. Lindsay, published by the Oxford University Press, as being the newest and most recent investigation in the Plautine field. For similar reasons the edition of Terence edited by Robert Yelverton Tyrrell, published by the same press mentioned above, has been used. As to the texts used in working up the other poets from whom illustrations have been taken, no one particular edition can be named. *Merry's Fragments of Roman Poetry* has been constantly referred to, but I have by no means confined myself to this work. This subject, however, will be discussed in detail in that portion of the work dealing with Ennius, Naevius, etc.*

The important point to be remembered here is that whenever I have called attention to the fact that the actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained, as I have quite frequently done, I invariably have reference to the texts of Lindsay and Tyrrell as a basis. The text of Lindsay shows a great deal more of independent work than that of Tyrrell. Comparatively speaking, Lindsay only infrequently departs from the reading of the codices, and when he does do so the reason is usually apparent. On the other hand, however, Tyrrell very fre-

*See Part II, *Miscellanea*.

quently departs from the manuscript readings and usually for no cogent reason. Too often has he adopted the reading of former editors, many times unnecessarily, and seldom ventures an original emendation. On the whole, if he had adhered to the traditional reading and had relegated more of Fleckeisen's conjectures to the foot-notes, my task would have been materially lightened.

And now a word must be said with reference to the restoration of the texts as given by the manuscripts. In every single case in which the text has been altered purely for metrical reasons, I have restored and used the manuscript reading with this important result: *with practically no exceptions, all such restorations have been found to be readily scannable simply by applying our Tripudic principle.* If the manuscripts have been found to differ in their reading, as has frequently been the case, the reading adopted has necessarily been more or less arbitrary. However, in the case of Plautus I have almost invariably made use of that reading designated by Lindsay as *codd.* This *siglum* denotes the reading of A and P, A being the *Ambrosianus palimpsestus, saec. iii-iv*; and P being the *archetypus codicum 'Palatinae' recensionis uel fons codicum BCDEVJO et correctionum B'* (see Lindsay's edition of Plautus, *Sigla*). If on the other hand, both A and P have differed, I have used that reading which has appeared to be the true one. With regard to Terence, the codex that has had most weight with me is, of course, A or the *codex Bembinus, saec. iv uel v, in Bibliotheca Vaticana.* In like manner, the best manuscripts of the other authors to whom reference has been made, have been adhered to strictly.

Many are the verses, lyric metres usually of course, which would admit of a different scansion from that of Lindsay's or Tyrrell's. To these I naturally have made no reference even when the text of the manuscript might have been retained by this alternative scansion, unless they are actually related to the matter at hand. As a concrete example, I might cite *Captivi* 509-510, where the reader is asked to compare Lindsay's scansion with that of Leo.

Another point to be noted in connection with my restorations of the original texts is this: the actual reading of the manuscripts has been retained only when editors have found it necessary for them to emend it, *rhythmo consulentes.* If the actual question of rhythm itself is not involved in the emendation, the emendation itself has naturally not entered the scope of this work. Thus, for example, *Amphitruo* 461 and 463 may be scanned equally easily with the manuscript reading of *faciat* and *prospereque* as well as with the emended reading of *faxit* and *prosperet*, respectively. Here the question of sense or good Latin, as it were, is involved and not the question of rhythm. Consequently, in the light of what has just been remarked, these emendations do not enter our sphere of the work, as being extraneous to the matter at hand.

It was not my original intention to restore the manuscript readings of our authors to the extent to which I did. When beginning this study of early Roman metrics, I was at first content to accept the readings as found in the editions of our best known scholars; but as the work progressed, I soon discovered that

emendations had been made more often *rhythmi causa* than for any other reason. As a result I discarded all the data collected up to that point and went back over the entire work, after I had adopted in every verse the reading of the manuscripts. Often the new reading made no difference in the scansion of the verse in question (see the preceding paragraph), but more often I had to include verses formerly omitted. The reader may rest assured then that in all the verses to follow he will find, almost without exception, the reading as actually found in the best codices.

Noteworthy and numerous are the instances in which the true reading of the manuscripts has been restored. And this has been accomplished by beginning the study with an open and impartial mind, and not on the assumption that Latin verse is based upon either a quantitative or an accentual structure. This latter view, however, is all that now can be believed. Never would our manuscripts have borne witness to certain of the readings actually contained therein, if the Romans had not had this vigorous stress accent, the nature of which has been so aptly described as the Bi-syllabic Stress; cf. *The Literary Saturnian* II, p. 104 ff.

III

Manifestations of the Pyrrhic Stress.

In selecting the material wherein the manifestations of the Pyrrhic Stress may be most obviously seen, necessarily a limit must be placed at some point. Consequently, although it would have been highly desirable to cover the entire range of Latin verse, or at least through the classical period, the limit has been placed with the two great comic writers as the latest point. Again, it has been thought best to limit the illustrations gathered from Plautus to ten of this poet's works. The selection of these ten plays has been by no means arbitrary; for I have attempted to avoid all suspicion of partiality in the selection of examples. On the contrary, the ten plays selected are those that would naturally be selected by one working in this field,* if it were found necessary to limit one's researches.

However, the remainder of Plautus's works have not been slighted. At the end of this portion of this *opusculum* there will be found appended a fairly complete list of illustrations gleaned from the other works of the poet, not considered in detail: that is to say, not involved in the selected ten. These illustrations are not intended to be complete, but the reader will find among them the vast majority of the cases in these plays in which the Bi-syllabic Stress has been at work. The plays represented by this latter list are *Asinara*, *Casina*, *Cistellaria*, *Curculio*, *Epidicus*, *Mercator*, *Persa*, *Poenulus*, *Stichus*, and *Truculentus*. The *Vidularia* will not be found included in this list for very necessary reasons. I have not been able to discover a single example in the small portion of it that is extant.

*Duff; *A Literary History of Rome*, p 176.

As to the works of Terence, I have included them in detail in their entirety. The reasons are obvious. There are only six of these plays to be considered and the rhythm of the African is so delicate and polished when compared with that of his predecessor, that it has been thought worth while to include the whole of this poet's works in the discussion. But another and more cogent reason exists. Unlike Plautus, who indulges in a great variety of meters, Terence practically confines himself to the iambic and trochaic measures. Only in the *Andria*, his earliest play, does he experiment slightly with some of the less common lyrical meters. It follows necessarily then that the reading of the text of Terence is more of a certainty than that of Plautus. So far as the latter is concerned, editors find themselves at much variance in regard to many of the passages written in lyrical measures. In all fairness then to those who may take a view different from the one maintained in this study, it must be admitted that these passages are well nigh valueless so far as the matter at hand is concerned. Thus for a scientific study on the true nature of the Latin accent, it would have been little less than charlatanism to omit even the slightest portion from the plays of Terence.

In addition to the plays of Plautus and Terence, use has been made of works of the poets' predecessors. For the very reason that this latter class's works are quite fragmentary it will be found that there exist very few examples showing the influence of the Pyrric Stress. The chief representative is, of course, Ennius. However it may be said at this point that the list is not intended to be complete and has been added only to make this present study more representative. The same phenomena will be found to occur in all cases, a thing which is to be expected of course, but as a matter of fact the works of Plautus and Terence are sufficient proof in themselves—more than sufficient, perhaps; for if such obvious manifestations of the Pyrrhic Stress occur in their works, what could we have discovered had the complete works of the un-Hellenized Naevius not perished?

It is almost needless to add that, although I have consulted Müller's *Plautinische Prosodie*, I have in no manner been influenced by it. Often, it appears, Herr Müller has not retained the manuscript reading (even when he could have done so), but more important still he has often distorted the scansion apparently to suit his own ends. Cf. page 30 and the *Amphitruo*, lines 199 and 601. This is done by Müller in his endeavor to avoid hiatus and at the same time explain the difficulty in question, *which he himself has often created!* Lindsay too is not wholly free from censure. In the *Captivi*, line 372, for example, he either would lengthen *ita* or insert *eam* when a simple hiatus before *ita* would solve the difficulty. Such cases I have not noticed.

In the following cases nothing has been noted when explicable by anything except the influence of the Bi-syllabic Stress. In every instance it will be seen that we can not resolve the difficulty except by recourse to the Pyrrhic Stress. For explanation of the division of the illustrations, see above, page 25 *et seqq.*

Amphitruo:

Lengthening.

- 207, si quae asportassent redderē, se exercitum extemplo domum
439, ubi ego Sosiā nolim esse, tu esto sane Sosia; thus Mercurius replies to Sosia
who in line 438 probably said "Sosiā", and elided *te interrogo*.
*507, opseruatotē, quam blande mulieri palpabitur.
545, prius tua opinione hic adero: bonum animum habe.—
550, et dies e nocte accedāt. ibo et Mercurium supsequar.—
554, mihi praedicas. eccerē, iam tuatim
555, facis, ut tuis nulla apud te fides sit.
587, nunc venis etiam ultro inrisum dominum: quae neque fieri
702, etiam tu quoque adsentaris hūic? quid uis fieri?
988, ille nauem saluam nuntiāt aut irati aduentum senis:

It will be observed in the last example that ille is pyrrhic; thus, ille. In all such verses, that is, those containing two or more different phenomena, reference will be made to the various phenomena in the proper places.

Shortening.

- 331, certe enim hic nescioquis loquitur. saluos sum, non me uidet
354, nescio quam tu familiaris sis: nisi actutum hinc abis
*391, dicito si quid uis, non nocebo. tuae fide credo? meae.
†542, numquid uis? ut quom apsim mē ames, me tuam te apsentī tamen
605, huic homini nescioquid est māli mala obiectum manu
660, meu' uir hicquidem est. sequere hac tu me. nam quid ille reuortitur
*661, qui dudum properare sēse aibat? an ille me temptat sciens
*681, ēt quōm te grauidam et quom te pulchre plenam aspicio, gaudeo.
749, hanç roga. mēquidem praesente numquam factumst, quod sciam
1006, siquidem uos uoltis auscultando operam dare
*1042, nām iam ad regem recta me ducam resque ut facta est eloquor
*1061, ita erae meae hodie contigit. nam ubi parturit, deos sibi inuocat
1063, ubi quisque institerat, concidit crepitu. ibi nescioquis maxuma

Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.

- 69, siue qui ambissent palmam his histrionibus
84, quīve quo placeret alter fecisset minus
156, inde cras quasi e promptaria cella depromar ad flagrum
634, praequam quod molestum est? ita quoīque comparatum est in aetate
hominum
*726, in somnis fortasse. immo uigilans uigilantem. (h)ae misero mihi
745, an etiam id tu scis? quippe qui ex te audiui, ut urbem maxumam

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

†See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

988, ille nauem saluam nuntiat aut irati aduentum senis

The so-called Iambic Law.

For a discussion of the real principle involved in the so-called Iambic Law and for illustrations thereof, see Part III, 1.

Synizesis.

For a discussion of the fundamental basis of the so-called principle of Synizesis and for examples thereof, see Part III, 2.

Final S.

Remarks on, and illustrations of, the variable character of S final will be found in part III, 6.

Mute and Liquid Combination.

A discussion of the variable character of a mute plus L or R, the reason thereof, and illustrations, will be found in Part III, 7.

Aulularia:

Lengthening.

- 13, agri reliquit ēi non magnum modum
135, da mi, optumā feminā, manum
144, id quod in rem tuām optimum esse arbitror
232, et te utār iniquiore ét meu' me ordo inrideat
316, pulmentum pridem eripuit ēi miluos
779, meu' fuit patēr Antimachus, ego uocor Lyconides

Shortening.

- †8, defodit, uenerans mē ut id seruarem sibi
71, nēscio pol quae illunc hominem intemperiae tenent
*171, nōuistin hunc senem Euclionem ex proxumo pauperculum
†227, factiosum, mē item esse hominem pauperum pauperrimum
283, mēquidem hercle, dicam propalam, non diuides
315, censen uero adeo ēsse parcum et misere uiuere
340, turba istaec nulla tibi erit: siquid uti uoles
†444, scis iam meam sententiam.— quō abis? redi rūrsum
†478, nam meo quidem animo sī idem faciant ceteri
†584, Fides, nouisti mē et ego te: caue sis tibi
*643, facin iniuriam mi ānnon? fateor, quia non pendes, maxumam
†680, quamquam hic manere mē erus sese iusserat

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

†See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

688, et caussa iusta est, siquidem ita est ut praedicas

714, Perii, interii, occidi. quo curram? quo non curram? tene, tene. quem
quis?

†715, nescio, nil uideo, caecus eo atque equidem quō eam aut ubi sim aut qui sim

723, peritissimus ego sum omnium in terra

†723a, nam quid mī opust uita, tantum auri

†724a, sedulō? egomet me defrudaui

728, atque hīc quidem Euclio est, ut opinor. oppido ego interii: palamst res

†781, noscere. filiam ex te tū habes. immo éccillam domi.

Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.

*185, iam illic homo aurum me scīt habere, eo me salutat blandius

262 num quae caussa est hodie quin faciāmus immo édepol optuma.

