

THE LATIN DUAL  
&

POETIC DICTION

STUDIES IN  
NUMBERS AND FIGURES

BY

ANDREW J. BELL

Macdonald Professor of Latin in Victoria College, and Professor of  
Comparative Philology in the University of Toronto

ERRORIBUS INLAQUEATUS MULTIPLICATUR.—Diomedes.

---

LONDON  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS  
HUMPHREY MILFORD  
VICTORIA COLLEGE PRESS  
TORONTO

1923

**\* A Distributed Proofreaders Canada eBook \***

This ebook is made available at no cost and with very few restrictions. These restrictions apply only if (1) you make a change in the ebook (other than alteration for different display devices), or (2) you are making commercial use of the ebook. If either of these conditions applies, please check with an FP administrator before proceeding.

This work is in the Canadian public domain, but may be under copyright in some countries. If you live outside Canada, check your country's copyright laws. **If the book is under copyright in your country, do not download or redistribute this file.**

*Title:* The Latin Dual and Poetic Diction

*Date of first publication:* 1923

*Author:* Andrew J. Bell (1856-1932)

*Date first posted:* August 28, 2013

*Date last updated:* August 28, 2013

Faded Page ebook #20130838

This ebook was produced by: Louise Hope

This e-text includes characters that require UTF-8 (Unicode) file encoding, primarily single Greek words or phrases:

αἰτιατική

There are also a few words of transliterated Sanskrit, and some Latin words printed with macrons or breves (used only when required by the subject):

akṣī  
currūs  
īīcō

If any of these characters do not display properly—in particular, if the diacritic does not appear directly above the letter—or if the apostrophes and quotation marks in this paragraph appear as garbage, you may have an incompatible browser or unavailable fonts. First, make sure that the browser's "character set" or "file encoding" is set to Unicode (UTF-8). You may also need to change your browser's default font.

Missing periods (full stops) at the end of Index entries have been silently supplied. Other typographical errors are shown with mouse-hover popups. The word "invisible" means that there is an appropriately sized blank space, but the expected text is not present. Asterisks are in the original.

[Preface](#)  
[Contents](#)  
[The Latin Dual & Poetic Diction](#)  
[Index](#)



THE LATIN DUAL  
&  
POETIC DICTION  
  
STUDIES IN  
  
NUMBERS AND  
  
FIGURES

BY

ANDREW J. BELL

Macdonald Professor of Latin in Victoria College, and Professor of  
Comparative Philology in the University of Toronto

erroribus inlaqueatus multiplicatur.—Diomedes.

LONDON  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS  
HUMPHREY MILFORD  
VICTORIA COLLEGE PRESS  
TORONTO  
1923

Printed in England.

---

IN MEMORIAM SAMUELIS SOBIESKI NELLES

ET IOHANNIS THORBURN, VIRORUM ET  
DOCTISSIMORUM ET SANCTISSIMORUM,  
HUNC LIBRUM D.D.D. A.J.B.

---

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS  
London Edinburgh Glasgow Copenhagen  
New York Toronto Melbourne Cape Town  
Bombay Calcutta Madras Shanghai  
HUMPHREY MILFORD  
Publisher to the University

---

## P R E F A C E

It will be objected that in our Grammars there stands no mention of a Latin dual. Nor does there stand there any mention of a Latin objective case, or of a Latin aorist. The Latin objective has been obscured by an unfortunate mistranslation of the Greek term αἰτιατική; but the dual did find a place in the oldest Latin Grammars we have, and the term aorist now plays a part in Latin grammatical terminology that seems to me far too great. But in the study of any language the part played by the words not expressed, but to be supplied in the mind of the reader or hearer, is very great, and I have endeavoured in the following pages to determine the origin and nature of some ellipses peculiarly Latin, that have not hitherto been adequately treated.

The ellipsis has in the past played a great part in investigations into Latin syntax; and the reason for this is evident the moment we try to construe into our own tongue a few consecutive verses of Virgil or Horace. But the older grammarians of modern times, such as Sanctius, applied to the solution of the problems thus presented the ellipses familiar to them in their own tongues, instead of endeavouring to discover the ellipses peculiarly Latin. This tendency wrought such mischief in their investigations into Latin syntax that there succeeded to it an opposite tendency to assume as few ellipses as possible in conducting such investigations. In many of the constructions which Sanctius attempted to solve by ellipses this tendency has justified itself; but it soon becomes evident to all students that Latin, like English or French or German, has its peculiar ellipses, and to understand the language they must be determined. In many cases we come to perceive that the words we do not see are of quite as much importance to the meaning as those we do.

For their constant support and sympathy I have especially to thank Chancellor Bowles, and my colleagues, Dean Robertson and Dean Wallace. My colleague in Latin, Professor De Witt, has helped me constantly with suggestions, and I have to thank him especially for his help in the question of Acestes' arrow. My old friend and class-mate, Professor Keys, has always been ready with sympathy and help, especially in questions affecting the Romance languages. I have further to thank Principal Hutton, Professor Alexander, Mr. Langton, Professor W. P. Mustard, Professor W. Sherwood Fox, and many others, for the kind patience and sympathy with which they have endured my demands on their time and attention. And lastly I have to thank the Board of Regents of Victoria College, whose generous help enables me to publish this book.

VICTORIA COLLEGE.

A. J. B.

# CONTENTS

## I. INTRODUCTORY

I. Geminusque Pollux	3
II. Domitus Pollucis habenis	9
III. Pilumnus and Pitumnus	16
IV. Liberi	19

## II. GREEK AND LATIN DUALS

V. The Numbers in Greek and Latin, and their Relations	23
VI. The Dual in Latin	25
VII. Inflections of the Dual	29
VIII. Inter	36
IX. Alter and Alius	39
X. Uter—Neuter—Uterque—Noster—Poetaster	47
XI. Use of the Dual for the Plural and of the Plural for the Dual	53
XII. Use of the Singular for the Dual and of the Dual for the Singular	59
XIII. Use of the Singular for the Plural	67
XIV. Use of the Plural for the Singular	72
XV. The Dual Pronouns σφώ, σφῶϊ, and σφωέ	79
XVI. The Schema Pindaricum and Allied Constructions	84
XVII. The Schema Alcmanicum, and further Syntax of the Dual	97
XVIII. Numerals, Cardinal and Distributive	102
XIX. Constructio ad Sensum	111
XX. Development of the Imperative in Latin	116
XXI. Use of the Infinitive for the Imperative	121
XXII. Ait fuisse navium celerrimus	131

## III. LATIN POETIC DICTION

XXIII. Poetic Diction	137
XXIV. Longe Lateque	161
XXV. Synecdoche and Metonymy	174
XXVI. Tellus Terra	192
XXVII. Prolepsis	204
XXVIII. Proximus ardet Ucalegon	215
XXIX. Illicet Extemplo	225
XXX. Tollo and Puto	246
XXXI. Hendiadys	257
XXXII. The Ellipsis with Que	264
XXXIII. Synchysis or Distribution	272

XXXIV.	Primus quisque—Iamdudum—Nequidquam	279
XXXV.	The Amphibole	293
XXXVI.	Zeugma	304
XXXVII.	Hypallage	315
XXXVIII.	Omission of the Prefix	330
XXXIX.	Antallage	340
XL.	Nisi and Donec	351
XLI.	First and Last	358
XLII.	The Oxymoron	386
XLIII.	Quod minime reris	394
XLIV.	Alia Quaedam	410
APPENDIX		422
INDEX OF PASSAGES		429
GENERAL INDEX		463

# I INTRODUCTORY

## I GEMINUSQUE POLLUX

WE read in Horace:

Tunc me biremis praesidio scaphae  
Tutum per Aegaeos tumultus  
Aura feret geminusque Pollux. (Od. 3. 29. 62-4.)

Lonsdale and Lee translate *geminusque Pollux*, ‘and Pollux with his twin brother’. Acron’s note is: 64. *Geminusque P. Pollux cum Castore intellegendus est; amborum enim stellae simul nascuntur*; and Porphyrio’s: *geminusque Pollux, quia horum sidera cum se ostendunt laborantibus nautis praebent spem salutis*. It is the constellation that is in question here, and the two stars rise together; so we feel sure that Pollux here is used for Castor and Pollux. But it is one thing to feel sure of this, quite another to see how this use is possible and what it involves.

Kiessling explains: ‘The one of the Dioscuri is named, the other merely signified by *geminus*’, and this explanation seems that commonly accepted. But if the Twins were commonly termed: *gemiini Castores*, and we found *geminus Castor* used to designate both, the use of *geminus* would not explain the difficulty, but merely double it. In naming the Twins, besides: *Castor et Pollux* (Cic. N. D. 2. 6. 2), *cum Castore Pollux* (Hor. Ep. 2. 1. 5), *gemelle Castor et gemelle Castoris* (Catull. 4. 27), we find in use *Castores* (Tac. Hist. 2. 24 et saepius), *Polluces* (Serv. ad Geo. 3. 89), *Gemini* (Varro, R. R. 2. 1. 7), *Castoras geminos* (Pacat. Pan. 39). To take a parallel use, we read in Juvenal: *geminos sub rupe Quirinos* (11. 105), of Romulus and Remus; if we followed Horace’s idiom, we should write: *geminum sub rupe Remum*. But the presence of *geminum* in this phrase would hardly account for the use of *Remum* for *Romulum et Remum*. Horace’s idiom does not stand alone, though Kiessling cites no parallels. But we read: *potaque Pollucis lympa salubris equo* (Prop. 3 (4). 22. 26). In Statius we read: *donec ab Elysiis prospexit sedibus alter Castor* (Silv. 4. 6. 15-16), where *alter Castor* is also of the constellation, and must stand for Castor and Pollux; and for Virgil’s *Haedi pluviales* (Aen. 9. 668) we find Horace using the singular in: *orientis Haedi* (Od. 3. 1. 28), and Propertius in: *purus et Haedus erit* (2. 26. 56).

The use of *Quirini* for Romulus and Remus, or of *Castores* for Castor and Pollux, is evidently connected with the usual likeness of twins: *proles indiscreta suis gratusque parentibus error* (Aen. 10. 392). Virgil seems to have extended this use to brothers in: *Assaracique duo et senior cum Castore Thymbris* (Aen. 10. 124), where the mention of Castor immediately after Assaraci suggests the analogy of *Castores*, Assaraci being probably for Assaracus and Ganymedes, descendants of an older pair of brothers of like names. The likeness that is not always found in twins is very common in brothers that are not twins. Lucan extends the use further in: *Heroas lacrimoso litore turres* (9. 955), where *Heroas* evidently means ‘of Hero and Leander’.

Cicero uses *Castor* for Castor and Pollux in: *in aede Castoris* (Verr. 2. 1. 129. 49), and: *ad Castoris* (Milo, 91. 33); with which we may compare: *ad vigilem ponendi Castora nummi* (Juv. 14. 260) or: *vicinum Castora canae transibis Vestae* (Mart. 1. 70. 3-4). This may primarily have been merely a short and convenient way of designating the shrine, and the longer form of the name of the second twin *Pollūces* (= Πολυδεύκης), still in use in Plautus’s day, adds probability to this view. If so, Horace’s use of the name *Pollux* for the two may be merely a poetic variation of the ordinary colloquial use. But the tendency to use the name of one of a pair to express both is so common in Latin both for proper and common names, as we shall see, that I hesitate to accept this account of its origin. We may believe, however, that the Romans in their adjurations: *Ecastor*, *Mecastor*, *Pol*, *Edepol*, were using the name of one of the twins for both; and Horace seems to



have both in mind in: *hac arte Pollux et vagus Hercules enisus arces attigit igneas* (Od. 3. 3. 9-10), when we compare: *dicam et Alciden puerosque Ledae* (Od. 1. 12. 25).

The use of the plural we noticed in Castores, usually called the Elliptical Plural, in Assaraci Virgil has extended from twins to a pair of brothers, and Lucan in Heroas to a pair of lovers; we might expect a similar extension of the use of *geminus Pollux* for Castor and Pollux. I read in Keller-Holder's Horace:

Videre †Raetis bella sub Alpibus  
Drusum gerentem Vindelici. (Od. 4. 4. 17-18.)

But all the manuscripts give *Raeti*, not *Raetis*, which is Bentley's emendation. This reading is confirmed by the Scholia of Acron and Porphyrio, more valuable than the manuscripts, as their readings are fortified by the explanations they add. Acron's scholium runs: 17. *Videre Rh. b. s. A. Per hyperbaton longum sensui superiori respondit. Qualem aquilam et leonem imbellis praeda, talem Drusum videre Rhaeti Vindelici barbarorum gentes*; and Porphyrio in the introduction to his Scholia on this ode writes: (*Haec ode*) *scripta est ergo in Neronem Drusum, privignum et successorem Augusti, qui Rhaetos Vindelicos bello vicit*. It seems certain that both Acron and Porphyrio had before them the text:

Videre Rhaeti bella sub Alpibus  
Drusum gerentem Vindelici;

and at present editors seem inclined to accept it. Very curious is Porphyrio's: *Drusum, privignum et successorem Augusti*; it looks as though he were following Horace in making *Drusum* stand here for *Tiberium*, for surely Porphyrio knew that *Tiberius*, not *Drusus*, was the successor of *Augustus*.

While most of the older scholars accepted the text of Acron and Porphyrio, and followed their explanation, which seemed to make of the *Rhaeti* and *Vindelici* a single people, subdued by a single victor, Bentley saw that Horace in the fourteenth ode of his fourth book stated plainly that, while *Drusus* subdued the *Vindelici*, it was *Tiberius*, the maior *Neronum*, who defeated the *Rhaeti*. This is confirmed by other historians of the period; and Bentley rightly stresses the words of *Velleius*: *divisis partibus Rhaetos Vindelicosque adgressi* (2. 95). The *Rhaeti* and the *Vindelici* are separate peoples, and *Tiberius* and *Drusus* were leading separate armies, when they defeated them at different places and different times. So Bentley accepts an emendation already suggested by *Heinsius*, *Raetis* for *Raeti*. He afterwards heard of a manuscript in the library of *Peter Francius* which had here the reading *Retis*; and this he thought, wrongly, was confirmed by the readings *Retii* and *Reti* in some of his own manuscripts. We have no further knowledge of this manuscript of *Francius*; and our business is, not to change the text handed down to us, but to explain as we best can the only evidence we have of what Horace wrote.

When we meet the ellipse we know in: good men and true, it does not puzzle us long. More puzzling to some readers was Horace's: *fortes creantur fortibus et bonis* (Od. 4. 4. 29); some scholars wrote a comma after *fortibus*, and joined *et bonis* with the following: *est in iuvenis*. But Bentley saw that *fortes et boni* was a usual pair, and supplied: *fortes (et boni) creantur fortibus et bonis*, where we have a union of two pairs, one of which is represented by a single term, as we saw *Castor and Pollux* represented by *Pollux*. Now in the verses in question we have a union of two pairs, the *Rhaeti* and *Vindelici* and *Tiberius* and *Drusus*, the latter of which is represented by *Drusus*. In the examples cited above the abbreviated pairs are designated by the same word, 'men' and 'men', *boni* and *boni*, and in v. 28 the pair thus shortened is named by the one word *Nerones*. And, as we shall see, this shortening of four to three is very usual in Latin and lies at the base of such usual figures as *hypallage* and *zeugma*.

Horace's motive in this use of the figure seems plain enough. The courtiers of *Augustus* thought and spoke of him as the *Jove* on earth; we find Horace drawing this parallel in:

Caelo tonantem credidimus lovem  
Regnare; praesens divus habebitur  
Augustus. (Od. 3. 5. 1-3.)

If he is *Jove* on earth, are not his boys, *Tiberius* and *Drusus*, the *Dioscuri* on earth? Horace nine years before had, in speaking of the *Dioscuri*, named them by the name of the second, *Pollux*; is he not paying the boys of *Augustus* a subtle compliment by naming them in like fashion by the name of the younger, *Drusus*? On this view our difficulties disappear; from *Drusum gerentem* in v. 18 we infer *Tiberium gerentem* for v. 17, and understand: *Videre Rhaeti Tiberium gerentem bella sub Alpibus, Drusum bella gerentem videre Vindelici*.

We have a further extension of this use in:

Non celeres fugae  
Reiectaeque retrorsum Hannibalis minae,  
Non incendia Karthaginis impiae,  
Eius qui domita nomen ab Africa  
Lucratus rediit, clarius indicant  
Laudes quam Calabrae Pierides. (Od. 4. 8. 15-20.)

Here in describing the exploits of the Scipios, Horace seems to attribute them to the younger Scipio, making him defeat Hannibal at Zama as well as burn Carthage. And yet it is only of the elder Scipio that we can understand the praises of the Calabrae Pierides; for Ennius had been dead nearly a quarter of a century when the younger Scipio destroyed Carthage with fire. It seemed to older scholars that Horace was confusing the elder with the younger Scipio, but Bentley rejected this as incredible. He threw out v. 17, which seemed to him to cause all the trouble, as it did not show the usual caesura. Just compare:

Lucratus rediit || clarius indicant,  
which does show this caesural pause with:

Non incendia Karthaginis impiae.

True, this caesura is at times obscured by synaloepha, as in:

Reiectaeque retrorsus || Hannibalis minae,

and is even found after the prefix of the verb, as in:

Dum flagrantia detorquet ad oscula (Od. 2. 12. 25);

and in the Greek use of this caesura there is no such regularity as Bentley assumed for the Latin. Still he concludes: *Agnosco enim monachalis plane genii et coloris*. But Acron had this verse before him in his text of Horace; here is his note explaining *impiae*: 17. *impiae*. Quae ter gessit bellum contra Romanos. Kiessling brackets it as spurious, and thinks it is inserted later to prevent any reader from referring: *eius qui . . . rediit* to Hannibal, a risk which seems remote. As we read on in the ode, we meet: *clarum Tyndaridae sidus* (v. 31), by which Horace probably hoped to suggest to his reader his previous use of Pollux for Castor and Pollux. (Cf. *geminos Scipiadae*, Aen. 6. 842.) So here again, when after *reiectae . . . minae* we imply *eius qui . . . rediit*, the difficulty disappears, and we have associated with the pair Zama and Karthago incensa the common designation *eius qui . . . rediit*. In the use of Pollux for the Twins (Od. 3. 29) the fourfold structure is not so evident, being obscured by the transference of *scapha* from the subject (*scapha et*) *aura* to the predicate *feret*.

In these three passages, to designate a pair connected by nature, name, qualities, or exploits, we have the name or designation of one of the pair, and that the second in each case. The first passage is of the Dioscuri, a pair usually expressed by the dual even in Doric, where the dual is rare. We have here, then, a case of the dual not passing into the plural, as has been assumed to be always the case, but into the singular. The dual has left few traces in Latin, where there was no such endeavour to restore it as is evident in post-Homeric Greek. Its earlier and speedier disappearance in Latin may well account for its passing to the singular there oftener than in Greek; for the dual that the Greeks tried to restore was a dual that was encroaching more and more on the domain of the plural. If the dual primarily indicates two objects paired in nature, such as the two eyes or the two hands, as is usually believed, it may be asked whether it is nearer the plural than the singular. I read in Gauthiot, *Du nombre duel: En Indo-Européen Skr. akṣī, Gr. ὄσσε, lit. akī, ne signifient pas proprement 'les deux yeux', ni 'la paire d'yeux', ni même 'l'œil et l'autre œil', mais 'l'œil autant que double'* (Festschrift für Vilhelm Thomsen, p. 131). We know how in Homer ὄσσε is repeatedly joined with a singular verb, though not so often as with one in the dual or plural. It is a neuter dual; and this use has been held to be parallel with that of the neuter plural with a singular verb; but it is no true parallel. If it were, the use of ὄσσε with the singular verb would be far more usual than its use with the dual or plural.

The dual certainly passes into the plural far oftener than into the singular; and the syntax of ὄσσε supports this. Our English use of 'to bow the knee' points to the same syntax, as does Marlowe's verse: *Than has the white breasts of the Queen of Love* (Faust, 1. 1. 132); and when Horace writes:

Gaude quod spectant oculi te mille loquentem (Ep. 1. 6. 19),

does he mean that only five hundred constitute the audience? If he means a thousand, then *oculus* must mean to him a pair

of eyes. So too in: in laxa nixa pedem solea (Prop. 2. 29. 40) we have both pedem and solea singular, but with dual force. We have a picture of this syntax of the pair in: clarum Tyndaridae sidus (Od. 4. 8. 31), representing it as a plural enclosed in a singular; and a similar one in: geminique sub ubere nati (Aen. 5. 285), where the dual has passed to the plural in nati, but to the singular in ubere; and when to: includunt caeco lateri (Aen. 2. 19) Servius notes: caeco lateri pro caecis lateribus, he is noting this use of a singular for a plural which is for an old dual. We have the opposite use of a plural, which is an old dual, for a singular in: Atridas Priamumque et saevum ambobus Achillem (Aen. i. 458), where ambobus can hardly be for three, and the union of Atridas with Priamum points to its use for Agamemnonem. When did Achilles condescend to reproach Menelaus?

## II

### DOMITUS POLLUCIS HABENIS

VIRGIL in his third Georgic, after a fine description of the horse, begins to illustrate it with examples thus:

Talis Amyclaei domitus Pollucis habenis  
Cyllarus (vv. 89-90).

The reader will notice that here we have Pollux in a rôle not usually assigned to him. Horace tells us:

Castor gaudet equis, ovo prognatus eodem  
Pugnis (Sat. 2. 1. 26),

following Homer's:

Κάστορα θ' ἰππόδαμον καὶ πῶξ ἀγαθὸν Πολυδεύκεα (Il. 3. 237).

Servius's note is: Atqui Castor equorum domitor fuit. Sed fratrem pro fratre posuit poetica licentia, ut *quas illi Philomela dapes* pro Progne, item *revocato a sanguine Teucris* pro Dardani; aut certe ideo Pollucem pro Castore posuit, quia ambo licenter et Polluces et Castores vocantur; nam et ludi et templum et stellae Castorum nominantur. The last argument might account for the use of Castor for Pollux, it hardly accounts for that of Pollux for Castor; while his fratrem pro fratre reminds me of the question of our boyhood, 'Who killed Cain?'

But we have a way in English of expressing briefly a series of four or five by the first and last. Murray tells me: 'First and last: all, "one and all".' Is this also Latin idiom? Horace writes:

Primosque et extremos metendo  
Stravit humum sine clade victor. (Od. 4. 14. 31-2.)

In the verses:

album mutor in alitem  
Superne, nascunturque leves  
Per digitos humerosque plumae (Od. 2. 20. 10-12)

in: digitos humerosque Horace gives a series of four by the first and last; and again in:

Caementis licet occupes  
Tyrrhenum omne tuis et mare Ponticum (Od. 3. 24. 3-4)

he indicates the whole system of the Mediterranean seas by its eastern and western extremes. So Catullus in:

Unam Septimius misellus Acmen  
Mavult quam Syrias Britanniasque (45. 21-2)

signifies in like fashion all the provinces of the Empire. We saw in the last chapter how Horace indicated a pair by one of its members. Here we have two pairs indicated by the first and last of their members.

Let us set down the pairs in order, beginning with the horses, as the passage is about horses. Of the two horses, Cyllarus and Xanthus, Cyllarus is the horse of Castor. Valerius Flaccus tells us:

Vectorem pavidae Castor dum quaereret Helles  
Passus Amyclaea pinguescere Cyllaron herba (1. 425-6).

So we must order the pairs: Cyllarus—Xanthus—Castor—Pollux. Virgil here uses Cyllarus for the pair Cyllarus—

Xanthus, and Pollux for the pair Castor—Pollux, but the secret of this figure was lost by Servius's day, and has not been recovered till now. Acron's note to: *hunc equis illum superare pugnus nobilem* (Od. 1. 12. 26) is: *amatorem equorum Castorem dicit ut est Virg.: talis Amyclaei domitus Pollucis habenis Cyllarus*. The only way we can account for his use of this verse to prove that Castor, not Pollux, was the *amator equorum* is to assume that Acron felt that all his readers, like himself, would at once see that Pollucis was here used by metonymy for Castoris.

Let us turn to Servius's Procne—Philomela example:

Aut ut mutatos Terei narraverit artus,  
Quas illi Philomela dapes, quae dona pararit,  
Quo cursu deserta petiverit, et quibus ante  
Infelix sua tecta super volitaverit alis. (Buc. 6. 78-81.)

Servius's note is: *Philomela dapes: atqui hoc Procne fecit; sed aut abutitur nomine, aut illi imputat propter quam factum est*. But in his note to v. 78 we read: *Omnes in aves mutati sunt: Tereus in upupam, Itys in fassam, Procne in hirundinem, Philomela in lusciniam*. Take his order of the *dramatis personae*; Virgil names them here by the first and last, but lest we might not understand that Philomela here is for Procne—Philomela, he appends two descriptions, one of the nightingale's dwelling: *quo cursu deserta petiverit* (poetic for: *quo volatu silvas petiverit*) and: *quibus ante . . . alis* for that of the swallow. With this specimen of Virgil's art we may compare his description of Romulus in the sixth Aeneid:

Viden ut geminae stant vertice cristae? (v. 779)

to which Servius's note is: *omnino in omnibus hoc egit Romulus, ut cum fratre regnare videretur, ne se reum parricidii indicaret: unde omnia duplicia habuit, quasi cum fratre communia*.

Unde omnia duplicia habuit. Nowhere does this seem truer of Virgil, or more striking than in the example I follow Servius in citing:

Quid loquar aut Scyllam Nisi, quam fama secuta est  
Candida succinctam latrantibus inguina monstros  
Dulichias vexasse rates et gurgite in alto  
Ah! timidos nautas canibus lacerasse marinis? (Buc. 6. 74-77.)

Here we have the exploits of Scylla, the daughter of Phorcus, apparently attributed to Scylla, the daughter of Nisus. We can again construct the figure: Scylla—Scylla—Phorci—Nisi, but it differs from the last example in that none of the description given fits Scylla Nisi. It looks to me like a very strong case of ἀπροσδόκητον; we can hardly assume a blunder on the part of Virgil, who had already set forth at great length in the Ciris the crime of the daughter of Nisus, and in Geo. 1. 406-9, repeats the last four verses of that poem. What he seems to mean is that Silenus told the tale of both Scyllas, but he specifies only the doings of the Scylla whose story he had not already told. But Propertius (4. 4. 39-40) confuses the two Scyllas, as Virgil seems to do here.

Easier to deal with is Servius's question (ad Aen. 1. 235), why Virgil always calls Dido Sidonia Dido, though she was from Tyre, not Sidon, and has no direct connexion with Sidon. Of course there was the indirect connexion, in that Tyre came from Sidon; it was settled by the Sidonians. This we could state in our fourfold form: Sidonia—Tyros—Tyria—Dido; by using the more remote epithet got by this figure Virgil calls forth in his reader's mind the origin both of Dido and of Tyre; and this is evidently one of the constant aims of poetic diction. The aim of prose is to state with all possible clearness and elegance the fact you wish to narrate, that of poetry to call forth in your narration by suggestion all the facts associated with the fact in question; and hence the use of a figure like hypallage.

To turn now to the remaining example cited by Servius, where Virgil seems to have gone wrong in his mythology:

Certe hinc Romanos olim volventibus annis,  
Hinc fore ductores revocato a sanguine Teucris,  
Qui mare, qui terras omni dicione tenerent,  
Pollicitus. (Aen. 1. 234-7.)

Servius's note is: *Teucrum pro Dardano posuit: Dardanus enim de Italia profectus est, Teucer de Creta: quia solent poetae nomina de vicinis provinciis vel personis usurpare*. But Italia and Creta are hardly neighbouring states like Tyre and Sidon; and one is rather led to think of the confusion between Teucer and Dardanus in the mind of Anchises, that led to the settlement of the Aeneadae in Crete. But our fourfold arrangement gives Romani—Cretenses—Dardanus—Teucer; and Virgil's use of Romani and Teucer here may be another use of this figure. But Servius's note to *revocato* here leads

further: dicendo *revocato*, ostendit Italiam, unde Dardanus fuerat. But by naming Teucer instead of Dardanus he straightway contradicts this; for how can the descendants of Teucer be called back to a country from which Teucer did not come? May not Virgil intend us to take re- in another sense?

Brugmann relates red-, the older form, to vret, which contains vr, a reduced form of the root ver that is found in vermis 'the wriggler', and in verto. Re- has primarily to do with turning back or repeating an action. But it is often used to emphasize a notion of iteration already expressed in the verb as in renovo, constantly in use for novo, 'I renew'. So in:

Sic pater Aeneas intentis omnibus unus

Fata renarrabat divum cursusque docebat (Aen. 3. 716-17)

renarrabat is simply: dictis iterata narrabat. In:

Vergilium finibus Atticis reddas incolumem precor (Od. 1. 3. 6-7)

Virgil is not returning to Attica, but Attica is his proper and purposed destination. Most interesting here is recipere, the correlative of reddere, which is in use throughout Latin letters from Plautus down, not only for 'to take back', but also for 'to take as one's own'. It is well distinguished from accipio in: (Peneus) accipit amnem Horcum, nec recipit, sed olei modo super natantem brevi spatio portatum abdicat, poenales aquas dirisque genitas argenteis suis misceri recusans (Plin. 4. 8 (15). 31). So in: Dissolve frigus ligna super foco large reponens (Hor. Od. 1. 9. 6-7), reponens seems to convey the idea that the hearth in winter is the proper place for the firewood; just as the right place for a book which I take down from my friend's shelves is the place from which I took it.

In Aen. 1. 235, then, Virgil by substituting Teuceri for Dardani indicates to his thoughtful reader that *revocato* is not to be taken here in its usual sense of 'called back', for Teucer had never been in Italy. The word *revocato* suggests to the reader that Dardanus the founder of the city of Troy was from Italy, and so it was natural that on the fall of Troy the Trojans should return to Italy, their old home. He reads on, and is surprised to find Teucer, and not Dardanus, connected with *revocato*; and his surprise at this serves to impress more strongly on his mind the idea which Virgil tries to convey throughout the Aeneid, that this return to Italy is a right and due recall, a recall by the gods. We have here one of the many cases, which call for a fuller treatment than they have yet received, where Virgil joins to an obvious meaning a second and less obvious, but one often marked by greater majesty and sublimity. He often uses the figure I have illustrated in this chapter for this purpose, and when I show that this expression of two related pairs by one member of each, as well as the more general expression of four objects by two, the first and last named, is not confined to proper names, but is often used with common nouns and adjectives, as well as verbs, I hope to convince my reader that we have here a figure that was readily comprehended by Virgil's readers in his day, but the secret of which was lost by the fifth century, the period of Servius, Acron, and Porphyrio. We find examples of it in English; in Bishop Bickersteth's well-known hymn, at the beginning of the last stanza:

See the feast of love is spread;

Drink the wine and break the bread.

while bread and wine give us a symmetrical pair, this is not true of break and drink, which are short for: break and eat, fill and drink; a use of two for four. For this alternate ellipsis in two connected pairs, a figure not named till now, I would suggest the name of Antallage, a term closely related to the names of the allied figures of Enallage and Hypallage, and not hitherto in use for grammar to my knowledge.

There seems another example of this figure in the Aeneid not mentioned by Servius in this connexion, where Virgil seems to contradict not merely current tradition, but the account he has himself given a little before. Hyginus notes (Gell. 10. 16. 12-13) that, though Virgil had named Theseus among those who had descended to the shades and returned to earth (qui ad inferos adissent et redissent), and had said:

Quid Thesea magnum,

Quid memorem Alciden? Et mi genus ab love summo est (Aen. 6. 122-3),

yet afterwards he inserts in his poem:

Sedet aeternumque sedebit

Infelix Theseus. (Aen. 6. 617-18.)