*257, istuc di bene uortant— ita di faxint. illud facito ut memineris

265, illic hinc abiit. di immortales, opsecro, aurum quid ualet!

294, nēmpē sicut dicis. quid? hic non poterat de suo

366, inde coctam susum subducemus corbulis

385, nunc tuscūlum emi et hāsce coronas floreas

460, illic hinc abiit. di immortales, facinus audax incipit

656, perii hercle: ille nunc intus turbat, hunc si amitto hic abierit

679, indeque opseruabo aurum ubi apstrudat senex

707, indeque expectabam, aurum ubi apstrudat senex

710, uideo recipere se senem: ille me non uidet

The So-called Iambic Law.

For a discussion of the real principle involved in the so-called Iambic Law and for illustrations thereof, see Part III, 1.

Synizesis.

For a discussion of the fundamental basis of the so-called principle of Synizesis and for examples thereof, see Part III, 2.

Final S.

Remarks on, and illustrations of, the variable character of S final will be found in Part III, 6.

Mute and Liquid Combinations.

A discussion of the variable character of a mute plus L or R, the reason thereof, and illustrations, will be found in Part III, 7.

†See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

Bacchides:§

Lengthening

123, is stultiōr es barbaro poticio

206, habitāt. ecquidnam meminit Mnesilochi? rogas?

484, mihi discipulus, tibi sodalis periit, hūc filius

631a, uenerāt aurum petere hinc

724-725, Although Lindsay calls this line a Trochaic Septenarius, I am unable to follow his scansion, as he marks bellus thus: bellūs, implying that the u is long. The line is beyond a doubt a Trochaic Septenarius, but a perfectly normal one. See Leo for the proper scansion.

764, nam non conducit hūc sycophantiae

904, It is not necessary to read nihili as Lindsay implies in his note. Scan normally with hiatus between nihili and homo.

932, On this line Lindsay reads: senex uenit diiambus displicet fort. nunc prius huc quam s. u. The line is perfectly normal if read with hiatus between quam and huc.

1087, Quiquomque ubi sunt, qui fuerunt quique futuri sunt posthac

1118, hau morōr. heus Bacchis, iube sis actutum aperiri fores

1127, rerin tēr in anno tu has tonsitari

1163, tun, homo putide, amatōr istac fieri aetate audes? qui non?

1209, neque adeo haec faceremus, ni antehac uidissemus fieri

Shortening.

|| 53, quī, amabo? quia, Bacchis, Bacchas metuo et bacchanal tuom

|| 72, ubi mi prō equo lectus detur, scortum pro scuto accubet

106, simul huic nescioquoui, turbare qui huc it, decedamus hinc

|| 111, namque ita me dī ament, ut Lycurgus mihi quidem

153, nil moror discipulos mi esse iam plenos sanguinis

|| 194, animast amica amanti: si abest, nullus est

|| 215, nullam aequae inuitus specto, si agit Pellio

|| 223, qui dē amittenda Bacchide aurum hic exigit

272, ducentos et mille Philippum. tantum debuit

356, siquidem hic relinquet neque secum abducat senex

|| 374, quae ut aspexi, me continuo contuli protinam in pedes

|| 384, uti eum ex lutulento caeno propere hinc eliciat foras

582, heus, ecquis hic est? ecquis hoc aperit ostium?

583, ecquis exit? Quid istuc? quae istaec est pulsatio?

|| 601, quis tū es? illius sum integumentum corporis

624, Lindsay would read this as an Iambic Dimeter, shortening the final i in peridi. I would suggest reading the verse as a Cretic and leaving the quantities normal.

|| See part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

§ Upon investigation it will be seen that verses 612-670 are of extremely uncertain scansion. Consequently they are of no value so far as this study goes, but for the sake of completeness references, when necessary, have been made to them.

651, nequiu' nil est quam egéns consili seruos, nisi habet
 ||682, quī in mentem venit tibi istuc facinus facere tam malum
 774, atque hīcquidem, opinor, Chrysalust. accessero.
 *797, bene nāuis agitur, pulchre haec confertur ratis
 ||858, nam nī ego exsoluor, iam manifesto hominem opprimet
 ||964, blanditiis exemit et persuasit sē ut amitteret
 || 966, pōste cum magnifico milite, urbis uerbis quī inermis capit
 || 985, tibi me iussit dare. sed metuo nē idem cantant quid priores
 || 1039, uerum, ut ego opinor, si ego in istoc sim loco
 1068, hoc est incepta efficere pulchre: uelutī mi
 || 1082, ego dare me meo gnato institui, ut animo opsequium sumere possit
 1134, quae nec lacte nec lanam ullam habent. sic sine astent
 ||1165, neque te tuost aequom esse iratum: si amānt, sapienter faciunt
 1169, non homo tūquidem es, qui istoc pacto tam lepidam inlepide appelles
 1184, ālterum tantum auri non meream. quid tandem si dimidium auri
 ||1192a, tē amabo et te amplexabor
 *1211, spectatores, uos ualere uolumus, et clāre ādplaudere

Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.

90, ille quidem hanc ābducet: tu nullus adfueris, si non lubet
 189, rogabis me ubi sit: uiuit. Nēmpe recte ualet?
 787, nunc hāsce tabellas ferre me iussit tibi
 886, et ego te et ille mactamus infortunio
 950, dolis égo deprensus sum, ille mendicans paene inuentus interit
 952, uinctus sum, sed dolis me exemi: item se ille seruauit dolis
 966, pōste cum magnifico milite, urbis uerbis quī inermis capit

The Iambic Law.

For a discussion of the real principle involved in the so-called Iambic Law and for illustrations thereof, see Part III, 1.

Synizesis

For a discussion of the fundamental basis of the so-called principle of Synizesis and for examples thereof, see Part III, 2.

Final S.

Remarks on, and illustrations of, the variable character of S final will be found in Part III, 6.

Mute and Liquid Combinations.

A discussion of the variable character of a mute plus L or R, the reason thereof, and illustrations, will be found in Part III, 7.

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

§See Vendryes, page 175 and note. Also cf. Menaechmi 344.

Lengthening.

- 9, *cumque hinc profugiens uendidit in Alide*
 11, *negat hercle illic ultimūs. accedito*
 25, *ut fit in bello, capitur alter filius*
 262, *captus est? ita. non igitur nos soli ignaui fūimus*
 555, *quibus inputari saluti fūit atque is profuit.* Notice in this line that Plautus says *fūit* but *profūit*,
 *791, *eminōr interminorque, nē quis mi opstiterit obuam*
 *834, *respice. Fortuna quod tibi nec facit nec faciēt, hoc me iubes*
 843, *bene facis. iube—. quid iubeam? ignem ingentem fieri*
 900, *cura quam optime potēs. — bene ambula et redambula*
 926, *quomque hunc conspicōr in potestate nostra*
 995, *ēheu, quom ego plus minusque feci quam me aequom fuit*
 998, *Vidi ego multa saepe picta, quae Accherunti fierent*

In this play there are several lines which editors usually emend to avoid an abnormal quantity. Line 372 is an example of this, but this line and others of its ilk have been omitted in giving the above examples. The reason is obvious. Verse 372 which reads according to the Mss. as follows:

quom seruitutem ita fers ut ferri decet

is an Iambic Senarius and, it appears, is usually read *itā* or *q. s. i. f. u. eam f. d.* Neither emendation nor lengthening of the *a* is necessary, but hiatus after *seruitutem* would make the line a perfect Senarius. Hence, as suggested above, all such verses have been omitted without comment; as they are clearly not a part of this study.

Shortening.

- 8, *āterum quadrimum puerum seruos surpuit*
 243, *ut qui erum me tibi fuisse atque ēsse nunc conseruom uelint*
 306, *qui imperare insueram, nunc alterius imperio opsequor*
 350, *fretus ingenio eius, quod me ēsse scit erga sese beniuolum*
 359, *nunc tu illum si illo es missurus, dīce, demonstra, praecipe*
 408, *numquam erit tam auarus quin te gratiis emittat manu*
 *417, *nox diem adimat; nam quasi seruos meus ēssēs, nihilo setius*
 *431, *atque horunc uerborum caussa cauēto mi iratus fuas*
 || 444, *tu hoc age. tu mihī erus nunc es, tu patronus, tu pater*
 459, *eadem percontabor ēcquis hunc adulescentem nouerit*
 *468, *itaque uēnter gutturque resident essurialis ferias*
 *479, *'saluete' inquam. 'quo imus una?' inquam: ad prandium atque illi*
tacent

*The reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

†536, mihi res ōmnis in incerto sita est. quid rebus confidam meis
 558, Hēgiō: fit quod tibi ego dixi, gliscit rabies, caue tibi
 || 600, crucior lapidem non habere mē, ut illi mastigiaē
 657, hīcquidem me numquam inridebat. Colaphe, Cordalio, Corax
 *704 (?), uōtāuisti. qur es ausus mentiri mihi?
 || 780, speroque mē ob hunc nuntium aeternum adepturum cibum
 *791, eminōr interminorque, nē quīs mi opstiterit obuīam
 823, eugepaē! edictiones aedilicias hīcquidem habet
 837, nēscioquem ad portum nactus es ubi cenes, eo fastidis
 866, essurire mihi uidere. mīquidem essurio, non tibi
 920, dicam ut sibi penum aliud ornet, sīquidem sese uti uolet
 || 959, sī eris uerax, tua ex re facies — ex mala meliusculam
 || 968, sī eris uerax, e tuis rebus feceris meliusculas

Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.

39, huius illic, hic illius hodie fert imaginem
 *60, foris illic extra scaenam fient proelia
 *94, nam Aetolia haec est, illic est captus in Alide
 105, ille demum antiquis est adulescens moribus
 109, unde saturitate saepe ego exii ebrius
 128, inde me continuo recipiam rusum domum
 246, pērque conseruitium commune, quod hostica euenit maru
 461, Miser homo est qui ipse sibi quod edit quaerit et id aegre inuenit
 573, nam ille quidem, quem tu hunc memoras esse, hodie hinc abiit Alidem
 *658, ite istinc atque ecferte lora. Num lignatum mittimur?
 751, illic est abductus recta in phylacam, ut dignus est.
 797, umerus aries, tum genu ad quēmque iecero ad terram dabo
 901, illic hinc abiit, mihi rem summam credidit cibariam
 1014, illi; hic iudicium fecit; nam hunc ex Alide huc reducimur

(Note on line 1014: *The line is hardly Iambic though it may be so scanned without reading illi as illi. All editors consider it Trochaic, as it evidently is; for it is found in the midst of a Trochaic system.*)

The Iambic Law.

For a discussion of the real principle involved in the so-called Iambic Law and for illustrations thereof, see Part III, 1.

—————

†See Léo on this verse.

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

Synizesis.

For a discussion of the fundamental basis of the so-called principle of Synizesis and for examples thereof, see Part III, 2.

Final S.

Remarks on, and illustrations of, the variable character of S final will be found in Part III, 6.

Mute and Liquid Combinations.

A discussion of the variable character of a mute plus L or R, the reason thereof, and illustrations, will be found in Part III, 7.

Menaechmi:

Lengthening.

- *31, puer inter homines āberrauit a patre
- 52, uelit, audacter imperato et dicito
- 327, proin tu ne quo abeas longiūs ab aedibus
- 506, sanum est, adulescens, sincipūt, intellego
- 624, num mihi ēs irata saltem? nunc tu non nugas agis
- 755, sed id quam mihi facile sīt hau sum falsus
- 846, priu' quam turbarum quid faciat ampliūs. enim haereo
- 877, qui me ui cogunt ut ualidūs insaniam
- 921, potionis aliquid priu' quam percipīt insania
- 923, dic mihi hoc: solent tibi umquam oculi duri fieri
- 1160, uenibit— uxor quoque etiam, si quis emptor uenerit

Shortening.

- 22, ūt quidem ille dixit mihi qui pueros uiderat
- 146, écquid adsimulo similiter? qui īstic est órnatus tuos
- 152, clam uxorem ubi sepulcrum habeamus ātque hunc comburamus diem
- *229, quām si aduēniens terram uideas quae fuerit tua
- || 238, sumu' circumuecti. sī acum, credo, quaereres
- 309, insanit hīcquidem, qui ipse male dicit sibi
- *321, tibi et parasito et mulieri? quās tū mulieres
- 336, ūt quidem ille insanus dixit qui hinc abiit modo
- †344, nunc in istoc portu stat nāuis praedatoria
- *350 adseruarote haec sī uōlti', nauales pedes
- || 460, sī id ita esset, non ego hodie perdidissem prandium
- || 513, omnis cinaedos esse censes quia tū és

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

†See note on Bacchides 797.