'How is it possible', asks Hyginus, 'that he should sit forever in the shades, whom Virgil has already named with those who have descended thither and again escaped thence? especially when such is the tradition about Theseus, and if Hercules himself plucked him from the rock and led him forth to the upper air?' His question calls for a franker and

better answer than it has yet received from commentators whether ancient or modern. Servius thinks that, though Hercules did deliver Theseus, still: *eum ita abstraxit, ut illic corporis eius relinqueret partem* (ad v. 617). Sidgwick thinks that in v. 122 Virgil represents Theseus as freed by Hercules, but that in v. 618 he has adopted a variant account. Most of our editors, like Conington, follow Heyne, who apparently fails to catch Hyginus's meaning, and adopts Servius's treatment of v. 122, where he speaks of Theseus as a *durum exemplum*, passed over quickly by Aeneas as not having ascended like Castor, Pollux, and Hercules; to render this more probable, he is for dividing *magnum* from Thesea and joining it with the following Alciden. But Conington rightly refuses to make this division, and compares Thesea *magnum* with Cissea *durum* (Aen. 10. 317). It seems to me that in: *quid Thesea magnum, quid memorem Alciden?* we have an easy poetic distribution for: *quid memorem Thesea magnum? quid memorem Alciden magnum?*, and that Servius's attempted evasion of the difficulty involves a departure from the plain sense of the passage.

No doubt Virgil had in mind two versions of the legend: that implied in Homer (Od. 11. 630 ff.), where we are told that, if Ulysses had remained longer in Hades, he would have further seen men of the foretime, Theseus and Pirithous, renowned children of the gods; and that given us by Apollodorus (2. 5. 12), and followed by Horace (Od. 4. 7. 27), where Hercules succeeds in rescuing Theseus, but fails to reach Pirithous. The latter is the account commonly received in Virgil's day, and plainly accepted by him in v. 122, though in v. 618 he seems at first sight to follow Homer. A century or so after we find that Plutarch does not take Theseus to Hades with Pirithous; in return for Pirithous's help in his abduction of Helen from Sparta he joins his friend in attempting to carry off Kore, the daughter of Aïdoneus and Persephone, sovereigns of the Molossi (Th. 31). In this attempt Pirithous was gobbled up (ῥόφνισε) by the king's dog, Cerberus, but Theseus escaped to be pushed off the rocks of Scyros by Lycomedes a little later (Th. 35). But though dead, he had not forgotten his beloved Athens; and in the charge and rout of Marathon, he returned to sustain his Athenians—an older Angel of Mons.

But did Virgil really show himself guilty of so flagrant a contradiction of himself in this second account, where to the cursory reader he seems to turn back to Homer's story? Let us examine more closely the passage from which Hyginus cited the apparent contradiction:

Saxum ingens volvunt alii, radiisque rotarum  
 Districti pendent; sedet aeternumque sedebit  
 Infelix Theseus, Phlegyasque miserrimus omnes  
 Admonet et magna testatur voce per umbras:

'Discite iustitiam moniti et non temnere divos.' (Aen. 6. 616-20).

We have seen how Virgil seems to use Pollux for Castor (Geo. 3. 89), Philomela for Procne (Buc. 6. 79), Teucer for Dardanus (Aen. 1. 235); how he really uses Scylla Nisi for Scylla Phorci (Buc. 6. 74), and Sidonia for Tyria as the standing epithet of Dido. May he not be using Theseus here for Pirithous? But in all the cases enumerated two pairs were involved, of which the first and last terms alone were expressed; here Theseus and Pirithous are plainly involved, but where is our second pair? Very close to the rock of Theseus here Virgil has set the wheel of Ixion; and according to the usual tradition Phlegyas was Ixion's father, and Pirithous Ixion's son. Both were whelmed in Tartarus, Ixion for his attempted rape of Juno, Phlegyas for burning the shrine of Apollo at Delphi in revenge for Apollo's seduction of his daughter Coronis. Most appropriate to both seems the second clause of Phlegyas's discourse: *et non temnere divos*. But where does Virgil get the first clause: *discite iustitiam*? Heyne cites Pindar (Pyth. 2. 39 ff.): 'They say that Ixion under injunctions from the gods proclaims this to mortals, as he is rolled on his winged wheel: Him that doeth good service draw near and recompense with fair reward.' So that while the second part of Phlegyas's speech here seems as appropriate to Ixion as to his father, the first clause is given by Pindar to Ixion, and transferred by Virgil to Phlegyas. The *magna voce* has occasioned surprise, and our editors compare with it the *vox exigua* proper to the shades (v. 493); but torments, like actions, speak louder than words, and *magna voce* is clearly a metaphor. Virgil, in his anxiety to give his reader the clue to his meaning, is not content with bringing the wheel of Ixion as close as he can to the rock of Theseus; looking back you will see that the last pair of proper names before the verses we have cited are those of the missing pair, Ixion and Pirithous (v. 601). We seem, then, to be following Virgil's express indications in taking Theseus Phlegyasque as short for Theseus et Pirithous, Ixion Phlegyasque. While Phlegyas is for Ixion Phlegyasque, an example of synecdoche, Theseus is used for Pirithous, an example of metonymy, both of which figures arise out of the use of one for a pair. So in Cyllarus (Geo. 3. 90) we have synecdoche; the steeds are of like merit.

### III

#### PILUMNUS AND PITUMNUS

IN Dr. Rendel Harris's *Cult of the Heavenly Twins*, he tells us of a pair of Italic deities, Picumnus and Pilumnus, the Castor and Pollux of Italy. I recalled Pilumnus in the *Aeneid*, but had no recollection of his association there with Picumnus. But if Virgil used the name Pilumnus for the pair, as Horace did Pollux, I felt sure that I should at once find the pair named in Servius's scholium to the verse. So I turned to the verse where he first names Pilumnus:

Luco tum forte parentis

Pilumni Turnus sacrata valle sedebat. (Aen. 9. 3-4.)

If Picumnus and Pilumnus are the Italian Castor and Pollux, then a grove sacred to Pilumnus will be sacred also to Picumnus, and Servius's note runs: *Parentis Pilumni*. Pilumnus et Pitumnus fratres fuerunt dii. Horum Pitumnus usum stercorandorum invenit agrorum—unde et Sterculinius dictus est—, Pilumnus vero pinsendi frumenti: unde et a pistoribus deus colitur. Quidam Pilumnus et Pitumnus Castorem et Pollucem accipiunt: nonnulli laudum deos: Varro coniugales deos suspicatur.

But Servius calls the brother of Pilumnus Pitumnus, and not Picumnus. Virgil knows Picus, but he knows nothing of Picumnus, and the only source of information about Picumnus of which I know is Nonius Marcellus's *Compendiosa Doctrina* (p. 518, M.): Picumnus et avis est Marti dicata, quam picum vel picam vocant, et deus qui sacris Romanis adhibetur. Virgil's name for the bird and god in question was certainly Picus, of which Picumnus may have been a later and corrupt form. And of Nonius's citations four identify Picumnus with Picus, and only one: idem Iuris Pontificii Lib. III; Pilumno et Picumno, associates him with Pilumnus; and even here Lucian Müller tells me that the codices give Picum and that Picumno is Bentley's emendation. Bentley is following a second note of Nonius (p. 528, M.): Piluminus et Picuminus di praesides auspiciis coniugalibus deputantur; and on this note seem to rest the corrections by Roscher, Wissowa, and Aust of Pitumnus in Servius to Picumnus. Ettore Pais retains Servius's spelling, rightly as it seems to me, for it is repeated four times in his commentary, a work far freer from blunders than Nonius's *Doctrina*. Of all the authorities Leonhard Schmitz cites in his article on Picumnus in Sir Wm. Smith's *Dictionary of Mythology* not one gives us the name Picumnus; and the article hardly seems an honour to English scholarship.

Can we derive the name Pitumnus? Has it any connexion with the function assigned him by Servius, the *usus agros stercorandi*? Servius tells us that the pilum or pestle, used in early times to pound the grain to prepare it for cooking, took its name from Pilumnus; but it was the other way, as we know. Pilumnus got his name from pilum. And Pitumnus gets a second name, Sterculinius from stercus 'dung'. Nor is it hard to see how the name Pitumnus is derived. Take the Greek ψιθυρος 'false'; it is a dissimilation of ψύθυρος, from a reduced form of the root we have in ψεύδω. So Pitumnus is plainly a dissimilation for Putumnus 'the stinking god', from the root we see in pŭter, of which we have a strong form or *guna* in pŭtidus. We need not wonder that Virgil had no room in his Epic for such a name; we might as well expect to find the verb 'to puke' in the *Paradise Lost*.

But we see from Nonius that the name Picumnus was used for Picus, the bird and the god. It is probable that this name was connected with Pilumnus, as appears from Nonius's second note. Some related that Danae, after landing in Italy, married Pilumnus, and bore him a son called after her Daunus, the father of Turnus. So that we have the following genealogies:

Pilumnus—Daunus—Turnus

Picus —Faunus—Latinus.

The association of Latinus and Turnus in Italian legend leads to an association of Daunus and Faunus, whence a rhyme association arises, which extends to Pilumnus and Picus, forming from Picus the second name Picumnus. That Picumnus, the corruption of Picus thus produced, was later confused at times with Pitumnus, seems not unlikely.

We meet Pilumnus again in:

Cui Pilumnus avus, cui diva Venilia mater (Aen. 10. 76);

and again in:

Pilumnusque illi quartus pater (10. 619),

where the quartus puzzles Servius, who thinks of this Pilumnus as the avus of the Pilumnus mentioned in v. 76. But it

seems more likely that both Virgil's avus and his quartus pater refer to the same Pilumnus, who is, strictly speaking, the tertius pater, according to the usual form of the legend. In:

Poscit equos gaudetque tuens ante ora frementes,  
Pilumno quos ipsa decus dedit Orithyia,  
Qui candore nives anteirent, cursibus auras (Aen. 12. 82-4)

the analogy of the white steeds of Castor and Pollux leads us to believe that Pilumno stands for Pilumno et Pitumno. Of course, as horses live only about thirty years, these could not be the same horses that Orithyia gave Pilumnus, but were descendants of them. Servius thinks the story a figment. How could Orithyia, born in Attica, and carried off to Thrace by Boreas, give horses to Pilumnus in Italy? In his note to Aen. 7. 410 he tells us that Danae came to Italy alone; in the note to Aen. 8. 345 we read that she came to Italy accompanied by two sons, whom she had of Phineus, Argos and Argeos, and held the place which is now Rome. In some families it is not so much the sexus as the genus that tends to variation. In Minos's line the taurus plays an important part; think of the nuptials of Europa, and the incest of Pasiphae. In the household of Boreas and his son-in-law Phineus this seems true of the horse. In the Iliad we read of the three thousand mares of Erichthonius, with whom Boreas falls in love as they graze and:

αἱ δ' ὑποκυσάμεναι ἔτεκον δυοκαίδεκα πώλους (20. 225).

Possibly Argos and Argeos, 'white' and 'whitey', whom Danae brought with her from Phineus, were the white horses sent by Orithyia. Servius identifies this Argos with the Argos whose death gave its name to the Argiletum according to some.

## IV LIBERI

THAT geminus Pollux could be used for gemini Castores or Polluces will seem easier to believe, when we see how liberi is used in Latin for a single son or daughter, and how far this use has been extended by analogy. We have here the opposite of the use of one for two, an opposite which we find as a rule in case of any abnormal construction. We read in the third Aeneid:

Idem (nos) venturos tollemus in astra nepotes  
Imperiumque urbi dabimus. (vv. 158-9.)

Servius's note to this is: *In astra nepotes* significat Gaium Iulium Caesarem, qui primus inter deos relatus est. He evidently refers nepotes to Caesar as founder of the Empire; otherwise he would have taken note of Romulus.

The construction plainly starts with liberi, as we find it in: ex Miseno autem eius ipsius liberos . . . a praedonibus esse sublato (Cic. Leg. Man. 33. 12). Plutarch tells us that it was a daughter of Antonius that was carried off (Pomp. 24). So in: occisus est cum liberis M. Fulvius consularis (Cic. Cat. 1. 4. 2), and: cum Ameriae Sex. Rosci domus, uxor, liberique essent (Pro Rosc. Am. 96. 34), liberi is for a single son; and in: coniugem et liberos meos (Tac. Ann. 1. 42. 2) Caligula is the only child of Germanicus in the camp. In: et Plancinam et filios variis modis criminari (Ann. 2. 57. 3) M. Piso is the only son with his father in Syria. Here it is extended from liberi to filii, as in: vagamur egentes cum coniugibus et liberis (Cic. Att. 8. 2. 3), where coniugibus (i.e. Terentia) is evidently attracted to the plural by the following liberis; as is parentibus in: quod me parentibus (i.e. Antonia), liberis, patriae intra iuventam praemature exitio raperent (Tac. Ann. 2. 71. 2).

In: coniugiumque domumque patres natosque videbit (Aen. 2. 579) we remember that Helen had only one child, her daughter Hermione. About patres there seems more uncertainty among scholars; it may be for Tyndareus alone or for Tyndareus and a second consort; and so a plural for a dual, like soceros (v. 457). But it seems most natural to take patres natosque here as a concrete expression for 'the delights of home', to put it more familiarly, 'papa and the children'; in which case patres is for Menelaus and is attracted by natos like parentibus in the last example. Coniugium and patres, the first words of each colon, should have a common reference. To this class of plurals will belong amores in: Acmen Septimius suos amores (Catull. 45. 1), Pompeius nostri amores (Cic. Att. 2. 19. 2), non ille oblitus amorum (Aen. 5. 334). Draeger has referred this syntax to the general or typical use of the plural, as we find it in: et maribus Curiis et decantata Camillis (Hor. Ep. 1. 1. 64) 'chanted by manly Romans of old like Curius and Camillus'. But all cases we



have cited thus far are plainly of individuals, and not typical. It is easy to see how from such cases we pass to typical uses; from:

Qui illum decrerunt dignum suos quoi liberos committerent (Ter. Hec. 212),  
where one child is vaguely referred to, it is easy to pass to:

Domus, uxor, liberi inventi invito patre. (And. 891.)

So in:

mussat rex ipse Latinus

Quos generos vocet aut quae sese ad foedera flectat (Aen. 12. 657-8)

Virgil transfers the plural *generi* from the leaders to their peoples, a transference easy in case of the *Aeneadae*, who are viewed as the family of Aeneas. We have a further step in: *aut ensem . . . ereptum reddi Turno, et vim crescere victis* (Aen. 12. 799), where the plural is not now a collective, but an abstract designating the class to which Turnus belongs. This is the natural course in language; from the concrete we get the collective, and from this the abstract or general use, but by far the greater number of uses like *liberi* for a single son or daughter are concrete and of individuals.

That *liberi* is found only in the plural is no sufficient answer to our problem; the singular of *liberi* is in use in *Liber Bacchus* and in *Libera Proserpina* (cf. *Κόρη Περσεφόνη*). The real solution may be that given by Gaius: *non est sine liberis, cui vel unus filius unave filia est* (de Verb. Signif. 1, cited by Gesner). So by a facile popular logic we have *liberi* used for either *unus filius* or for *una filia*, as we have seen.

# II

## GREEK AND LATIN DUALS

### V

#### THE NUMBERS IN GREEK AND LATIN, AND THEIR RELATIONS

NUMBERS are three, Dionysius Thrax tells us, Singular (ένικός), Dual (δυϊκός), Plural (πληθυντικός). But there are singular expressions used also for many, e.g. δῆμος, χορός, ὄχλος; and plurals used both for singulars and duals; for singulars, e.g. Ἀθῆναι, Θῆβαι; and for duals, e.g. ἀμφοτέροι (p. 30, Uhlig). Such is the statement about numbers in our oldest grammar; but it is far from being full or exhaustive. Let us state the matter a little more fully and in detail.

(1) The singular is used for the plural. Dionysius's examples are all nouns of multitude, where no one would dream of counting the units, or treating them as individuals, e.g. ψάμμος or ψάμαθος 'sand'. Here the Greek usually has either the singular or the plural with the same meaning; e.g. λαός or λαοί; while Latin uses the singular populus. In English we use now the singular, now the plural, saying 'wheat' and 'barley', but 'oats' and 'pease'. When Virgil ventured in imitation of ὄλφιτα to write hordea 'barleys', he met with Bavius's reproach:

Hordea qui dixit, restat ut tritica dicat,

a reproach fully justified by Latin idiom.

(2) The plural is used for the singular. Dionysius's examples for Greek are names of cities, like Athens or Thebes, and Latin gives us similar examples in Veii, Gabii, Corioli. The same is true of festivals held on a single day like Θεσμοφόρια, Διονύσια, Ἑλευσίνια, Saturnalia, Kalendae, Idus.

(3) The plural is used for the dual; indeed Homer uses the plural δοιοί instead of δύω (Il. 5. 206), and in the first Iliad Achilles greets the two heralds: χαίρετε, κήρυκες (v. 334). After Aristotle the dual passes out of use in Greek, and for a pair the plural is regularly used. In Latin duo and ambo are the only two duals recognized by the Romans, and for the remaining cases of these words plural forms are used, like ambos or duobus. Speaking generally, when the dual goes out of use the plural takes its place.

(4) The dual is used for the plural. In Greek for several pairs we often find the dual used, and not the plural, as in: οἱ δ' ἅμα πάντες ἐφ' ἵπποισιν μάστιγας ἄειραν (Il. 23. 362) 'and they all with one accord raised their whips upon their teams'. Dionysius does not proceed to give us this use, probably from a natural piety. Zenodotus, the founder of the Alexandrian school of grammarians, maintained that Homer used the dual for the plural; but Aristarchus of Samothrace, the teacher of Dionysius, wrote in refutation of this a treatise now lost. No doubt he tried to show that in all examples of this use cited by Zenodotus there was an idea of pairing involved that justified the use of the dual. But the syntax of ἀλόντε with γένησθε in:

μήπως, ὥς ἀψῖσι λίνου ἀλόντε πανάγρου

ἀνδράσι δυσμενέσσιν ἔλωρ καὶ κύρμα γένησθε (Il. 5. 487-8)

seems to involve no such idea of pairing. In Latin while octo and viginti, old duals, are used as plurals, this idea of pairs is primarily involved, though no longer felt. But equae 'the mares', primarily a dual (= Skt. açve), is used for any number of mares.

(5) We have examined in the previous chapters a number of cases where in Latin the singular is evidently used for the dual. This use seems rarer in Greek; but where in Skt. we have nāsā 'the nose', a duale tantum, in Greek we find ῥίς or ῥῖνες, a singular or a plural.

(6) The dual is used for the singular, but not in Greek or Latin. But in Latin we find plurals used for older duals in use for the singular. In Sanskrit we find two duals used for two related singulars in: Mitrā Varunā. So in: Lugete o Veneres Cupidinesque (Catull. 3. 1) we have two plurals used similarly for two related singulars.

I might proceed to ask how far we have reason to believe that the dual number is coeval with the singular and the plural. The dual seems to have existed in all branches of the Indo-Germanic family of languages; and so we have a right to consider it an inflexion of the primitive Indo-Germanic. But probably it was much later and more imperfect in its development than the singular and the plural. The inflexions for the dual of nouns, pronouns, and verbs seem to show from their lack of development that the dual was later, and was never in regular use even for pairs. Its use is most fully developed and most regular in Sanskrit and Gothic, both artificial or book languages as we know them.

## VI THE DUAL IN LATIN

THAT the dual existed in Latin, is recognized by Donatus and his school. In Donatus's Ars we read: Est et dualis numerus, qui singulariter enuntiari non potest, ut *hi ambo*, *hi duo* (IV. 376. 23, K.). Servius, in his commentary to Donatus's Ars, adds that this is why they are irregular in declension; they have dual forms for the nominative, and plural for the oblique cases (IV. 408. 17, K.). To duo and ambo Sergius adds uter and neuter (IV. 540. 7, K.). Later anonymous grammarians under the influence of philosophy seem disinclined to accept the dual: quia non est in natura rerum hic tertius numerus (Ars Anon. Bern., Suppl. 84. 18, K.); sed hunc non recipimus, quia, qui singularitatem excedit, in pluralitate deprenditur (Comm. Einsidl. in Don. Artem, Suppl. 240. 14, K.).

The earlier Roman grammarians like Donatus were fortunately free from this influence, and were determined in their view by the form of duo and ambo; for duo corresponds exactly to the Greek δύο, and ambo, mutatis mutandis, to ἄμφω. Duo is shortened from the older duō by the law of brevis brevians, the same that gives us benē and malē. Porphyrio's note to Hor. Sat. 2. 3. 248 is: ludere par impar, uni dui (Cod. Med.); so in the fifth century of our era duo seems to have developed a plural dui, just as δύο developed δοιοί. The φ in ἄμφω is for an older bh (cf. Skt. ubhau); the Roman, who could not aspirate as did the Greek, and down to 150 b.c. wrote Corintus as he pronounced it, for bh wrote b in ambo.

But the Latin grammarians had a further motive for emphasizing the fact that they found a dual in Latin. Latin grammatical studies, Varro tells us, begin in 157 b.c., when Crates of Mallos, sent to Rome as ambassador from King Attalus, while taking a walk on the Palatine, fell and broke his leg. During the inactivity consequent on his accident, he found time to give some attention to the Latin language, which he decided was a depraved derivative of Greek. The circle of the Scipios and the Aemilii eagerly adopted the notion that associated their language with Greek; and grammatical studies of this tendency came into fashion. But a century later Romans were no longer so disposed to accept this view; and it was to refute one Hypsicrates, who wrote from this standpoint, that Varro composed his De Lingua Latina. That Latin is an independent language, he maintains, and points to the number of Latin cases, one more than in Greek, to prove his point. All the older Latin grammarians follow him in this endeavour to show that Latin is at least as rich as Greek in grammatical inflexions. The two forms ambo and duo seem to some of them a narrow basis for their claim of a Latin dual; so we read in Cledonius: et communis est numerus, qui et dualis dicitur apud Graecos, ut species, facies, res (V. 10. 19, K.). In assigning genders, when a word had the same form for the male and the female, as ἄνθρωπος or homo, the Greeks and Romans agreed that its gender was 'common'. Cledonius finds that species, facies, res have the same form for the singular and the plural, and so sets up a 'common number', equivalent to the Greek dual, he tells us. In this he seems to have found no following.

But the Greek verb also has forms for the dual distinct from the plural forms; and so some Romans claimed that forms like legere, fecere, conticuere were duals (vide Cledonius, V. 60. 6, K.). All Latin usage is against this; Donatus denies that they are duals, and Macrobius, to prove they are not, cites Virgil's conticuere omnes (Aen. 2. 1), and una omnes fecere pedem (5. 830). In the Commentum Einsidlense (Suppl. 256. 3, K.) we find legēre confused with the infinitive legēre: dicimus enim legere volo et legere volumus in singulari numero et in plurali;—another attempt to establish a common number as a dual. Legēre seems the old and genuine form of the third plural perfect, which later, on analogy of the present, became legērunt.

But our great Latin grammarians like Vossius and Ruddiman make no mention of a Latin dual. They seem to have held the grammar of Priscian to be of higher authority than that of Donatus; and Priscian knows nothing of a Latin dual; nor do his sources, Charisius and Diomedes. In a.d. 327 Constantine removed the seat of empire from Rome to Byzantium; and at once the Greeks, who have henceforth to administer Latin law, feel the need of a knowledge of the Latin language. To satisfy this the great grammars of Charisius and Diomedes are composed; and as both are intended to teach Greeks Latin, both state with emphasis that Latin, unlike Greek, has no dual; and Priscian, who like them composed his great work in Constantinople about 150 years later, follows them in this. But Donatus and the older grammarians were right in their claim that there was a Latin dual, and that traces of this number and of forms arising from its presence still exist in Latin.

We may review briefly these traces. Like *ambo* and *duo*, *octo* is the Greek ὀκτώ, the Sanskrit *aṣṭau*, which Fick thought meant primarily ‘the two points’, i.e. the two hands held out with the thumbs folded into the palms. So *viginti* is the two tens, like the Greek εἴκοσι (old *ῥίκασι*) and the Sanskrit *viṇṇati*; and in all three the ending *ī* is the regular ending of the neuter dual in Sanskrit. Wilamowitz thinks that in the inscription: M. C. Pomplio No. f. dedron Hercole, Pomplio is a dual, and his view is favoured by Leo (Pl. Forsch. 333); and Schulze thinks that in: Q. K. Cestio Q. f. Hercole donu dederō (C.I.L. 14. 2891) Cestio is a dual.

The ending *o* found in *ambo*, *octo*, Pomplio, Cestio, seems the ending in ἵπῳ and in the Skt. *aṣṭvau*, where the *u* seems a reduction of the *vi-* in *viginti* and means ‘two’. It is the root of the Skt. *vidya* ‘knowledge’ (cf. *scio* and *descisco*), and of the old verb *vido* found in the compound *divide*. When we read in Horace:

Hoc iter ignavi divisimus, altius ac nos  
Praecinctis unum (Sat. 1. 5. 5-6),

the translation of *divisimus* induced by its opposition to *unum*, ‘we made two of’, seems justified by its derivation.

Sommer (Lat. Laut- u. Formenlehre, 424) explains *ū* in neuters of the fourth declension as got by analogy from the *ū* in *genū* and *cornu*, which are old duals like the Skt. *sūnū* ‘the two sons’. *Cornū* = die beiden Hörner = das Gehörn = das Horn. So in English, speaking of the two knees, we use the phrase ‘to bow the knee’. He thinks *genūs* is for an older *genuos*, where the ending *os* is that of the gen.-abl. dual in Skt. Brugmann is inclined to agree that *genūs* is the old genitive dual, but refuses to accept *genu* as a nominative dual till he has more evidence that *sūnū* is an Indo-Germanic form. It is interesting to meet this fresh case of a dual passing into the singular.

But the great majority of Latin forms once dual, if we follow Brugmann, now appear as plurals. *Equae* is the exact equivalent phonetically of the Skt. *aṣve*, and meant primarily ‘the pair of mares’; *θύραι* is primarily ‘the pair of doors’, and corresponds to a Latin *forae* still found in the acc. *foras* and the abl. *foris*. The later development of the dual in Greek, τὰ κόρα, which has nothing to correspond with it in Sanskrit, confirms this theory. The plural of *aṣve* is *aśvās*; and in Oscan *totas*, the plural of *tota* a city, is evidently formed in the same way. We find traces of this old and genuine plural in Latin; Nonius quotes from Pomponius: quot laetitia insperatas modo mi irrepere in sinum; under the lemma: accusativus pro nominativo (500. 33, M.). But a comparison with Umbrian and Oscan makes it probable that *laetitia* here is really the old nominative plural, which was superseded by the dual *laetitia*. Still the close connexion of this dual form with the pronominal genitive ending *-som* makes it likely either that with this dual was associated a form got by analogy from the pronominal plural *populoi* (= *populi*), or that this dual was regarded later as a similar pronominal plural. Its association with the pronominal genitive seems even closer than that of the genuine pronominal plural; for in Latin the use of *terrarum* (old *terrasom*) for *\*terrum* (old *terrom*) seems older than that of *liberorum* for *liberum*; while in Greek we have the corresponding χωράων, but ἱππόων is not developed.

The adjectives *uter* and *neuter* are not duals, but singulars with an ending *-ter* that associates them with the dual. While the pf. pl. *legēre* is not a dual, the ending *-tis* in *estis* seems to Brugmann a form of the Skt. ending *-thas*, used for the second dual of primary tenses in the active voice. Still this ending may be the old plural ending *-te*, still in use in the imperative *regite*, but changed to *regitis* in the indicative after the analogy of the second sing., *regis*. These, then, are the Latin inflexions of nouns or verbs that have been thought dual in origin.

## VII

### INFLEXIONS OF THE DUAL

I TRANSLATE from Diomedes, de Numero (I. 334-5, K.): Verbs, moreover, are inflected by both numbers, the singular and the plural. The dual is in use among the Greeks only, but by us is excluded, just as it is in nouns. Nowhere can there be found in Latin any expression which shows the dual number. For the Romans, mindful of antique usage, refused to use the dual, which had been adopted as a novelty in the usage of later ages. For though it (the dual) is claimed as belonging from the beginning to discourse as produced by nature, it was disregarded and kept in obscurity, and for a considerable period lay hidden in uncertainty between both numbers, as well the singular as the plural. Later, however, as age followed age, it was adopted through a regard for scrupulous accuracy, and crept in as an intercalary number, and for this reason it is rare in old writers, since its frequent use involves constant error. To such an extent is this the case that all expressions of the Greek tongue that are unintelligible are explained as due to usages of this nature (i.e. of the dual). Only in Attic does it flourish to any great extent, and most of all in Homer, who, whilst he used the Attic dialect, as one favouring his mother-tongue, to follow the opinion of some, was after all not ignorant of ancient usage, as that well-known verse attests. For though they (the heralds) were two, himself mindful of antiquity set forth (Achilles') greeting of them after this fashion: χαίρετε κήρυκες ἄγγελοι (Il. 1. 334). Besides, it seemed superfluous to the ancients, especially when the inflexion of the dual was shaped after the likeness of the plural.

As the only detailed statement about the dual proceeding from an ancient Greek, I find this passage interesting. Diomedes feels that the dual is later in development than the singular or the plural, that it is not a necessary number, nor one in general, but only in occasional use; and that from a striving after scrupulous exactness of expression that commonly led to error. Perhaps an examination of the inflexions of the dual for nouns, verbs, and pronouns may make his meaning clearer; we shall see that in languages like Sanskrit and Greek, where the dual is most in use, it developed few inflexions in comparison with the singular and the plural; and these in consequence were likely, if much used, to occasion frequent confusion of meaning. If a number has only one case form, as has the Greek dual, to express the genitive, dative, ablative, locative, and instrumental relations, it is easy to see what confusion would arise from its frequent use even for natural pairs. And so it seems likely that never in any branch of Indo-Germanic was the dual in constant popular use; at most it was used only to some such extent as we find it in Homeric Greek. In Sanskrit the dual has three case forms for nouns: one for the nom.-acc. ending in -au for masculines, -ī for neuters, and -e (= ai) for feminines; a second in -os for the gen.-loc.; a third in -bhyām for the dat.-instr.-abl. For a late and artificial number like the dual it is natural to expect that the endings should be significant, and that is what we find. The ending -e (= ai) is really the neuter ending -ī added to the fem. stem -ā, originally the ending of the so-called neuter plural; and so it may be classed as a mere variety of the neuter ending -ī. The ending -au is probably for older -āvi, where the vi means 'two', as it does in viginti. Whether the neuter -ī is another form of vi is a question suggested by forms like vōi and σφῶi, which scholars are disposed to answer in the affirmative. In the ending -os of the gen.-loc. the -s seems a reduced form of the genitive ending -as (= os) which has been added to the nom. ending -āu, giving us -au-s (= os). The ending -bhyām is a variation of the dat.-abl. -bhyas, whose nature will appear more clearly when we come to pronouns. It seems to have no cognate parallel except in Avestan; and as it is not found in any of the Central or Western groups, it cannot be claimed for primitive Indo-German. But the ending -os is claimed for Latin, as we saw.

For Greek nouns the dual shows two case forms: the nom.-acc. in -ω for o stems, in -ᾱ for α stems, and in -ε for the rest; and the gen.-dat. ending in -αiv for α stems and in -οiv for the rest. The endings for α stems, as we shall see, are late developments following the analogy of those for o stems. We find for pronouns vōε for vōi, which suggests that -ε is a degeneration from -ī, the ending still in use for pronouns and φίκατι. Probably this -ī is for fi, identical with vi, of which the reduced form v is part of the ending -ω (= au). In the gen.-dat. ἵπποiv is shortened from the Homeric ἵπποiv (= ἵπποiv), and the relation of this -fiv to -fi will be seen when we come to pronouns.

In Latin we noticed Sommer's view that genū and cornū are old duals. It is hard to understand the ū on any other theory; for in the Greek γόνυ and the Sanskrit janu the u is short; and in γονός (= γονφος) it is reduced to a consonant. If genu is really an old dual we can understand forms of the gen. sing. found in inscriptions like conventuus (C.I.L. 2. 2416) as for conventuos, showing the ending of the Sanskrit gen.-loc. dual.

For verbs we find a full set of personal forms for the Sanskrit dual, but a defective one for Greek. The so-called secondary or aorist forms are simpler and more primitive than the so-called primary or present ones—a state of things which appears natural only when you think of the aorist as the old timeless form of the verb, out of which the present was evolved. Sanskrit shows for the aorist tenses active: 1st dual -va, 2nd -tam, 3rd -tām; and for the middle: -vahi, -thām, tām. In the present tenses active we have -vas, -thas, -tas, and for the middle -vahe, -the, -te; for the pf. active -va, -thur,

-tur, and for the middle -vahe, -the, -te. The imperative shows only one variation from these, -vahai for the 1st middle. In Greek we find for aorists 2nd -τον, 3rd -την in the active, and 1st -μεθον, 2nd -σθον, 3rd -σθην in the middle; for presents 2nd -τον, 3rd -τον in the active, and 1st -μεθον, 2nd -σθον, 3rd -σθον in the middle. At first sight the present endings seem the simpler here; but it may be questioned whether it is really simpler to use the same inflexion for 'you two' as for 'they two'.

The only point of coincidence between the Greek and Sanskrit inflexions is in the endings -τον, -την of the aorist tenses, which correspond phonetically and in meaning to the Sanskrit -tam, tām; and we may take this as our starting-point. The middle endings -σθον, -σθην seem to come from the 2nd pl. ending -σθε on the analogy of -τον, -την; and -μεθον to have come from -μεθα, the 1st pl. ending, on the analogy of -σθον, -σθην. In the aorist tenses at times -τον is used for the 3rd, and -την for the 2nd (Hirt, Gr. Laut- u. Formenlehre, 403. 3), and it seems that from this confusion has arisen the use of -τον and -σθον for both the 2nd and 3rd persons in the present tenses. How this came about we shall understand better when we consider the use of σφῶι for 'you two'. Why the 1st dual should develop much later than the 2nd and 3rd, and not at all for the Greek active, we may understand when we see that -va, its oldest ending in Skt., seems originally a word meaning 'two' or 'both', but later 'we two' or 'we'. If the English 'we' is really the same word as the Skt. va, probably the 1st plural was originally very closely connected with the idea of 'two', and it was long before the need of a separate form for the 1st dual was felt.

In Sanskrit let us start from -va, the ending of the aorist 1st dual, related to -vi, the noun-ending of the dual, as dva is to dvi. The impf. has -va; the pres. has -vas, on analogy of the 1st pl. -mas; and the middle has aor. -vahi, pres. -vahe, on analogy of the 1st plurals -mahi and -mahe. Following -vas comes the 2nd dual -thas from the 2nd pl. -tha; and following -thas from the 3rd dual -tām we get -tas. For the middle the aorist middle has -tām for the 3rd, which it changes to -thām for the 2nd and to -the and -te for the 2nd and 3rd present after the plural endings -dhvam, -dhve, -nte; and the pf. endings -thur and -tur evidently follow the 3rd pl. pf. ending -ur. So -vahi, -vahe, -vahai follow the first plurals -mahi, -mahe, -mahai. So, like the Greek endings, excepting -τον and -την, all Sanskrit endings excepting -tam and -tām are evidently late formations, and indicate the truth of Diomedes' view that the dual was a later formation, possibly from a striving after meticulous accuracy.

While in the Latin verb we find no endings in use as dual, Brugmann and Thumb agree that -tis in estis or ducitis is the Skt. -thas (= -thes), and that the primary Italic -tes has changed to -tis after the analogy of -is in ducis. If cornūs is really the old genitive dual, and estis really the old 2nd dual of the pres. active, the only dual inflexion for cases in Latin is in use as a singular inflexion, and the only dual inflexion for persons as a plural inflexion. This balance, too, might seem to indicate that, when the Latin dual disappeared, while it usually passed to the plural, at times it became a singular.

To understand the dual endings of the verb in Greek and Sanskrit we must give some attention to the Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit personal pronouns, and especially to their dual forms in Greek and Sanskrit. Let us begin with vῶι, 'we two'. Homer has an older form, νό (Od. 15. 475 and 16. 306), which has been adopted by Attic, where it develops the gen.-dat. νῶν, not found in Homer. But Homer has usually νῶι, and from it he forms a gen.-dat. νῶιν. We feel that νό is an old dual like in ending to δύο and ἄμφω; what then is νῶι? Brugmann thinks it is for an older νῶφι, the -φι being the same as the φι in φίκατι and the vi- in viginti; so that νῶφι is equivalent to 'we two two'. The Greek νό is probably the Skt. nau, used as an enclitic for the acc. dat. gen. dual 'we two'. In later Greek we have νῶε, with the same ending as δοῦρε 'the two spears', which may develop on its analogy. The Greek νό appears in Latin as nos, passing into the plural just as ambo passes into ambos and duo into duos. That nos is first an acc. and later a nom. is confirmed by the use of nau in Skt. as an acc. and not a nom., while in Avestan the corresponding enclitic acc. has developed a nom. nā. It may be that we have here the starting-point for the use of the acc. pl. as a nom. in Latin, which we see in homines, a use which spreads to the sing. in the French homme (= hominem), while on (= homo) has become a specialized term.

While nau in Skt. is the enclitic acc. for 'us two', nas is the corresponding enclitic pl. for 'us'. The English 'us' is the German uns (= ṛs), which is a reduced grade of nas, which may have been nos or nes in Indo-Germanic. This reduced form appears in the first syllable of the accented acc. asmān (= ṛsman), and in the Aeolic ἄμμε (= ṛsme), the Skt. asma-, found in the dat. asmābhyām and the instr. asmābhis. The Doric form is ἄμε, which gets its aspirate from ὕμε 'you', just as ἐσμέν gets its first syllable from ἐστέ. From ἄμμε and ἄμε, old accusatives, come the nominatives ἄμμες and ἄμες. The Attic ἡμεῖς; has changed α to η and -ες to -εις after the analogy of τρεῖς, thinks Brugmann; for it is a plural, not a dual.

We have found the root of ‘us’ in a reduced form of nos; but ‘we’ seems an older form of vos. This form appears in the Skt. *vām*, the enclitic acc. for ‘you two’, in *vayam*, the Skt. nom. pl. for ‘we’, and in *āvām* and *yuvām*, the nom. duals for ‘we two’ and ‘you two’, as also in *vas*, the enclitic acc. for ‘you’. We may begin with *vām*, according to Brugmann for *va-am*, the *va* being the same word as is used to form the 1st dual aorist, to which is added *-am* after the analogy of *aham*, *tvam*, *vayam*, and *yūyam*. This *va* ‘two’ is our ‘we’ and the Latin *vos*, got from the same root and in the same way as the Skt. *vas*, and being the plural form. The root *va* ‘two’ has become ‘we two’ by association with verbal forms in the first pl. and ‘you two’ by association with verbal forms in the second pl.

This *vām* (= two) is joined to the root *yu-* in *yuvām*, the Skt. nom. dual ‘you two’. The root *yu-*, also found in the Skt. nom. pl. *yūyam* ‘you’, is the root of our ‘you’, and seems the same as the root of Latin *iuvo* ‘I help’. In Greek we have the Aeolic *ῥμμε*, and the Doric *ῥμε*, corresponding phonetically to the Skt. *yusma-* in the instr. *yusmābhis* ‘with you’. It passes to the Attic *ῥμεῖς*, formed like *ῥμεῖς*, except that the rough breathing is not got by analogy, but represents the Skt. *y*. The *v* added in *vōiv*, *σφῶiv*, *ῥμῖv*, and *ῥμῖv* is probably the same that we have in *ποσῖv* and *ἀνδράσiv*, though that does not explain it, for it seems older in *vōiv*.

*Nos* and *vos*, then, are to be associated in derivation with the Skt. enclitic duals *nau* and *vām*, and with the Skt. enclitic plurals *nas* and *vas*. Brugmann notes that they, too, are used as enclitics at times, as in: *ob vos sacro*, old for *obsecro vos*, and: *Quo nos cumque feret melior fortuna parente* (Od. 1. 7. 25). Both of them have a double genitive, one with a singular ending and a singular meaning: *nostri*—*vestri*; and the other a plural in form and meaning: *nostrum*—*vestrum*. It is worth noting that these twin genitives are formed, not from *nos* and *vos* directly, but from the dual possessive forms *noster* and *vester*; so that here again we have a balancing of singular and plural in connexion with the dual, such as we have repeatedly observed.

When we turn to the 2nd and 3rd dual forms we get a balancing, not of number but of person. We noticed how in the aorist tenses of the verb the 3rd dual is used at times for the 2nd, and the 2nd for the 3rd; while in the present tenses the 2nd is used throughout, when we turn to dual pronouns of the 2nd and 3rd persons, we have the 3rd person with a slight variation used throughout. We have seen how *vōiv* and *vōe* are used for ‘we two’; *σφῶiv* is used for ‘you two’, and *σφῶe* for ‘they two’. Brugmann’s idea, that in *σφῶiv* the *φ* is for an older *ῑ* and that it must be connected with *σύ*, seems most improbable. Both *σφῶiv* and *σφῶe* are dual forms got from *σφι* after the analogy of *vōiv* and *vōe*. Brugmann shows us (Vergl. Gr. II<sup>2</sup> p. 413) how from *οῖ* (= *σφοῖ*) we get an instrumental *σφι* or *σφiv*, mistaken later for a dative and expanded to *σφίσι* or *σφίσiv*; how this develops a genitive *σφέων*, an accusative *σφέας* or *σφέα*, and a nominative *σφεῖς*. There can be little doubt that *σφῶiv* and *σφῶe* are variant duals developed from the same instrumental, and that the problem here is much the same that we have in the German use of *Sie* for *Ihr*, and later for *Du*.

The use of *ῥμεῖς* and *nos* for *ἐγώ* and *ego* is very common in Greek and Latin, and we shall speak of it presently when dealing with the Plural of Modesty. That of *ῥμεῖς* and *vos* for *σύ* and *tu* is not developed in either classical Greek or Latin, though we find uses approaching it from which the later uses in Low Latin and French are derived. These consist in the choice of a single person out of the number addressed, so that he or she alone of that number is indicated by the noun or pronoun used in the address; as in: *νῆα ἰθύνετε, φαίδιμ’ Ὀδυσσεῦ* (Od. 12. 82), *προσέλθετ’ ὦ παῖ* (Soph. O. C. 1104), *heus foras exite huc aliquis* (Pl. Epid. 399), *ibitis Aegaeas sine me, Messala, per undas* (Tibull. 1. 3. 1), *vos, O Calliope, precor, adspirate canenti* (Aen. 9. 525).

The use of *Sie* for *Ihr* probably arose from a substitution of indirect for direct address, similar to that which substitutes *ella* for *voi* in Italian; and in Greek, too, it is likely that, in addressing a herald or a vassal chief, the king feeling that the absent ruler, and not the present herald, should determine the form of address, used ‘they two’, and not ‘you two’, in addressing him and his lord. Latin prefers the second person to the third in such a case, but the Greek use here seems to follow the lines of modern courtesy.

## VIII

### INTER

WHILE words ending in *-ter* are not duals, as some Roman grammarians taught of *uter* and *neuter*, in origin they are

connected with the dual notion, the ending -ter being a comparative ending. It is interesting to see how far they continue to express this notion, how far they pass on to the expression of three or more, or pass back to one. In this respect the uses of inter will prove noteworthy.

Inter has cognates in all branches of Indo-Germanic: in Sanskrit and Zend, in Armenian and Old Bulgarian, in Greek and Italic, in German and Celtic. In English we have *under*, in German *unter* meaning 'among' as well as 'below'. In Latin, while it usually means 'between', or 'among', it is at times the equivalent of *per*. Its derivation is not obscure, the first syllable being the Latin *in*, Greek *ἐν*, English *in*. When *en-* is followed by a syllable with an initial mute, the *e* becomes *i* in Latin, and so the Greek *ἐντός* appears there as *intus*. We can see the same tendency in our pronunciation of England. The cognate of *inter* in Greek, *ἐντέρα*, is a substantive, not a preposition.

The ending -ter is evidently the same as the Greek ending -τερος, and we have it in the Latin *exterus*, which develops a double comparative, exterior. The corresponding *interus* has disappeared, interior having taken its place. It is the usual ending for comparatives in Sanskrit; and there, too, it is often joined with prepositions, as in *uttaras* 'higher', from *ud* 'up'. In English and German the usual comparative ending is -er, which we see in the Latin *superum* and *inferum*. While in Latin the idea of below is usually given by *inferus* and *infra*, *inter* in composition has this meaning at times, as in *interire* 'to go down' and *interficere* 'to slay'. We shall understand this shifting better if we compare the use of *imus* 'lowest', primarily the superlative of *in* (= *in-mus*) and meaning *inmost*, as we see it in Catullus's phrase: *imis exarsit tota medullis* (64. 93). But it is commonly felt to be a superlative of *inferus*, as in: *imis avolsam solvit radicibus* (Aen. 8. 237-8), where in relation to the earth 'lowest' is also 'inmost'.

*Inter*, then, as a preposition means primarily 'between two objects', as in: *qui (mons) est inter Sequanos et Helvetios* (B. G. 1. 2). Virgil often places it so as to present us with a picture of this meaning, as in: *terras inter caelumque* (Aen. 4. 256). But just as the dual passes from a pair to two or more pairs, so we find *inter* passing to two pairs in: *namque manus inter maestorumque ora parentum* (Aen. 2. 681), and then to several in: *ante oculos interque manus sunt omnia vestras* (11. 311). In this way it seems to have been transferred to a plurality of objects with the meaning 'among', as in: *micat inter omnes Iulium sidus, velut inter ignes Luna minores* (Od. 1. 12. 46-8).

Scholars have been puzzled by a curious repetition of *inter* 'between', found in both prose and verse. We read: *inter Hectora Priamiden animosum atque inter Achillem ira fuit capitalis* (Sat. 1. 7. 11-13), and again: *Nestor componere lites inter Peliden festinat et inter Atriden* (Ep. 1. 2. 11-12). Wickham's note is: 'an illogical, but a Latin use', and he compares: *quid intersit inter popularem . . . et inter constantem* (Cic. Lael. 95. 25). But though we feel this use illogical for *inter* 'between', it seems quite logical for *inter* 'among', as in: *Lycus inter et hostes inter et arma fuga muros tenet* (Aen. 9. 556-7), with which compare: *fortunate senex, hic inter flumina nota et fontes sacros frigus captabis opacum* (Buc. 1. 51-2). Either is right with *inter* 'among'; but for *inter* 'between' we feel that the logical use is that in: *inter Padum atque Alpes* (Liv. 5. 35. 2). We have then *inter* 'between' at times in Latin following a syntax not unusual for *inter* 'among'; a syntax which gives a higher degree of weight and balance to the pair in competition.

But we read in Lucretius: *inter saepta meant voces et clausa domorum transvolitant* (1. 354-5) 'voices pass through walls, and fly through houses shut', Munro. It seems clear that here *inter* is used for *per*; and in Virgil:

*Ecce autem flammis inter tabulata volutus*

*Ad caelum undabat vertex turrimque tenebat* (Aen. 12. 672-3),

'and lo! a spire of flame wreathing through the floors wavered up skyward and held a turret fast', Mackail. In this sense of *per* it is more usual for time than for place. Cicero writes: *qui inter annos tot unus inventus sit* (Leg. Man. 68. 23), and: *quae inter decem annos . . . nefarie flagitioseque facta sunt* (Verr. 1. 37. 13); and Livy: *inter ipsum pugnae tempus decem naves regiae . . . ad Thronium in sinu Maliaco stabant* (36. 20. 5). In all these examples it seems more natural to use *per* than *inter*. We find Gellius writing: *qui plus cernunt oculis per noctem quam inter diem* (9. 4. 6). But it is easier to see how the use arose for place than for time. We expect to find: *inter ripas fluit Tiberis*; but Virgil writes:

*ubi Lydius arva*

*Inter opima virum leni fluit agmine Thybris* (Aen. 2. 781-2),

where *arva* is substituted for *ripas*, the whole for the part. So we have *inter arva*, where in prose we should write *per arva*, or *per agros*. And so we read:

*hunc inter (lucum) fluvio Tiberinus amoeno*

*Verticibus rapidis et multa flavus arena*



In mare prorumpit. (Aen. 7. 30-2.)

Of course in return we may expect per for inter, and in:

Principio delubra adeunt pacemque per aras exquirunt (Aen. 4. 56-7),

Sidgwick translates per aras, ‘amid the altars’. In: concussam bacchatur fama per urbem (4. 666) we have a poetic expression for: turbatos bacchatur fama inter cives. Perhaps we might connect with these examples the verbs interire and perire with closely approximate meanings. But it is quite plain that inter has a singular, as well as a plural and dual force.

## IX

### ALTER AND ALIUS

**SPEAKING** generally, alius seems to play the part in older Latin that alter plays in Silver and later Latinity. In archaic Latin alius is often used to denote the other of two as well as of three or more. It is also found at times with the meaning of ‘any one’, like aliquis. In Golden Latinity as a rule alter is ‘one of two’, and alius is ‘the other’ of three or more. But in Virgil alter is already used for ‘the other’ of three or more; and in later Latinity and the Romance languages altro or autre is the regular word for ‘other’, while of alius few traces subsist. The Romance languages follow poetic diction, which tends of two words to choose the stronger and more emphatic; and that in this case was plainly alter.

Both start from the root ali-, which we have in the English ‘else’, and in the Greek ἄλλος (= alyos), ἄλλότριος, and reduplicated in ἄλλήλων, where the duals ἄλλω-ἄλλω passed to neuter plurals ἄλλα-ἄλλα, contracted to ἄλλᾶλα (Ion. ἄλληλα) with a single λ in the 2nd syllable, parallel to the single s in misi, as following a long vowel. We have another grade of this al- in ol or ul, that we find in olli, archaic for illi, and in ultro and ultra ‘on yon side’. We read:

alii ventosis foliibus auras

Accipiunt redduntque, alii stridentia tingunt

Aera lacu. Gemit impositis incudibus antrum.

Illi inter sese multa vi brachia tollunt

In numerum versantque tenaci forcipe massam. (Aen. 8. 449-53.)

It is clear that illi is parallel to the preceding two alii, and that it denotes a third class of smiths, who wield the hammer; and Servius’s note is: ‘illi’ quidam pro ‘alii’ accipiunt. Henry wished to read alii here, but the kinship of the words was felt by Virgil.

While *autre* goes back to the root ali-, not so our ‘other’; we see its root in ‘and’ and in the German *andere*, in the Sanskrit *anyas*, and the Greek ἄντιος; it was once *onper*; but the n is lost in ‘other’ just as the n of Gans and hanter is lost in goose. In Greek ἄντιος has lost the sense of ‘others’, and is ‘some’. So in Latin aliquis has as a rule lost its old meaning of ‘some one else’ and means ‘some one’. But I read in Tacitus: ne eis quidem annis, quibus Rhodi specie secessus exsul egerit, aliquid quam iram et simulationem et secretas libidines meditatum (Ann. 1. 4. 4). Our editors usually correct aliquid to aliud, against all the manuscripts, but aliquid here probably still conveyed to Tacitus and his readers the meaning ‘anything else’. So the Skt. anye ‘others’ passed to the Greek ἄντιος ‘some’; and in Latin aliquos usually means ‘some’; but we read:

Quique sui memores aliquos fecere merendo. (Aen. 6. 664.)

While most editors change aliquos to alios, Sidgwick retains aliquos, the reading of all good manuscripts, but finds a ‘Virgilian pathos’ in his rendering ‘some hearts’ suggesting the narrow range of gratitude for human merit; but it is far more likely that Virgil still felt here in aliquos, the old meaning ‘others’. And in:

Sin aliquem infandum casum, Fortuna, minaris (Aen. 8. 578),

the meaning must be ‘some dread fate other (than his return)’; and Cicero has: vellem aliquid Antonio, praeter illum . . . libellum (Brut. 163. 44), and Seneca: aliqua res extra eloquentiam (Cont. Top. 22), and Porphyrio: neminem posse aliquid agere quam quod consuerit (ad Od. 1. 1. 16).

An anonymous grammarian tells us that aliquando is compounded of alius and quando, and is in use for the past and the future; evidently he feels that it naturally marks some other time than the present. But generally we have for ‘something

else' aliquid aliud, for 'somewhere else' alicubi alibi, alicunde aliunde for 'from some other quarter', and alias aliquando for 'at some other time'; i.e. the loss of the idea 'other', constant in ἄλλοι, is only usual in aliquis. This loss seems to have come from such repetitions as we have in: sin aliquis exstiterit aliquando (Cic. de Orat. 3. 80. 21), or: verum aliquando aliqua aliquo modo alicunde ab aliqui aliquast tibi spes mecum fortunam fore (Pl. Epid. 331-2), where we feel all but the first 'other' superfluous. But in: hic opus est aliquot ut maneas dies (Pl. Poen. 1421) the natural translation is 'it is well for you to wait a few days longer'. And so in Nonius's reading of: nec nobis praesente aliquis quisquam nisi servus (Pl. Amph. 400).

In return we have a number of cases where alius seems to mean the same as aliquis or ullus; e.g.: neque maius aliud neque praestabilius invenias (Sall. Jug. 1. 2), non alia ante Romana pugna atrocior fuit (Liv. 1. 27. 11), neque enim aliud . . . difficiliter reperient (Quintil. 4. 2. 38), quamvis non alius flectere equum sciens aequae conspicitur gramine Martio, nec quisquam citius aequae Tusco denatat alveo (Od. 3. 7. 25-8) (where alius is balanced by quisquam), Eridanus, quo non alius per pinguis culta in mare purpureum violentior effluit amnis (Geo. 4. 372-3). Probably with examples like these we are to associate such uses as: Fama, malum qua non aliud velocius ullum (Aen. 4. 174), or: mulier qua mulier alia nulla est pulchrior (Pl. Merc. 101), so that for the union aliud ullum we have above aliud used in the sense of ullum, a usage we must examine under Metonymy. So in:

Sed non ante datur telluris operta subire

Auricomos quam quis decerpserit arbore fetus (Aen. 6. 140-1),

ante quam quis is poetic for alii quam qui; and the direct prose would be: illi soli dabitur qui et.

While in archaic and classical Latin alius is usual where three are in question, it is used at times to express the other of two, i.e. for alter; e.g. in: per illam tibi copiam copiam parare aliam licet (Pl. Epid. 323-4), remedium tumultus fuit alius tumultus (Tac. Hist. 2. 68. 4). In uses like: ex loco in alium locum (Plin. Ep. 10. 69), aliudque cupido, mens aliud suadet (Ov. Met. 7. 19-20), alius est amor, alius cupido (Afran. com. 23), alius seems the opposite of idem, a force heightened to mutatus in:

Non vires alias conversa numina sentis? (Aen. 5. 466.)

Here, too, when the clause is negative, alius is equivalent to alter, as is clear when we compare: malum qua non aliud velocius ullum (Aen. 4. 174) with: Misenum . . . quo non praestantior alter (6. 164). In: quos alios muros, quae iam ultra moenia habetis? (9. 782) we are very close to the use of alius instead of alter for 'second', which we reach in: alius Latio iam partus Achilles (6. 89).

This explains the idiom unus . . . alius for alter . . . alter, in: (leges) duas promulgavit, unam . . . aliam (B. C. 3. 21), and: unam . . . epistolam acceperam . . . in qua significabatur aliam te ante dedisse (Cic. Att. 7. 12. 1). Alius is not used for alter in union with another numeral, as in: altero vicesimo die (Cic. Fam. 12. 25. 1); but we read: quarum unam incolunt Belgae, aliam Aquitani, tertiam . . . Celtae (B. G. 1. 1. 1), ab alio expectes, alteri quod feceris (Com. Inc. 82), geminae . . . portae, quarum altera . . . aliam (Val. Fl. 1. 833-5), duo agmina parant quorum altero populo invaderentur, alii castra Romana adpugnarent (Ann. 4. 48. 4). We have in: quaeritur huic alius (Aen. 5. 378) alius used for compar, a use that would be striking even for alter.

Alius is at times constructed with the ablative, as though it were a comparative, e.g.: alius Lysippo (Ep. 2. 1. 240), alium sapiente bonoque (Ep. 1. 16. 20), expertis alia experiri (Liv. 5. 54. 6), si accusator alius Seiano foret (Phaedr. 3, Prol. 41). True, the ending -ius hardly seems the same as that we have in maius -oris, or in plus (= plouios) -pluris. Hence Sommer (302. 1) thinks the comparative force inherent in the root ali-, just as minor-minus, with no proper comparative ending, gets its comparative force from the root mi- 'to lessen'. But Brugmann believes that it is from words like alius that the ending -ios gets its comparative force. We have this ending in medius, δεξιός, and σκαιός (older σκαφίός, Latin scaevus). No doubt δεξι- and σκαφι- are old locatives like ali- 'on yon side'. Tertius has this same comparative ending, and illustrates the use of alius for one of three, as well as for one of two; for if alius is originally a comparative, the latter will be its primary force.

We find, then, that alius, often a comparative in force and probably primarily in form as well, had in old Latin already passed on to a use for one of three as well as for one of two, a use it retained there to a considerable degree. Through its association with words like quis or ullus, it had lost this comparative force at times, and had with it lost all reference to a dual or plural, i.e. was absolutely singular. We may note its omission in:

Impastus ceu plena leo per ovilia turbans,

Suadet enim vesana fames, manditque trahitque  
Molle pecus mutumque metu (Aen. 9. 339-41),

where the last phrase seems equivalent to: *et mollis pecoris alia mandit trahitque alia*.

We read in Servius: *alter enim de duobus dicimus, non de tribus* (ad Buc. 3. 34), and when we find it used of three and not of two, we seem to have entered on a new period in its history. When we read in Cato: *(vinum) in dolium infundito, . . . transfundito in alterum dolium, post dies xx in alterum dolium transfundito* (R. R. 112. 2), it is not quite certain that it is three objects, and not a succession of pairs with which we have to do. But in:

Hoc erat, alma parens, quod me per tela, per ignes  
Eripis, ut mediis hostem in penetralibus, utque  
Ascanium, patremque meum, iuxtaque Creusam  
Alterum in alterius mactatos sanguine cernam? (Aen. 2. 664-7),

the use of *alter* for one of three is plain. But we have also:

Tum geminas vestes auroque ostroque rigentes  
Extulit Aeneas . . .  
Harum unam iuveni supremum maestus honorem  
Induit (11. 72-3 and 76-7).

And in like fashion we find: *unum exuta pedem* (4. 518) and: *unum exserta latus* (11. 649), where we have, not, it is true, *alter* for *unus*, but *unus* for *alter*. And thus we find *alter*, too, like *inter*, advancing from two to three, and apparently receding from two to one; for it is replaced by *unus*.

Properly, in designating the members of a pair we should have *alter . . . alter*, as in: *alter istinc, alter hinc adsistite* (Pl. Rud. 808). But often, as with Castor and Pollux, only one need be expressed, as in: *in altera parte fluminis* (B. G. 2. 5. 6); or the other is designated by a different word, as in: *summus ibi capitur meddix, occiditur alter* (Enn. Ann. 328); and so *alter* takes on the meaning of 'second', as in: *erus . . . et erus alter* (Pl. Capt. 1005), becoming a preferred competitor of *secundus* that may imply inferiority, as we see in: *haec fuit altera persona Thebis, sed tamen ita secunda ut proxima esset Epaminondae* (Nep. Pelop. 4. 3). We find it used for second in a series of three; e.g.: *primus . . . alter . . . tertius* (Aen. 5. 310 ff.) or: *una . . . alter . . . extremus* (5. 563 ff.). Hence we get *unus et alter* 'one or two' and *unus aut alter* 'one or perhaps two', which in later Latin comes to mean the same as Cicero's *unus et alter*. While *alius* is not used as an ordinal numeral in union with other ordinals, *alter* is often thus used, as in: *litteras quas mihi altero vicesimo die reddidit* (Cic. Fam. 12. 25. 1). In: *alter ab undecimo tum me iam acceperat annus* (Buc. 8. 39) Servius is quite positive that the thirteenth, not the twelfth year, is meant, the twelfth being too far from puberty.

Familiar is the reciprocal force of *alius* repeated, as in: *ceteri verbo alius alii adsentiebantur* (Sall. Cat. 52. 1), *ut ipsi inter se alii aliis prodesse possent* (Cic. Off. 1. 22. 7). When *alter* is thus repeated, and only two are in question, it sometimes has this force, as in: *ut alter alterius iudicium non modo reprehendat, sed etiam rescindat* (Cic. Cluent. 122. 43), but sometimes not, as in: *consules primum religiones, deinde alterum alterius mors et comitia . . . impediunt* (Liv. 41. 16. 7). But for more than two it is commonly reciprocal, as in: *ut nemo memoria dignus alter ab altero videri nequiverint* (Vell. 1. 16. 5), *cum alter alterum indignaretur imperare* (of four) (Capitol. Alb. 1. 2), *omnes rediere . . . inconsideratae dementiae alter alterum arguentes* (Amm. 31. 15. 15).

As early as Lucretius we find the union *alius . . . alter* in: *ex alio terram status excipit alter* (5. 835), *hic odor ipse igitur, naris quicumque lacessit, est alio ut possit permitti longius alter* (4. 687-8). But this confusion was not felt in some phrases. We feel how different from *altero die* or *alio die* used for it in: *servolos rogita-bam . . . item alio die quaerebam* (Ter. And. 89) 'on the next day', is *alio die* in: *mox quasi alio die studebat* (Plin. Ep. 3. 5. 11) 'as on an ordinary day', or: *confecto negotio bonus augur . . . 'alio die' inquit* (Cic. Phil. 2. 83. 33) 'not to-day'. By *altero die* we mean 'on the morrow', 'on the day after', as in: *altero die pervenit Caesar* (B. C. 3. 30. 6), *altero die quam a Brundusio soluit* (Liv. 31. 14. 2). But in the Itin. Anton. (Plac. re. R. 30) *alia die de natale domini* is 'the day after his master's birthday', and *alia die* (Pallad. 9. 8. 6) 'on the following day'.