(Note on line 513: In comparing Greek verse with Latin, we say that in the former in an iambic dipody the Greeks allowed the substitution of a spondee or a dactyl for an iambus only in the first half, just as in a trochaic dipody the corresponding substitutions of spondee and anapest were allowed only in the second half. This line can be considered as containing a short tu only if we hold to the theory that the Romans maintained their camouflage in the last half of the last foot: in other words, it seemed to be too great a strain on the Roman to follow the above rule, for he lost all distinction between even and odd feet except in the last. And in this verse Plautus even seems to have let his artificial Hellenistic metrics go whence they came.)

*548, nūmq̄uid me uis? haec me curatūrūm dicito--

*556, ut, sīquis sequantur me, hac abiisse censeant

|| 751, idem hercle dicam sī auom uis adducere

|| 789, quid ille faciat nē id opserues, quō eat, quid rerum gerat

802, recte praehibet, melius sanam est; mulier, mentem sumere

*824, non edepol scio. profecto ludit te hic. non rūte tenes?

872, eu hercle morbum acrem ac durum! di, uostram fidem!

(I do not admit a lacuna after *durum*, but consider *di uostram fidem!* to be the end of the verse as the Mss. show.)

916, iam hercle occipiat insanire primum. quin tū me interrogas

1002, erum meum indignissime nescioqui sublimen ferunt

1024, liberem ego te? uerum, quādoquidē, ere, te seruauī. quid est?

*1046, socer et medicus me insanire dicebant. quid sit mira sunt

|| 1076, tū erus es: tu seruiom quare. tu salueto: tu uale

*1137, namque edepol hīc mihi hodie iussi prandium apparari.

Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.

57, Epidamniensis ille quem dudum dixeram

308, habitas? di illos homines qui illic habitant perduint

793, siue illic siue alibi lubebit? quae haec, malum, impudentiast?

897, ita ego illum cum cura magna curabo tibi

1022, nam āpsque ted esset, hodie numquam ad solem occasum uiuerem

The Iambic Law.

For a discussion of the real principle involved in the so-called Iambic Law and for illustrations thereof, see Part III, 1.

Synizesis.

For a discussion of the fundamental basis of the so-called principle of Synizesis and for examples thereof, see Part III, 2.

Final S.

Remarks on, and illustrations of, the variable character of S final will be found in part III, 6.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

Mute and Liquid Combinations.

A discussion of the variable character of a mute plus L or R, the reason thereof, and illustrations, will be found in Part III, 7.

Miles Gloriosus:

Lengthening.

- 242, ut si illic concriminatus sūt aduersum militem
*313, Sceledre, Sceledre, quis homo in terra te est altēr audacior?
*376, ūnde exit haec huc? ūnde nisi domo? domo? me uidē? te uideo.
625, nihil arnas, umbra ēs amantis magi' quam amator, Pleusicles
633, pol id quidem experiōr ita esse ut praedicās, Palaestrio
832, neque illic calidum exhibēt in prandium
848, numquam edepol uidi promerē. uerum hoc erat
927, mihi des, quiescas ceterā? ni ludificata lepide
964-5, nuptast an uiduā? et nupta et uidua. quo pacto potis

(Note on v. 964-5: The attention of the reader is called to the fact that the a in the first *uidua* is long, but in the second one in the same line it is short. And yet there are those that say that Plautus would be an *auncient* when he wrote the first portion of the verse, but upon entering the latter half of the same verse he immediately stripped himself of his antiquity and talked like his contemporaries who said *uidua* and not *uiduā*.)

- 1216, Era, eccum praesto militēm. ubi est? ad laeuam. uideo.
1239, si pol me nolet ducere uxorem, genua amplectar
1277, quin tua caussa exegit uirūm ab se. qui id facere potuit?
1316, tibi salutem me iusserunt dicerē. saluae sient

Shortening.

- || 25, ubi rū es? eccum. edepol uel elephanto in India
155, ipse exit: hīc illest lepidus quem dixi senem
158, mīquidem iam arbitri uicini sunt meae quid fiat domi
166, nēscioquid malefactum a nostra hic familiast, quantum audio:
174, modo nēscioquis inspectauit uostrum familiarium
183, sīquidem centiens hic uisa sit, tamen infitias eat
*229, tūte unus si recipere hoc ad te dicis, confidentiast
289, nēscioquo adulescente. quid ego, Sceledre, scelus ex te audio?
|| 293, uerum enim tu istam, si te dī ament, temere hau tollas fabulam
*296, tuom stultiloquium. qui uero dupliciter? hīc dicam tibi.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

311, hercle quidquid est, mussitabo potius quam inteream male
 330, quin domi eccam! nescioquae te, Sceledre, scelera suscitant.
 || 332, mē homo nemo deterrebit quin ea sit in his aedibus
 *365, tūne me uidisse in proximo hic, scelestē, ais osculantem?
 *368, tūne me uidisti? atque his quidem hercle oculis—carebis credo
 402, nescio quid credam egomet mihi iam, ita quod uidisse credo
 *497, expūrgare uolo me. tun ted expurges mihi
 520, siquidem non eadem est. uise ad me intro, iam scies.
 || 571, ne tu hercle, si te dī ament, linguam comprimes
 607, sed speculabor nēquis aut hinc aut ab laeua aut a dextera
 624, nouo modo tu homo amas, siquidem te quicquam quod faxis pudet
 || 684, tū homo et alteri sapienter potis es consulere et tibi
 || 708, ī apud me aderunt, me curabunt, uisent quid agam, ecquid uelim.
 || 735, quī homines probi essent, esset is annona uilior
 *752, nām prōletario sermone nunc quidem, hospes, utere
 *774, qua n institui. perpurigatis āmbo damu' tibi operam auribus.
 || 785, eam des quae sit quaestuosa, quāe alat corpus corpore
 || 863, quo tū agis? missus sum alio: iam huc reuenero
 *994, nūmqūsnam hic prope adest qui rem alienam potius curet quam suam
 || 1047, quā ab illarum? nam ita me occursant multae: meminisse hau possum
 *1088, atque adeo (audin tu?) dicitō docte et cordate, ut cor ei saliat
 *1094, Quid mihi nūnc es auctor ut faciam, Palaestrio
 *1118, dicas uxorem tibi necessum ēsse ducere
 *1162, uolo. uoluptatem mecastor mi imperās. ēt scīn tu quem ad modum?
 *1201, a Philocomasio. quīdnām tam intus fuisse te dicam diu?
 || 1247, tibi et Phaoni Lesbio, tam mulier sē ut amaret
 *1251, si amauit umquam aut si parem sapientiam hīc habet ac formam.
 1265, nescio tu ex me hoc audiueris an non: nepos sum Veneris.
 1281, sed quid ego uideo? quid uides? nescioquis eccum incedit
 || 1403, ita me dī ament, ultro uentumst ad me. mentitur, feri.
 || 1410, itaque ancilla, conciliatrix quāe erat, dicebat mihi

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.

- *20, praeut alia dicam— quae tūque numquam feceris
120, ille *qui* me cepit dat me huic dono militi
*245, cum suo amatore amplexantem atque osculantem. immo ut optume!
262, nam ille non potuit quin sermone suo aliquem familiarium
271, nam illic est Philocomasio custos meu' conseruos qui it foras
337, nēmpē tu istic ais esse erilem concubinam? atque arguo
*374, ūnde exit haec huc? ūnde nisi domo? domo? me uidē? te uideo.
508, quōdque concubinam erilem insimulare ausus es
586, illic hinc apscēssit. 'sat edepol certo scio
614, quid tibi, Pleusicles? quōdne uobis placeat, displiceat mihi?
687, quae mihi numquam hoc dicat 'eme, mi uir, lanam, ūnde tibi pallium—'
719-20, continuo excruciarer animi; si ei fōrte fuisset febris
757, fit pol illud ad illud exemplum. ut docte et perspecte sapit!
830, nego hercle uero, nam ille me uotuit dicere
906, nēmpē ludificari militem tuom erum uis? exlocuta's.
922, nēmpē tu nouisti militem meum erum? rogare mirumst.
1051, quae per tuam nunc uitam uiuit: sit nēcne sit spes in te uno est
1072, quōmque me oratricem hau spreuisti sistique exorare ex te
*1217, aspicio limis, oculis ne ille nos se sentiat uidere
1233, ergo iste metus me macerat, quod ille fastidiosust
1388, ipse illic sese iam impediuit in plagas

The Iambic Law.

For a discussion of the real principles involved in the so-called Iambic Law and for illustrations thereof, see Part III, 1.

Synizesis.

For a discussion of the fundamental basis of the so-called principle of Synizeses and examples thereof, see Part III, 2.

Final S.

Remarks on, and illustrations of, the variable character of S final will be found in Part III, 6.

Mute and Liquid Combinations.

A discussion of the variable character of a mute plus L or R, the reason thereof, and illustrations, will be found in Part III, 7.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

Mostellaria:§

Lengthening

- 41, canem, capram commixtam. quid uis fieri?
 85, argumentaque in pectus multa institui
 170, ita me di ament, lepidast Scaphā, sapit scelestam multum
 174, ergo ob istoc uerbum te, Scaphā, donabo ego hodie— aliqui
 194, nolo ego mihi male te, Scaphā, praecipere. stulta es plane
 245, uideo enim te nihili penderē prae Philolache omnis homines.
 *323, si tibi cordi est facerē, licet. lepida es.

(Note on line 323: The verse is an Ana. Pent. Cat.)

- 337, illi ego ex omnibus optime uolo
 376, quaeso edepol, exsurge: pater aduenit. tuo' uenit pater?
 710, peius posthac fore quam fuit mihi
 722, quid nunc? quam mox? quid est? quod solet fieri hic
 784, heus Theopropides! hem quis hic nominat me?
 *1100, quod agas, id agas. quid tu porro uis serere negotium?

Shortening.

- || 43, si tū oles, neque superiores accumbere
 *75, ne tu erres hercle praeterhac mihi non facies moram
 *148, quin cum fundamento perierint nec quisquam esse auxilio queat
 176, nolo ego te adsentari mihi. nimi' tūquidem stulta es mulier.
 || 182, ita tu me ames, ita Philolaches tuo' tē amet, ut uenusta es
 229, siquidem hercle uendundus pater, uenibit multo potius
 || 231, quid illis futurum est ceteris qui tē amant? magis amabunt
 || 268, ut speculum tenuisti, metu nē olant argentum manus
 *295, mea Philematium, potare tecum conlibitum est, mihi libet§

§Realizing that certain verses of this play are of extremely doubtful scansion, I take this opportunity to offer a suggestion as to their real reading. V. 699 with Ms. reading restored is Cretic: *tota turget mihi uxor, scio nunc, domi*. VV. 704 and 705 restored after the Mss. are Trochaics: *neminem sollicitat sopor: in omnibus Ire dormitum odio est, uelut nunc mihi*. V. 738 with the Ms. reading restored is a perfect Cretic: *quo modo? pessimo. quae ne subducta erat....* And finally vv. 894-5, retaining the reading of the Mss., may be considered Priapean (?): *nouit erus me. suam quidem pol culcitulam oportet*.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

§The Mss. show *libet* which Bently deletes. But cf. 296.

|| 305, tu me amas, ego tē amo; merito id fieri uterque existumat.

|| 355, quī hodie sese excruciarī meam uicem possit pati?

447, meu' seruos hīcquidem est Tranio. o Theopropides

*452, seruat neque quī rēcludat neque qui respondeat

(*453, pultando pedibus paene confregi hasce āmbas)

(Note on v. 453: Cf. Men. 513.)

*454-5, eho an tūte tetigisti has aedis? cur non tangerem?

*501, deceptus sum: hospes hīc me necauit isque me

*502, defodit insepultum clam ibidem in hīsce aedibus

562, quo tē agis? nec quoquam abeo. ne ego sum miser

671, siquidem tu argentum reddituru's, tum bona

*747, nunc hoc quod ad te noster mēmē misit senex

761, nescioquem esse aedificatas insanum bene

873, scio quod properas: gestis aliquo; iam hercle ire uīs, mula, foras pastum

896, si sobrius sis, male non dicas. tibi optemperēm, quom tu mihi nequeas?

899, heus, ecquis hīc est, maxumam qui his iniuriam

933, heus uos, ēcquis hasce aperit? quid istas pultas ubi nemo intus est?

1075, siquidem pol me quaeris, adsum praesens praesenti tibi

*1141, nūmquid aliud fecit nisi quod faciunt summis gnati generibus?

(Note on v. 1141: This verse is to be read as an Iam. Oct.)

*1159, quīdquid fecit, una nobiscum fecit: nos deliquimus

|| 1160, faenus, sortem sumptumque omnem, quī amica *empta* est, omnia

Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.

210, tu iam quod quaerebas habes: ille te nisi amabit ultro

*283, non me curare istuc oportet. quem opsecro igitur? eloquor

334-5, scio, in mentem uenit modo: nēmpē domum eo commissatum.

*362, sed ego— sumne ille infelix qui non curro curriculo domum?

743, inde ferriterium, postea *crux*. *per tua te genua opsecro*

1091, uel hominem aedis iube mancupio poscere. immo hoc primum uolo

The Iambic Law.

For a discussion of the real principle of the so-called Iambic Law and for illustrations thereof, see Part III, 1.

Synizesis.

For a discussion of the fundamental basis upon which the so-called principle of Synizesis rests and for examples thereof, see Part III, 2.

Final S.

Remarks on, and illustrations of, the variable character of S final will be found in Part III, 6.

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

Mute and Liquid Combinations.

A discussion of the variable character of a mute plus L or R, the reason thereof, and illustrations, will be found in Part III, 7.

Pseudolus:

Lengthening.

- 147, neque Alexandrina beluata tonsiliā tappetia
233, iam diu ego huic bene et hic mihi uolumūs et amicitia est antiqua
*252, uorte nac te, puerē. non licet conloqui te?
311, ilico uixit amator, ubi lenoni supplicat
355, ego scelestus nunc argentum promerē possum domo
739, ecquid is homo habēt aceti in pectore? atque acidissumi.
740, quid, si opu' sit ut dulce promat indidem, ecquid habet? rogas?
786, quamquam illud aiunt magno gemitu fieri
921, haec ea occasiost: dum ille dormit, uolo tu priōr occupes adire.
929, ipsus sese ut negēt esse eum qui siet

Shortening.

- *152, hoc uide sis, ut alias res agunt! hoc agite, hoc animum aduortite
*159, at haec retunsast. sine siet: itidem uos quoque ēstis plagis omnes
*182, qur ego uestem, aurum atque ea quibus est uobis usus, praehibeo? aut
quid mi
|| 197, lanios, qui item ut nos iurando iure malō male quaerunt rem, audi
*209, taceo. at taceas malo multo quam tacere tē dicas. tu autem
|| 280, quia tibi minas uiginti prō amica etiam non dedit
*372, uerum quamquam multa malaque in me dicta dixistis mihi
*392, ex multis, atque exquire ex illis paucis unum qui certust cedo
408. uerum is nescioquo pacto praesensit prius
|| 415, si de damnoseis aut si de amatoribus
*445, si quis hic loquitur? meus hic est quidem seruos Pseudolus.
*501, quom es mussitabis? scibam. cūr nōn dictumst mihi?
531, siquidem istaec opera, ut praedicas, perfeceris
*534, quā te in pistrinum condam? non unum quidem diem modo
*641, magis erat solutum quā si ipsi dederis. at enim scin quid est?
*672, hic doli, hic fallaciae omnes sunt, hic sunt svphantiae
693, uenit eccum Calidorus, ducit nescioquem secum simul
*877, si credis, nummo: si nōn credis, ne mina quidem
|| 943, ita me di ament— ita non facient: mera iam mendacia fundes.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

978, ipse ego is sum, adulescens, quem tu quaeritas. tūn es Ballio
 *992, sēd quid agit is? quod homo edepol fortis atque bellator probus
 995, nam necesse est hodie Sicyoni me esse aut cras mortem exsequi
 1028, metuo autem nē erus redeat etiam dum a foro
 *1088, quia numquam a me abducet mulierem iām, nēc potest
 1091, memini. em illius seruos huc ad me argentum attulit
 1105, nam qui liberos esse ilicō se arbitrantur
 1136, heus ubi estis uos? hīcquidem ad me recta habet rectam uiam
 1139, ēcquis hoc aperit? heus chlamydate, quid istic debetur tibi?
 1159, mane modo istic, iam reuortar ad te. quid nunc fiet, Simo?
 *1183, quin tu mulierem mi emittis? aut rēddis argentum. mane.

Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.

175, quae capiti, quae uentri operam det, quāēque suae rei, quae somno studeat
 239a, mītte me sis. *sino*: sine modo ego abeam
 353, fateor. nēmpē conceptis uerbis? etiam consutis quoque.
 *392, ex multis, atque ēxquire ex illis paucis ūnum qui certust cedo
 394, postquam illic hinc abiit, tu astas solus, Pseudole
 442, idne tu mirare, si patrissat filius?
 *451, sintne illa uera nēcne sint quae tibi renuntiant!
 588, inde me et simul participes omnis meos praeda onerabo atque opplebo
 925, numquam edepol erit ille potior Harpax quam ego. habe animum bonum
 954, illicinest? illic est. mala mercist, *Pseudole*, illuc sis uide
 1169, sequere. quid ais? nēmpē tu illius seruos es? planissime.
 1188, meo peculio empta. nēmpē quod femina summa sustinent.

The Iambic Law.

For a discussion of the real principle involved in the so-called Iambic Law and for illustrations thereof, see Part III, 1.

Synizesis.

For a discussion of the fundamental basis of the so-called principle of Synizesis and for examples thereof, see Part III, 2.

Final S.

Remarks on, and illustrations of, the variable character of S final will be found in Part III, 6.

Mute and Liquid Combinations.

A discussion of the variable character of a mute plus L or R, the reason thereof, and illustrations, will be found in Part III, 7.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

Rudens:

Lengthening

- 199, is nauem atque omniā perdidit in mari
201, uecta mecum in scaphast excidit. ego nunc sola sum.
203, leniōr esset hic mi eiūs opera
217, leibera ego prognata fūi maxume, nequiquam fūi.
233, certo uox muliebrīs auris tetigit meas
*244, tu facis me quidem ut uiuerē nunc uelim
287, quo nunc copiā ualebit
329, eadem, sacerdos Veneriā haec si quid amplius scit
390, qui suos parentes noscerē posset: eam ueretur
692, uobis pro castris, moeniā hinc ego uos defensabo
694, tibi auscultamus et, Venūs alma, ambae te opsecramus
724, non licēt: ita est lex apud nos— mihi cum uostris legibus
*935a, ibiquē regnum magnum insrituam
975, mare quidem commune certost omnibūs. adsentio
*1002, uide sis quouiū arbitratu nos facerē uis. uiduli
1086, et crepundiā. quid si ea sunt aurea? quid istuc tua?
1131, perii hercli ego misēr! ut priu' quam plane aspexit ilico
1404, palam age, nolo ego murmurillum neque susurrum fieri

Shortening.

- 97, prope me hic nēscioquis loquitur. heus, Sceparnio!
*109, qui oratione nōs hīc ōccupatos occupes
138, ut uerba praēhibes, me periisse praedicās
190, hāncine ego partem capio ob pietatem praecipuam?
*218, nunc qui minu' seruio quām si serua forem nata?
|| 222, ita res sē habent: vitae hau parco, perdidī spem qua me oblectabam
|| 225, neque eam usquam inuenio neque quō eam neque qua quaeram consultumst
282, sed haec pauperes res sunt inopesque, puellae:
|| 379, quid faceret? si amabat, rogas, quid faceret? adseruaret
|| 438, dabitur tibi aqua, ne nequiquam mē ames. cedo mi urnam. cape
482, muliercula hanc nēscioquae huc ad me detulit
484, siquidem mihi his ultro adgerunda etiam est aqua
*509, quam quae Thyestae quondam ānteposita est Tereo
|| 528, cum uestimentis postquam aps tē abii, algeo

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

530, ita salsam praehibit potionem et frigidam
 561, nescioquem metuentes miserae? nocte hac aiunt proxuma
 *604, natas ex Philomena atque ex Progne esse hirundines
 608, in ius uocat me. ibi ego nescioquo modo
 || 756, ni erit tam sincerum ut quiuis dicat ampullarius
 765, ego dabo ignem, siquidem in capite tuo conflandi copias
 804-5, ehem! optume edepol eccum clauator aduenit
 *836, non accedam potius. illic astato ilico
 848, quis illas nunc illic seruat? nescioquis senex
 913, neque piscium ullam unciam hodie pondo cepi, nisi hoc quod fero hic in rete
 972, quos quam capio, siquidem cepi, mei sunt; habeo pro meis
 986, immo hercle haud est, siquidem quod uas excepisti. philosophe!
 || 1027, quo pacto? sine me hinc abire, tu abi tacitus tuam uiam
 *1335, praei uerbis quiduis. id quod domi est, numquam ulli supplicabo
 1388, id ego continuo huic dabo adeo me ut hic emittat manu
 1403, tibi operam hucquidem dat. tace. concede hoc tu, leno. licet

. Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.

143, ille qui uocauit nullus uenit? admodum
 264, puellae. sed unde uos
 343, nempe rem diuinam facitis hic. quid somnias. amabo?
 *412, nunc, ne morae illi sim, petam hinc aquam unde mihi imperauit
 *559, illuc est, opsecro, negotii quod duae mulierculae
 565, nempe meae? nempe nescio istuc. qua sunt facie? scitula
 567, nempe puellae? nempe molestus est. i uise, si lubet
 *687, bonum animum habete. nam, opsecro, unde istic animus mi inuenitur?
 *736, numqui minus hasce oportet esse liberas? quid, liberas?
 887, illic in columbum, credo, leno uortitur
 1080, nempe tu hanc dicis quam esse aiebas dudum popularem meam?
 1100, omnia istaec ego facile patior, dum hic hinc a me sentiat.
 1240, ille qui consulte, docte atque astute cauet
 1392, bene merenti bene referre gratiam. nempe pro meo

The Iambic Law.

For a discussion of the real principle involved in the so-called Iambic Law and for illustrations thereof, see Part III, 1.

Synizesis.

For a discussion of the fundamental basis of the so-called principle of Synizesis and for examples thereof, see Part III, 2.

¹ See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

Final S.

Remarks on, and illustrations of, the variable character of S final will be found in Part III, 6.

Mute and Liquid Combinations

A discussion of the variable character of a mute plus L or R, the reason thereof, and illustrations, will be found in Part III, 7.

Trinummus: †

Lengthening.

- 226, magister mihi exercitōr animu' nunc est
280, patrem tuom si percoles per pietatem
532, si in opserendo possint interfieri
585, nam certumst sine dote hau darē. quin tu i modo
644, atque honori posteriorum tuorum ut uindex fieres
788a, sed quom opsignatas attulerit epistulas
837, ruere antemnas, scindere uelā, ni tua pax propitia foret praesto

Shortening.

- 12, adulescens quidam est quī in hisce habitat aedibus
43, hīc ille est senecta aetate qui factust puer
*192, nūmqūid uis? cures tuam fidem. fiet sedulo
218, ūnde quicquid auditum dicant, nisi id appareat
235, ita faciam, ita placet: ōmnium primum
‡ 242, nam quī amat quod amat quom extemplo sauiis sagittatis perculsust
243-4, ilico res foras labitur, liquitur. 'da mihi hoc, mel meum, si me amas, si
audes'§
*302, tuis seruiui seruitutem imperiis, ēt praēceptis, pater
305, quī homo cum animo inde ab ineunte aetate depugnat suo
330, quid is? egetne? eget. habuitne rem? habuit. quī eam perdidit
*339, de mendico male meretur qui ei dat quod edit aut quōd bibat
386, tute ad eum adeas, tūte concilies, tute poscas. eccere!
*413, quīd quōd ego defrudaui? em, istaec ratio maxumast
425, tarpezitae mille drachumarum Olympico
*428, pro illo adulescente quem tu aiebas ēsse diuitem

†Upon inspection it will be observed that certain portions of the lyrical passages of this play are hopelessly uncertain. At best, conjectures made by editors are merely personal preferences. References, however, are made to these passages for the sake of completeness.

‡ See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

§This scansion of Lindsay's is obviously impossible. The line consist of two Cretics.

*474, edim, nisi si ille uotet. at pol ego etiāmsi uotet
 557, quin hīcquidem cupit illum ab se abalienarier
 *601, postquam exturbauit hīc nōs ex nostris aedibust†
 623, nēscioquid non satis inter eos conuenit: celeri gradu
 648, praēōptauisti amorem tuom uti uirtuti praeponeres
 *679, facilest inuentu: datur ignis, tamen ētsi ab inimico petas
 851, pol hīcquidem fungino generest: capite se totum tegit
 868, fores pultabo. ad nostras aedis hīcquidem habet rectam uiam
 870, aperite hoc, aperite. heus, ēcquis his foribus tutelam gerit?
 876, meum gnatum hīcquidem Lesbonicum quaerit et amicum meum
 880, multa simul rogitas, nēscio quid expediam potissimum
 933, ōmniū primum in Pontum aduecti ad Arabiam terram sumus
 *935, sed ubi apsinthium fit ātque cunila gallinacea
 991, at etiam maledicis? immo, saluos quandōquidem aduenis
 1030, di immortales, basilica hīcquidem facinora inceptat loqui!
 1055, meus est hīcquidem Stasimus seruos. nam ego talentum mutuom
 1078, eamus intro, sequere. quo tu tē agis? quonam nisi domum?
 1115, hic homost ōmniū hominū praecipuos
 1116, uoluptatibu' gaudiīsque antepotens
 1119, ita gaudiīs gaudiūm suppeditat

Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.