We have *alter* for 'the neighbour' in: *qui nihil alterius causa facit et metitur suis commodis omnia* (Cic. Leg. 1. 41. 14), *cave ne portus occupet alter* (Hor. Ep. 1. 6. 32). Just as we have *alterum tantum* for 'as much again', we have *alter ego* for 'a second self' in: *te me esse alterum* (Cic. Fam. 7. 5. 1), and so *alter idem* in: *est enim is quidem tamquam alter*

idem (Lael. 80. 21). But it is obvious that this may be carried too far; and just as from *ad* and *salto* we have *adsulto*, from *ad* and *alter* we have *adulter*, the ‘too neighbourly’ man. We read in Festus: *et adulter et adultera dicuntur, quia et ille ad alteram et haec ad alterum se conferunt* (Paul. p. 22). Probably the *alter* in: *fruitur nunc alter amore* (Tib. 1. 5. 17), *quam vacet alterius blandos audire susurros* (Prop. 1. 11. 13) has much the same significance; for in late Latin *alterare* is used for ‘to spoil’, much in the same sense as *adulterare*.

We noticed how *alius* is used as the opposite of *idem*, and in Virgil advances to the sense of *par* or *compar*. But in Horace we have *alter* used as the opposite of *idem* in: *quotiens te speculo videris alterum* (Od. 4. 10. 6). In late Latin instead of *alius* . . . *alius* we have *alter* . . . *alter* as in: *altera substantia divinitatis, altera humanitatis* (Vinc. Ler. 13. 19), *et aena et lignea et fictilia simulacra, et alterius alteriusque materiae* (Prosper, in Ps. 113. 4). So for more than two *alter* becomes usual, as in: *alter adulescens decessit, alter senex, aliquis praeter hos infans* (Sen. Ep. 66. 42),

Et nunc ex illo forsán grege gentibus alter

Iura dat Eois, alter compescit Hiberos,

Alter Achaemenium secludit Zeugmate Persen (Stat. Silv. 5. 3. 185-8),

cum *alter* maneret in Capitolio, *alter* in Palatio, *alter* . . . *alter* . . . *alter* (Lampr. Hel. 30 4). Hence we have the mixture in: *altera detur si similis tellus, aliaeque* . . . *exsurgant rupes* (Sil. 12. 72-4), *altera nox aliisque gravat plaga caeca tenebris* (Stat. Theb. 8. 16).

When we see the clearer and more definite force of *alter* in classical Latin, we need not be surprised that it proved the victor. And yet it was not always felt clear or forcible enough to give the sense ‘one of the two’, and we have often *alteruter* used for this. But in such a case, when it is repeated, it is expressed by *alter* only, as in: *ne* . . . *alteruter alterum praeoccuparet* (Nep. Dio 4. 1), *aut etiam alterutrum, nisi terminet alterum* (Lucr. 1. 1012).

Sommer feels that *-ter* in *alter* is the same as *-ter* in *aliter*. *Alter* is for the old *aliteros* where, because of the two *morae* following *ali-*, the *i* has fallen out, while in *aliter*, the old neuter singular, there followed but one *mora*, the short syllable *-ter*; and he compares *validus* with *valdē*, where the *i* is lost before the final *-dē*, the equivalent of two *morae*. *Aliter* is the same kind of adverb as we have in *dulce ridentem* ‘laughing a sweet laugh’, a cognate accusative neuter of the adjective. Osthoff accounted for the *-ter* in *breviter* as being contracted from *itere*, *breviter* being primarily *brevi itere* (Woelff. Arch. 4. 455); but Delbrück pointed out that the ending *-iter* in *obiter* and *pariter* must be connected with the *-ter* in *inter*, *subter*, and *propter*. Probably *propter* was originally *propiter*, and perhaps behind *inter* lies an older *initer* (cf. ἐνί); but the proclitic use of these words as prepositions would naturally lead to shortening as well as loss of accent, giving us *propter* and *inter*. Certe for *\*cedite* Sommer thinks was shortened very much as was our ‘good-bye’; he calls it an *allegro* form. *Aliter* looks like a starting-point for such adverbs as *celeriter*. Very clear becomes the sense of *atque* in union with it in: *omnia plena pacis aliter, ac mihi Calvena dixerat (aliter)* (Cic. Att. 14. 9. 3), and we see at once the force of *aliter et in*: *si aliter est, et oportet (aliter esse)* (Att. 11. 23. 1). Mela’s *aliter a ceteris agunt* (1. 57) shows the way to Cledonius’s *velocius equus ab equo* ‘one horse runs faster than another’.

*Iterum*, unlike *aliter*, has assumed the ending of the acc. sing. masc.; perhaps we may connect it thus: *semel et iterum pervenire* ‘to reach one meal and then a second’. Its root is the same that we have in *ibi* (= thereby) and *ita*; and *iterum rogo* is: ‘I ask that second thing.’ The other form *itero*, found in inscriptions, would stand naturally for *iterum* in: *ac primo quidem decipi incommodum est, iterum stultum, tertio turpe* (Cic. de Inv. 1. 71. 39).

*Ceteri* we are constantly using in *et cetera*, not seeing, as the Romans, too, failed to see, that *ceteri* was a contraction for *caeieteri*, the Roman equivalent of καὶ ἑτέροι ‘and the others’. For ἑτέροι the Doric ἄτεροι seems the older form, being for σῆτεροι ‘the one party of the two’ (cf. ἐν for *sem*). In common use it is ‘the remaining majority’ as opposed to *reliqui* ‘the remaining few’; but, as we shall see, there are many uses of it which show this to be a later and acquired meaning. We have *cetera* for *alia* in: *ceu cetera nusquam bella forent* (Aen. 2. 438-9) and *alia* for *cetera* in:

Inde alias animas quae per iuga longa sedebant

Deturbat, laxatque foros (6. 411-12),

and in:

Obstipuerunt animis alii, sed Troius heros

Agnovit sonitum (8. 530).

The spelling in inscriptions is at times *caeteri*. The form *ceterus* is not in common use, and the meaning makes this

natural. In *caetera multitudo* and *caeterum tritum* the use of the nominative is easy, but *caeterus vir* would be impossible. Still we have masculine collectives; and Gesner<sup>1</sup> cites: *ceterus ornatus domi Pompeiis emptus est* (Cato R. R. 22. 3), which I do not find in Keil's edition. Usually *alius* is used for it, as in: *et alius exercitus ratibus iunctis traiecit* (Liv. 21. 27. 6). *Ceterum* the conjunction, and *cetera* are got from the same construction as we have in: *cetera Graius* (Aen. 3. 594).

<sup>1</sup> Gesner did not receive this into his own text of the *Auctores de Re Rustica*, but notices it there as a reading got from the notes of Politian, and adopted in the editions of Jenson and Jo. Gymnicus.

## X

### UTER—NEUTER—UTERQUE—NOSTER—POETASTER

OF all words ending in *-ter* that arise from the dual, *uter* seems most puzzling in its formation. Clearly it should be *cuter* (old \**quateros*, Att. *πότερος*, Ion. *κότερος*, Skt. *kataras*), and we do find in inscriptions *necuter* (C.I.L. vi. 1527. 64), as well as *necubi*, *sicubi*, *necunde*, *alicunde*. Neuter, says Sommer, is a later formation, developed after the change of the old \**cuter* to *uter* (Lat. L. & F. Lehre, p. 469). Either, says Brugmann, we have a wrong division into *nec-uter*, *nec-ubi*, &c., aided by the presence of a *uter* 'one of the two', which appears as *ater* in Old Slavic, or the initial *cu-* was altered to *u* by internal phonetic change (Vg. Gr. II<sup>2</sup>, 2. 346. 3). What this phonetic change may be Brugmann does not specify.

What is the relation between *quis* 'who?', and *quis* 'any one'? Clearly they are originally one and the same word; but *quis* 'who?' has an acute accent, which *quis* 'any one' has lost. The change is old; for the same is true for the Greek *τίς* and *τις*. We have already noticed how *ali-* in *aliquis* lost its force. So *numquis hoc dixit?* plainly meant to begin with: 'now who has said this?'. The strong phrase accent on the first word is analogous to the strong initial stress accent on *aliteros*, which led to the loss of *i* and changed the word to *alter*; and in like fashion the *quis* in the second place is weakened in meaning and accent, and we get: 'Now has any one said this?'. *Quis* thus reduced becomes an enclitic, as we find it in *aliquis* and *ecquis*.

The *-uter* in neuter does not mean 'which of the two', but 'either'. So with the *uter* in *uterque* 'either soever'; but *uter* standing alone is usually 'which of the two'. Still, when we have *uter* repeated, the second does not mean 'which of the two', but seems to be the *uter* which Brugmann identifies with the old Slavic *ater*, meaning the same as *alter*. For in: *quaerere . . . uter utri insidias fecerit* (Cic. Mil. 23. 9) or: *ambigitur . . . uter utro sit prior* (Hor. Ep. 2. 1. 55) the second *uter* has the same force as it has in: *neuter utri invidet* (Pl. Stich. 733); and we have a very close parallel to: *si quis quid contra rempublicam fecerit*. So to the Roman the second *uter* (= *alter*) might seem to bear the same relation to the first *uter* (= *cuter*), as *quid* here bears to *quis*. And so from the proportion *quis? : quis :: cuter : uter* we should get the use of *uter* for 'which of the two?', as well as for 'the other of the two'.

*Cuter* was for *quo-ter* 'which of the two?'; but the *u* in *uter* is a reduction of the *ve-* that we find as *vi-* in *viginti*, as the dual *vau* in Sanskrit, and as the plural *vos* and 'we' in Latin and English. It appears in the Skt. *ubhau* 'both'; and *uter* is 'one of the two', while *alter* is rather 'one of yon two'. We have, then, in *alteruter* very much such a reduplication as we have in *quisquis*; and in: *omnium controversiarum, quae essent inter aratorem et decumanum, si uter velit, edicit se recuperatores daturum* (Cic. Verr. 2. 3. 35. 14) *uter* seems short for *alteruter*. Quintilian tells us: *de praemiis quaeruntur duo: . . . ex duobus uter dignior; ex pluribus quis dignissimus* (7. 4. 21). So far as I know *uter* is used only of two persons or things, or of two parties or sets, as in: *aliquando utrimque sunt testes, et quaestio sequitur, ex ipsis: utri meliores viri* (Quint. 5. 7. 34). Unlike *alter*, *uter* is a dying word in later Latinity, and *quis* tends to take its place; as is plain from: *quos igitur anteferet* (Ann. 1. 47. 2).

In *uterque* the *-que* is worth a note. I have no doubt that in origin it is the same *-que* that we have in *geminusque* Pollux. From *qui* (= how?), the accented locative of *quis?*, we get an indefinite *qui* 'somehow', just as from *quis?* we get *quis* 'some one'. Ribbeck saw that we had this *qui* in a weakened form in *neque* (= *nequi* 'no how'); but he distinguished that *que* from the conjunction *que*, and thought of: *neque opes neque arma habebant* as involving an asyndeton. But in: *hostium currus arma castra cepit* we have an older syntax than in: *hostium currus et arma et castra cepit*; for *et* as a conjunction is late, and never developed in Greek, where *ἐτι* remains the adverb. But *que*, Greek *τε*, Skt. *ca*, is very old. When we

remember, however, that *ut* is primarily ‘how?’ and *que*, ‘somehow’, and compare Cicero’s use of *ut* in: *cum machinatione quadam aliquid moveri videmus, ut sphaeram, ut horas, ut alia permulta* (N. D. 2. 97. 38), with the use of *que* in:

*Captivi pendent currus curvaeque secures . . .*

*Spiculaque clipeique ereptaque rostra carinis* (Aen. 7. 184 and 186),

we feel that in the examples cited both *ut* and *que* are conjunctions with meanings closely allied.

*Que*, then, in *uterque* will mean ‘somehow’ or ‘soever’ and *uterque* ‘one of the two soever’ or ‘either of the two’. We have in Horace’s: *mihi cumque salve rite vocanti* (Od. 1. 32. 15) *cumque* for ‘whenever’, and in: *indignor quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus* (A. P. 359) *quandoque* with the same sense. And we have *cumque* used as the corresponding indefinite ‘at any time soever’ in:

*Contemplator enim cum solis lumina cumque*

*Inserti fundunt radii per opaca domorum* (Lucr. 2. 114-5),

‘observe, pray, when at any time the sun’s rays are admitted, and pour their light through the shaded chambers’. Munro feels that *cum . . . cumque* is for *quandocumque* and means ‘whenever’. No doubt it was in this meaning that *cumque* was subjoined to *quando*, and it was in this union that it got the force of ‘soever’ instead of the older ‘whenever’, in which meaning it usually takes the place of the simpler *que* in later Latin. In this sense it is subjoined to *uter* ‘which of the two’, while to *uter* (= *alter*) it is *que* that is subjoined.

*Uterque* is, then, originally ‘either’ rather than ‘both’, and it seems that the meaning ‘both’ was evolved from double uses such as we find in: *quia uterque utrique est cordi* (Ter. Phorm. 800) or: *cum uterque utrique esset exercitus in conspectu* (B. G. 7. 35). It was easy and usual to omit the second *uterque*, as in: *eodem die uterque eorum ex castris stativis . . .* (*utrumque*) *exercitum educunt* (B. C. 3. 30. 3), where the *eorum* pluralizes the verb, and with the omission of *utrumque* *uterque* assumes the force of ‘both’. With this meaning it is used in the singular for two individuals, and in the plural for two classes, but in poetry it is often used in the plural for individual objects, as in: *palmas utrasque* (Aen. 6. 685). Vossius (ad Vell. 2. 34. 3) notices the use in archaic Latin of *uter* for *uterque*, as in: *utris summo studio pugnantibus* (Quadrig. apud Gell. 9. 13. 8), probably a use of *uter* for *alteruter*.

*Neuter*, a trisyllable according to Priscian, is *ne+uter* (= *alter*). It is joined with a following *utri* (= *alteri*) in: *neuter utri invidet* (Pl. Stich. 731); but oftener with a following *alter*, as in: *neutra alteri official* (Quint. 1. 1. 14), and Quintilian’s usage shows that his Latin is not *neuter neutrum diligit*, but *neuter alterum diligit*; following which most editors have changed *utri* to *alteri* in the verse of Plautus cited above. Like *alter* it soon passes on from two to three, designating usually an excluded third, as in: *quid bonum sit, quid malum, quid neutrum* (Cic. Div. 2. 10. 4). In this use it comes to designate the neuter gender and the neuter verb; and by an easy and usual abbreviation we have *neutra verba* for *verba neutrius generis*, and *neuter anguis* (Cic. Div. 2. 62. 29), i.e. *anguis nec mas, nec femina*. In this new use its genitive is no longer *neutrius*, but *neutri*. This passage to a meaning that obscures its relation to *alter* is easy; and in this meaning it often ceases to have any connexion with two or more, passing to a singular sense.

*Noster* and *vester* by their ending *-ter* designate an opposition of ‘ours’ to ‘yours’ and vice versa, analogous to that felt in *meum* and *tuum*. Their use for a single person is apparently to be connected with the plurals of Modesty and Majesty. *Noster* standing with a proper name seems short for *vir nostri ordinis*, or for *nostras*, as in: *quisquis es . . . noster eris* (Aen. 2. 149-50); or for *nobis favens* (cf. *suus*), as in: *sin nostrum adnuerit nobis victoria Martem* (12. 187). Horace’s use of *noster* for *ego* in: *per totum hoc tempus subiectior in diem et horam invidiae noster* (Sat. 2. 6. 47-8), Acron explains: *verba invidiorum refert*; but in: *minime istuc faciet noster Daemones* (Pl. Rud. 1245), we should rather say: ‘your friend *Daemones*’. We have already spoken of the use of *vos* for *tu*; in Ov. Her. 19. 62 Burmann reads: *pectora nunc iuncto vestra fovere sinu*, where *vestra* would be for *tua*; but A. Palmer reads *nostra*. In: *crimen amor vestrum* (Aen. 10. 188) *vestrum* seems of Cupid and Venus, though Servius says that some took *vestrum* for *tuum*.

*Superum* is related to *super* as is *alterum* to *aliter*. It seems to have lost much of its comparative force in such uses as: *omnes supera alta tenentes* (Aen. 6. 787), or: *supera ardua linquens* (7. 562); and it is easy to understand the formation from such uses of the double comparative *superior*, just as the use of *inferi* for the underworld would lead to the use of *inferior* for Tartara. *Super* is a comparative from *sub* (= *ex upo*), meaning either ‘from beneath’ (i.e. up), or ‘beneath’. With the accusative *super* is the opposite of *subter*; but with the ablative it often loses its comparative force, becoming equivalent to *de*, and losing all idea of ‘two’. *Subter* is both the preposition opposed to *super*, and the adverb opposed to

supra.

While extra, intra, citra, ultra offer nothing of interest here, contra (= quom-tra) ‘to what extent on the other side’, and so ‘facing’ or ‘over against’, at times loses its force of opposition, and passes to ‘before’ or ‘to’. We read in the Vulgate: peccatum meum contra me est semper (Psal. 51. 3), and: flens orare contra Caesarem coepit (Bell. Alex. 24. 3).

It is to the doubtful point of division in a word like posterus that Sommer attributes the rise of the ending -teros out of the older -eros. Probably this -eros was subjoined to poste, the opposite of ante (older postid and antid); the root pos- is plain in \*posne, later pone, and so -teros here came to be regarded as the comparative ending. Words like ἀριστερός from ἄριστος, which gave rise by analogy to δεξιτερός instead of the older δεξιός, would aid in this development. Of the pair dexter and sinister in Latin, the origin of the former seems clear: it is the welcoming hand (cf. δέχομαι) as well as the hand with which the orator gesticulates (cf. δείκνυμι); my old teacher, Studemund, thought that sinistra marked the hand the speaker held *in sinu*; and I know of no other probable etymology.

‘Accompanying you’ and ‘at your side’ (sequos) gives the sequester (= sequent-ter). On the analogy of this term of local significance we get words like equester and pedester, paluster and campester; terraster, rurester in Apuleius, and tellustris in Capella. Sommer thinks that positives like agrestis and caelestis helped to extend this formation, The ending -iester seems reduced to -ister in magister, minister, and sinister; that the last is of late development is indicated by its double comparative sinisterior, which probably follows deterior in formation.

What of words like poetaster? Beside the avunculus or ‘little grandfather’, the elder brother who at the father’s death took his place as the protector of the sister and her children, we have his wife the matertera (= matritera, Walde) or ‘second mother’, who takes the place of the sister, should she die; and should this happen, the filia is the filiatera or filiatria of the matertera. On the analogy of words in -aster and -ister the son would now be the filiaster of the uncle, who in turn would be his patraster—neither the son nor the father in the full sense of the term. So we get calvaster ‘tending to baldness’ and surdaster ‘tending to deafness’, pilaster, oleaster, lotaster, poetaster. Our mulatto and the French mulâtre testify to a Low Latin mulaster. We read in Plautus’s Epidicus: sed quis haec est muliercula et ille gravastellus qui venit (v. 620). Festus gives this reading, but in another part of his compendium he cites the word as ravistellus—perhaps the oldest variant on record for Latin literature. Gravastellus is evidently a diminutive from gravaster ‘the man turning grey’; while ravistellus is a like diminutive from ravister, a pejorative of ravus ‘gray’ following the analogy of minister. We see that beside ravus, the classical form, there existed an older gravus, German grau, our ‘grey’. And so it is possible to think of Roma as a later development of groma, as lactis is probably for an older \*glactos. This is confirmed when we compare Nova Carthago (Aen. 1. 366) with Roma quadrata. Nova Carthago in the verse cited is the old, not the new, Carthage; and the epithet novus is joined with it here because the word Carthage itself meant New Town. So perhaps quadrata is joined with Roma, because Roma was itself the ‘square’ of the gromaticus.

## XI

### USE OF THE DUAL FOR THE PLURAL, AND OF THE PLURAL FOR THE DUAL

FOR the syntax of the dual we are most indebted to Berthold Delbrück, who, starting from the view that it was primarily intended to designate natural pairs like ὄσσε, ὀφθαλμῷ, χεῖρε, πόδε, μηρῷ in Greek, showed how it passed on to two objects usually found paired, like ἵππῳ or βόε, the horses or oxen of the span, or δοῦρε, the pair of spears carried by the Homeric warrior. But when it passed on from pairs to the expression of any two objects not paired in such fashion, it was then used for the plural, and this called forth in return a use of the plural for the dual. Delbrück notes an example of this in:

καὶ γὰρ νῦν δύο παῖδε, Λυκάονα καὶ Πολύδωραν,  
οὐ δύναμαι ἰδέειν Τρώων εἰς ἄστυ ἀλέντων (Il. 22. 46),

where the δύο παῖδε are not a pair, but two of the fifty sons of Priam. So in Il. 3. 246 the ὄρνε δύο are any two lambs from the flock. The plural is properly opposed to the singular, its function being the expression of more than one; and so here we have an open invasion of its realm by the dual.

The dual is often used to express several pairs, as in:

ὅσσε δ' ἄρα σφέων  
δακρυόφιν πίμπλαντο, γόον δ' ὤϊετο θυμός (Od. 20. 348-9),

or in:

Ξάνθε τε καὶ σύ, Πόδαργε, καὶ, Αἴθων Λάμπε τε δῖε  
νῦν μοι τὴν κομιδὴν ἀποτίνετον (Il. 8. 185-6),

or in:

κούρω δὲ δύω καὶ πεντήκοντα  
κρινάσθων κατὰ δῆμον (Od. 8. 35-6).

In: δύω δέ τέ οἱ Θύραϊ εἰσὶν (Od. 13. 109) we have the plural thus used, and δύω does not emphasize the duality, but gives the number of pairs.

In: λεύσσετον πάντα (Aesch. Eum. 255) we have the dual used of the chorus of twenty-four, which falls into two ἡμιχόρια; and in: καὶ περὶ τούτου πάντες ἐξῆς οἱ σοφοὶ πλὴν Παρμενίδου συμφερέσθων, Πρωταγόρας τε καὶ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς, καὶ τῶν ποιητῶν οἱ ἄκροι τῆς ποιήσεως ἑκατέρας κτλ. (Plato Theaet. 152 e) we have the dual used for a plurality of persons falling into two divisions, not paired nor necessarily equal in number. In Russian I find that the dual is used after the numerals two, three, four, and both. In:

αἶ κ' ἀποκηδήσαντε φερώμεθα χεῖρον ἄεθλον (Il. 23. 413).

Lang and Leaf translate: 'if through heedlessness we win but the worse prize'; and at first sight one might suppose that ἀποκηδήσαντε was here used of three, Antilochus and his team. We should, however, rather, translate: 'but if through the heedlessness of you two we win', &c., recognizing here a fine example of the Σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρη. In Latin we find:

Atridas Priamumque et saevum ambobus Achillem (Aen. 1. 458),

where it seems at first sight that ambobus is used for three. Servius's note runs: atqui tres dixit; sed Atridas pro uno accipe, quos unius partis constat fuisse. But the union here with Priamum leads me rather to accept Atridas for one, it is true, but to take that one as Agamemnon.

We have already noticed:

μή πως, ὥς ἀψῖσι λίνου ἁλόντε πανάγρον,  
ἀνδράσι δυσμενέσσιν ἔλωρ καὶ κύρμα γένησθε (Il. 5. 487-8).

Here the Scholiast, possibly repeating Aristarchus's explanation, explains ἁλόντε as in agreement with σὺ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι, which he supplies as the subject of γένησθε. But plainly there is no idea of pairing necessarily implied here, and we have a use of the dual for the plural with nothing to palliate it. In:

ὅτι νῶϊν ἀνήκεστος χόλος ἔσται (Il. 15. 217),

νῶϊν is evidently not of two, but of five: Poseidon, Athene, Hera, Hephaestus, and Hermes. In:

ὥς δ' ὅτε χεῖμαρροι ποταμοὶ κατ' ὄρεσφι ῥέοντες  
ἐς μισγάγκειαν συμβάλλετον ὄβριμον ὕδωρ (Il. 4. 452-3),

where we have the two armies of the Greeks and Trojans compared to two wintry streams that fling together their stormy waters, we have the two streams in the plural, the verb in the dual, and the waters in the singular. In Latin the plural octo is an old dual denoting two groups of four each, and viginti is 'two tens'.

In:

εἴπερ γάρ κ' ἐθέλομεν Ἀχαιοὶ τε Τρῶες τε  
ὄρκια πιστὰ ταμόντες ἀριθμηθῆμεναι ἄμφω (Il. 2. 123-4),

ἄμφω is used not of two individuals, but of two nouns of multitude.

So in:

Se satis ambobus Teucrisque venire Latinisque (Aen. 7. 470).

In prose we often find ambo for bini as opposed to singuli, as in: oculi vel ambo vel singuli (Cels. 6. 6. 14). In an enumeration of warriors Virgil has Assaracique duo (Aen. 10. 124) but in the next verse is: germani Sarpedonis ambo,



where ambo is merely a poetic variety for duo. In return we find him using duo for bina in: duo quisque Alpina coruscant gaesa manu (Aen. 8. 661-2), where the dual would be used for a number of pairs. From such uses it is easy to explain Virgil's use for twelve of now bis seni in: pueri bis seni quemque secuti (Aen. 5. 561), now bis sex in: bis sex thoraca petitum perfossumque locis (Il. 9-10). When we compare: tum pendere poenas Cecropidae iussi, miserum, septena quotannis corpora natorum (6. 20-2) with Theseus's words in Euripides:

σώσας κόρους

δὺς ἐπτά, ταῦρον Κνώσσιον κατακτανόν (H. F. 1326-7),

we see a use of septena corpora for bis septem corpora, which we shall consider further in a following chapter.

The plural is often used for the dual. By this I do not mean to assert that the plural is often used in Greek or Latin to express two objects. For two objects not forming a pair the plural, not the dual, is the proper idiom. Indeed, even when the plural is used for a natural pair, like oculi or humeri, we are not sure that there ever was a time when it was not properly so used. An examination of the inflexions of the dual makes it probable that the dual appeared later than the plural, and in natural language was never constant in use, but always sporadic. True, in Sanskrit it is used with much regularity and constancy, and I am told the same is true of Gothic; but these are both book languages like mediaeval Latin. When I read in Homer: δῶν κανόνεσσ' ἀραρυῖαν (Il. 13. 407), I have no right to say that κανόνεσσι is a dative plural used for an older dative dual κανόνουιν: Homer has no such dual. Of natural pairs ὅσσε is the only one he uses always in the dual; he never uses πόδε, though he has ποδοῖν; χεῖρες is far commoner with him than χεῖρε, and in:

καὶ ῥ' ἀπομόρξατο χερσὶ παρειὰς φώνησέν (Od. 18. 200),

'and with her two hands she wiped off her two cheeks and spake', Ohler explains that when two duals meet thus in a phrase, for both of them a plural is used. Ohler seems to think there was a time when all natural pairs found expression by the dual only; but there seems little ground for this belief.

Gottfried Hermann thought δῶν was a mark of the later use of the dual, as opposed, to the natural use; that ἵππῳ meant the team, but δῶν ἵππῳ any two horses from the herd. But uses like δῶν Αἴαντε (Il. 18. 163), Ἀτρεΐδα δῶν (Il. 1. 16) make me feel that the effect of δῶν, as of ἄμφω, is merely to emphasize the duality, just as una emphasizes ambo in: una ambo abierunt foras (Ter. Eun. 702).

But words like θύραι, or foras, or equae, which were once duals, but are now plurals, seem certain examples of the use of the plural for the dual. Words like Μοῦσαι, or νῆκαι, or mensae, or animae, may never have been duals, but may be merely later plurals formed on the analogy of θύραι or equae. But elliptical plurals like Αἴαντες (Il. 7. 164) for Ajax and Teucer, Castores for Castor and Pollux, δεσπότης for 'the master and mistress', fratres for 'brother and sister' may be asserted as uses of the plural for an older dual.

Some editors have suspected such a dual in: patres natosque videbit (Aen. 2. 579). But Leda is certainly dead by this date, as is probably Tyndareus; even if he is still thought of as living, the idea that patres here is for Helen's father and stepmother hardly seems to suggest the height of domestic felicity here implied. We have seen how liberis turned the preceding coniuge to the plural in Cicero (Att. 8. 2. 3); probably in like fashion natos here has changed patrem to patres, which is here for Menelaus.

But no editor of Virgil, to my knowledge, has suspected an old dual in: vidi Hecubam centumque nurus (Aen. 2. 501). Heyne's note is: *centum nurus* latius dictum; quinquaginta enim erant filiae, totidem filiorum uxores seu nurus. But κουράων . . . δώδεκ' ἔσαν τέγχοι θάλαμοι (Il. 6. 247-8) clearly implies that Priam and Hecuba had only twelve daughters. Servius has five explanations to offer, each more improbable than the preceding; he begins: aut finitus est numerus pro infinito ὑπερβολικῶς, and ends by referring the centum to the following per aras, though he finds that in v. 523 aras has become haec ara, which would be a transition from a hundred to one. (Aras in v. 501 is a plural for a singular, following the analogy of altaria.) It is small wonder that he adds: est autem haec plena adfectu et dolore repetitio. Only his first explanation has any probability in itself, and it seems barred by the quinquaginta thalami in v. 503. But we read:

infelix qua se, dum regna manebant,

Saepius Andromache ferre incommitata solebat

Ad soceros (Aen. 2. 455-7),

which Virgil evidently hoped would explain to his readers his parallel use of nurus less than fifty verses after. For

soceros and nurus are correlatives, and soceros is certainly for *socerum et socrum*, as Heyne saw. In *nurus* we have a plural used for an old dual, which stands, not for one pair, but for fifty pairs, each of a *filius* and a *nurus*. In such a case the masculine form is usually preferred, but here we have the close association with *Hecuba* to determine the gender. Then from the story told by *Deiphobus* in the sixth *Aeneid* it is clear that it was in effect a ballroom into which the Greeks were so rudely intruding.

Another plural used like the Greek elliptical dual is: *geminosque Triones* (*Aen.* 1. 744 and 3. 516), where there is general agreement among scholars that it is the Great and Little Bear that are meant. *Septentriones* is shortened to *Triones*, as is *Acroceraunia* to *Ceraunia* (*Aen.* 3. 506). In: *septem subiecta trioni* (*Geo.* 3. 381) we have a *tnesis* that shows how easy this shortening was; and in *Cicero* we have for the Little Bear: *Minor Septentrio* (*N. D.* 2. 111. 43). In: *egressi superant fossas* (*Aen.* 9. 314) *fossas* seems a similar elliptical plural for: *vallum et fossam*; we have already noticed *geminos sub rupe Quirinos* (*Juv.* 11. 105).

Bentley mentions as a *crux* for grammarians: *fortissima Tyndaridarum* (*Hor. Sat.* 1. 1. 100). Is *Tyndaridae*, of which we have here the genitive, a *nom. pl. masc.* of *Tyndarides*, and so a dual in form merely, but really a plural in meaning, being ‘the four children of *Tyndareus*’? or is it the plural of *Tyndarida*, the Latin form of *Tyndaris*, and so dual in meaning as well as in form, being the two daughters of *Tyndareus*? Bentley favours the former view, notwithstanding the *fortissima*, which must have made the phrase seem feminine in meaning to the Roman reader. *Lucian Müller*, favouring the same view, quotes *dulcissime rerum* (*Sat.* 1. 9. 4) as a parallel for the lack of agreement in gender. *Wickham* goes so far as to warn the student against connecting *fortissima* in meaning with *liberta* (v. 99), with which it seems in agreement; for it is surely her exploit *Horace* is lauding here. When we recall the old Roman use of *cratera* for *κρατήρ*, and that of *Ancona* for *Ἀγκών*, we shall see that the Roman would naturally use *Tyndarida*, the Greek accusative form, as the nominative for *Τυνδαρίς*. This seems a case where from the Latin *Scholia* we may learn how the Romans themselves understood the phrase. *Porphyrio*’s note is: *At hunc, etc., Eleganter, quia Clytaemnestra Tyndarei filia fuit, quae Agamemnonem maritum securi percussit*; *Acron*’s: *Tyndaridarum, Graecarum mulierum, pro Tyndaridum; significat autem Clytaemnestram aut Helenam. Nam Clytaemnestra Agamemnonem, Helena Deiphobum interfecit, et ambae Tyndarei filiae. Acron*’s scholium plainly points to *Tyndaridarum* as the *gen. pl.* of *Tyndarida*, used for *Τυνδαρίς*. But *Tyndaridae* here seems used to designate the class of women who kill their husbands, a class that finds its prototype, according to *Acron*, in either *Clytaemnestra* or *Helen*. *Fortissima* of course belongs to *liberta*, to whom *Horace* awards the palm for vigour in her class; *divisit medium*, making a clean and clear cut. *Tyndaridarum*, then, is neither a masculine plural nor a feminine dual, but a feminine plural.