137, ille qui mandauit, eum exturbasti ex aedibus
 218, ūnde quicquid auditum dicant, nisi id appareat
 259, quamquam illud est dulce, esse et bibere
 328, bene uolo ego illi facere, si tu non neuis. nēmpē de tuo?
 427, nēmpē quas spopondi. immo 'quas dependi' inquit
 *537, ut ad incitas redactust! apage a me istunc agrum!
 672, ille qui aspellit is compellit, ille qui consuadet uotat
 *717, abit hercle illequidem. ecquid audis, Lysiteles? ego te uolo
 *792, illum quem habuit perdidit, alium post fecit nouom
 *809, lepida est illa caussa, ut commemorauī, dicere
 853, ille qui me conduxit, ubi conduxit, abduxit domum
 862, ni illic homōst aut dormitator aut sector zonarius
 998, postquam illic hinc abiit, post loquendi libere

The Iambic Law.

For a discussion of the real principle involved in the so-called Iambic Law and for illustrations thereof, see Part III, 1.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

†Cf. Rudens 109.

See part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

Synizesis.

For a discussion of the fundamental basis of the so-called principle of Synizesis and for examples thereof, see Part III, 1.

Final S.

Remarks on, and illustrations of, the variable character of S final will be found in Part III, 6.

Mute and Liquid Combinations

A discussion of the variable character of a mute plus L or R, the reason thereof, and illustrations, will be found in Part III, 7.

.

Examples from the remaining plays of Plautus, not considered in detail above,[†] will be found immediately after Terence.

[†]Cf. what has been said on this subject, page 30 *sup.*

TERENTI COMOEDIAE

Adelphoe:

Lengthening.

*40, atque ex me hic natus non est, sed ex fratrē. meo is
106, iniuriumst; nam si esset unde id fieret

Shortening.

*60, uenit ad me saepe clāmītans 'quid agis, Micio? . . .'
*77, fateatur se nēscire imperare liberis
79, nēscio quid tristem uideo: credo, iam ut solet
|| 111, pro Iuppiter, tu homo adigis mē ad insaniam!
211, nēscio quid concertasse cum ero? numquam uidi iniquius
|| 215, qui potui melius, quī hodie usque os praebui? age, scis quid loquar?
237, hōcine illo dignumst? hocine incipere Aeschinum
261, quid est? quid sit? illius opera, Syre, nunc uiuo. festiuom caput
*337, an hoc proferendum tibi uidetur usquam ēsse? mi equidem non placet
*350, experiar. quid istic? āccēdo ut melius dicis. tu quantum potes?
*475, compressu grauida factast: mensis hīc decurūst est:
527, rogitabit mē ubi fuerim: 'ego hodie toto non uidi die.'
533, quin tu otiosus esto: ego illius sensum pulchre calleo
540, nē ego homo sum infelix: fratrem nusquam inuenio gentium;

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

§Cf. Rudens, 836.

*560, quam ob rem? me impulsore hanc emptam ait ēsse. non tu eum rus
hinc modo
572, illius hominis, sed locum noui ubi sit. dic ergo locum
605, omnes, quibus res sunt minus secundae, magis sunt nēscio quo modo
635, prodit nēscio quis: concedam huc. Ita uti dixi, Sostrata.
640, quandōquidem hoc numquam mi ipse uoluit dicere
658, nēscio quo puerum natum, neque eum nominat
680, et scio: nam tē amo: quo magis quāe agis curae sunt mihi
709, hic non amandus? hīcine non gestandus in sinust? hem
780, nostin? iam scibo. quid agis? quō abis? mitte me.
903, qui tē amat plus quam hosce oculos. sed quor non domum
956, quid istuc? ager dabitur Hegioni quandōquidem hic uolt. gaudeo
976, sīquidem prima dedit, haud dubiumst quin emitti aequom siet
979, Syre, processisti hodie pulchre. sīquidem porro, Micio

Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.

72, ille quem beneficio adiungas ex animo facit
213, ego uapulando, ille uerberando, usque ambo defessi sumus
395, ille somnium. rum sineres uero illum tuom
*405, de psaltria istac. ain uero? uah, nil reticuit.
*577, quod nam? illic ubi etiam caprificus magna est. noui. hac pergito

The Iambic Law

For a discussion of the real principle involved in the so-called Iambic Law and for illustrations thereof, see Part III, 1.

Synizesis.

For a discussion of the fundamental basis of the so-called principle of Synizesis and for examples thereof, see Part III, 2.

Final S.

Remarks on, and illustrations of, the variable character of S final will be found in Part III, 6.

Mute and Liquid Combinations

A discussion of the variable character of a mute plus L or R, the reason thereof, and illustrations, will be found in Part III, 7.

Andria:

Lengthening.

*153, sine nunc me mēo uiuere interea modo.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

437, potin es mihi uerum dicerē? nil facilius.
443, laudo. dum licitumst ēi dumque aetas tulit
613, qui sum pollicitus ducerē? qua audacia id facere audeam?
792, hic socer est. alio pacto haud poterat fieri

Shortening.

*87, dicebant aut Niceratum; nam hī trēs tum simul
191, hoc quid sit? omnes quī amant grauiter sibi dari uxorem ferunt
*214, quo iure quaque iniuria praecipitem me in pīstrinum dabit
236, hōcine humanum factu aut inceptu? hōcine officium
patris?
340, laetus est nēscio quid. nil est; non dum haec rescuiit mala
*358, rogo: negat uidisse sē. mihi molestum; quid agam cogito

(Note on line 358: The Mss. read *uidisse sese*, but the majority of editors omit the *sese*. I have written *se*, as I am inclined to think that the double form *sese* arose because of the preceding *se* in *uidisse*.)

465, quid ego audio? actumst, sīquidem haec uera praedicat
487, deos quaeso ut sit superstes, quāndōquidem ipsest ingenio bono
*509, nē tu hōc mihi posterius dicas Dauī factum consilio aut dolis
*536, ausculta paucis: ēt quid ego te uelim et tu quod quaeris scies
608, mi obtigisse, quāndōquidem tam iners, tam nulli consili sum
625, hōcine est credibile aut memorabile
*647, falsus es. nōne tibi sat esse hoc uisum solidumst gaudium
*682, faciam. at iam hoc opust. hem. . . sēd māne concrepuit
(sic Mss.) a Glycerio ostium
*706, ad agendum: ne uociuom ēsse nunc me ad narrandum credas
734, nēscio quid narres. ego quoque hinc ab dextera.
*744, reliquit mē homo atque abiit. di uostram fidem.
787, hīc ēst ille: non te credes Dauom ludere.

(Note on line 787: This line may be scanned as indicated above, or the alternative scansion of *ille* may be used if so desired.)

841, et nēscio qui id tibi sum oblitus hodie, ac uolui, dicere.
*936, tum illam relinquere hīc est ueritus. postilla nunc primum audio.
947, te credo credere. ita me dī ament, credo. quod restat, pater. . .

Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.

266, dum in dubiost animus, paulo momento huc uel illuc inpellitur.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

787, hic est ille: non te credes Dauom ludere.

(Note on line 787: For a variant scansion of this same line, see line 787 sup. under *Shortening* and note thereon.)

The Iambic Law.

For a discussion of the real principles underlying the so-called Iambic Law and for illustrations thereof, see Part III, 1.

Synizesis.

For a discussion of the fundamental basis of the so-called principle of Synizesis and for examples thereof, see Part III, 2.

Final S.

Remarks on, and illustrations of, the variable character of S final will be found in Part III, 6.

Mute and Liquid Combinations.

A discussion of the variable character of a mute plus L or R, the reason thereof, and illustrations, will be found in Part III, 7.

Eunuchus:

Lengthening.

92, pars aequa amoris tecum ac pariter fieret

774, male mulcabo ipsam. pulchre. in medium huc agmen cum uectē, Donax

Shortening.

*9, idem Menandri Phasma nunc nūpēr perdidit

50, sīquidem hercle possis, nil prius neque fortius

98, credo, ut fit, misera praē amore excludi hunc foras

140, apud me, ac non id metuat, nē, ubi acceperim

182, saltem ut concedas solum. sīquidem biduom

186, faciundumst quod uis. merito tē amo, bene facis

193, dies nōctisque mē ames, me desideres

242, qui color, nitor, uestitus, quāē habitudost corporis!

291, non temerest: et properans uenit: nēscio quid circumspectat

298, nēscio quid de amore loquitur: o infortunatum senem!

*356, tum magis id dicas. quōd nām quaeso hercle? eunuchum. illumne obsecro

374, quandōquidem illarum neque te quisquam nouit neque scit qui sies

446, sīquidem me amaret, tum istuc prodesset, Gnatho

448, iam dudum tē amat, iam dudum illi facile fit

479, ego illum eunuchum, sī opus sit, uel sobrius. . . !

*558, Chaerea, quid est quod sic gestis? quīdue sibi hic uestitus quaerit?

¹ See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

² The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

615, ita me dī ament, quantum ego illum uidi, non nil timeo misera.
 649, nēscio quid profecto absente nobis turbatumst domi.
 *681, ne comparandus hīcquidem ad illumst: ille erat
 *706, concede istim huc paululum: audin? etiā nūc paululum: sat est
 717, actumst, siquidem tu me hic etiam, nebulo, ludificabere
 *741, usque adeo ego illiūs ferre possum ineptiam et magnifica uerba
 || 804, sicine agis? quis tū homo es? quid tibi uis? quid cum illa rei tibist?
 828, infelix, siquidem tu istaec uera praedicas
 1019, siquidem istuc inpune habueris. . . ! uerum? reddam hercle. credo
 || 1037, bene, ita me dī ament, factum. audin tu, hic quod ait? tum autem
 Phaedriae
 1080, neque istum metuas nē amet mulier: facile pellas ubi uelis
 Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.

343, illa sese interea commodum huc aduorterat
 *370, responde. capias tu illius uestem? uestem? quid tum postea?
 *618, militem rogat ut illum admitti iubeat: ille continuo irasci
 The Iambic Law.

For a discussion of the real principle involved in the so-called Iambic Law and for illustrations thereof, see Part III, 1.

Synizesis.

For a discussion of the fundamental basis of the so-called principle of Synizesis and for examples thereof, see Part III, 2.

Final S.

Remarks on, and illustrations of, the variable character of S final will be found in Part III, 6.

Mute and Liquid Combinations.

A discussion of the variable character of a mute plus L or R, the reason thereof, and illustrations, will be found in Part III, 7.

Heauton Timorumenos:

Lengthening

*165, non conuenit, qui illum ad laborem impulerim
 455, sensi. nam unam ei cenam atque eius comitibus
 *724, decem minas quas mihi dare pollicitust. quod si is nunc me
 747, ne ille haud scit, hoc paulum lucri quantum ei damni adportet
 785, credebam. minime. scite poterat fieri
 1026, eius ut memineris atque inopis nunc te miserescat mei

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

1030, ita mihi atque huic sis superstes, ūt ex me atque hoc natus es;
1037, patiar, Clitipho, flagitiis tuis me infamem fieri
1043, facere pudivit. ēheu, quam nunc totus displiceo mihi

Shortening.

87, scire hoc uis? hāc quidem causa qua dixi tibi
*194, parentis, patriam incolumem, amicos, genus, cognatos, diuitias
*203, huncine erat aequom ex illius more an illum ex huius uiuere?
236, faciam; sed nescio quid profecto mi animus praesagit mali
|| 287, eius anuis causa opinor quā erat mortua
*299, quōm tām negleguntur eiūs internuntii
|| 308, prae gaudio, ita me di ament, ubi sim nescio:
324, siquidem id saperest uelle te id quod non potest contingere
331, quid aliud tibi uis? siquidem hoc fit. siquidem? experiundo scies
*333, tuam amicam huius esse amicam. pulchre: cedo, quid hic faciet sua?
|| 360, ut sit necessus. merito tē amo, Clinia
|| 383, minumeque, ita me di ament, miror si te sibi quidque expetit
*527, uicinum hunc: nostin? at quasi is non diuitiis
|| 537, eho quaeso laudas quī eros fallunt? in loco
*551, siquid huius simile forte aliquando euenerit
|| 569, ut equidem, ita me di ament, metui quid futurum denique esset!
*576, apud alium prohibet dignitas, apud alium ipsius facti pudet
620, nescio quid tristis est: non temerest: timeo quid sit. quid siet?
625, credo. nescio quid peccati portat haec purgatio
|| 660, nostrast, si itast. uiuitne illa quoi tu dederas? nescio
|| 686, atque ita me di ament ut ego nunc non tam meapte causa
*715, tū forsitan quid me fiat parui pendis, dum illi consulas
759, uidere egisse iam nescio quid cum sene
*810, ut te quidem omnes di deaque quantumst, Svre
|| 836, quas prō alimentis esse nunc duco datas
*1001, miror nōn cōtinuo hunc abripi iusse: ad Menedemum hunc pergam
1038, di istaec prohibeant! deos nescio: ego, quod potero, sedulo
1064, immo, quandōquidem ducendast, egomet habeo propemodum

Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.