With the Homeric use of *Αἴαντες* for ‘*Ajax and Teucer*’ we may associate the use of *Ἕλληνες* for ‘*Hellen and his people*’ and *Teutones* for ‘*Teuto and his people*’ noticed by *Hirt* (*Gr. L.- und F.- Lehre*, p. 213). He further cites as a parallel the *Skt.* *śvaśurās*, ‘the father-in-law and his connexions’; and *Reichelt* notices a like use in *Avestan* (*Av. El.* p. 221). Along the same line of development seem the *Skt.* compounds ending in *-adi*, as in *deva indradayas*, ‘the gods beginning with *Indra*’ (*Whitney, Skt. Gr.* 1302 d). In *οἱ περὶ Φαβρίκιον* (*Plut. Pyrrh.* 20) for *Fabricius*, we have the opposite. So *Herodotus* has *οἱ ἀμφὶ Μεγαρέας καὶ φλειασίους*, meaning the same as *οἱ Μεγαρέες καὶ φλειάσιοι*, used immediately after in 9. 69. Out of the Attic use of *οἱ ἀμφὶ Πρωταγόραν* for ‘*Protagoras and his school*’ develops the use of this phrase for *Protagoras* himself, and from *οἱ περὶ Ἡράκλειτον* ‘the school of *Heraclitus*’, or *οἱ περὶ Ἀρχίαν πολέμαρχοι* (*Xen. Hell.* 5. 4. 2) ‘*Archias and his colleagues*’, seems to develop the phrase for *Fabricius* cited above.

## XII

### USE OF THE SINGULAR FOR THE DUAL AND OF THE DUAL FOR THE SINGULAR

IN introducing the cases of the dual *Brugmann* writes: As regards formation the dual seems to have been a singular of which the essential formative elements originally expressed the quality of being coupled or paired (*Vergl. Gr.* II<sup>2</sup>. 2. 194). In discussing the Irish *da fer* (= two men) he notices the use of the *nom. sing. masc.* *fer* as a dual, as likewise of the *masc. sing. tene*, and the *neut. sings. dligeid, tech, ainm*, ascribing the use to a likeness in form that developed there. We noticed *Sommer*’s belief that *genu* and *cornu* are old duals that have become singulars, and that he bases the change, not

on form, but on the notion of pair in ‘the two knees’, or in ‘the two horns’, making meaning, not form, the cause of the transfer. The use of Castor, or of Pollux, to name both the Twins, seems based not on the form of the word, but on the idea of pair in the Gemini, because of which the name of the one at once suggests to the reader or hearer the name of the other. Meaning seems more important than form in producing this change: if in a dual you emphasize the idea of ‘two’ or division, it will pass to the plural; if you dwell on the notion of pair, it may pass to the singular.

This change from the dual to the singular, though it escaped the notice of the Roman grammarians, seems to me certain for Latin and probable for Greek, though to a less extent. Just as in Latin we find *nasus* or *nasum* in the singular and *nares* in the plural, while in Skt. we have only *nāsā* in the dual, in Greek we have *ῥίς, ῥή*, and *ῥίν, τό*, as well as *ῥίνας* for the nose. We read in Horace: *gaude quod spectant oculi te mille loquentem* (Ep. 1. 6. 19), not, however, of five hundred spectators, for *oculus* here evidently means a spectator, i.e. a pair of eyes. Usually we have the plural, as in: *qui siccis oculis monstra natantia (vidit)* (Od. 1. 3. 18); but what of: *quisquis ingentes oculo irretorto special acervos* (Od. 2. 2. 23-4) or: *solus mullisne coheres, veloci percurre oculo* (Sal. 2. 5. 54-5)? We read in Horace: *non islic obliquo oculo mea commoda quisquam limat* (Ep. 1. 14. 37-8), but in Ovid: *altera, si memini, limis subrisit ocellis* (Am. 3. 1. 33). In: *cum tibi sol tepidus plures admoverit aures* (Hor. Ep. 1. 20. 19) I feel that the singular of *plures aures* is *una auris* (= auditor unus); and I read in Martial: *aurem non ego tertiam timerem* (12. 24. 10) ‘I should not fear a third pair of ears’. So in Virgil: *simul hoc dicens attollit in aegrum se femur* (Aen. 10. 856-7) *femur* must be for *utrumque femur*; for his wound was *imo inguine*; (*hasta*) *ima sedit inguine (imo)* v. 785-6. More interesting is:

tum pendere poenas  
Cecropidae iussi, miserum, septena quotannis  
Corpora natorum. (Aen. 6. 20-2.)

Heyne asks: *Cum pueri septem septemque puellae mitterentur, quidni alterutrum tantum poni potuit?* But he has no answer. Conington’s answer is very close to the mark: ‘The story mentioned seven youths and seven maidens, but Virgil has chosen only to name the former’. But we have here, too, a dual passing to a singular, each *corpus natorum* consisting of a youth and a maid.

Virgil uses the plural of *geminus* as an adjective to designate well-matched pairs, as in: *gemi . . . immensis orbibus angues* (Aen. 2. 203-4), *geminæ columbae* (6. 190), *geminæ belli portae* (7. 607), *geminæ somni portae* (6. 893), *geminæ quercus* (9. 681), *huc geminas nunc flecte acies* (6. 788), *geminæ slant vertice cristae* (6. 779). The last two examples are noteworthy; in the last the crests are on the same head, and when pairs are thus connected we commonly have the singular, not the plural, as in: *gemina teguntur lumina nocte* (Catull. 51. 11), *gemino demittunt brachia muro turriti scopuli* (Aen. 3. 535), *geminum pugnae proponit honorem* (5. 365), *gemina super arbore sidunt* (6. 203). So we may regard: *geminique sub ubere nati* (5. 285) as short for: *gemi (gemino) sub ubere nati*, an abbreviation of four to three, from which *hypallage* takes its origin; cf. *geminos huic ubera circum ludere pendentes pueros* (8. 631-2). So, too, with *geminum (geminæ) pugnae proponit honorem*. In: *solem geminum et duplices . . . Thebas* (Aen. 4. 470) we have, probably, the exchange of number for the sake of variety. That *foris* in the sing. and *fores* in the pl. are both used for the pair of doors is plain from: *ad geminae limina prima foris* (Ov. Her. 12. 150) and: *frustra clavis inest foribus* (Tib. 1. 6. 34). Along with *θύραι* ‘the pair of doors’, which Brugmann thinks an old dual, Homer uses *θύρη* for ‘the door’. Probably *foras* is the acc. pl. and *foris* the abl. pl. of an old \**fora*, corresponding with this; and *foris* is a new nom. sing. formed on the analogy of *fores*, the old plural of *fora*. (Cf. *manus* ‘good’, and *manes* ‘the kindly ones’.)

By Homer’s time duals like *θύραι* had become plurals; in their stead had begun the development of duals in *ᾱ* for *α*-stems following the analogy of duals like *ἵππῳ*. We see this beginning in Homer, not for feminines, but for masculines like *Ἀτρεΐδᾱ*; but the development is soon extended to feminines. It was an irregular and partial development; for the use of the dual in Greek was passing away. We find side by side *ταῖν χερῶν* and *τοῖν χερῶν*, *τὰ κόρα* and *τὸ στήλα*. Attraction played its part, as we see from *ἀμφοῖν τοῖν χερῶν*, but *ταύταιν ταῖν ἀδελφᾶν*. The form *ταῖν* seems to have developed for the article before *τά*; Plato and the Orators have *ταῖν ὁδοῖν*, but *τὸ ὁδὴ*, Sophocles and Aristophanes write *τὰ κόρα*, but *τὸ χεῖρε*. One of the results of the struggle thus prolonged of the dual against the prevailing plural seems to have been that, when the dual disappeared, it was almost always the plural that took its place. There is no trace of such a revival of the dual in Latin; it probably disappeared there more readily and speedily; and so more of its uses passed to the singular.

Our most interesting example of this use of the singular for the dual occurs in Horace’s first Canidia epode, where the boy, whom the witches are about to kill to obtain an unguent from his marrow, after a vain appeal to their feelings as women, in a second speech threatens them with the vengeance of gods and men. Its opening words have proved a *crux*

for all editors:

Venena magnum fas nefasque non valent  
Convertere humanam vicem (Epod. 5. 87-8).

To this text, given by all manuscripts of any value, Bentley adds the note: *Durissimus locus, neque, quocumque modo veritas et excutias, sententiam commodam praebens. Scio equidem ut conati sint explicare veteres novique interpretes; sed si quid video laterem lavarunt. . . . Multa quidem ipse nequidquam tentavi, quae piget hic referre; tamen, ne omnino asymbolus veniam, dicam aliquid, quod etsi ne mihi quidem placeat, Rutgersiano haud deterius fore credo. Ergo ecce tibi correctionem, qualiscumque est:*

Venena magica fas nefasque non valent,  
Non vertere humanas vices.

Of our novi interpretes Kiessling reads:

Venena maga non fas nefasque, non valent  
Convertere humanam vicem.

In *maga* non he follows an improvement on Bentley's *magica* suggested by Moritz Haupt, and he calls the *magnum* of the manuscript meaningless (*sinnlos*); but he does not venture to change the number of *humanam vicem*.

Turning to the *veteres* we read in Acron: *Venena magnum f. n. n. v. c. h. v. Lex enim humana habet malis poenam, bonis praemia pollicenda, et ideo furens puer dicit, haec eas carminibus mutare non posse. Porphyrio gives us: Ven. magnum fas nefasque. Magnum fas venena sunt, si hostibus dantur, magnum nefas, si amicis. Non valent conv. hum. vicem. Sic sensus est: Quamvis venena multum possint, non tamen valent merita in contrarium vertere, ut liberentur poena, aut mala mereantur. Vices autem appellantur poenae, quae in scelerosis admissis regerentur.*

It is evident that both accept the text cited by Bentley as that of all good manuscripts, and it might seem significant that both give in full *magnum*, the word rejected by Bentley and found meaningless by Kiessling. There are two things of the greatest importance to note in Porphyrio's second scholium: (1) in his explanation he substitutes *vices* for the *vicem* of his text, (2) in arranging Horace's words he joins *non valent* with *convertere*. We have in the distich *non valent* in the first verse, and *convertere* in the second, giving us a not very difficult example of distribution; we must fill out each of these, understanding for each *convertere non valent*. So we have: *venena magnum fas nefasque convertere non valent; convertere non valent humanam vicem (= vices, Porph.)*. Acron's note gives us the true meaning of *humanam vicem*: it is a singular where prose would use a plural; a singular for a dual, the *praemia* and *poenae* of the *lex humana*, which here balance the *fas nefasque* of the gods. It is put in the singular to vary the diction of the couplet, just as in: *et solem geminum et duplices se ostendere Thebas* (Aen. 4. 470) *solem geminum* is put in the singular to give variety to the verse.

Why do Bentley and Kiessling feel *magnum* to be inadmissible, in face of such clear testimony from Scholia and manuscripts? *Venena ait magica*, says Bentley, *id enim epitheton necessarium hic videtur; quippe venena per se et absolute posita non possunt rem magicam denotare*. If *venena* were here used in its proper and absolute sense of 'drugs', one might readily supply *magica* from the theme of the whole poem, which is of the *maga Canidia*; and Horace might well deem its expression here unnecessary. But Bentley is hopelessly prosaic; usually in poetry words of importance are not used 'per se et absolute'; and Acron tells us implicitly that *venena* is here used for *carmina* 'spells'. *Magnum* is 'sinnlos', thinks Kiessling. True, it is not here applied to a material object, the size of which can be determined by the *modius* or the *decempeda*. But *magnus* is at times applied to *animus*; we have them connected in *magnanimus* 'high-souled'. From the *humanam* of the second verse we might have expected *divinum* in the first, but *divinum* is already implied in *fas* as opposed to *lex*. *Convertere* means 'to change wholly', or 'to reverse entirely'. In balancing *magnum fas nefasque* by *humanam vicem*, the poet has chosen for variety to use the singular, not the plural, to express the dual idea of the rewards and penalties of human law. We shall translate then: Your spells have not the power wholly to reverse the right and wrong of high heaven; they have not the power to reverse even the rewards and punishments of men.

It seems strange at first sight that Brugmann is willing to accept *cornus* (old *cornuus*) as for an older gen. dual *cornuos* corresponding to the Skt. gen.-loc. dual in -os, but is unwilling to accept *cornu* as the old nom. dual. A similar irregularity is noted, however, for Polish by Delbrück; while *reçe*, the old nom. dual, 'the two hands', has become a plural, *reku*, its gen.-loc., has passed to the singular (Vergl. Synt. I, p. 145). From examples like: *iam cornu petat et pedibus qui spargat harenam* (Buc. 3. 87 et Aen. 9. 629), *cornu ferit ille* (Buc. 9. 25), *qui vexat nascenti robora cornu* (Juv. 12. 9) it is plain that the singular *cornu* in Latin stands at times for a pair of horns. The plural is far more common;

as is *genua* in: *tarda trementi genua labant* (Aen. 5. 431-2) but we read: *nuda genu nodoque sinus collecta fluentes* (1. 320), and: *impressoque genu nitens terrae adplicat ipsum* (12. 303). In:

*quamquam tardata sagitta*

*Interdum genua impediunt cursumque recusant* (12. 746-7),

Wagner relying on inferior manuscripts changed *tardata* to *tardante*, and he is followed by Forbiger and Ladewig. Only one of Aeneas's knees is affected by the arrow, and *interdum* seems to show that it is this one knee which at times impedes him in the race. Ribbeck has retained *tardata*, as all the manuscripts on which he relies give this reading, which is clearly the more difficult; and this is the reading of Conington and Sidgwick, who do not explain Wagner's difficulty in translation, however. Probably we have here a use of *genua* for *genu*, the opposite of *genu* for *genua*.

We read: *et gemina auratus taurino cornua voltu* (Geo. 4. 371). We have also *geminæ nares* (Geo. 4. 300), *geminas aures* (Culex 150), *geminos lacertos* (Moretum 21), *geminas acies* (Aen. 6. 788), showing that *gemi* is felt to be the numeral appropriate to pairs. While neither *duo* nor *ambo* is joined with the singular, we noticed *solem geminum* (Aen. 4. 470) 'twin suns', *gemino muro* (3. 535) 'twin walls', *geminum honorem* (5. 365) 'a pair of prizes', *gemino ab ovo* (Hor. A. P. 147) 'from the twin eggs', and *geminæ foris* (Ov. Her. 12. 150) 'a pair of doors'. It is reasonable to place here: *geminus Pollux* (Hor. Od. 3. 29. 64) and *geminus Castor* (Ov. A. A. 1. 746). If the Latin dual passes into the singular at times, it is only to be expected that the numeral for two appropriate to the dual shall also appear as a singular.

The dual is used as the singular at times, in return for the uses of the singular for the dual. I have already noticed the use of *Atridas* (Aen. 1. 458), and of *tardata sagitta genua* (Aen. 12. 746-7). Of course in Latin it is the plural used for the dual that is in question.

In poetry a part of the body is often expressed by the plural, where we should expect the singular. We read: *coniugis ille suae complexus colla lacertis* (Ov. Met. 1. 734); why *colla*? Many parts of the body occur in pairs; e.g. *oculi*, *aures*, *genae*, *manus*, *pedes*, *genua*; and after analogy of such parts it became a poetic fashion to use the plural even for such parts as were not paired, like *cervix*, *collum*, *mentum*, *dorsum*. Often such uses are plainly to vary the diction, as in: *nunc animis opus, Aenea, nunc pectore firmo* (Aen. 6. 261), with which compare: *violenta pectora Turni edocet* (10. 151-2) and: *his animum arrecti dictis* (1. 579). Here *animis* is the mind of Aeneas, but *animum* the minds of Aeneas and Achates; while both *pectore* and *pectora* are of a single person. In: *manus iuvenem . . . post terga revinctum* (Aen. 2. 57) *terga* of a single person seems to follow the analogy of *pectora*, a paired part. So in Homer we read:

τὸν . . . ὁ μὲν ἰῶ

*βεβλήκει τελαμῶνα περὶ στήθεσσι φαεινόν* (Il. 12. 400-1),

and:

ἢ τ' ἀνὰ νῶτα θεούσα διαμπερὲς αὐχέν' ἰκάνει (Il. 13. 547),

where *νῶτα* seems to follow the analogy of *στήθεα* in like manner.

Still more noteworthy is the use of the dual in Sanskrit in the double elliptical form *Mitrā Varunā*, the two *Mītras*, the two *Varunas*, for *Mitra* and *Varuna*; or in *pitarau-mātaraū*, the two fathers, the two mothers, for the father and the mother. We find the same idiom in *Mithra Ahura* in the Avesta (Reichelt, Av. Synt. p. 222). In: *lugete, O Veneres Cupidinesque* (Catull. 3. 1) Schwyzer (Ig. F. 14, p. 28) thinks that the plurals *Veneres Cupidinesque* are for old duals, and mean merely *Venus* and *Cupid*.

The development of this construction seems interesting, and can be traced with the help of Anglo-Saxon and old Irish. In Skt. the dual *Mitrā* is used for *Mitra* and *Varuna*, just as in Greek *Ἀγμέμνων* for *Agamemnon* and *Menelaus* (Il. 1. 16), or in Latin *Castores* for *Castor* and *Pollux*. But at times uses like *Mitrā* 'the two *Mītras*' did not convey clearly enough the name of the second member of the pair, and so the second name would be added, at first in the singular. So we read: *ā yad ruhāva Varuṇas ca navam* (R. V. 7. 88. 3) 'when we two and *Varuna* get on board the ship', with the meaning 'when I and *Varuna* get on board', &c. We have the same syntax in the Anglo-Saxon phrase: *wit Scilling* 'we two *Scilling*' for 'I and *Scilling*'. Zimmer gives us from Irish (K. Z. 32, p. 152 ff.): *doronsat sid ocus Fergal* 'they made peace and *Fergal*' for 'he and *Fergal* made peace'; a syntax reflected in the Latin life of *Fintan*: *in illo autem die ante vesperum venit Fintanus ad consilium, et salutaverunt se in vicem et Lasserianus*. But instead of advancing to two duals as in Sanskrit, or to two plurals as in Latin, Irish changes the verb back to the singular, influenced, Zimmer thinks, by an impersonal use of the verb; and we have a form which Zimmer translates thus: *She came from the East in the shape of two swans and her*

maid.

In Greek Wackernagel cites from Homer:

ἐς δ' ἐνόησ' Αἴαντε δύω, πολέμον ἀκορήτω  
ἐσταότας, Τεῦκρόν τε νέον κλισίῃθεν ἰόντα (Il. 12. 335-6),

where he thought Αἴαντε δύω . . . Τεῦκρόν τε parallel to the āvām Varuṇās ca of the example cited from the Rig-Veda, where he amplifies āvām from the -va in ruhāva. And this view seems confirmed by:

τὴν δ' ἐν Ἴσθμῳ διπλόα θάλλοις' ἀρετά,  
Φυλακίδα, κεῖται, Νεμέα δὲ καὶ ἀμφοῖν  
Πυθέα τε, παγκρατίου (Pind. Isth. (5). 17 ff),

‘further, Phylacides, a double crown of glory is at Isthmus stored and at Nemea both for thee and for Pytheas, a pancratiast’s crown’ (Myer’s transl.). The Scholiast explains ἀμφοῖν Πυθέα τε by ἀμφοτέροις ὑμῖν, σοί τε καὶ τῷ Πυθέα, making it parallel with Αἴαντε . . . Τεῦκρόν τε. But the Greek never advanced to Αἴαντε Τεύκρω τε as did the Sanskrit to Mitrā Varuṇā.

It seems clear that this advance in Sanskrit was due to an assimilation of the second to the first in number. So in Latin from an older Veneres Cupidoque, where Veneres primarily meant Venus and Cupid, we have Veneres Cupidinesque (also in Catull. 13. 12 and Martial, 9. 11. 9 and 11. 13. 6). But the assimilation of the first to the second was also possible, as we find it developing in Irish from: they and Fergal, to: she . . . and her maid. This is what takes place in Greek, giving us the Schema Alemanicum, as we see it in:

ἦχι ροὰς Σιμόεις συμβάλλετον ἡδὲ Σκάμανδρος (Il. 5. 774),

where συμβάλλετον becomes intelligible only when we think of its primary subject as Σιμόεντε, ‘the Simois and Skamander’, which, after Σκάμανδρος was added, passed back to Σιμόεις under the influence of its form and meaning.

Of course it would be absurd to think of the Latin construction here as directly influenced by the Skt. syntax. Gauthiot, in the paper Du Nombre Duel already cited, shows that this curious doubling of the dual is not uncommon in Finnish; and from its development in languages so independent of each other we may conclude that it is a natural and easy development of the dual wherever found. Other peculiarities of the dual, such as its passage to the singular, may be even more easily assumed as probable developments of the dual number wherever it occurs. (See Appendix A.)

Delbrück holds that the primary use of the dual is for natural pairs, like ὄσσε or χεῖρε. But that this use, though very old, is older than, or even as old as, that for twins, as in the Skt. Áśvinau, is opposed to much that we see in the development of number and gender. In the next chapter we shall see reasons for believing that the plural was used primarily of persons, and was extended to things later. The use of gemini, as the numeral appropriate to the dual in Latin, and accompanying it in its passage to the singular as well as to the plural, tends to confirm this. The sensation, at times of joy, but oftener of horror, called forth by a birth of twins among savages of to-day, may give us some idea of its importance among primitive men. In Russian the use of the dual is extended from dva, ‘two’, and oba, ‘both’, to trí, ‘three’, and chetyre, ‘four’ (Figgis, Russ. Gram., p. 91). The extension to ‘four’ seems the same as that we cited from Il. 8. 185-6; but its use with three seems easiest to understand when we think of the evident association of gemini with tergemini. Delbrück notes that Slovenian, and Upper and Lower Serbian have kept the same construction and almost to the same extent to which it existed in Old Bulgarian; he thinks it an effect of analogy (Vergl. Synt. I, p. 144-5).

### XIII

#### USE OF THE SINGULAR FOR THE PLURAL

BEFORE the threefold system of gender that marks the Indo-Germanic languages there seems to me to have existed a twofold system still found in many languages of more primitive structure and sometimes styled higher and lower. This division has been commonly identified with that between living and lifeless objects, but as a rule women and children belong to the lower class, while the sword and shield of the warrior are found at times in the higher. When we turn to Greek we find that adjectives in rarer use, like ἄλλογος, have often only two forms, and that some, like ἰφθίμος, are of either two or three forms in Homer; cf. ἰφθίμους ψυχᾶς (Il. 1. 3) with θυγατέρ’ ἰφθίμη; (Od. 15. 364). So βέβαιος in

Thucydides has only two forms for gender, but three in Euripides; χρήσιμος has usually two forms in Attic, three appear in the Orators. In Latin hilaris with two forms changes to hilarus with three. In Roman law women and children are res, as opposed to the free man, the vir sui iuris, who is a persona; and this distinction, which lies at the basis of Roman law, may reasonably be held to represent a distinction of great importance and antiquity in primitive Indo-Germanic society. As we have already noted, there is strong reason for assuming that before the threefold distinction for number which seems to have marked Indo-Germanic, there existed a twofold distinction of the singular and the plural. Older grammarians held that 'while there may be multitude in things, there can be plurality only in persons' (Farrar, Gr. Synt. p. 65, note). Irregularities in the use of the singular for the plural, that do not arise out of the disappearance of the dual, seem mainly due to this primary restriction of plurality to persons.

In many of the languages that have only two genders, a higher and a lower, nouns of the lower gender form no plurals. In both Greek and Latin words denoting materials, grain, flocks, and herds of cattle show much confusion in their use of the singular and the plural. This confusion is very familiar to us in English, where we say oats, pease, and beans, but wheat and barley. Greek uses for 'blood' αἷμα and αἷματα, and Latin cruor and cruores; in Greek we have ζιὰ and ζιαιά, in Latin far and farra; Greek has for 'fat' only στέαρ, but Latin adeps and adipēs; in Greek 'dust' is κόνις, in Latin pulvis and pulveres. But while in Thucydides we have: ἄμπελον κόπτοντες (4. 90. 2), but: λίθοις τε καὶ κεράμῳ βαλλόντων (2. 4. 2), still there seem traces of a definite tendency here, differing in Greek and in Latin.

For materials Greek tends to use the plural for the general name and the collective sense, while the singular rather means a bit of the material in question. Thus κρέα is usually 'dressed meat', as in: κρέα ὠπτημένα (Ar. Plut. 894), while: ἄρνειον κρέας (Pherecr. Δουλ. 1) is 'a bit of lamb'. But in Latin caro is the general term for flesh, as in: carne pecudum famem propulsare adacti (Ann. 14. 24. 1), while carnes is used for 'bits of flesh', as in: pedes ponēs super concisis carnes (Vulg. Exod. 29. 17). We find many deviations from these tendencies, however, both in Latin and Greek. While σάρκες is the usual word for 'flesh', σάρξ is also in use. Ὑδωρ is Homer's usual word for 'water', except for the sea, where he has ὕδατα ἀενάοντα (Od. 13. 109). But later ὕδατα is much more common and varied in use, being for showers in οὐρανίων ὑδάτων ὀμβρίων (Pind. Ol. 10. 2), and for mineral springs in Ὑδατα Σέξτια for the Latin Aquae Sextiae. Homer uses δάκρυ in: δάκρυ χέων (Il. 1. 357) as the collective; and the old grammarians regarded δάκρυα as from δάκρυον, and not from δάκρυ, which seems the older form. While Homer uses either ξύλα or ξύλον for firewood, in later Greek ξύλα is firewood, and ξύλον a plank or bench. It seems clear that in Greek, too, the singular is older than the plural here. In Latin lignum is wood and ligna firewood, and it is natural to regard the specialized term as later than the general.

Turning to grain, we have already cited Bavius's censure on Virgil for writing hordea for hordeum in imitation of the Greek ἄλφιτα or κριθαί. Later Greek writes ἄλφιτα, but Homer has the singular ἄλφιτον as well; he uses κριθαί thrice, but κριθῶ occurs eight times in the Homeric poems. No Greek word ends in θ, and so he cannot write κριθῶ, of which κριθαί would be the old form of the plural, κριθαί being a second plural following the analogy of πυροί and ἀλείατα 'wheat'. He uses πυροί four times, but the singular πυρός five times. He has not ἄλευρα which later Greek uses for wheat. Latin has no plural for triticum, but it uses frumenta for 'kinds of grain', as in: tritico vel aliis frumentis (Columella 8. 9. 2). Avena is 'oats', but avenae 'wild oats' in: steriles dominantur avenae (Geo. 1. 154). Here too the plural seems late, and in Latin rare.

For cattle, where in Greek we have πρόβατα, or κτήνεα, pluralia tantum, in Latin pecu is the generic term. This has the plural pecua or pecuda, later pecudes, for members of the herd, and pecora for herds. Latin pluralizes equus and bos freely as does Greek ἵππος and βοῦς; but, unlike Greek, for the smaller creatures of the farmyard it tends to use the singular as a collective, as in: Villa abundat porco, haedo, agna, gallina (Cic. Sen. 56. 16).

We see the same respective tendencies in Greek and Latin, when we turn to bodies of men. In Homer λαός for a body of men, as in λαὸν ἀγείρω (Il. 16. 129), is far more usual than the plural in λαοὶ . . . ἀγροῖωται (Il. 11. 676); but in Attic Greek the reverse is the case. Plato has still ὁ πολὺς λεώς, but the herald's cry: ἀκούετε λεῶ, 'hear, O people!', our Oyez, oyez, shows the prevalence of the plural. In Aristophanes λεῶ seems the equivalent of plebs; in N.T. Greek λαοὶ becomes specialized as the opposite of κληροί. In Latin populus is pluralized only to designate the peoples of different states, till we reach the African Latin of Augustine and Apuleius. Plebs is the collective, having plebeiī for individuals, and is never pluralized till Columella uses it for swarms of bees in: duas vel tres alveorum plebes (9. 11. 1). But στρατός is singular like exercitus; στρατιώτης like miles is individual or collective; and we find ὁ πεζός and ἡ ἵππος

like pedes and eques for infantry and cavalry. Manus is the hand, and the band of hands. Uses like: ὀκτακισχλίην ἀσπίδα (Herod. 5. 30), or: παρμένοντας αἰχμῶ (Pind. Pyth. 8. 58) ‘standing by their spearmen’, have their nearest and perhaps only parallel in Cicero’s: hasta infinita (Phil. 4. 9. 4) ‘endless auction sales’. The use of pondo for librae arises from a use parallel to that of Pollux for Castor et Pollux, or of uter for alteruter, that of pondo for pondo librae ‘pounds in weight’, where pondo is the ablative of an old pondum, which later became pondus.

The neuter plural in Greek is regularly constructed with a singular verb. The exceptions to this rule are in the proportion of one to three in Homer, but become fewer in later Attic. In many of the Homeric exceptions the neuter plural is accompanied by a numeral as in:

οὐδ’ εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ’ εἶεν (Il. 2. 489)

Many can be explained by the σχῆμα πρὸς τὸ συνώνυμον as in:

ὥς τῶν ἔθνεα πολλὰ νεῶν ἄπο . . . ἐστιχόωντο (Il. 2. 91-2),

where ἔθνεα is constructed as though it were λαοί. The rule is pretty closely followed in Plato and the Drama; but Thucydides and Xenophon show many exceptions, mainly of the classes noted above, as in: τὰ τέλη (= οἱ ἄρχοντες) τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων . . . αὐτὸν ἐξέπεμψαν (Thuc. 4. 88. 1) or: φανερά ἦσαν καὶ ἵππων καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἵχνη πολλά (Anab. 1. 7. 17).

While in the accusative absolute we should have the singular here, as in: δόξαν ἡμῖν ταῦτα (Plat. Prot. 314 c), we find also the plural, as in: δόξαντα δὲ ταῦτα καὶ περανθέντα τὰ μὲν στρατεύματα ἀπῆλθε (Xen. Hell. 3. 2. 19), where the δόξαντα seems attracted by the following ταῦτα, just as is ἀδύνατα in: ἀδύνατά ἐστι ταῦτα ποιεῖν. Just as the use of ἀδύνατα for ἀδύνατον is extended by analogy to phrases where there is no following plural to attract, as: τὴν πεπρωμένην μοῖραν ἀδύνατά ἐστιν ἀποφυγεῖν (Herod. 1. 91), so here, too, we have the plural in the acc. abs. with no following neuter plural, as in: δεδογμέν’, ὡς ἔοικε, τήνδε κατθανεῖν (Soph. Ant. 576). This construction of the neuter plural with a singular verb is not found in classical Latin, but occurs in Plautus: quae imperasti . . . factumst ilico (Bacch. 726).