237, pergin istuc prius diiudicare quam scis quid ueri siet?
*515, ille Cliniai seruos tardiusculust

(Note on line 515: All the Mss. agree in this verse in reading *Cliniae*, which Bentley writes as above, i. e. *Cliniai*. Brix, whom Tyrrell follows, has *adulescentis* (unde?) to avoid *ille*.)

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

The Iambic Law.

For a discussion of the real principle involved in the so-called Iambic Law and for illustrations thereof see Part III, 1.

Synizesis.

For a discussion of the fundamental basis of the so-called principle of Synizesis and for examples thereof, see Part III, 2.

Final S.

Remarks on, and illustrations of, the variable character of S final will be found in Part III, 6.

Mute and Liquid Combinations.

A discussion of the variable character of a mute plus L or R, the reason thereof, and illustrations, will be found in Part III, 7.

Hecyra:

Lengthening.

*604, si ceterā sunt ita ut uis itaque uti esse ego illa existumo

*820, qua re suspectus suo patri fuit Phidippo ēt exsolui:

830, eum haec cognouit Myrrinā, in digito modo me habente

Shortening.

186, dixere causam nēscio quam tum. iterum iubet:

*210, quae me et te et familiam ōmnem dedecoras, filio luctum paras;

232, illius dices culpa factum? haud equidem dico, mi Laches

233, gaudeo, ita me dī ament, gnati causa; nam de te quidem

258, at ita me dī ament, haud tibi hoc concedo, etsi illi pater es

276, nam ita me dī ament, quod me accusat nunc uir, sum extra noxiam

*281, nēmini ego plura ex amore acerba credo esse homini umquam oblata

*289, si non rediisses, hae irae factae ēssēt multo ampliores

304, sed magnum nēscio quid necessest euenisse, Parmeno

319, nullus sum. quidum? perii. quam ob rem? nēscio quod magnum malum

321, pauitāre nēscio quid dixerunt: id si forte est nescio

336, nēscio quid iam dudum audio hic tumultuari misera

343, nam quī amat quoi odio ipsust eum bis facere stulte duco:

*367, post quam me aspexere ancillae, aduenisse ilico ōmnes§

383, nam uitiumst oblatum uirgini olim ab nēscio quo inprobo

*430, ere, etiā nūc tu hic stas? equidem te exspecto. quid est? †

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

§ See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

§Cf. Plautus, Men. 513.

†Cf. Eunuch. 706, Plautus, Trin. 474, etc. for etiāmnūc, etiāmsī.

453, quam ob rem non redducam? nescio quem ego hic audiui loqui
 492, quandōquidem illam a me distrahit necessitas
 || 496, mane, inquam: quō abis?— quae haec est pertinacia?
 523, atque eccecam: uideo. quid ais, Myrrina? heus tibi dico. mihine, mi uir?
 *552, si modeste ac raro fecit haec, nōne ea dissimulare nos
 560, siquidem ille ipse non uolt et tu sensi in eo esse, Myrrina
 || 579, uerum ita me, dī ament itaque optingant ex te quae exoptem mi, uti
 *589, illius stultitia uicta ex urbe tu rus habitatum migres?
 || 642, bene, ita me dī ament, nuntias, et gaudeo
 *753, lepida cs. sed scin, quid uolo potius sodes facias? quiduis? cedo
 *787, ob eam rem uin ergo intro eam? i, atque exple animum eis, coge ut credant
 827, nescio quid suspicariet, magis coepi instare ut dicat
 828, homo se fatetur ui in uia nescio quam compressisse
 || 864, perliberalis uisast. dic uerum. ita me dī ament, Pamphile
 867, omnia omnes ubi resciscunt. hic quos fuerat par resciscere
 *877, immō uerō scio, neque hoc imprudens feci. ego istuc satis scio. ah

Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.

120, ille primo se negare; sed postquam acrius
 *217, multo melius hic quae fiunt quam— illic ubi sum adsidue scio
 *437, immo quod constitui me hodie conuenturum eum
 726, immo uero abi, aliquam puero nutricem para
 *877, immō uerō scio, neque hoc imprudens feci. ego istuc satis scio. ah

The Iambic Law.

For a discussion of the real principle involved in the so-called Iambic Law and for illustrations thereof, see Part III, 1.

Synizesis

For a discussion of the fundamental basis of the so-called principle of Synizesis and for examples thereof, see Part III, 2.

Final S.

Remarks on, and illustrations of, the variable character of S final will be found in Part III, 6.

Mute and Liquid Combinations.

A discussion of the variable character of a mute plus L or R, the reason thereof, and illustrations, will be found in Part III, 7.

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

Phormio:

Lengthening

9, quod si intellegeret, quom stetit olim noua
378, adulescens, primum abs te hoc bona ueniā peto
593, argentum opus esse et id quo pacto fieret
645, quod dixi adeo ēi: 'quaeso, quid si filiam. . .'
1030, habet haec ēi quod, dum uiuat, usque ad aurem obganniat

Shortening.

*14, nullum inuenire prōlogum potuisset nouos

(Note on v. 14: With this exception Terence regularly writes *prōlogum* with a long o. Here editors would continue the Terentian practice by writing *posset*, although the Mss. are unanimous in reading *potuisset*, the reading which I have adopted. To be compared with this verse are such verses as And. 5, Heaut. Tim. 11, Hec. 9, etc. It is because Terence regularly has made the first o long that I have considered such verses as the above normal and this verse of abnormal quantity.)

193, te nominat. nēscio quod magnum hoc nuntio exspecto malum. ah
*294, āddo istuc 'inprudens timuit adulescens': sino
302, hui, dixti pulchre! siquidem quisquam crederet
405, quandōquidem solus regnas et soli licet
|| 419, 'actum,' aiunt, 'nē agas.' non agam? immo haud desinam
|| 426, iratus est. tu tē idem melius feceris
*483, nām per eius unam, ut audio, aut uiuam aut moriar sententiam
*609, adibo hōsce: o salue, noster Chremes. salue, Geta
*648, ut ad pauca redeam ac illius mittam ineptias
*725, uolo ipsius quoque haec uoluntate fieri, ne se eiectam praedicet
*791, ac rebus uilioribus mūlto tamen talenta bina. hui
|| 883, uale. uale, Antipho. bene, ita me dī ament, factum: gaudeo
|| 911, 'nam quī erit rumor [populi], 'inquit, 'id si feceris?'
|| 954, monstri, ita me dī ament, simile. inieci scrupulum. hem
969, non hercle ex re istius me instigasti, Demipho
992, non mihi respondes? hīcine ut tibi respondeat
|| 1005, uxorem duxit. mī homo, dī melius duint!
*1028, faxo tali sit mactatus atque infortunio hic est

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

|| See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.

*21, quod ab illo ādlatumst, id sibi esse rellatum putet
109, ille qui illam amabat fidicinam tantam modo
307, nēmpe Phormionem? istum patronum mulieris
*333, aliis aliunde est periculum ūnde aliquid abradi potest:
681, inde sumam; uxori tibi opus esse dixero
936, immō uero uxorem tu cedo. in ius ambula

The Iambic Law.

For a discussion of the real principle involved in the so-called Iambic Law and for illustrations thereof, see Part III, 1.

Synizesis.

For a discussion of the fundamental basis of the so-called principle of Synizesis and for examples thereof, see Part III, 2.

Final S.

Remarks on, and illustrations of, the variable character of S final will be found in Part III, 6.

Mute and Liquid Combinations.

A discussion of the variable character of a mute plus L or R, the reason thereof, and illustrations, will be found in Part III, 7

PLAUTINA ADDENDA

In these *Plautina Addenda* I have gathered more or less at random cases where the Pyrrhic Stress attests the true reading. These have been selected from the plays of Plautus not taken up in detail above and are not intended to be exhaustive.† Noteworthy are the instances in which the true reading of the Mss. has been restored, simply by allowing the true accentuation of the word in question to receive its due.

Asinaria:

- 66, quippe qui mage amico utantur gnato et beneuolo
637, ille qui illas perdit saluos est, ego qui non perdo pereo
676, illic hanc mi seruandam dedit. i sane bella belle.
794, fôrte si tussire occepsit, ne sic tussiat

Casina:

- 362, tace, Chaline. comprime istunc. immo istunc qui didicit dare
599, quin tu suspendis te? nēmpē tute dixerās

Cistellaria:

- 43, haēc quidem ecastor cottidie uiro nubit, nupsitque hodie
62, indidem unde oritur facito ut facias stultitiam sepelibilem
168, ille clam opseruauit seruos qui eam proiecerat
561, ūnde tibi talenta magna uiginti pater

Curculio:

- 705, quōdne promisti? qui promisi? lingua. eadem nunc nego.

†See page 52 and note.

Epidicus:

*61, nēscio edepol quid tu timidu's, trepidas, Epidice, ita uoltu n tuom
81, illic hinc abiit. solus nunc es. quo in loco haec res sit uides
334, quippe tu mi aliquid aliquo modo alicunde ab aliquibus blatis
449, ego sum, si quid uis. nēmpe quem in adulescentia
*522, atque me minoris facio prae illo, qui omnium
624, estne consimilis quasi quom signum pictum pulchre aspexeris?

Mercator:

*182, hōc quod te interrogo responde. quin tu si quid uis roga
600, tristis incedit (pectus ardet, haereo), quassat caput
*671, atque incedit eccam tandem. quin is ocus
*699, sēd quānam hinc a nobis exit? aperitur foris
738, immo sic: sequestro mihi datast. intellego
*761, te odisse aequae atque anguis. egone istuc dixi tibi?
776, nēmpe me hinc abire ueis. uolo inquam. abibitur

Persa:

42, qui ipso siti aret. sicine hoc te mi facere? quid faciam? rogas?
*68, sēd si legerupam qui damnet, det in publicam
107, ita fieri iussi. ēcquid hallecis? uah, rogas?
*137, sicut istic leno nondum sex menses Megaribus
200, illic hinc abiit ~~in~~ero huc. sed quis haec est quae me aduersum incedit?
201, Paegnium hic quidemst. Sophoclidisca haec peculiarest ei
225, ēcquid habes? ēcquid tu? nil equidem. cedo manum ergo. estne haec
manus?

232, illa militia militatur multo magi' quam pondere
*233, atque ego hānc nūnc operam perdo. quid iam? quia peritae praedico
520, iste qui tabellas adfert adduxit simul
544, hospes ille qui has tabellas attulit. hicinest? hic est
545, haecine illāst furtiua uirgo? iuxta tecum aequae scio
760, unde ego omnis hilares, ludentis, laetificantis faciam ut fiant §
830, tace, stulte: hic eius geminust frater. hicinest? ac geminissumus

Poenulus:

2, inde mihi principium capiam, ex ea tragoedia
72, ille qui surripuit puerum Calydonem auehit
80, si quid amandare uoltis aut curarier
109, unde sit, quoiatis, captane an surrupta sit

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

§The measure *laetificantis* proves the line to be Trochaic against the unanimous verdict of the editors. Cf. page 20 and first foot note.

119, ille qui adoptauit hunc sibi pro filio
 182, ille me censebit quaeri: continuo tibi
 *372, atque te faciet ut sies ciuis Attica atque libera
 419, p̄erque meos amores perque Adelphasium meam
 445, illic hinc iratus abiit. nunc mihi cautio est
 625, istic est thesaurus stultus in lingua situs
 664, ūt quidem ipse nobis dixit, apud regem Attalum
 665, inde nunc aufugit, quoniam capitur oppidum
 669, immo ut ipse nobis dixit, quo accures magis
 680, illic est ad istas res probus quae quaeritas
 782, idque in istoc adeo | aurum inest marsuppio
 902, ibidem gnatust, inde surruptus fere sexennis, postibi
 917, illic hinc abiit. di immortales meum erum seruatum uolunt
 *975, sēd quaenam illaec auis est quae huc cum tunicis aduenit?
 1055, inde sum oriundus. di dent tibi omnes quae uelis!
 1098, hic illi malam rem dare uolt. frugist si id facit
 *1116, sed i atque euoca illam: si eae meae sunt filiae
 1153, inde porro ad puteum atque ad robustum codicem
 *1166, sed eccas uideo ipsas. haecine meae sunt filiae?
 *1206, quōdque haru-pex de ambabus dixit— uelim de me aliquid dixerit
 1237, ite si iris. quid nos fecimus tibi? fures estis ambae
 1238, nōsne tibi? uos inquam. atque ego scio. quid id furtist? hunc rogato
 1348, nēninem uenire qui istas adsereret manu

Stichus:

67, si quid me quaeret, inde uocatote aliqui: aut iam egomet hic ero
 176, quia inde iam a pusillo puero ridiculus fui
 182, nulli negare soleo, si quis me esum uocat
 352, ēcquis huc ecfert nassiternam cum aqua? sine suffragio
 †509, nunc quia tē amicum mi experior esse, creditur tibi
 526, ōmniū me exilem atque inanem fecit aegritudinū
 577, atque ēccum tibi lupum in sermone: praesens essuriens adest
 679, inter illud tamen negotium meis curauī amicis
 768, rēdde cantionem ueteri pro uino nouam

Truculentus:

46, si iratum scortum fortēst amātori suo
 254-5, ēcquis huic tutelam ianuae gerit? ecquis intus exit?
 362, nēmpē tu eris hodie mecum, mea Phronesium?
 663, tat! ecquis intust? ēcquis hoc aperit ostium?