‘There can be plurality only in persons’; is the plural in -a really a plural to begin with? or merely an augmentative? In Homer we find from μηρός the plural μηροί for the separate thighs in: μηρούς τ’ ἐξέταμον (Il. 1. 460), but in: αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μῆρ’ ἐκάη (v. 464) μῆρα designates the pile of thighs heaped upon the altar. This view is strengthened by the Homeric use of ὕδατα for the ocean, and of κέλευθα in: ἐπέπλεον ὕγρὰ κέλευθα (Il. 1. 312) ‘they sailed the watery ways’. The use of οἰκία, a neuter plural in Homer, for a single dwelling, and its transition to a feminine singular in Attic, both point strongly in the same direction. There seems good reason to think that abstracts in -α and -η in Greek and in -ia in Latin are really this old neuter plural in a collective sense, used later as singulars to denote the abstract idea deduced from the collection in question.

Just as τὰ οἰκία, a plural of parts, is used to designate a single house in Homer, like μέγαρον ‘the hall’, and then passes to ἡ οἰκία in Attic with a new plural αἱ οἰκίαι, so ἀναλκείη ‘a lot of weak acts’ has already in Homer attained the force of ‘weakness’ and has formed a new plural ἀναλκεῖαι ‘acts of weakness’. A like collective in Latin is Italia, which means (1) the collection of Itali, (2) the land where they dwell. Prose usually admits only the second sense of such collectives, but poetry often shows them in their primary meaning, as in: Graecia Barbariae lento collisa duello (Hor. Ep. 1. 2. 7) ‘the Greeks ground down in slow warfare with the Trojans’. It is not often that in Latin literature we can see the old plural Graecia passing into the feminine singular; or the collective sapientia ‘a gathering of sages’ passing into the abstract sapientia ‘wisdom’. But in Sallust’s: interea servitia repudiabat, cuius initio ad eum magnae copiae concurrebant (Cat. 56 fin.), does not the syntax of cuius with servitia make it appear a singular rather than a plural?

When in Tacitus we read: Firmius Catus senator, ex intima Libonis amicitia (Ann. 2. 27. 2) ‘of the intimate friends of Libo’, or: plures seditioni duces (Ann. 1. 22. 1) ‘the mutineers get more leaders’; or in Propertius: turpior et saeculi vivere luxuria (1. 16. 12) ‘to live in greater shame than the wantons of her time’; or in Virgil: adsit laetitiae Bacchus dator (Aen. 1. 734) ‘let the winegod, bestower of joy, cheer the joyous throng’, we understand the force of virtus in: exigui numero, sed bello vivida virtus (Aen. 5. 754) ‘few in number, but a band of heroes strong for war’; or in: non aliter socium virtus coit omnis in unum (Aen. 10. 410) ‘so all the hero-band of allies gathers together’. It is plain that the collective sense in point is not confined to abstracts in -ia, but may extend to others. We read: ianua Tarpeiae nota pudicitiae (Prop. 1. 16. 2) ‘the well-known gate of the virgin Tarpeia’, where the abstract is transferred to a single person; and now we can understand: spes quoque suas ambitioni donant ‘they consecrate their young hopefuls, too, to



politics'; . . . cruda adhuc studia in forum pellunt 'they hurry the raw schoolboys into the lawcourts' (Petron. Sat. 4).

Draeger thought it worth his while to collect all plurals of abstract nouns that he found in Latin, and he tells us that of 3,814 found, only 2,500 are used in the plural. Of such plurals rarest seem those which are used in the abstract sense, as in: virtutes voluntariae, quae quidem proprie virtutes appellantur (Cic. Fin. 5. 38. 13). Far more usual is the plural in a concrete sense as in: heroum mira virtutes indicat arte (Catull. 64. 51) 'exhibits with wonderful skill the deeds of heroes'. So color, the abstract quality in: qui color, nitor, vestitus, quae habitudo corporis (Ter. Eun. 242), passes to 'blossoms' in: aurave distinctos educit verna colores (Catull. 64. 90), and to 'gauds' in: furtivis nudala coloribus (Hor. Ep. 1. 3. 20). Vitia is usually concrete, in the sense of 'twists' or 'perversities'. Rarest is the transference to the person exercising the quality: artes is commonly used of the various arts, or the works of art in which they are shown; rare and late is the use of ars for the book teaching them, as in: volvitque Palaemonis artem (Juv. 6. 452), and still rarer its use for those skilled in them, as in: Mnemosyne Iovi fecunda novies Artium (i.e. Musarum) peperit chorum (Phaedr. 3, prol. 18-19).

## XIV

### USE OF THE PLURAL FOR THE SINGULAR

HOMER uses οἰκία and μέγαλα, neuters plural, for a single house and a single hall. As in Greek we have οἶκος ὁ and οἰκία τὰ for a single house, so in Sanskrit we have grham, a neuter singular, and grhās, masculine plural, for a house; and Boehtlingk-Roth explain this use of grhās as of a house consisting of several structures or rooms. So in Greek we have δῶμα and δώματα for a house; in Latin aedes in the singular is the temple, a single room with its hearth or altar (cf. αἶθω 'I burn'), but in the plural a house, which consisted of several rooms. In Horace's: te . . . Glyceriae decoram transfer in aedem (Od. 1. 30. 3-4), with aedem we should supply futuram, as when Venus arrives, the house will have become a temple. In poetry sedes is often used like aedes for a single dwelling, as in: ipsius at sedes . . . fulgenti splendent auro (Catull. 64. 43-4); such a use of domus is rare, but there seems an example of it in: ubi . . . perventum ad limina sedis antiquasque domos (Aen. 2. 634-5).

In Greek names of places are commonly singular, e.g. Ὀρχομενός, Δυφνοῦς (= δαφνόεις 'abounding in laurel'), Σικυών 'the cucumber bed', Μαραθών 'abounding in fennel'; many of them being clearly epithets of τόπος. But some, like Ἀθῆναι and Θῆβαι, are plurals. For both of these we have the names of the older town or citadel, the Cecropia and the Cadmeia, to which later additions were made, constituting the new cities of Athens and Thebes; so that we have reason for regarding them, too, as plurals of parts. In Italy most towns were primitive hill forts; and the names Arpinum, Nomentum, Privernum, Tusculum, Ferentinum, seem epithets of oppidum or castellum. Some like Velitrae, Fidenae, Faesulae, may be plurals of parts like Mycenae, or Thebae. But just as Mycenae becomes Mycena in Virgil, so we find Fidenae for Fidenae (Aen. 6. 773), following the tendency to make names of cities epithets of urbs or civitas, like Nola, Aricia, Bola, Cora, Norba. The Greek use of Μυκῆνη for Μυκῆναι probably represents the same tendency. Masculine plurals like Falerii, Corioli, Gabii, Arpi seem primarily names of peoples, which is clearly the case with Veii; for we read in Livy: Romani Veique in armis erant (5. 1. 1). Veientes like Falisci is evidently a later formation. And in Greek we read of Delphi in Herodotus: Κροῖσος . . . τέμψας αὐτὶς ἐς Πυθῶ, Δελφοὺς δωρέεται (1. 54).

Turning to common names of places, we have λιμὴν or λιμένες for the harbour in Greek, ὄχθη or ὄχθαι for the river bank, δυσμή the sunset but δυσμαί the west, ἀκτὴ the promontory but ἀκταί the coast-line. In Latin castra is the camp, angustiae and fauces the mountain pass, hortus the garden but horti the park, finis the boundary but fines the territory. Rostra is plainly the tribunal adorned by the rostra brought from Antium. Πύλαι, θύραι, and fores are old duals, but perhaps they are rather to be regarded as instruments, with which we proceed to deal in our next paragraph.

The use of τόξα rather than τόξον for the bow (Il. 1. 45) is likely to puzzle the student. It used to be explained as a plural of excellence; but then why should it be τόξα, a plural, while still hanging on the shoulders, but βίός, a singular (v. 49), when in Apollo's hands, wreaking destruction on the Greeks? In the Odyssey the bow of Ulysses is τόξα (21. 349), but τόξον (v. 352) without any apparent change of meaning. Arcus in Latin is singular not plural for a single bow. And we have for pincers forceps and forcipes, forfex and forfices for scissors, volsella and volsellae for tweezers. In Greek λαβίς and πυράγγρα are singulars. So tabellae the memorandum book is at times tabella, and codicilli is a short note, but

codicillus is at times used for the note appended to the will. Bracca as well as braccæ is used for the breeches, as is brax as well as braces. Clitellæ is usual for the saddle, but the singular forms cletella, cretella, cratella occur in the glosses. Molæ is the mill, and mola the upper millstone, but there are examples of mola the mill, like the Greek μύλη, which is either mill or nether millstone, the upper being ὄνος and the union at times αἱ μύλαι. You will see that in all these cases the instrument consists of two parts, giving naturally a dual for the union, which may pass to the singular as well as to the plural. Fides in the singular is 'the string', in the plural 'the lyre'; but the singular is often used with the latter meaning. Virgil has currus and currūs for the chariot, as Homer has ἄρμα and ἄρματα. Scala is a step, and scalæ a collection of steps, a ladder; but I read of Jacob in the Vulgate: vidit in somnis scalam stantem super terram (Gen. 28. 12). And it may be that the habit of instruments of twofold structure has passed by analogy to those of more complex nature.

Both Greek and Latin use plurals to designate a single day. Kalendæ is used for the first day of the month, Idus for the middle, and Nonæ for the fifth or seventh intervening. Delbrück seems right in his belief that this plural, too, is a plural of parts. For 'night and day' Homer uses: νύκτας τε καὶ ἡμᾶρ (Il. 5. 490), and the Greek for midnight is μέσαι νύκτες. The division of the night into three watches must have been very old; it gives rise to the phrase: trir aktun for 'night' in the Vedic Hymns, and in Homer we read:

παρώχωκεν δὲ πλέων νύξ  
τῶν δύο μοιράων, τριτάτῃ δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται (Il. 10. 252-3).

From this use of the plural for the night arises by analogy a habit of indicating feasts or special holidays by the plural, though they last but a day. Weihnachten 'holy nights' is the German for Christmas, and feriae the Latin for a holiday, of which word nundinæ the market day, nuptiæ the wedding, and exsequiæ the funeral seem to be epithets. By analogy we get epulæ the banquet, funera the funeral, tenebræ darkness, and somnia sleep.

We have already spoken of the use of the plural for single parts of the body, e.g. colla for the neck, and fauces for the throat. Many of the human organs occur in pairs, e.g. βλέφαρα, ὄτα, ῥῖνες, oculi, genæ, tempora; and hence arises a tendency to use the plural for parts, too, that are not paired, e.g. γενειάδες the chin, σπλάγχνα, viscera, exta. In return we note a tendency to use the singular for organs that occur in pairs, as in: dexter adi pede sacra secundo (Aen. 8. 302). Fauces the jaws is usually plural, but the abl. sing. fauce is common, and the nom. faux is attested. We have here a further example of a dual finding expression by the singular as well as by the plural. In: linguis micat ore trisulcis (Aen. 2. 475) the plural seems used to give variety to the phrase, and at the same time to indicate the triple division of the lingua, following the analogy of the plural of parts.

Very common both in Greek and Latin is the Plural of Modesty, e.g. the use by an orator of nos for ego in speaking of himself and his acts. So often Cicero, as in: Moloni . . . dedimus operam (Brut. 307. 89), and he often joins nos with a following singular, as in: dissuasimus nos; sed nihil de me (Lael. 96. 25). In the primary use of this figure the speaker sinks his individual personality, and identifies himself with the people, class, or craft to which he belongs; whence the name. Of this we have a fine example in the speech of the physician Eryximachus: ἄρξομαι δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἱατρικῆς λέγων, ἵνα καὶ πρεσβεύωμεν τὴν τέχνην (Plat. Symp. 186 b). Very usual and appropriate to orators is the speaker's identification of himself with his audience, as seen in the familiar phrases: ὡς ἀκούομεν, or: ὥσπερ πυνθανόμεθα. The poets, too, pass without an effort from the first plural to the first singular, as in:

ἥλιον μαρτυρόμεσθα δρῶς' ἃ δρᾶν οὐ βούλομαι (Eurip. H. F. 858),

or in:

deus nobis haec otia fecit.

Namque erit ille mihi semper deus. (Buc. 1. 6-7.)

The Plural of Majesty seems to arise from the principle of collegiality in office so usual in Greece and Rome. We read: τά τε Συρακοσίων ἔφη ὁμῶς ἔτι ἦσσω τῶν σφετέρων εἶναι (Thuc. 7. 48. 5), where σφετέρων is oblique for ἡμετέρων, the speaker who uses the plural being one of the associated generals. In the days of the Augusti and Caesares there developed from this a form of court speech in which phrases like nostra maiestas or nostra serenitas appeared and were with the Roman Empire perpetuated to our own times.

Plurals of Modesty and Majesty are usually of the first person, or of the third in oblique narration. But when the speaker uses nos for himself, it is only natural that he should use vos in addressing a representative of the opposite party. In the beginning of his tenth epistle, Horace uses the singular for his friend Fuscus, but the plural for himself in:

Urbis amatorem Fuscum salvere iubemus  
Ruris amatores;

but when in v. 9 he addresses his friend as vos in:

Quae vos ad caelum effertis rumore secundo,

we feel that he is performing what is due to courtesy in putting Fuscus, the leader of the opposing party, on a level with himself; while in:

Quo iste voster expolitor dens est (Catull. 39. 20),

voster seems to mean 'a man of your nation'; but in:

Furi, villula vostra non ad Austri

Flatus opposita est, neque ad Favoni (Catull. 26. 1-2),

or in:

tenet ille immania saxa,

Vestras, Eure, domos (Aen. 1. 140-1),

the plural pronoun is used virtually as it is with us. The use is not common before the fourth century, but is evidently fully developed then.

Just as we have vos for tu, and nos for ego, primarily for the class of men to which tu or ego belongs, so we find proper names pluralized, especially the names of persons of some marked excellence or defect, to denote men of like excellence or defect. This is very clear in: τῆδε γὰρ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ μυρίους ὄψονται ἀνθ' ἐνὸς Κλεάρχους (Anab. 3. 2. 31), and in: οὐκ ἔφη νοῦν ἔχειν αὐτοὺς εἰ μὴ πολλοὺς ἐν τῷ παιδί τούτῳ Μαρίου ἐνορῶσι (Plut. Caes. 1). So, too, in:

Extulit haec Decios Marios magnosque Camillos (Geo. 2. 169),

and in:

Nenia . . . et maribus Curiis et decantata Camillis (Hor. Ep. 1. 1. 63-4),

and:

caedunt Lepidos, caeduntque Metellos

Corvinosque simul (Lucan 7. 584-5),

and: interfectos Romae Varrones, Egnatios, Iulos (Ann. 1. 10. 3). And we have the transference clearly set forth in:

Lys. Unus tibi hic dum propitius sit Iupiter,

Tu istos minulos cave deos flocci feceris.

Ol. Nugae sunt istae magnae; quasi tu nescias

Repente ut emoriantur humani Ioves (Pl. Cas. 331-3),

and inverted in:

Non mihi isti placent Parmenones, Syri,

Qui duas aut tres minas auferunt eris.

Nequius nil est quam egens consili servos. (Bacch. 649-51)

We have a like transition from an individual singular to a general plural for common nouns in:

Cyl. An opsono amplius

Tibi et parasito et mulieri? Men. Quas mulieres,

Quos tu parasites loquere? (Pl. Men. 320-2),

and in:

Lyco. Lusco liberto tuo:

Is Summanum se vocari dixit: ei reddidi,

Qui has tabellas obsignatas attulit. Ther. Quas tu mihi tabellas,

Quos tu mihi luscus libertos, quos Summanos somnias? (Curc. 543-5),

and in:

Aesch. Verum hoc mihi moraest,

Tibicina et hymenaeum qui cantent. . . . Dem. Missa haec face,

Hymenaeum turbas lampades tibicinas. (Ter. Ad. 904-7.)

So in Virgil: clipeum efferri iussit, Didymaonis artes (Aen. 5. 359), ‘one of the masterpieces of Didymaon’. With this compare:

Mucius, imposuit qui sua membra focus (Mart. 10. 25. 2),

and: exsulibusne datur ducenda Lavinia Teucris (Aen. 7. 359). So in Lucan’s verses:

Hoc animi nox illa dedit quae prima cubili

Miscuit incestam ducibus Ptolemaida nostris (10. 68-9),

where it is plain from nox illa that it is Caesar, and not Caesar and Antony, to whom the poet refers in ducibus. So Horace in:

quod male barbaras

Regum est ulta libidines (Od. 4. 12. 8),

uses regum for Terei. And in Claudian’s verses:

Pauper erat Curius, reges cum vinceret armis (In IV Cons. Hon. 413),

and:

contentus honesto

Fabricius parvo spernebat munera regum (In Ruf. 1. 200-1),

reges is plainly for Pyrrhus. We read in Virgil:

superos Arruns sic voce precatur:

Summe deum, sancti custos Soractis Apollo (Aen. 11. 784-5),

where superos is explained as Apollo, and in:

Perque deos oro, quos hosti nuper ademi (Ov. Met. 13. 376),

deos is clearly for Minervam (cf. v. 380).

Servius tells us (ad Aen. 1. 139): bonum antiqui dicebant manum; and Festus that cerus manus in the Saliaric hymn is for creator bonus. Manes seems the old plural of manus, though it is treated as a plurale tantum as a rule; being used as a general plural for the spirit of the deceased, as in:

Nec patris Anchisae cinerem manesve revelli (Aen. 4. 427),

or for the spirits of the dead generally as in:

Nocturnosque movet manes. (Aen. 4. 490.)

It is used for inferi ‘the lower world’ in:

Haec manes veniet mihi fama sub imos (Aen. 4. 387),

and for: supplicia quae sunt apud manes (= inferos) according to Servius in: quisque suos patimur manes (Aen. 6. 743).

We find in Greek ὁδῖνες, and in Latin minae, nugae, inimicitiae, pluralia tantum as involving the idea of indefinite repetition. With these Delbrück joins preces, found in the sing. dat. preci, acc. precem, abl. prece, and we may add vices, found in the sing. gen. vicis, acc. vicem, abl. vice. It seems to me that here, too, is the natural place for such plurals as Alpes and Pyrenaei.

Delbrück notices that while ὁ ἥλιος is the only object of its kind known to the ancients, it formed the plural οἱ ἥλιοι for ‘sunny days’ or ‘rays of sunshine’; and the Latin sol was parallel in its use of soles. When we turn to:

Soles occidere et redire possunt (Catull. 5. 4),

we see the reason at once in the naïve conceptions of primitive astronomy; even Lucretius favoured the view that a new sun was formed every morning. In Greek ὁ μῆν, primarily the moon, has come to mean the month, and there is formed from it a secondary ἡ μῆνη for the moon, not often used; for the usual term for moon is ἡ σελήνη, old \*σελασνα, ‘the shining one’. In Latin \*men has been lengthened to mensis, just as \*aus (= οὔς), still plain in ausculto, has been lengthened to auris, old \*ausis; and from it is formed mena the moon goddess, though luna, old \*loucsna, ‘the shining one’, is the usual term. With this plural of repetition we might associate nomina in: tua sectus orbis nomina ducet (Hor. Od. 3. 27. 75-6) and: vitreo daturus nomina ponto (4. 2. 3-4), where we shall have no longer one, but two names through the repetition consequent on the transfer.

## XV

### THE DUAL PRONOUNS σφώ, σφῶϊ, and σφωέ

OF the dual inflexions of the Sanskrit verb the oldest are evidently -tam and -tām, the endings of the second and third persons of the aorist dual. We cannot derive or explain them, and, what is more significant, they seem cognate with the corresponding -τον and -την, the endings of the Greek aorist dual. The Greek present active has the endings -τον and -τον for the second and third, and the correspondence of -τον and -την, the endings of the old timeless aorist, with the Sanskrit, makes it probable that from them proceed the later present pair -τον and -τον. But if these are merely the aorist endings transferred to the present, how have we -τον in the third person for the present? The cause that led to the conversion of -την to -τον in the third present, seems also to have led to the occasional use of -τον for -την in the third aorist, and of -την for -τον in the second. I think the cause of this confusion was the use of the dual pronoun of the third person for the second person as well as the third. Such a use, as we have seen, is common in German, Italian, and Spanish; and so need hardly seem a monstrous hypothesis for old Greek.

We find for the pronoun of the first dual in Greek nom. and acc. νό, νῶϊ, and νῶε in Antimachus and Corinna, and νῶϊν for the gen. dat.; for the second person σφώ and σφῶϊ for the nom. acc. and σφῶϊν for the gen. dat.; for the third person σφωέ for the acc. (for the nom. also in later Greek) and σφωίν for the gen. dat. Here we seem to have in reality two pronouns, and not three: for σφώ, σφῶϊ, σφωέ, and σφῶϊν, if we disregard accent, are exactly parallel to νό, νῶϊ, νῶε, νῶϊν; and we see from τίς that change of accent accompanies a later development in meaning, such as would result from the use of the third personal pronoun σφώ for the second person as well. Most philologists of to-day derive σφώ 'you two' from the same root as we have in σύ, while they connect σφωέ with σφίν and σφέ. Hirt divides σ-φω, and would form it on the analogy of ἄμφω. But both pronouns have the same possessive σφωίτερος, and both have the same gen. dat. σφῶϊν, if we disregard accent, and the ancients believed both to be cognates of σφεῖς and σφίσι; some of them were clearly at a loss to distinguish σφῶϊ from σφωέ.

Apollonius Dyscolus cites thus the verse:

τίς τ' ἄρ σφῶϊ θεῶν ἔριδι ζυνέηκε μάχεσθαι; (Il. 1. 8),

as the reading of Seleucus and many others, and supported by manuscript authority. They justified this reading on the lines we have been following: if σφῶϊν means 'of you two' in Il. 8. 416, and σφωίν 'of them two' in Il. 8. 402, and σφῶϊ is the acc. 'you two' in Il. 1. 336, then by analogy σφωί must be 'them two' in Il. 1. 8. In all this they were analogists, not anomalists; and were beating Aristarchus with his own weapons. Apollonius thus amplifies their argument: All singular pronouns have the same ending for the accusative, as ἐμέ, σέ, ἔ, and so with all plurals, ἡμᾶς, ὑμας, σφᾶς, and the first and second dual too have the same ending, e.g. νῶϊ, σφῶϊ; therefore we expect σφωί as the third dual. In favour of σφωέ, which he thinks the right form, he argues that the difference in person is never expressed merely by a variation in accent, forgetting for the moment σφῶϊν and σφωίν. Recalling them to memory, he adds that the forms of the second dual are really wanting, and that for them accented forms of the third are used; for that all pronominal forms beginning with σφ are originally of the third person is clear from σφέας, σφίσι, σφέτερος, σφός. Such forms, when transferred to the second person, naturally take an accent; for the second persons have deictic power, while the forms of the third lack deixis; hence the use of the enclitics σφέ and μίν for the third singular as well. But the use of the form σφωέ for the accusative of the third is justified by the analogy of ἐμέ, σφέ, and ἔ (Gram. Gr. II. 22. 67-9). Apollonius, then, believes that σφῶϊ, σφῶϊν are really pronouns of the third person that have taken an accent when they were transferred to the second.

His son Herodian, in a note to Il. 1. 574, tells us that σφώ is not a contraction from σφῶϊ: that is clear from its accent. Its ending is the -ω that we have in ἵππῳ; νό and σφώ are old duals meaning 'we two' and 'they two', to which the suffix -ι (= ϖι), also meaning 'two', is appended; so that in νῶϊ we have 'we two two'. Σφωέ is found only in the accusative in Homer, and is formed from σφώ, after the analogy of μέ, σέ, ἄμμε, ὕμμε, as Apollonius conjectured. We find νῶε, also an accusative, used too as a nominative in later writers, since in all other duals the acc. and the nom. are alike. In examining the meanings of σφώ, σφῶϊ, and σφωέ, we must begin with σφώ.

We find σφώ used thrice in the Iliad as a nom., and once as an acc. In: εἰ δὴ σφώ . . . ἐριδαίνετον (Il. 1. 574) Hephaestus is addressing Hera, but speaking of Zeus and her. In: σφώ δὲ μάλ' ἠθέλετον (Il. 11. 782) Nestor is addressing Patroclus, but is speaking of Achilles and Patroclus. In addressing one person and speaking to him of himself and another we use

the honorific ‘you’ even though it is evident that he is inferior to the other. But this use of the honorific ‘you’ is a comparatively late development in Latin and Greek. Neither in Attic nor in classical Latin has it become the usual form of address for one person, as it has in French and English. It is not unreasonable to think that, in the older form of expression for two persons thus spoken of, the Greeks were guided by the importance of the person addressed, and not by his presence; that Hephaestus, bearing in mind the supremacy of Zeus, followed the older fashion, addressing Hera and Zeus, when Zeus was away, as ‘they two’, and not as ‘you two’. True, in Il. 11. 781 we read ὅμῃ for Achilles and Patroclus, expressed by σφῶ in v. 782. Here the later and honorific ‘you’ is used side by side with what I think the older use, which keeps in view the relative importance of Achilles and Patroclus. In: Αἴαντε, σφῶ μὲν τε σιώσεται (Il. 13. 47) we have the dual pronoun joined with a plural verb, the later use for the dual. That it was the lesser Ajax that Poseidon addressed here, we may conclude from: τοῖν δ’ ἔγνω πρόσθεν Ὀυῖλος ταχὺς Αἴας (v. 66). Finally in: Ζεὺς σφῶ εἰς Ἴδην κέλετ’ ἐλθέμεν (Il. 15. 146) we have both Apollo and Iris addressed by Hera, and the two plurals ἔλθητε and ἴδυσθε (v. 147) referring back to σφῶ as their subject; so that σφῶ here is treated as identical with ὑμᾶς. But in three of the four uses of σφῶ, of the two persons, the one inferior in rank or importance is the one addressed.

Homer uses σφῶι five times in the nominative. In: ἔμβητον καὶ σφῶι (Il. 23. 403) it is addressed to the horses of Antilochus, and in: φράζεσθον δὴ σφῶι, Ποσειδάων καὶ Ἀθήνη (Il. 20. 115) both persons addressed are present. The remaining three are addressed to two persons, of whom only one is present: in σφῶι . . . ἔπετον κρέα (Il. 11. 776), of Achilles and Patroclus, Patroclus is addressed; and in: σφῶι δ’ ἀποστρέψαντε πόδας (Od. 22. 173), of Eumaeus and Melanthius, Melanthius is addressed; but in:

Αἴαν, σφῶι μὲν αὖθι, σὺ καὶ κρατερός Λυκομήδης,  
ἔσταότες Δαναοὺς ὀτρύνετον (Il. 12. 366-7),

it is clearly the more important of the two that is addressed.

Homer uses σφῶι six times in the accusative. Of these, one is of the horses of Achilles (Il. 17. 443). Two are of a pair both present, of each of which one is the inferior, in Il. 4. 286 of the Ajaces, in Il. 1. 336 of Talthylus and Eurybates. One (Il. 7. 280) is used by the two chief heralds of the Greeks and Trojans, Talthylus and Idaeus, of the champions they represent, Ajax and Hector. Of the remaining two, one (Il. 5. 287) is of Aeneas and Pandarus, of whom Pandarus is present, the other (Il. 10. 552) is of Diomedes and Ulysses, and Ulysses is present. The accusative is of less importance here than the nominative, as the idea of address is less emphasized. Many of the ancients in Il. 7. 280 and 10. 552 read, not σφῶι, but σφῶε, being perhaps determined by the analogy of νῶι and νῶε.

Σφῶιν is twice used as a genitive, once (Il. 1. 257) of Agamemnon and Achilles, and once (Od. 16. 171) of Ulysses and Telemachus, of whom Ulysses is present. Of the eleven uses of σφῶιν as a dative, three are of horses (Il. 17. 451; 23. 408 and 411). Of the remaining eight, in four both persons addressed are present (Il. 13. 55; 16. 556; Od. 21. 209 and 212); in four it is the inferior that is present (Il. 4. 341; 8. 413 and 416; Od. 23. 52). In Od. 4. 62 we have the later form σφῶν used of Peisistratus and Telemachus, of whom both are addressed. We see, then, that while of the oblique cases a large proportion are used of a pair of whom the inferior is addressed, in the nominatives this is the case of the great majority.

When we turn to uses of -τον and -την as verb inflexions, according to Monro we have three examples in Homer of the use of -τον in the third person (ἐτεύχετον, Il. 13. 346; διώκετον, Il. 10. 364; λαφύσσετον, Il. 18. 583), where the metre forbids -την. Zenodotus read forms in -την for the second dual in καμέτην (Il. 8. 448) λαβέτην (Il. 10. 545), ἠθελέτην (Il. 11. 782), where Aristarchus and our editors have preferred forms in -τον. With ἠθελέτην, σφῶ was expressed as its subject. The dual forms of the middle in -σθον and -σθην are formed on the analogy of the active forms; so it is not astonishing to find three in -σθον as variants for the third dual: ἀφίκεσθον (Oxford Text ἐφίκοντο) in Il. 13. 613; θωρήσσεσθον (O. T. θωρήσσοντο) in Il. 16. 218; πέτεσθον (O. T. πετέσθην) in Il. 23. 506. The tendency in Attic to read -την and -σθην for both persons of the aorist dual seems an effort to distinguish them from the present, which has -τον and -σθον for both persons. Sanskrit offers no confusion parallel to that we have noticed in Greek between -τον and -την; tam is always the inflexion of the second, and tām of the third. Nor are there pronouns in Skt. liable to a like confusion with those in Greek; there a dual pronoun yuvām ‘you two’ has been evolved out of the plural yuyam ‘you’, on analogy of āvām ‘we two’.

Σφῶ is probably derived from σφίν (= σφ-φιν) the instrumental of οὔ (= σφ-ου) on the analogy of νό. The pronoun οὔ was primarily used for both singular and plural like the Latin sui, its cognate. From σφίν after the analogy of μέ and σέ

was formed σφέ also used for both singular and plural. We find this σφέ for the dual σφωέ in Il. 11. 111 and 115; Od. 8. 271; 21. 192 and 206; Hes. H. S. 62. For both σφώ and σφωέ the possessive is σφωίτερος, which is ‘of you two’ in Il. 1. 216. Just as σφε is used for σφώ or σφωέ, so σφίτερος is used for σφέτερος by Apollonius Rhodius in 1. 643 and with reflexive force in 3. 600. It is used for σός (Ap. Rh. 3. 395), just as σφέτερος is used for the singular as well as the plural.

We have what looks at first glance like an interesting parallel to this use of σφῶϊ for ‘you two’ in the Aeneid. We read:

Vivite felices, quibus est fortuna peracta  
Iam sua: nos alia ex aliis in fata vocamur. (Aen. 3. 493-4.)

Servius’s explanation is satisfactory; sua: id est dura, propria Troianorum, ut (Aen. 6. 62) hac Troiana tenus fuerit fortuna secuta. But it is very probable that Virgil, in thus shaping his verse, had in mind the Homeric use of σφώ for the second person.