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

†See Part III, 4. So-called semi-hiatus.

For several other isolated cases (which, nevertheless, have occurred sporadically in the selected ten plays of Plautus), such as *amābō*, *sēsē*, *dērīdes*, etc., see Müller *Plautinische Prosodie*, pages 446, 447, 448, where, however, the citations are not always the reading of the Mss. It has not been thought necessary to include these few sporadic examples in the above cases, as an isolated instance of undue shortening or lengthening is not of sufficient value alone to maintain a thesis: and although I am of the opinion that all the cases are nothing more than ordinary manifestations of the Pyrrhic Stress, nevertheless in all fairness to those who might take issue with this point I will readily grant them that they may be easily and satisfactorily explained by analogy to such cases as have been cited and recited above; e. g. *inde*, *quīppe*, *iste*, *ēsse*, *ēsēs*, etc.

.

MISCELLANEA

In addition to the foregoing examples gathered from the plays of Plautus, not included in the selected ten, it has been deemed best to add a number of like instances gathered from the works of the poet's predecessors. These adscititious illustrations have, on the whole, been taken from Merry (see *Bibliography*), mainly for the reason that the work is fairly representative and readily accessible to all readers. I have, however, not confined myself to Merry's collection, but have also done my gleaning in any other fertile spots that have presented themselves, without going directly to the extant fragments of the poets themselves. Hence an exhaustive study of these poets must not be expected, but only those cases which are of outstanding value and have thus found their way, by virtue of their merit, into collections or elsewhere.

Lengthening.

Qua pro confidentia ausus uerbum cum eo fūerim
(*Com. R. F.*, p. 21.)

Solus anem seruāt: at Romulus pulcher in alto
(*Ennius, Annales*, Book I)

omnibu' cura uiris uter essēt induperator
(*Ibid.*)

moenia, concubiā, uigilesque repente cruentant
(*Ibid.* Book VII)

quae nunc te coquit et uersāt in pectore fixa
(*Ibid.* Boox X)

itā neque domino liquit e me gaudia
(*C I L.* XII, 912)

Shortening.

Uirtutes generis mieis moribus accumulaui
(Inscription of Cn. Cornelius Scipio Hispallus)

Inserit Inoni uersus, putō, tale docimen
(Trag. R. F., p. 4)

āteris inanem uoluulam madidam dari
āteris nuces in procliui profundier*
(Naevius, *Ariolus*)

Uirginēs nam sibi quisque domi Romanus habet sas
(Ennius, *Annales*, Book I)

Müller would read *uirgnes*, comparing the form *Proserpna* in Naevius, *Bellum Punicum*, Book II. The codices, however, do not read *Proserpna* but *Proserpina*.

Qui antehac inuicti fuērunt pater optime Olympi,
(*Ibid.*, Book VI)

imminet Leoni Virgo caelesti situ
(C I L. VII, 759)

quam nei esset, credo, nēscioqui inueidit deus
(C I L. I, 1306)

Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc.

ille trauersa mente mi hodie tradidit repagula
(Ennius, *Medea Exul*)

Qui uolt ēsse quod uolt, ei ita dat se res, ut operam dabit
(Ascribed to Ennius, *Medea*)

Editors vary much as to the reading of this verse, but it appears that the reading as given above is the true one.

ille trīstis est dum cibum seruat, tu ridens uoras
(*Ibid.*, *Satires*, Book IV.)

.

*This appears to be the authentic reading.

PART III

APPLICATIONS OF THE LATIN ACCENT

Part III

In the first division of the preceding part of this study, we recognized eight usually accepted variations from the classic norm, found in the works of the early Roman poets. As was then suggested, these eight divisions have been reduced to seven by including under the general term Shortening all such cases as word-combinations with *quidem*, non- or partial-elision, etc. For purposes of clearness, it seems best now to discuss each case recognized and to offer any criticisms that may arise. From these discussions it will be seen that every case of apparent disagreement of earlier Latin with that of later times is in no way disagreement at all. The entire mass of Latin poetry is in entire conformity with the Tripudic Theory, and of course necessarily so, since the theory is merely an expression of what the actual poetry itself shows us. The real difference between the earlier and later poetry is, as has been said, the fact that the latter had fallen more completely under the spell of Hellenizing sophistication.

I

The Iambic Law.

There appears to be a slight variation among scholars as to the exact nature of the so-called Iambic Law. The statement of its range which appears to be the least non-committal seems to be about as follows: A long syllable may be shortened when it is preceded by a short, and either preceded or followed by the accent of a word or word-group, or by the verse ictus. Thus $\acute{\text{—}}$ may become $\acute{\text{—}}$, and $\acute{\text{—}}$ may become $\acute{\text{—}}$. The short syllable preceding the shortened long must be a monosyllable or begin a word. The long syllable which is shortened is usually (a) a monosyllable, (b) the long syllable of an iambic word, (c) the first syllable of a polysyllabic word, or (d) quite rarely the second syllable of a polysyllabic word. As to the last case, and one or two others commonly considered as coming under the influence of the Iambic Law, there seems to be some doubt as to whether the law really is in operation.

Examples of the Iambic Law are so numerous in the early Roman poets that I have not thought it worth while to note them. The reader cannot read a page of a single early play or poem without meeting probably a half dozen cases. The most note-worthy cases of its operation in our study are as follows, in which the short syllable has affected a following long syllable through a mute plus a liquid in the majority of examples: Amphitruo, 939 (see d sup.) Aulularia, none; Bacchides, 404, 641*, 1016*, 1041, 1167, 1183; Captivi, 398; Menaechmi, 259, 677*; Miles Gloriosus, none; Mostellaria, none; Pseudolus, 178, 544a; Rudens, 927; Trinummus, 652, 695†; in the works of Terence we probably find no such cases as those just listed.

*The actual reading of the Mss. is to be retained.

†Cf. line 687.

In the *Carmen Arvale* we have our earliest illustration of this law, in the form *sinas incurrere*. This fact has been pointed out by Professor FitzHugh in *The Sacred Tripudium*, p. 19f, who gives a clear and concise statement of the real principle. His remarks are as follows, with a slight modification of my own to reconcile his symbols with the results of later research: "it is clear that in all iambic

combinations with the acute stress on the short, e. g. *sinās* = $\bar{A}-\bar{A}$, the acute stress will invade the last syllable, unless the two syllables are kept apart as thesis and arsis (i. e. $\bar{A}-\bar{A}$), and since it requires but one more short syllable to support it the remaining half of the subsumed long is discarded. Consequently, such iambic accentual combinations $\bar{A}-\bar{A}$ = $\bar{A}-\bar{A}$, when beginning either thesis or arsis, and accordingly confined thereto and subjected to the single stress, become pyrrhic $\bar{A}-\bar{A}$ = \bar{A} , because the expiratory strength of the accent is exhausted upon a long or two shorts, and therefore the last half of the long remains unvoiced. This is the explanation of the Iambic Law, which is purely a result of the stress accent of Latin speech, and entirely independent of the verse-ictus. The traditional *sins* for *sinās* (i. e. *sinās*) illustrates the phonetic operation of the law *sinās* = *sinās* = *sins*." And all this in the light of, and as an inevitable result of, what has been said of the Pyrrhic stress in the first part of this study.

But why limit ourselves to an Iambic Law? Why are we forbidden to have a Trochaic, Spondaic, Bacchic, etc. Law? Surely our need for other laws is sufficiently pressing, if we insist upon viewing Latin poetry as quantitative. Our very real, and by no means *apparent* only, *nēmpē*, *quippē*, *illē*, etc. would have been very nicely explained by a Trochaic Law. If other laws had become our heritage, such a verse as *Rudens* 279 would have needed no bolstering up in order to be scanned quantitatively: *nam*, says Lindsay, '*uidēs*' in *versu bacchaico displicet*. Let us rid ourselves, then, of this idle dream of an Iambic Law and waste no more paper and time in vain conjectures as to when it does, or does not, apply. The bisyllabic phenomenon occurs -- to that we all agree. Why can we not see, then, that it is purely an outcome of the stress accent of Latin speech and utterly unrelated to the verse-ictus?

II

Synizesis.

As has been hinted before, it is my own conviction that synizesis, the settling together or blending of adjacent vowel sounds into one, is merely a special case of what has been called the Iambic Law, previously discussed, whenever the first vowel is accented. Just as in the case of this law, so in the treatment of synizesis I have not thought it worth while to make note of all cases, on account of their very frequent occurrence. Scarcely a half page of any early play or poem can be read without meeting a half dozen examples. Consequently, it would have been time ill spent even to have attempted to make a collection of these examples.

The relationship between Synizesis and the Iambic Law can well be seen in such a line as *Andria* 538:

per te deos oro et nostram amicitiam, Chremes,
or, again, *Phormio* 296:

non fuit necesse habere; sed id quod lex iubet.

In both of the examples cited we find the quantitative scansion to be a short followed by a long. In both cases, too, the long syllable is either preceded or directly followed by the verse-ictus or the word-accent. Here, then, are all the prerequisites necessary for a perfect application of the so-called Iambic Law. But we have seen the real explanation of the Iambic Law and that it was entirely independent of the verse-ictus. Here too, then, the same result obtains and the mere fact that a consonant does not intervene between the vowels is purely accidental. The additional fact that two such adjacent vowel sounds are easily slurred into one may, of course, have been an aid. But I believe that it was a thing apart.

As to such cases of synizesis occurring in words like *deinde*, *proinde*, *antehac*, etc., the same thing results. Of course, it may be urged, that *deinde* with a short *e* preceding the long syllable is quite different from *antehac*, the first syllable of which is long and would not come under the so-called Iambic Law. To such an objection I would reply that it must be remembered how, in the light of what has been said in Part I, the *de* in *deinde* became short; and again, such words as have been listed under Shortening and Nempe, Ille, Quippe, etc. must be remembered. Furthermore, it is not a very far cry from *abhinc* to *dehinc*. It is merely a distinction without a difference.

III

Lengthening.

From the examples cited in the immediately preceding part of this work, it will be seen that often certain vowels are found to be long, which grammarians assure us to be short. It has also been pointed out that this unusual lengthening is of two kinds: that is, so-called original quantity retained and arbitrary lengthening. It appears, however, that the whole procedure is arbitrary. That is to say, we have seen that the stress accent of Latin speech is pyrrhic in nature — it can, if necessary, shorten syllables usually considered long. It does this solely by not dwelling on the syllable in question throughout the time usually devoted to that syllable. In like manner, then, it can lengthen syllables usually considered short by giving that syllable its own two fold nature. In other words, it dwells on these syllables twice the length of time usually devoted to them. This process is just as legitimate and natural as its antithesis. It is merely the *alter ego* of the verse-ictus.

Consider, for example, *Miles Gloriosus*, 964-5:

nuptast an uidua? | et nupta et uidua. quo pacto potis

in which the same word *uidua* occurs twice but with varying quantities. Is it conceivable that Plautus used in the first case the so-called original quantity of the *a* and in the second case in the same verse the then contemporary pronunciation of the word? And yet, to repeat what I have previously said with regard to this verse, "there are those that say that Plautus would be an *ancient* when he wrote the first portion of the verse, but upon entering the latter half of the same verse he immediately stripped himself of his antiquity and talked like his contemporaries who said *uiduā* and not *uiduā*."

It will be noticed that lengthening most commonly occurs in trisyllabic words having the scansion - - - and - - -. And these too are usually infinitives; but the phenomenon is by no means confined exclusively to such words. In a word like *dicere*, for example, we often find the final *e* made long, though in such a line as *Miles Gloriosus* 27, in the combination *dicere uolui* it must not be supposed that such is the case. Here the *e* is short and the remainder of the thesis is supplied by the *u* of *uolui*. In the second class of words mentioned we often find *feri* scanned with a long antepenultimate. This word in particular quite frequently has the scansion just mentioned. The entire business, though, is readily comprehensible in the light of the Tripudic doctrine.

IV

Shortening.

The reversal of the principle, by which short vowels can be made long, I have called Shortening. That is, under this head are considered all those cases in which the pyrrhic nature of the Latin accent has been at work. Here we have to notice the following sub-divisions: 1) word combinations with *quidem*, 2) partial- (i. e. so-called semi-hiatus) and non-elision, 3) Systole, and 4) other cases not usually recognized.

1) The objections to asserting that *quidem* has the power to shorten a preceding *me*, *te*, *tu*, *si*, or *quando* have already been pointed out. The statement is in itself an absurdity.* for how can a following word affect a preceding word before the following word has been arrived at? The other objections to such a

*After Professor Fitzhugh's exposure of the ludicrous self-contradiction of W. M. Lindsay's theory of the Saturnian verse (*Indoeurop. Rhyth.*—65), which represents it as trochaic in its first dipody and iambic in its second:

Virum mihi | camena
Consol censor | aidilis

theory have already been pointed out on page 26. Repetition here would be useless. The secret of the business lies in the fact that the Roman, if necessary, could consider such a combination as *mequidem* to have the formula A-G, that is - - - instead of A-G-G, that is - - -.

2) Little need be said of so-called semi-hiatus, except in explanation of those cases which I have considered to be such. I have regarded all such cases as *dī ament*, *nē amet te*, *quī item me*, etc. as so-called semi-hiatus. That is, I look upon them as - - - rather than - - - with complete hiatus and the operation of the so-called Iambic Law. Although there is no objection to this latter scansion, it is merely moving the phenomenon from one category and placing it in another. The matter is really identical in kind, but differs merely in point of view. Conversely, such combinations as *ne ego*, etc. have always been considered - - - and not - - -. That is, here the hiatus is probably complete.

The whole principle is resolvable in the presence of the pyrrhic stress. It was just because the Romans had this pyrrhic stress— this stress of twofold intensity— that they were enabled to feel the two words as a single word-combination, and could thus shorten the long syllable at will.

3) The principle of Systole has the identical basis as the two foregoing cases. We are told by grammarians that long syllables which had commenced to be pronounced short were often written short in poetry. This shortening has been given the name Systole. The question to be asked here is "Why had these long syllables commenced to be pronounced short?" It is all well and good to state that this was the fact, but it is a great deal more satisfying to know *why* it was the fact. Considered in the light of the powerful initial and medial stresses that all Latin words of sufficient length had, the matter at once explains itself. Repetition here would be useless.

4) Unclassified cases. Numerous are the examples of shortening not recognized by grammarians. Quite as numerous are those cases in which the text is always emended to avoid them. Editors are strangely silent with regard to such words as *esses* often to be found as two short syllables. *Esse* too and *mille* (once) are at times to be scanned as two short syllables. These last words are clearly to be explained like *nempe*, *ille*, *quippe*, etc., but in discussing these words I have confined myself solely to that group which editors explain as ending in a silent letter. To be noted also is the fact that the *e* in *nescio* is often to be

it was hardly to be expected that we should be visited after thirty years with another guess at "Early Latin Verse" (Oxford, 1922), at the same hands, in which *venire* and *dedisse*, and the like, tribrachic, are repudiated as "rubbish," while *tuquidem*, *mequidem*, etc., as anapaests, 'need not startle our readers as a phonetic mystery, because 'sheep' takes a short vowel in 'shepherd, and 'goose' in 'gosling!'" Cf. Lindsay's preface and p. 73.

scanned as short. I do not believe that in such cases the *io* becomes a long syllable by so-called synizesis and the *e* is retained as long. In the first place, *io* is never made one long syllable outside of this particular word—if here. In the second place, *Adelphoe* 77 attests that the *e* is short when necessary. Again, the first syllable of *omnis* and its forms is often to be scanned as short. *Hecyra* 367 and elsewhere show this fact. Numerous other instances where the same word occurs again and again as short can be cited, but all of them can be found in the examples given above. The explanation, at this point in the work, is quite obvious.

V

Nempe, Ille, Quippe, Etc.

We have already pointed out that even where the so-called Iambic Law does not hold good, the pronoun *ille* sometimes shows the apparent scansion *illē*. Likewise, we find *quippe*, *iste*, *ūnde*, *nēmpr*, *inde*, and even *immo*. These scansions are not merely "apparent": they are real.† And the Romans actually did pronounce these words, on occasion, with a short initial syllable.

We are informed by editors that the probable explanation lies in the fact that the final vowel of these words was silent. To strengthen the hypothesis, they cite such words as *dice* and *hice** which later became *dic* and *hic*. These words prove, if anything, just the reverse: and, besides, in what way do the backers of this hypothesis know that the final vowel in these words was silent? The forms just mentioned occur both in prose and poetry. From the former we can learn nothing: from the latter, everything. And what does poetry teach us with regard to the pronunciation of such words? The final *e* is pronounced every time except in cases of elision, of course. Consequently, it is anything but wise to assume, then, that *ille* was pronounced *ill'*. By no means analogous is the case of *uiden* for *uidesne*. The Romans did not write *uidesne* and pronounce it *uiden*, but wrote *uiden* and pronounced it exactly as it was written.

Furthermore, we do not know of a single instance in which the Romans wrote a vowel and did not pronounce it. Why then should it be done in the case of this small class of words? No, clearly the apparent *ille* is a very real one. And it is just in such words of common occurrence that we would expect to find such a beautiful application of our so-called pyrrhic stress.

†It is difficult to understand how Lindsay could investigate "early Latin verse" and yet deny that *ille* actually existed (page 163). Although he professes to "abjure airy speculations" and concern himself "with statistics and solid facts" (page 10), in order to "restore order and harmony among lovers of Plautus" (page IX), yet we feel even now that the introductory paragraph of this study must remain unchanged.

See Skutsch, *Studien zur Plautinischen Prosodie* (Leipzig, 1892), pp. 30 ff.

VI

Final S.

The part played by an *s* final in making position is of an extremely variable nature. If the vowel preceding the *s* is short, it must often be scanned as short even when the *s* is followed by a consonant. It is idle study, however, to attempt to account for the variable character of this *s* final by means of accent. Its explanation undoubtedly resolves itself to the same as that of *m* final. If I have occasionally noted a line in which the part played by an *s* final causes a phenomenon to arise in scansion, which would otherwise be normal, it will be seen at once that such lines are rare and self-explanatory.

VII

A Mute plus L or R.

In the early poets we find, almost without exception, that if a short vowel precedes a mute plus an *l* or an *r* the syllable is kept short. At first glance it would seem that accent could play no very important part in this phenomenon, and to the views of many editors the two have nothing in common. But it is undoubtedly due to the presence of this all-pervading pyrrhic accent that we regularly find *patre*, for example, considered as two shorts (i. e. A.), and not as a long and a short (i. e. A-G). This is regularly the case, in which the exception proves the rule.

Consequently, I have not thought it worth while to add the examples to my collection. On the contrary, I have collected the exceptions.

To be noticed and compared with each other are verses 683 and 715 of the *Aulularia*. Here the word *opsecro* is found to be scanned both with a short and with a long penultimate. Line 15 of the *Mercator* (*sūo pātre*) is surely corrupt. But, although the exceptions are very interesting, nevertheless it is more interesting to note the consistent part played by the pyrrhic stress in maintaining a short vowel before this particular combination of mute plus liquid.

PART IV

CONCLUSION

Part IV.

Conclusion.

From the evidence which the literature itself of Rome exhibits there is only one conclusion that one may sanely draw. It is only too well established that our current theory of Latin accent and versification is mere fiction, having its origin in the ancient untruths which had as their aim the assimilation of Latin theory to Greek. These false pieces of propaganda have been blindly copied and re-copied down the ages for some two thousand years, until they have been regarded as axiomatic through sheer force of custom, and even today our grammarians continue to dole them out as truths. The Romans were so utterly infatuated with Greek culture that they actually added longs and shorts to their purely accentual rhythm in their mad endeavor to imitate their Greek neighbors. Then it occurred to a wily Greek grammarian, one Tyrannio Amisenus by name,† to bestow upon the Latin language a false musical accent like that of the Greek, in order that this bogus system of quantities previously adopted might seem genuine. Dr. James S. McLemore has recently shown* that this false doctrine is what has come down to us to the present day. The only reason that the doctrine has enjoyed the length of life that it has enjoyed is the fact that the quantitative fiction of Latin verse was accepted as genuine, and not artificial. Consequently, the musical theory, then, aroused no hint of suspicion; for, as in Greek, a really genuine quantitative rhythm demands a musical accent in the language, entirely without dependence upon the verse ictus.

However, there are numerous instances in the *Grammatici Latini* in which the real nature of the Latin accent and Latin versification is completely given away. Modern scholars, however, either feign ignorance of what is meant in these particular passages or insist that they are the utterance of some heretic. Accordingly, the passages are figuratively burned at the stake; that is, they are bracketed. [Sergius] (Keil IV, p. 533) says, for example: "*Terentius rhythmis scribit comoedias vel Plautus.*" And at once the martyr is led to the stake—for uttering the absolute truth! Other passages are passed over uncomprehendingly. Thus we find: "*Bacchius, Oenotrius, tripudians, saltans, quem Graeci pariambum dicunt: constat ex brevi et duabus longis, temporum quinque, ut Agenor, Athenae, dictus παρὰ τὰς Βάκχας, quia bacchantibus convenienter componebatur. Huic contrarius est palinbacchius, Latius, qui et Saturnius, ultimibrevis, quem propompicon, alii*

†Cf. *Indoeuropean Rhythm*, p. 52 ff.

*The Tradition of the Latin Accent, 1917 (incompetently "reviewed" and misrepresented in *The Class. Weekly* XI. 160, where the fitness of the "reviewer" for his task is ludicrously adumbrated in the double r and single n of his "Tyrranio"!)

thesekon vocant."* What else could the epithet *thesekon* mean than "thesis-mad"?— as has previously been pointed out; that is, θέσις and ἡλεός. Still others have been beautifully mistranslated, in the endeavor to reconcile them to the false-faced theory of Latin quantities. Cicero quite ambiguously, but ambiguous with a definite purpose, writes: "*In versu quidem theatra tota exclamant, si fuit una syllaba brevior aut longior.*"† And the adherents of the quantitative theory find delight in being able to translate this as follows (just as the smiling Cicero knew they would): "Indeed in the matter of verse the entire theatre cries out, if even a single syllable is too short or too long." I wonder if the following translation has ever occurred to their minds: "Indeed in the matter of verse the entire theatre raises an outcry, if it (i. e. the verse) is too long or too short by even a single syllable." All of which has quite a different meaning from the preceding translation and grammatically is just as good. From the point of view of truth and science, it is far superior. Or once again we find: "*In eadem opinione et Varro fuit, qui in leges suas redigit accentus, . . .*"‡ Quite a naive (but intentionally misleading) statement. Surely Varro "reduced the question of accent to his own laws"; for if all the evidence is true he most assuredly never reduced them to their own laws. *Sed quid plura?* Examples, such as those just mentioned, might be indefinitely multiplied.§

What then, do the quantities of the Roman poets demonstrate to us? It is quite clear that at least three inferences may be drawn therefrom. 1) The Latin language was a language possessing a strong stress accent and had, all artificialities being stripped away, nothing in common with the musical tones of the Greek. 2) Latin accent was what we have called a superstress, because it was of a two-fold or pyrrhic intensity. Latin rhythm, therefore, because it depended directly upon Latin accent, is a rhythm of the double accent. 3) Latin rhythm, furthermore, is not quantitative. Quantities are present to be sure; but the function of these quantities was merely to hide that "grave virus," so execrated by Horace. For the non-quantitative tripudium was "*indoctum, vulgare, incompertum*". For, in the final analysis, quantity in Latin is a "mere superfluous dress in slavish imitation of Greek usage." A merely casual examination of the verses previously shown indubitably attests this fact.

As may be expected, though, Hellenizing orthodoxy maintains a suspicious silence with regard to tripudic rhythm except when this rhythm may be hidden and disguised under a masquerade of quantities. But, be it understood, this taciturnity is not due to ignorance on the part of the grammarians, but is due only to the tradition which accepted and recognized nothing as real art unless

*Diomedes, Keil I, p. 479.

†Cicero, *Orator*, LI, 173.

‡ [Sergius], Keil IV, p. 529.

§For several of the translations cited here, I am indebted to suggestions offered, during various conferences, by Professor FitzHugh. As to others, we both translate alike, though independently.

based on the artificial (to the Romans) quantitative metric system of the Greeks, and thus completely ignored in theory what could not possibly be ignored in practice. *The Sacred Tripudium*, 59.

It is clear from the very doctrine of the Sacred Tripudium that its ancient, natural, and necessary laws have been consistently excluded from all scientific and artistic inquiry. For the Hellenized Roman there was only a base contempt for his own native rhythm which he, nevertheless, actually used in all his speech and verse; and although he thus could not avoid or violate it, he could, and did, ignore it in all his metrical propaganda. Consequently, we have to resort to his literature itself—our only infallible guide—in order to determine whether Roman rhythm was quantitative or accentual. And we learn without the shadow of a doubt that the Roman possessed a non-quantitative rhythm in accordance with his bi-syllabic stress accent; the initial accent, however, being in a less favored position than the medial accent, has been excluded from all Greek propaganda. And thus has arisen our semi-truthful Tri-syllabic Law of Latin Accentuation.

Possessing such good foster fathers, as it did, this Tri-syllabic fiction gained an advantageous and propitious start. And once entered on its pernicious career, like Dame Rumor,

Mobilitate uiget uirisque acquirit eundo;
Parua metu primo, mox sese attollit in auras
Ingrediturque solo et caput inter nubila condit.