## XVI

### THE SCHEMA PINDARICUM AND ALLIED CONSTRUCTIONS

WE turn to the Schema Pindaricum or Boeoticum. Following the analogy of: τὰ ζῶα τρέχει, thinks Riemann, certain poets, and especially Pindar, use the singular of the verb with the names of things in the masculine or feminine plural. Jelf and Riemann seem right in citing as an example of this construction the well-known couplet of Hipponax:

δυ’ ἡμέραι γυναικός ἐστιν ἥδιστα  
ὅταν γαμῇ τις κάκφέρῃ τεθνηκυῖαν (Fr. 29, B.).

Gaisford conjectured εἰσιν for ἐστιν, and Bergk adopted this in his edition, because he found it in one of his manuscripts, as he was almost sure to do. His business was to account for the usual reading ἐστιν, rather than substitute for it a reading which some scribe would inevitably introduce in his copy.

Eustathius tells us that Homer invented this schema, and cites to prove his point:

καμάτῳ δὲ καὶ ἰδρῶ νωλεμές αἰεὶ  
γούνατά τε κνήμαί τε πόδες θ’ ὑπένερθεν ἐκάστου  
χειρές τ’ ὀφθαλμοί τε παλάσσετο μαρναμένοισιν  
ἄμφ’ ἀγαθὸν θεράποντα ποδώκεος Αἴακίδαο (Il. 17. 385-8).

We notice that, while in our first example the subject is a single pair, in this it consists of a large number of pairs; both of these might take the dual in Greek. But we noticed that, when a woman used her two hands to wipe her two cheeks, the plural, not the dual, was the number in use, not merely for the verb, but for the pairs connected with it. And we also noticed that in Latin the dual found expression, not always by the plural, but often by the singular; and that there were traces of this usage in Greek as well. To follow the old rule, the number of παλάσσετο may be determined by the nearest subject ὀφθαλμοί, and its synonym ὅσσε takes the singular thrice in Homer. This view of the construction is strengthened when we turn to:

πναιῇ δ’ Εὐμήλοιο μετάφρενον εὐρέε τ’ ὦμῳ  
θέρμετ’ (Il. 23. 380-1),

and we feel it natural to compare this with:

οὔτε τοι ὀξύτατον κεφαλῆς ἐκδέρκεται ὅσσε (Il. 23. 477),

and still more when we turn to: εἰ ἔστιν τούτῳ διττὸ τὸ βίῳ (Plat. Gorg. 500 d), or to:

ἡμῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἔστ’ οὔτε κάρυ’ ἐκ φορμίδος  
δούλῳ διαρῥιπτοῦντε τοῖς θεωμένοις (Ar. Vesp. 58-9),

or to:

καὶ Μᾶγος Ἄραβος, Ἀρτάβης τε Βάκτριος,  
σκληρᾶς μέτοικος γῆς ἐκεῖ κατέφθιτο (Aesch. Pers. 318-19),

or even to: Ὅμηρος μὲν νυν καὶ τὰ Κύπρια ἔπεα χαιρέτω (Hdt. 2. 118).

Wilpert (Das Schema Pindaricum, Oppeln, 1900) quotes as an example of this schema:

ἦ τοι ἔμοι χλαῖναι καὶ ῥήγεα σιγαλόνετα  
ἤχθεθ' (Od. 19. 337-8),

where we have plainly a duality of collectives; but it is easier to regard the ἤχθετο as determined by ῥήγεα, the nearest subject. Still this is not so plausible in: ἵνα δοκοῦντι δικαίῳ εἶναι γίγνηται ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης ἀρχαί τε καὶ γάμοι (Plat. Rep. 363 a), or in: ἔστι μὲν που καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλεσιν ἄρχοντές τε καὶ δῆμος (ib. 463 a), or in: σκέλη μὲν οὖν χεῖρες τε ταύτη καὶ διὰ ταῦτα προσέφν πᾶσιν (Plat. Tim. 45 a), or in ἀφ' ὧν ἔμοι ξενία καὶ φιλότιτες πρὸς πολλοὺς καὶ βυσιλέας καὶ πόλεις καὶ ἄλλους ἰδίᾳ ξένους γεγένηται (Andoc. 1. 145). In the last example the two subjects are so closely allied in meaning, that we might assume that the singular verb is determined by what Gildersleeve calls a Unity of Subject. But of this more presently. It seems probable that in the examples cited we have a duality of idea in the subject; and that this follows the same rule as do the duals cited above in taking the verb in the singular. So from: σάρκες καὶ νεῦρα ἐξ αἵματος γίγνεται (Plat. Tim. 82 c) we may assume that in: οὐδ' ἐπὶ χεῖρες οὐδὲ πόδες (Hdt. 6. 86 γ' 2) ἐπὶ is for ἔπεστι.

This tendency to take the verb in the singular was probably strengthened by the construction with the singular of another class of plurals expressing a unity of idea, a class that seems to have fused with the duals cited above in creating this schema. We have such a plural in:

ξανθαὶ δὲ κόμαι κατενήνοθεν ὄμους (Hym. in Cer. 279),

and in:

ἐκ δὲ οἱ ὄμων  
ἦν ἑκατὸν κεφαλαὶ ὄφις (Hes. Theo. 824-5),

where the snakes' heads are felt as constituting a mane. It is felt, we are told, in: τῆς δ' ἦν τρεῖς κεφαλαί (Hes. Theo. 321) that after ἦν a subject is expected designating the head of the monster, and from this we have a singular verb, but it finds expression in τρεῖς κεφαλαί. With a feeling that this was the true explanation of the schema grammarians everywhere quoted:

ἐν δ' ἀγαθοῖσι κεῖται  
πατρώϊαι κεδναὶ πολίων κυβερνάσιες (Pind. Pyth. 10. 71-2),

and taught: The speaker begins with a single subject in mind; and this determines the number of the verb, but afterwards finds expression in a plural form. But we read in Pindar:

μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι  
ὕστέρων ἀρχαὶ λόγων  
τέλλεται (Ol. 11. 4-6).

Wilpert quotes: λάχλαι νιν μέλαν γένειον ἔρεφεν (Ol. 1. 68) (where all my editions read ἔρεφον). And, to turn to prose, we have in Plato: πάχλαι καὶ χάλαζαι καὶ ἐρυσίβαι ἐκ πλεονεξίας καὶ ἀκοσμίας περὶ ἄλληλα τῶν τοιούτων γίγνεται ἐρωτικῶν (Symp. 188 b). Even when the verb precedes the subject, as in:

ἦν δ' ἀμφίπλεκτοι κλίμακες  
ἦν δὲ μετώπων ὀλόεντα  
πλήγματα καὶ στόνος ἀμφοῖν (Soph. Trach. 520-2),

or:

ἐνῆν δ' ὕφανται γράμμασιν τοιαῖδ' ὕφαί (Eur. Ion 1146),

or: διηγεται σάρκες (Pind. Fr. 183), where σάρκες is the Latin caro, or in:

μέγα τοι δύναται νεβρῶν παμποίκιλοι στολίδες (Eur. Hel. 1358),

the interval between the verb and the following subject is so short as to make this view improbable. The plural subject σάρκες gives us a singular idea, and Wilpert thinks that στολίδες designates a single garment.

But the theory deduced from the position of κυβερνάσιες does fit the latest form of this schema, and the form usually found in prose. We read in Herodotus: ἔστι δὲ μετὰ τῆς τε παλαιῆς πόλιος, ἣ τότε ἐπολιορκέετο, καὶ τοῦ νηοῦ ἑπτὰ στάδιοι (1. 26). So in Plato: ἔστι γὰρ ἔμοιγε καὶ βωμοί (Euthyd. 302 c) and in: ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους ὥσει ἡμέραι ὀκτώ (Luke 9. 28). But in: ἔστι δὲ ἑπτὰ στάδιοι ἐξ Ἀβύδου ἐς τὴν ἀπαντίον (Hdt. 7. 34) there is no interval between the verb and its subject, and the unity of idea in ἑπτὰ στάδιοι may well determine the number of ἔστι. The feeling of interval is very strong in: προσξυνεβάλετο οὐκ ἐλάχιστον τῆς ὀρμῆς αἱ Πελοποννησίων νῆες ἐς Ἰωνίαν



ἐκεῖνοις βοηθοὶ τολμήσασαι παρακινδυνεύσαι (Thuc. 3. 36. 2), where Arnold thinks that the subject the speaker has in mind, when he begins, is τὸ τὰς ναῦς τολμῆσαι. In this prose form Kühner seems justified in comparing the schema with the French: il est des hommes, or: il est cent choses, where the German seems more logical with its: es sind viele Dinge. But to account for the origin of the schema from this last stage in its history, as is so commonly done, seems absurd. Even here the original duality of the subject is often evident, as in: ἦν δὲ τοῦ δανείσματος τετταράκοντα μὲν καὶ πέντε μναῖ ἑμαί, τάλαντον δ' Εὐέργου (Dem. 37. 4)

Our reference to il est leads us naturally to the use of ἔστιν οἱ for ἔνιοι, as we see it in: ἐνταῦθα δὴ οἱ βάλλοντες ταῖς βολαῖς ἔστιν οἱ καὶ ἐτύγχαναν καὶ θωράκων καὶ γέρρων, οἱ δὲ καὶ μηροῦ καὶ κνημῖδος (Xen. Cyr. 2. 3. 18). We find ἔστιν ᾧ for ἔνια in: καὶ (Κλεόπομπος) ἀποβάσεις ποιησάμενος τῆς τε παραθαλασσίῳ ἔστιν ᾧ (χωρία) ἐδήλωσε καὶ Θρόνιον εἶλεν (Thuc. 2. 26. 2). Ἔστιν ᾧ for ἔνια is quite in harmony with Greek syntax, suitable in meaning, and of a like number of syllables. The natural result of this correspondence would be that in ἔστιν ᾧ the primary meaning of the first two syllables would be obscured to some extent, just as in ἔνια the primary force of ἐνι- was partially lost, and they passed from 'some other' (cf. Skt. anye) to 'some'. In ἔστιν apparently it was the idea of number that was obscured, and this seems to have taken place gradually; and by a series of stages of which ἔστιν οἱ was the last.

The idiom belongs to prose, and appears first in Herodotus. But neither Herodotus nor Thucydides gives us ἔστιν οἱ, which we find first in Xenophon. Herodotus has: εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ λέγουσι τοὺς ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου νικῆσαι Πολυκράτεα (3. 45); and Thucydides: εἰσὶ δὲ αἱ καὶ οἰκήτορας μετέβαλον ἀλίσκόμεναι (1. 23. 2) et saepius. But in cases where the masculine and feminine of the pronoun do not differ from the neuter in form, we find the transition to them already in Herodotus and Thucydides; e.g. in: προδοῦναι τὰ ῥέεθρα τῶν ποταμῶν ἔστι ὧν (Herod. 7. 187); and: αὐχμοὶ τε ἔστι παρ' οἷς μεγάλοι (Thuc. 1. 23. 3); and so in Plato: ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ οἷς βέλτιον τεθνάναι ἢ ζῆν (Phaedo 62 a); and in Xenophon: ἢ ἔστιν οἷς καὶ πάνυ ἀρέσκει; (Mem. 2. 3. 6). But in Plato we find masculine forms of the pronoun differing from the neuter thus constructed, as in: ἄκων δ' ἔστιν οὗς ἐγὼ ἐπαινῶ καὶ φιλῶ (Prot. 346 e) and in Xenophon: ἔστι δὲ ᾧς ἂν καὶ πόλεις τῆς ἀναγραφῆς ὀρεγομένας (Vect. 3. 11). Last of all we come to ἔστιν οἱ in the example first cited; but even in later Greek εἰσὶν οἱ seems more usual. Propertius has imitated ἔστιν οἷς in:

Est quibus Eleae concurrat palma quadrigae,

Est quibus in celeres gloria nata pedes (3. 9. 17),

which Paley calls 'a bold and perhaps unique Graecism'.

We see how starting from ἔστιν ᾧ, parallel to ἔνια, in about fifty years we come to ἔστιν οἱ, parallel to ἔνιοι, in which probably the ἔστιν is no longer felt as the third singular of a verb, but as the first two syllables of an indefinite pronoun. This result is undoubtedly aided by the use of ἔστιν ὅτε for ἔνιοτε (Phaedo 62 a).

Parallel to this seems the development in the force of ἐν τοῖς in the phrase: ἐν τοῖς πρῶτοι. This is a prose construction also, found in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Plato, and of the later Atticists in Lucian. The oldest example I know of is in: τοῦτό μοι ἐν τοῖσι θεϊότατον φαίνεται γενέσθαι (Herod. 7. 137), where Rawlinson favours the translation: 'in my opinion this was one of the cases in which the hand of heaven was most plainly manifest'. It occurs six times in Thucydides: (1) ἐν τοῖς πρῶτοι δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι τὸν τε σίδηρον κατέθεντο (1. 6. 3) 'the Athenians were among the first who, laying aside iron,' &c.; (2) καὶ κατὰ τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον ὃν αἱ νῆες ἐπλεον, ἐν τοῖς πλείστοι δὴ νῆες ἅμ' αὐτοῖς ἐνεργοὶ κάλλει ἐγένοντο, παραπλήσια δὲ καὶ ἔτι πλείους ἀρχομένου τοῦ πολέμου (3. 17. 1) 'at the time when the ships were at sea, the Athenians had one of the largest fleets they ever had all assembled together, effective and in good trim, though the number of their ships was as large or even larger at the beginning of the war', where I have changed Jowett's translation slightly to get rid of the contradiction between his 'the largest' and 'even larger'; (3) οὕτως ὥμῃ ἡ στάσις προυχώρησε, καὶ ἔδοξε μᾶλλον, διότι ἐν τοῖς πρώτῃ ἐγενετο (3. 82. 1) 'to such bitter extremes did the civil strife proceed; and it seemed the more so, because it was among the earliest'; (4) μέγιστόν τε καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρῶτον ἐκάκωσε τὸ στράτευμα τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἢ τοῦ Πλημμυρίου λῆψις (7. 24. 3) 'a very severe blow and one of the greatest that befel the Athenians was the taking of Plemmyrium'; (5) ἄλλοι δὲ . . . ἐν τοῖς χαλεπώτατα διῆγον (7. 71. 3) 'others again . . . were involved in one of the hardest of cases'; (6) καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος, ἀνὴρ ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα καὶ ἐκ πλείστον ἐναντίος τῷ δήμῳ (8. 90. 1) 'and Aristarchus, who had been one of the foremost and most uncompromising in his opposition to the commons'.

In Plato, Matthiae, whom I follow, notes these six examples: (1) ἦν ἐγὼ, ὥς ἐμοὶ δοκῶ, ἐν τοῖς βαρύτεραις ἂν ἐνέγκαιμι (Crito 43 c) 'one of the saddest which in my opinion I could be bringing you'; (2) καὶ οὐχ ἥκιστα Ἀθηναίων σὲ

(ἐνέξεσθαι), ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα (ib. 52 a) 'that of the Athenians you were not the least, but one of the most involved'; (3) λέγοντες ὅτι ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα Ἀθηναίων ἐγὼ αὐτοῖς ὁμολογηκῶς τυγχάνω ταύτην τὴν ὁμολογίαν (ib. 52 a) 'saying that I happened to be one of the Athenians that had been most forward in making this acknowledgement'; (4) καὶ τούτων (ἡ ψυχὴ) μοι δοκεῖ ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα πρὸς ἄλληλα σκοπεῖσθαι τὴν οὐσίαν (Theaet. 186 a) 'and methinks these are among the things of which the soul most carefully considers the essence with regard to each other'; (5) παρεγγόνει δ' ἐν τῇ συνουσίᾳ, Σωκράτους ἐραστῆς ὢν ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα τῶν τότε (Symp. 173 b) 'and he had been at the gathering, being one of those who at that time were most attracted to Socrates'; (6) ἀκούω Δίωνος ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα ἐταῖρον εἶναι τέ σε νῦν καὶ γεγονέναι διὰ παντός (Ep. 358 c) 'I hear that you both now are and have ever been one of the closest friends of Dion'.

I have translated all these examples with the view that ἐν τοῖς is restrictive, and not intensive, in its force; but I am not certain that its force, primarily restrictive as it is, is clearly felt in each one of the last six examples. You will notice that five of these give: ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα, showing that the idiom is crystallizing in a single phrase, which more and more tends to the same meaning as μάλιστα. When in later Greek we read ἐν τοῖς μάλα, it is plain that this is an equivalent for μάλα, and that the ἐν τοῖς has become otiose.

But two other views call for a brief notice. Morris (ad Thuc. 1. 6. 3) quotes: καὶ Θηραμένης ὁ τοῦ Ἄγωνος ἐν τοῖς συγκαταλύουσι τὸν δῆμον πρῶτος ἦν (Thuc. 8. 68. 4) 'Theramenes, too, Hagnon's son, was foremost among those that overthrew the democracy'. This is not an example of our idiom; but with its help Morris interprets Thuc. 1. 6. 3, supplying thus: ἐν τοῖς τὸν τε σίδηρον καταθεμένοις πρῶτοι Ἀθηναῖοι αὐτὸν κατέθεντο, giving an intensive force. But how shall I fit this explanation to my second example? True, Jelf speaks of ἐν ταῖς with this construction; but he cites no example. While Jowett thinks ἐν τοῖς intensive in the first three examples, he makes it restrictive in the fourth, and it seems the same in the fifth and sixth. Have we then here an idiom used in two opposite meanings, and defeating one of the aims of prose, that of clear expression?

The older interpreters of this idiom dealt with it in simpler fashion, and compared it with: ἐν μαλακωτάτοις τῶν μαλακωτάτων (Plat. Symp. 195 e), and with ἐν τοῖς μεγίστοις μέγιστον (Crat. 427 e), where Stallbaum would omit μεγίστοις, making it an example of our idiom. So in Thucydides ἐν τοῖς πρῶτοι would be short for ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις πρῶτοι, about the intensive force of which there can be no doubt. But ἐν τοῖς πλεῖστοι seems so adverse to this solution that its supporters wish to omit the whole passage in Thuc. 3. 17 where the former occurs. Non tali auxilio.

Morris quotes ἐν τοῖς πρῶτοι as found in Thucydides 7. 19. 4 and 8. 89. 2, and ἐν τοῖς πρώτων in 7. 27. 3. But these are the readings of Bekker, not of the best manuscripts, which give ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις. Some editors now recognize that here Thucydides gives better expression to his idea by ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις than by ἐν τοῖς πρῶτοι or πρώτων. But while Bekker is wrong in changing the manuscript reading, no one has questioned the correctness of his Greek; he has substituted for the adverbial phrase ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις in the predicate the adjective πρῶτοι with its modifying phrase ἐν τοῖς, and this is exactly parallel to the use in τριταῖοι ἦλθον for τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἦλθον, or in Latin of vespertinus erro for vesperi erro. This is the way in which our idiom comes to pass, passing from ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις to ἐν τοῖς πρῶτοι, where after a time the ἐν τοῖς come to be regarded as the first two syllables of the adverb, like παρα- in παραχρῆμα.

We may be asked why, when Bekker found ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις twice in Thucydides, but ἐν τοῖς πρῶτοι only once, he did not change ἐν τοῖς πρῶτοι to ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις. Plainly because of the Scholium: ἐν τοῖς — ἐν τούτοις ποιητικῶς· ὑπερβιβάζεται γὰρ ὁ δέ ('ἐν τοῖς is used poetically for ἐν τούτοις; for the δέ is transposed'), i.e. we should have ἐν τοῖς δέ πρῶτοι, where τοῖς δε would be for τούτοις. While this Scholium assures the text, it seems to suggest Morris's explanation; for ἐν τούτοις must be for: ἐν τοῖς . . . καταθεμένοις. Indeed this Scholium seems very unfortunate: all three things it tells us are wrong; the expression belongs to prose, not to poetry; the δέ is placed after ἐν τοῖς πρῶτοι, because that is felt as one word; and the view that ἐν τοῖς is for ἐν τούτοις comes to grief in the next two examples we meet. Plainly the force of ἐν τοῖς had been quite obscured by the time this Scholium was written.

Just as in Greek we pass from ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις to ἐν τοῖς πρῶτοι, so in Latin we pass from absente me to absente nobis. We read:

Restituis cupido atque insperanti ipsa refers te  
Nobis (Catull. 107. 5-6),

and:

Perfida nec merito nobis inimica merenti (Tib. 3. 6. 55),

in both of which nobis is the plural of modesty for mihi; so that if these examples stood alone, they might be thought due to sense construction. In:

Nescio quid profecto absente nobis turbatumst domi (Ter. Eun. 649),

where absente nobis is for absente me, Donatus wishes to supply me, and some modern editors, accepting this, connect nobis with turbatumst, 'we have had some disturbance'. But Donatus quotes two further examples that make this improbable; one from Pomponius: praesente amicis inter cenam (Fr. 47, Rib.), and one from Varro: id praesente legatis omnibus exercitu pronuntiat (De Serm. Lat. V, Fr. 82, Wilm.). Under absente Nonius gives us (p. 76, M.): nec nobis praesentest aliquis quisquam nisi servus (Pl. Amph. 400), where all manuscripts have: nec nobis praeter me aliquis quisquamst; and: adest si hic absente nobis venierit puer (Afran. Fr. 6, Rib.); under praesente from Pomponius: quidam apud forum praesente testibus mihi vendidit (Fr. 168, Rib.), and from Accius: Est res aliqua, quam praesente his prius maturare institit (Fr. 428, Rib.); also from Fenestella, Annalium Lib. II: et quaedam exta praesente suis, quaedam absente porrecissent, and from Novius: te volumus dono donare pulcro praesente omnibus (Fr. 57, Rib.). Of these eleven examples only five can be solved as sense constructions, and the remaining six seem rather examples of a transition, as from praesente amico to praesente amicis. And this is Donatus's second solution; for he adds: aut ἀρχαῖσμός ἐστιν figura absente nobis pro absentibus nobis . . . absente nobis cum dicit, pro praepositione ponit 'absente', ut si diceret 'coram amicis'. Absente and praesente, then, he feels to be prepositions like coram.

So in Cato and Gellius we find fini used as the predicate of an ablative absolute, and afterwards as a post-position and preposition. We read in Gellius: hac, inquit, fini ames, tamquam forte fortuna et osurus, hac itidem tenus oderis, tamquam fortasse post amaturus (1. 3. 30), where hac fini balances hac tenus. So: qua fini (id. 1. 3. 16), and ea fini (6. 3. 29). These phrases are ablatives absolute, in which 'that being the limit' is taken as 'up to that limit'. So in our 'till now', where 'till' is the Greek τέλος, the German Ziel. In Cato we read: cupa qua fini in modiolos erit (R. R. 21. 3, K.), and: postea operito terra radicibus fini (ib. 28. 2), where radicibus fini 'the roots being the limit' gives us a parallel to praesente amicis. In: amphoras nolito implere nimium; ansarum infimarum fini (R. R. 113. 2) 'don't fill your jars too full; up to the bottom of the handles', Cato constructs fini with the genitive just as Catullus does tenus in: nutricum tenus (64. 18); and so Caesar in: pectoris fini prominentes (B. G. 7. 47. 5). It appears as a preposition in a fragment of Sallust quoted by Arusianus Messius: fini inguinum ingrediuntur mare (231, L.). I may add that Arusianus seems to cite absente populo as the link between absente me and absente nobis (213, L.).

Interesting is the parallel to praesente nobis we have in: istorum nominandi copia. From: sui nominandi copiam habent, by a change of subject we have: illorum nominandi copiam habemus. Nominandi, attracted by sui, which is singular in form but plural in meaning, becomes like absente indifferent to number. We have few examples of this idiom, most of which we find in Cicero; but the two we find in archaic Latin are so well developed, that we must regard the idiom as quite as characteristic of archaic as of classical Latin. Schmalz tries to account for it by relating it to the genitive of the Greek substantival infinitive as found in: τοῦτων οὐχὶ νῦν ὁρῶ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ λέγειν (Dem. 2. 4). But what is the relation of τοῦ λέγειν to nominandi? The influence of Greek syntax on that of archaic Latin is very slight.

We have these two examples of this idiom in the Latin of the second century b.c.:

Nominandi istorum tibi erit magis quam edundi copia,

Hic apud me (Pl. Capt. 852-3),

and:

Novarum (fabularum) qui spectandi faciunt copiam

Sine vitiis (Ter. Heaut. 29-30).

Varro gives us: principium generandi animalium (R. R. 2. 1. 3) and Lucretius: poenarum . . . solvendi tempus (5. 1225). It is not found in Caesar, Sallust, Livy, Horace, or Virgil; but Draeger quotes from Cicero the six following examples: earum autem rerum . . . infitiandi rationem (Verr. 2. 4. 104. 47), ne reiciundi quidem amplius quam trium iudicum . . . faciunt potestatem (Verr. 2. 2. 77. 31), fuit exemplorum eligendi potestas (Inv. 2. 5. 2), quarum potiendi spe inflammati (Fin. 1. 60. 18), (causa) eorum, quae secundum naturam sunt, adipiscendi (Fin. 5. 19. 7), (facultas) caedis faciendae bonorum, diripiendae urbis, agrorum suis latronibus condonandi (Phil. 5. 6. 3), with one from Cornificius: isti magistri, omnium dicendi praeceptores (Her. 4. 9. 6). In Silver Latin we find only: iocandi licentia diripiendique pomorum et opsoniorum rerumque omnium missilium (Suet. Aug. 98. 3). Fronto has: tantus usus studiorum bonarumque artium communicandi (Ep. ad Aur. 1. 24); and Gellius: verborumque fingendi et novandi studium (4. 15. 1) and: causarumque

orandi cupiens (5. 10. 5). We read in Caesar: neque sui colligendi hostibus facultatem relinquunt (B. G. 3. 6) and: venerunt . . . sui purgandi causa (ib. 4. 13), and in Livy: vestri adhortandi causa (21. 41. 1), in which examples the gerundive agrees with the form, and not with the meaning of the pronoun. So the gerundive becomes in a measure indifferent to number, and from: sui colligendi facultatem hostibus reliquit we should get: hostium colligendi facultatem reliquit eorum duci.

That this is the true explanation of the idiom is confirmed by examples where it is not number, but gender, that is in question. We read in Plautus: quia tui videndi copias (Truc. 370), where tui is feminine, but videndi agrees with it in form rather than meaning. Hence the gerundive becomes indifferent to gender at times, and we have: lucis das tuendi copiam (Pl. Capt. 1008), eius (= uxoris) videndi cupidus (Ter. Hec. 372), where Donatus takes no notice of the irregularity, copia placandi sit modo parva tui (fem.) (Ov. Her. 20. 74), and: crescit enim adsidue spectandi cura puellae (Prop. 3. 21. 3).

Let us turn from this rare and complicated construction to a common and simple one, the agreement of the verb with two subjects connected by καί or et. The answer seems easy to the grammarian: the verb must be in the plural. When Kipling ventured to write: 'The tumult and the shouting dies', he was at once assailed by our pedants. But we read in Homer:

Τρώων δὲ κλαγγή τε καὶ ἄσπετος ὄρτο κυδοιμὸς  
θυνόντων ἄμυδις (Il. 10. 523-4),

a passage which Kipling may have had in mind. In Greek related pairs of words commonly take a singular verb, as we have already noticed in dealing with the Schema Pindaricum. So in:

ὄθι νητὸς χρυσὸς καὶ χαλκὸς ἔκειτο  
ἔσθῃς τ' ἐν χηλοῖσιν ἄλις τ' εὐῶδες ἔλαιον (Od. 2. 338-9),

or in:

πάντα τύχη καὶ μοῖρα, Περικλέες, ἀνδρὶ δίδωσιν (Archil. Fr. 16, B.),

or:

ἀλλ' εὐγενὴς μὲν ὁ κτανὼν τε χω' θανὼν (Soph. Phil. 336)

or:

εἰ δ' Ὀρφέως μοι γλῶσσα καὶ μέλος παρῆν (Eur. Alc. 357),

or: ἔδοξε γὰρ δὴ ἡμῖν ἡ πολιτικὴ καὶ ἡ βασιλικὴ τέχνη ἡ αὐτὴ εἶναι (Plat. Euthyd. 291 c), or: οὗ δὴ καὶ ἐκφανὴς ἐγένετο ἡ τῆς πόλεως ῥώμη καὶ ἀρετὴ (id. Menex. 243 c), or: ἄνεμος καὶ χειμὼν διεκώλυσεν αὐτούς (Xen. Hell. 1. 6. 35). It is not that the pair of words describe the same object, nor that the objects they designate are not often opposed; it is that they constitute a correlated pair, such as will naturally be expressed by a dual; and hence, like the dual, they are at times constructed with a singular verb.

When we turn to Latin this becomes even plainer. 'Close union often amounts to unity', says Gildersleeve. But in Latin close union very often gives us plurality, and ideas mutually opposed are constructed with a singular verb as well as with a plural. In archaic and classical Latin as a rule with a closely related pair of words the verb is in the singular, as in: tua fama et gnatae vita in dubium veniet (Ter. Ad. 340), (fabulae) novae novum intervenit vitium et calamitas (id. Hec. 2), cum tempus necessitasque postulat (Cic. Off. 1. 81. 23), societas hominum et communitas evertatur necesse est (ib. 3. 22. 5), ut summus furor atque amentia consequatur (Rose. Am. 66. 24); but in: (fortuna), quam nemo ab inconstantia et temeritate seiunget, quae dignae certe non sunt deo (N. D. 3. 61. 24) we have the plural. This is especially the case when the members of a pair are contrasted, as in: ius et iniuria natura diiudicantur (Leg. 1. 44. 16) or: nam vita et mors iura naturae sunt (Sall. Hist. 2. 50. 5, Kr.). But we have both: religio et fides anteponatur amicitiae (Off. 3. 46. 10) and: ni virtus fidesque vostra spectata mihi forent (Sall. Cat. 20. 2). While Cicero and Caesar as a rule have the singular with ideas so closely related, Livy has the plural very often, and Sallust and Tacitus favour the plural. So we have: caedes ac tumultus erat in castris (Liv. 10. 20. 10), but: quod passim eos simul pavor terrorque distulerant (id. 6. 42. 8) and: ubi ira et aegritudo permixta sunt (Sall. Jug. 68. 1). We read: si pax veniaque ab dis impetrata esset (Liv. 1. 31. 7), but: postquam pax et concordia speciosis et inritis nominibus iactata sunt (Tac. Hist. 2. 20. 3); and we have the same pairs now with the singular, now with the plural, in: senatus populusque Romanus intellegit (Cic. Fam. 5. 8. 2), and: si antidea senatus populusque iusserit (Liv. 22. 10. 6); but: cum senatus populusque Romanus pacem comprobaverint (Liv. 37. 45. 14), and: auctor essem senatui populoque Romano, ut eam vos habere sinerent (Liv. 36. 32. 5). And in Livy: tempus et locus convenit (1. 24. 2); but in Tacitus: ubi locus veneficii tempusque composita sunt

(Ann. 4. 10. 2). And turning to names of persons: Palatium Romulus, Remus Aventinum ad inaugurandum templa capiunt (Liv. 1. 6. 4), but: Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur (Aen. 1. 574). We have here to do with pairs that are potential duals, and so are constructed now with a verb in the plural, now in the singular.

The opposite will also be found: when two subjects are disjoined by οὔτε or ἢ, by neque or aut, while they will usually take a singular, they will be constructed with the plural at times. So we have in Homer:

οὐδ' ἐδύναντο

οὔθ' ὁ τὸν ἐξέλασαι καὶ ἐνπιρῆσαι πυρὶ νῆα

οὔθ' ὁ τὸν ἄψ ὤσασθαι (Il. 15. 416-8),

and in a fragment of Bacchylides: θνατοῖσι δ' οὐκ αὐθαίρετοι οὔτ' ὄλβος οὔτ' ἄκαμptos Ἄρης οὔτε πάμφθερσις στάσις (Fr. 36, B.), and in Euripides: καί μ' οὔθ' ὁ Πλούτωνος κύων οὔθ' οὔπι κόπη ψυχοπομπὸς ἄν Χάρων ἔσχον (Alc. 360-2); and with ἢ in: ὅταν ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἀδελφὴ τῷ γένωνται καλοί (Plat. Leg. 838 a). So in Latin: haec si neque ego neque tu fecimus (Ter. Ad. 103), erant enim quibus nec senatus gloriari neque princeps possent (Plin. Pan. 75); and with aut in: si quid Socrates aut Aristippus contra morem consuetudinemque civilem fecerint locutive sint (Cic. Off. 1. 148. 41), or: quaerere puerum aut puellam qui supponantur mihi (Pl. Truc. 403-4). Seu . . . seu with a plural verb is recorded only in: et me seu naturalis sollicitudo seu fides sedula, non ad diligentiam modo, verum ad amorem quoque commissae rei instigent (Frontin. de Aquaed. Praef.), and tam . . . quam in: ut proprium ius tam res publica quam privata haberent (ib. 128).

When we have more than two subjects connected by et or καί, in Latin the verb usually agrees with the last of its subjects, in Greek with the nearest, as in: aetas et forma et super omnia Romanum nomen te ferociorem facit (Liv. 31. 18. 3), ζῶντι τῷ δικαίῳ . . . ἄθλά τε καὶ μισθοὶ καὶ δῶρα γίγνεται (Plat. Rep. 614 a). But in: ἡμεῖς δὴ, ἐγὼ καὶ Στράτιος καὶ Στρατοκλῆς . . . παρεσκευάζοντο ἅπαντες λαγχάνειν (Isaeus, 11. 15) the agreement presents difficulty. Probably we have the third plural dependent on the pair Stratius and Stratocles.

What is the construction with plurals joined with δύο? With masculine and neuter plurals the dual may be used as in: ἐξ ἧς αὐτῷ γίγνεσθον υἱεῖς δύο (Isae. 8. 10), and: δύο πυρὸς σώματα εἰς ἓν συνίστασθον εἶδος ἀέρος (Plat. Tim. 56 e). With masculines the plural is the rule, as in: τῆς δ' ἀρχῆς αὐτῷ λοιποὶ δύο μῆνες ἦσαν (Antiphon 6. 42), while with neuters the singular is usual, as in: δύο δέ μοι τῆς κατηγορίας εἶδη λέλειπται (Aeschin. 1. 116). At times, however, we have neuters plural taking a singular and a plural verb in successive clauses, as in:

καὶ δὴ δοῦρα σέσηπε νεῶν καὶ σπάρτα λέλυνται (Il. 2. 135).

Very curious is the union of a singular with a plural verb in:

τῷ δ' οὔ τι γυνὴ καὶ νήπια τέκνα

οἴκαδε νοστήσαντι παρίσταται οὐδὲ γάνυνται (Od. 12. 42-3).

We may have here a use of a singular and a plural with νήπια τέκνα, but more probable seems the use of both singular and plural with the dual Union: γυνὴ καὶ νήπια τέκνα.

## XVII

### THE SCHEMA ALCMANICUM, AND FURTHER SYNTAX OF THE DUAL

WE have already spoken (pp. 64 ff.) of the development of the Schema Alcmanicum from a form of the extended elliptical dual, which was perfected in the Skt. Mitrā Varunā, and becomes a plural in Veneres Cupidinesque. We noted in Irish: doronsat sid ocus Fergal 'they made peace and Fergal', for 'he and Fergal made peace'. In the Latin life of Fintan we read: venit Fintanus . . . et salutaverunt se in vicem et Lasserianus. If in the second clause we supply Fintanus from the first, we have: Fintanus salutaverunt se in vicem et Lasserianus, a construction exactly parallel to several examples of the Schema Alcmanicum. In the development of the extended elliptical dual we seem to have three stages: (1) the dual Mitrā for Mitra and Varuna, (2) the addition for clearness of Varuna to this dual, (3) the assimilation of this Varuna to the preceding Mitrā in Mitrā Varunā 'the two Mitras, the two Varunas'. In the examples from Anglo-Saxon: wit Scilling 'we two Scilling' for 'I and Scilling', and in that cited from Irish we seem to have the second stage. The

assimilation to the third stage in Greek seems to have been, not progressive as in Sanskrit, but retrogressive. Take the example we have from Alcman: Κάστωρ τε πῶλων ὠκέων δματῆρες, ἱπτόται σοφοί, καὶ Πολυδεύκης κυδρός (Fr. 9); this was probably before the retrogressive assimilation: Κάστορες τε πῶλων ὠκέων δματῆρες κτλ., which makes the δματῆρες intelligible. But Κάστορες was assimilated in number to the following Πολυδεύκης. In: Τυδεὺς μάχην συνῆψε Πολυνείκης θ' ἅμα (Eur. Suppl. 144) and: Αἰσός ποτ' ἀντεδίδασκε καὶ Σιμωνίδης (Ar. Vesp. 1410) the verb has also been assimilated to the singular, leaving now nothing of the Schema but its peculiar order of words.

Of the examples we have of this curious figure we have already cited:

ἦχι ροὰς Σιμόεις συμβάλλετον ἡδὲ Σκάμανδρος (Il. 5. 774),

where we still see the dual, the primary number of the figure. This dual has become plural in:

ἦ μὲν δὴ θάρσος μοι Ἄρης τ' ἔδοσαν καὶ Ἀθήνη (Od. 14. 216),

and in:

ἔνθα μὲν εἰς Ἀχέροντα Πυριφλεγέθων τε ῥέουσι  
Κώκυτός θ' (Od. 10. 513-4).

The verb is omitted, and we have a predicate substantive in the example cited from Alcman. We have ἦ for καὶ or δέ in:

εἰ δέ κ' Ἄρης ἄρχωσι μάχης ἦ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων (Il. 20. 138),

and we have the Schema transferred to objects in:

πέμψε δ' Ἑρμᾶς χρυσόραπις διδύμους υἱοὺς ἐπ' ἄτρυτον πόνον,  
τὸν μὲν Ἐχίονα, κεχλάδοντας ἦβα, τὸν δ' Ἑρυντον (Pind. Pyth. 4. 178-9),

with which compare the example already cited (p 65) from Pind. Isth. 4. 17 ff.

While in Sanskrit the dual is used strictly to designate two objects, without dvā when the duality of the objects is well understood, otherwise with dvā or ubhau, in Greek its use is occasional and irregular. From the number and nature of its inflexions we concluded that this is its natural use in a language not developed into a book-language, like Gothic or Sanskrit. It uses δύω at times with the natural dual, as in: Ἀτρεΐδα . . . δύω (Il. 1. 16), or Αἶαντε δύω (Il. 12. 335), while the developed duals are used in Homer with or without a δύω or ἄμφω; as in: δοῦρε (Il. 13. 241), but δοῦρε δύω (Il. 3. 18); λέοντε (Il. 16. 756), but λέοντε δύω (Il. 5. 554); θῆρε δύω (Il. 15. 324), but κάπρω (Il. 11. 324), αἰετώ (Od. 2. 146), and γῦπε (Od. 11. 578). Then we have the plural with δύω in: Αἶαντές τε δύω (Il. 13. 313), δύω κήρυκας (Il. 3. 116), δύω ἵππους (Il. 8. 290), δύω νύκτας δύο τ' ἡματα (Od. 9. 74), and Αἶαντε δύω, θεράποντες Ἄρης (Il. 10. 228). With ἄμφω the dual is more the rule, since the plural ἀμφοτέροι is in use; but we find it with the plural in the Odyssey: ἄμφω χεῖρας (8. 135), ὀφθαλμοί τε καὶ οὐατα καὶ πόδες ἄμφω (20. 365), ἄμφω φάεα καλά (19. 417) and even in the Iliad: ἄμφω . . . ὀφθαλμοί (16, 348-9). From these examples it is plain that the Greek dual does not give so clear a distinction of meaning as does the Sanskrit dual in: vedam, vedau, vedānva 'one veda, or two, or more than two'. We have also plural adjectives joined to dual substantives, as in: ἄλκιμα δοῦρε (Il. 16. 139), ὅσσε φαεινά (Il. 13. 435).

The use of the masculine dual in: τῷ γ' ὥς βουλεύσαντε (Il. 1. 531), for Achilles and Thetis, seems to us natural enough. But when both are female, the epic still uses the masculine dual, as in: προφανέντε ἀνὰ πτολέμοιο γεφύρας (Il. 8. 378), and in: πληγέντε κεραυνῷ (Il. 8. 455), where the reference is to Hera and Athena; or in Hesiod's Works and Days:

ἶτον προλιπόντ' ἀνθρώπους Αἰδῶς καὶ Νέμεσις (199-200).

We must remember that by this time the old dual for -α stems had become a nominative plural, and the new dual in -α was not yet developed except for masculines like Ἀτρεΐδα (Il. 1. 16), αἰχμητά (Il. 7. 281), ἵππω ὠκύπετα (Il. 8. 41-2), Αἶαντε κορυστά (Il. 18. 163). So the old Epic has no feminine form for the dual, a form that develops only in Attic. We read in Thucydides: ἄμφω τὸ πόλεε (5. 23. 1), in Xenophon: ἄμφω τούτῳ τὸ ἡμέρα (Cyr. 1. 2. 11), but Sophocles gives us:

τὸ δ' εὐχλόου Δήμητρος εἰς προσόψιον  
πάγον μολοῦσα (O. C. 1600-1),

where Jebb prefers the μολοῦσαι of one manuscript; but though forms in ᾱ are rare even in Attic, the inscriptions give τὸ στήλα, ταμία and the like, and, as the more difficult reading, μολοῦσα is to be preferred.

For the first dual Homer uses νῶϊ (νῶ twice, in Il. 5. 219 and Od. 15. 475) for the nom.-acc. and νῶϊν for the gen.-dat. The verb following is always in the plural for the active; but Homer has once the first dual middle in περιδόμεθον (Il. 23. 485), where νῶϊ is not expressed. When we remember that in English 'us' is plural, but 'we' (= two) seems

primarily dual, we may deduce from this syncretism of dual and plural in the pronoun a very old syncretism in the first plural of the verb, where all separate forms for the first dual seem late developments. Marstrander says: Tout compte fait, la hitt. 1<sup>re</sup> plur. -o -en me semble reposer sur la vieille forme du duel (Caractère indo-européen de la langue hittite, p. 152). The Skt. first duals ending in -va, -vas, -vahi, and -vahe, have nothing cognate in the verbs of the western branches of Indo-Germanic; and the evident significance of these endings (va = two) also indicates late development. We may conjecture that of the two surviving Greek inflexions for the first plural, -μεν and -μες, one was originally dual. When the verb has the same form for the dual and the plural, as is the case in the Greek active, it is natural that the dual pronoun should be attracted by it, and should show a plural meaning at times even in Homer. And in: νῶϊν ἀνήκεστος χόλος ἔσται (Il. 15. 217) νῶϊν evidently stands for the five divinities, Poseidon, Hera, Athena, Hermes, and Hephaestus.

In the late Epic of Quintus νῶϊ and νῶϊν are plurals, used on occasion for two, just as is ἡμεῖς or ἡμῖν. In 3. 485 Quintus uses νῶϊν for two, and in 10. 31 it is a dual, though joined with a plural participle. In: λίπομεν βλαφθέντε νόημα (9. 492) we have the first plural joined with a dual participle to express two, a union easily paralleled in Homer. But in 1. 213, 369, 583, 725, &c., νῶϊ and νῶϊν are plurals. In 13. 344 Quintus uses ἕας for ἡμετέρας, following the use of ἑαυτὸν for ἑμαυτὸν. Indeed by the time of Aristotle the dual had ceased to exist as a separate number; and when Aristotle or Lucian uses ἄμφω with a singular verb, it is the use of a singular verb with a neuter plural.

We found the dual joined formally with three in:

αἶ κ' ἀποκηδήσαντε φερώμεθα χεῖρον ἄεθλον (Il. 23. 413),

though in meaning the participle is to be distinguished from the verb. In:

τὼ δὲ βάτην παρὰ θῖνα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης (Il. 9. 182),

while there is no formal irregularity, we feel that τὼ βάτην is really of three, not of two, for Phoenix accompanied Nestor and Ulysses. There is a curious contrast between the passages; in the first, the two horses, that are to do the real work in the race, determine the number of the verb; in the second, Phoenix, the guardian of Achilles' boyhood, who is to take a leading part in reconciling him to Agamemnon, is left out of account to all appearance in both subject and verb.

Just as in γυνὴ καὶ νήπια τέκνα (Od. 12. 42) we have a dual union, so in:

σκευὴ τε γάρ σε καὶ τὸ δύστηνον κára  
δηλοῦτον ἡμῖν ὄνθ' ὃς εἶ (Soph. O. C. 555-6),

σκευή; is felt as a collective singular. In:

αὐτανεψίῳ πατὴρ ἂν εἶη σὸς τε καὶ τούτων γεγώς (Eur. Heraclid. 211-12),

the use of γεγώς for γεγῶτε in agreement with αὐτανεψίῳ is due to the attraction of the intervening εἶη. In Il. 5. 487-8 we noticed the union of ἀλόντε with γέννησθε, where the Scholiast explained ἀλόντε as in agreement with σὺ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι to be supplied. Pindar gives us:

σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυᾶ·  
μαθόντες δὲ λάβροι  
παγγλωσσία κόρακες ὧς ἄκραντα γαρύετον  
Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον (Ol. 2, 94-7),

‘wise he who in his nature has knowledge; but they, who have but learned, boisterous in multitude of words, are but as crows that chatter idly against the divine bird of Zeus’. The Scholiast refers μαθόντες γαρύετον to Simonides and his nephew Bacchylides; but Mr. Verrall thinks it a hit at the new art of rhetoric, taking the κόρακες for Corax and Tisias, a parallel to uses like Castores or Assaraci (Aen. 10. 124). In the verses we have a parallel drawn first in general terms by the opposition of a singular to a plural, and then passing to the designation of two particular persons by a dual.

To conclude, when we see the irregularities in agreement of the dual with the plural in: νῦν μὲν γὰρ οὕτως, ἔφη, διάκεισθον, ὥσπερ εἰ τὼ χεῖρε, ἃς ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τῷ συλλαμβάνειν ἀλλήλοιν ἐποίησεν, ἀφεμένῳ τούτου τράποιντο πρὸς τὸ διακωλύειν ἀλλήλω, ἢ εἰ τὼ πόδε θεῖα μοῖρα πεποιημένῳ πρὸς τὸ συνεργεῖν ἀλλήλοιν, ἀμελήσαντε τούτου ἐμποδίζοιεν ἀλλήλω (Xen. Mem. 2. 3. 18), we may well feel that by Xenophon's time all feeling for the dual as a number distinct from the plural is lost; and that, while forms like νῶϊ may remain in use, they will be treated as plural forms, just as are θύραι or κρᾶναι δύο (Theocr. 5. 47).

## XVIII

### NUMERALS, CARDINAL AND DISTRIBUTIVE

Is the Latin for 'mile' mille passus or mille passuum? The question may be put in a more general form: is mille an adjective or a noun? Now, in the grammars of the Greeks and Romans the ἐπίθετον or nomen adiectivum is not yet separated from the ὄνομα or nomen substantivum. Gens is a noun; but ingens, its negative form, is always an adjective. Our rule is that mille in the singular is an adjective, as in: mille passus, but in the plural a noun governing the genitive, as in: duo milia passuum. Centum, too, is an adjective, but its plurals ducenti, trecenti, sescenti, are also adjectives, and Gellius (1. 16) cites several exceptions to the rule for mille, closing with the much debated passage in the Milo, where he reads: ante fundum Clodi . . . facile mille hominum versabatur valentium (53. 20). He further cites from Varro: plus mille et centum annorum, from Cato: mille passum, from Cicero: mille nummum (Phil. 6. 15. 5), and from Lucilius the ablatives milli passum and milli nummum.

Of these phrases mille passuum or passum seems the most common. Kühnast (Synt. Liv. 80) finds in Livy ten examples of mille passus, nine of mille passuum; Caesar and Cicero each use mille passuum once only, but the Agrimensores have only mille passus. Brix (ad Trin. 425) finds in Plautus mille nummum six times, mille passuum twice, and one example each of mille with annorum, drachumarum, medimnum and modiorum. In Terence we find mille with drachumarum (Heaut. 601) and with nummum (ib. 606). In Augustan poetry the construction is rare; it does not occur in Lucretius, Virgil, or Ovid; Horace has it once in mille ovium (Sat. 2. 3. 197). In return we find the plural used as an adjective in: sagittarios . . . tria milia numero habebat (B. C. 3. 4), quattuor milia pedes (Columella 5. 1. 10), decem amplius milia coissent homines (Flor. 3. 20. 3), tribus millibus nummis (Apul. Apol. 59), anni ad haec tempora prope duo milia sunt (Arnob. 2. 71). We may conclude that just as sahasra in Sanskrit, so mille and milia in older Latin could be used either as adjectives or nouns, but that later in both prose and verse mille was usually an adjective, milia a noun, in construction.

But Gellius cites from Lucilius: ad portam mille a porta est, sex inde Salernum 'from gate to gate is a mile, six thence to Salernum', where mille not mille passus, is the Latin for 'mile'; a use of one for two like that of Pollux for Castor and Pollux. He also cites from Lucilius:

Non milli nummum potes uno quaerere centum,

'out of one thousand sesterces you can't get a hundred (thousand)'. His conclusion is: ita 'unum mille' et 'duo milia' certa atque directa oratione dicitur. No doubt the use of duo milia would naturally lead to that of unum mille, and we find it repeated in Macrobius (Sat. 1. 5. 7), where, however, he is plainly copying Gellius. Mille is by etymology sm̐-ghes-le, corresponding mutatis mutandis to the Skt. sa-has-ra, and cognate with χίλιοι (older \*χεσλίοι). Gellius cites χίλιοι in this connexion, and we have in Herodotus χιλίην ἵππων 'a thousand horse' (5. 63. 3). Sm̐ is the reduced form of sem (= ἑν), so that in itself mille means 'one thousand'; and probably that is why in Latin older than Gellius we have only one example of unum mille. To: divum promittere nemo (Aen. 9. 6) Servius notes: nemo pro nullus posuit, et est acyrologia: nam 'divum nemo' non possumus dicere, cum proprie 'nemo' sit 'ne-homo'. Properly nemo is for ne-hemo, for which homo is a later assimilation. But Plautus wrote: nemo homo usquam ita arbitratust (Pers. 211). Nullus is for ne-unlus, a diminutive of unus; and yet Cicero writes: nulla re una magis oratorem commendari (Brut. 216. 59). Even more striking is the acyrologia that appears in Pliny's: nullas duas . . . effigies (N. H. 7. 1. 8). If we found unum centum, it would be parallel to this; for centum, old centom, is likewise an example of the use of one for two, being for dekm̐ dkm̐tom 'tens of tens', as our 'hundred' is for hund-rede 'rede' or 'tale of tens'. Our 'thousand' is not cognate with mille, but seems for stavas hund 'strong in hundreds'. Cf. tauros, old stauros, our 'steer'.

For duo milia Lucretius uses bis mille as a poetic variety in: bis mille sagittae (4. 408), as does Horace in: bis mille equos (Epod. 9. 17). Should they not have written bis milleni? I find no example of milleni older than the second century of our era. Camerarius read: millenum numero navium (Pl. Bacch. 928), but the manuscripts give mille cum. In Gaius I read: quinque hominibus singulis, millenos asses legando (2. 225). It is probable that bis milleni was not yet developed in Horace's day, and that bis mille was the only form in use. With the multiplicatives we often find the cardinals, even when the corresponding distributives are already in use. We have in Caesar: vicies centum milium passuum (B. G. 5. 13) and in Livy: decies centum milia (43. 6. 11) and in Pliny: quater mille sescentos (N. H. 36. 13). In poetry it is very common; Ennius gives us: ter quattuor corpora sancta avium (Ann. 90, M.) and lumina bis sex (ib. 344), and Cicero: bis sex ardentia signa (Arat. 568). Virgil has: ter denis navibus (Aen. 10. 213) but: ter centum annos (ib. 1. 272). Since



duodecim and quattuordecim do not fit into a hexameter, the dactylic poets resort to variants with bis. Virgil uses bis seni thrice, but bis sex four times; he has bis septem twice, but never bis septeni. Horace has: bis quinque viri (Ep. 2. 1. 24) and: bis trium ulnarum toga (Epod. 4. 8). Ovid gives us: volucrum bis quattuor (Met. 12. 15), lisque decem decies inspicienda viris (Trist. 2. 94), milia qui novies distat ab urbe decem (ib. 4. 10. 4), and Martial: si dederint superi decies mihi milia centum (1. 103. 1). We have in Chalcidius phrases like: bis duo quattuor, and: bis duo bis, quod est octo. Nonius quotes twice from Varro: semel unum singulum esse; Ausonius has: ter tria multiplicanti (Edyll. 11. 2); iuris idem tribus est quod ter tribus (ib. 11. 4); ut idem congrege ter trino per ter tria dissoluatur (ib. v. 52-3). Neither Greek nor Sanskrit has a distributive numeral, showing it to be a later formation, and the correspondence of bis mille with δισμήριος and of the idiom in ter quattuor or bis septem with Skt. trisapta and tridaśa make it certain that the use of cardinals with the multiplicative is the primary one.

In Latin from the numeral adverbs bis, ter, quater, are formed by the addition of the stem suffix -no plural adjectives: bini, trini or terni, quaterni, and on this analogy quini, seni, &c., usually called distributives. Priscian tells us: alios quoque vocales . . . solent ex duabus syllabis in unam longam transire, ut . . . bis uni bini (Gramm. II. 126. 23). This is not quite valueless for the derivation of bini; for Priscian evidently felt that the suffix -no here is the same that we find in unus. Closely connected with bini is unus in the series una, bina, trina castra; and as trina is older than terna just as tris is the older form of ter (cf. agros and ager, Skt. ajras and अग्रός) we may assume that this is the series for which the distributives were first devised. Further this series seems to me to present fewer exceptions than any other use of these numerals. Cicero indeed tells us: bina enim non dicuntur nisi de bis quae sunt numeri tantum pluralis, as cited by Servius in his note to: frenaque bina (Aen. 8. 168); where he adds that Cicero in a letter to his son blamed him for having written 'direxi litteras duas'; for litterae, when it means 'epistle', is numeri tantum pluralis, and bina, not duo, is used with such. But from what I have already said, you can see that duo castra was older than bina castra; and it is significant that Cicero's boy still uses duo. Servius himself is not blameless here; he says of Virgil's frena bina: poetice, nam duo debuit dicere. But just as litterae takes binae as being a plural of parts, a combination of many letters, so frena, like frenum and freni, means 'a bridle', and is a plural of parts. 'Two homes' is usually binae aedes, as 'one home' is unae aedes, but a natural plural of unus is duo, and so Ulpian writes: si quis duas aedes habeat, et alteras tradat (Dig. 8. 4. 6). Very curious is the lack of agreement in:

en quattuor aras:

Ecce duas tibi, Daphni, duas altaria Phoebō (Buc. 5. 65-6),

an example, it seems to me, of the σχῆμα πρὸς τὸ συνώνυμον; i.e. in duas altaria, where altaria means aras, duas is made to agree with aras, the word understood, and not with altaria, the word expressed. Servius agrees with the manuscripts in his citation of the verse; but when he cites it again, apparently from memory, in his Scholium to Aen. 3. 305, he has duoque altaria Phoebō, showing how ready he himself was to use duo with a plurale tantum. Caper tells us: binas tabulas dicimus, non duas (Gramm. VII. 108. 8); he is dealing with the plural of the union of two tablets, that form a note-book; just as Cicero was dealing with the plural of the union of many letters, which makes up an epistle. In: decreverunt . . . equos duo phaleratos, bina equestria arma (Liv. 30. 17. 13) we have the uses of the cardinal and the multiplicative side by side.

The multiplicative adverbs are constructed in two ways: either with a numeral they multiply as in: bis duo quattuor, or with a numeral limiting them as in: bis uno die venit. In the first we find the multiplied numeral often attracted by the multiplier into the multiplicative form, as in bis bina quattuor. We have in Macrobius: bis bina, quae sunt quattuor . . . bis bina bis, quae sunt octo . . . ter terna, quae sunt novem . . . ter terna ter, id est, ter novena, quae sunt viginti septem (Somn. Scip. 1. 6), quae si bis bina quot essent didicisset (Cic. N. D. 2. 49. 18), ternos ter cyathos . . . petet (Hor. Od. 3. 19. 14), ter bibe vel totiens ternos (Auson. Edyll. 11. 1), ter decies ternos habeat, deciesque novenos (ib. V. 90). The form terna for trina now appears, and seems clearly due to assimilation to the preceding ter in ter terna. For bis iterum is a variant in: sub Sereno bis et Serviano iterum consulibus (Spart. Hadr. 3. 8), and we find it used for bis in: octonis iterum natalibus actis (Ov. Met. 13. 753). We find bis with ordinals also, as in: bis tertia ducitur aestas (Pont. 4. 10. 1), bis decimus . . . ab urbe lapis (Mart. 4. 57. 4); and such a use seems natural when we turn back to bis sex and bis septem. That bini is primarily not distributive, but multiplicative, seems certain from its use in: binos ducentos Philippos (Pl. Bacch. 1050), where binos is plainly for bis, an adjective used for an adverb, as we find in: domesticus otior (Hor. Sat. 1. 6. 128) or vespertinumque pererro . . . forum (ib. v. 113-14).

We notice how in: ter bibe vel totiens ternos the repetition of ter is avoided. In: saepe tribus lectis videas cenare

quaternos (Hor. Sat. 1. 4. 86) the *ter* to be implied from *tribus* with *quaternos* is omitted, as we shall prove is usual with similar pairs. So in: *duo quidam gladiis subcincti, ac bina iacula gestantes* (Suet. Jul. 84. 3) the *bis* implied from *duo* is omitted with *bina*, as it is in: (*Fabius et servus*) *iere pastorali habitu, agrestibus telis, falcibus gaesisque binis armati* (Liv. 9. 36. 6) and: *Thracum et Illyriorum . . . par numerus, bina milia erant* (ib. 33. 4. 4). The number of consuls is so well known that in: *consulibus bellum cum Hannibale et binae legiones decretae* (ib. 25. 3. 3) both *duo* (or *bini*) and *bis* are omitted, and we have the two pairs, *consulibus duobus . . . bis binae*, represented by the first and last. So in: in *ea* (*spatha*) *bina foramina tribus locis sunt* (Cels. 8. 15), *sunt bini (venti) in quattuor caeli partibus* (Plin. N. H. 2. 119), *liberi tres et tres liberae cum binis comitibus* (Edict. Ulp. Dig. 25. 4. 1. 10), where we have a sentence parallel to Liv. 33. 4. 4, and *bis* is to be supplied with *binis*. With these omissions we have *bini*, *terni*, *quaterni* passing from multiplicatives to distributives.

When the multiplicative is limited by another number, we find a like omission frequent in the limiting number. We read: *non semel, sed bis, neque uno, sed duobus pretiis unum et idem frumentum vendidisti* (Cic. Verr. 2. 3. 179. 77), *et unus rempublicam bis servavi, semel gloria, iterum aerumna mea* (Sest. 49. 22), *de eadem causa bis iudicium apiscier* (Ter. Phorm. 406), where the limiting numeral is either expressed or clearly implied. But in: *illic bis pueri die numen . . . tuum laudantes* (Hor. Od. 4. 1. 25-7), *dolia cum vino bis in die fac extergeantur* (Cato, R. R. 26), *alienus oves custos bis mulget in hora* (Virg. Buc. 3. 5), *semel in mense sulcos . . . fodere oportet* (Cato, R. R. 43. 2), the numeral is omitted, not implied as in *eadem*.

Turning to corresponding multiplicative adjectives we have: *ut in iugera singula ternis medimnis decidere liceret* (Cic. Verr. 2. 3. 114. 48), where to balance *iugera singula* and to account for the form of *ternis* we should have *semel ternis medimnis*. While I know *semel unum*, I have never met *semel bini*, *semel terni*, or the like. *Semel*, though logically required, seems never expressed in such unions; and the use of *bina* and *terna* here seems due to analogy with *bina* for *bis bina* and *terna* for *ter terna* in the examples we noted above. So we have: *bini senatores singulis cohortibus praepositi* (Liv. 3. 69. 8) *singulas binae ac ternae naves circumsteterant* (B. G. 3. 15), *vix singulis aetatibus binos oratores laudabiles constitisse* (Cic. Brut. 333. 97).

But in such clauses even the balancing number, like *singuli*, is very often omitted, as in: *si inermes cum binis vestimentis velitis ab Sagunto exire* (Liv. 21. 13. 7), *cum bina iugera agri plebi dividerentur* (id. 6. 36. 11), *binae tunicae in militem exactae* (id. 9. 41. 7), *Graeci stipati, quini in lectulis, saepe plures* (Cic. in Pis. 67. 27), *nihil columbis fecundius . . . pulli nascuntur bini* (Varro, R. R. 3. 7. 9), *neque ea (vere) minus binis arandum, ter melius* (ib. 1. 27. 2), (*dentes*) *triceni bini viris adtribuuntur* (Plin. N. H. 7. 16. 15. 71), *compendi feci binos panes indies* (Pl. Pers. 471), *nam ex eis praediistalenta argenti bina statim capiebat* (Ter. Phorm. 789-90), where *statim* is for *quotannis*. So in: *quotannis annui bini reges creabantur* (Nep. Hann. 7. 4), *neque . . . quicquam . . . findi in bina secundo* (Lucr. 1. 532-3), *bina die siccant ovis ubera* (Buc. 2. 42), *immane est vitium dare milia terna macello* (Sat. 2. 4. 76). In such a phrase as: *multibus singulis binas hastas dedit*, both *singulis* ‘one at a time’ and *binas* ‘a pair’ seem still multiplicative in force, and the distributive idea comes from their union with *dedit*. But when *singulis* is omitted, as in: *militibus binas hastas dedit*, with the omission of *singulis* this distributive force at once passes to *binas*, now ‘two apiece’.

In: *bini consules cum binis consularibus exercitibus ingrediebantur fines nostros* (Liv. 23. 42. 9) this distributive force is present neither in *bini* nor in *binis*; *bini consules* is merely ‘the pair of consuls’, being no longer the shortened multiplicative for *bis bini*; and *binis* is evidently for *duobus*, being attracted by the preceding *bini*. In a letter of Pollio’s to Cicero we read: *binis tabellariis in duas naves impositis* (Cic. Fam. 10. 33. 3), where *binis* is again used loosely for ‘a couple of’ and the following *duas* has not yet been attracted to *binas*. To:

*ipse uno graditur comitatus Achate*

*Bina manu lato crispans hastilia ferro* (Aen. 1. 312-13),

Servius’s note is: *bina* si ad utrumque referas, bene dixit *bina*; si ad Aeneam tantum, antiquus mos est *bina* pro *duobus* poni, sicut et *duplices*. The antique fashion was rather, as I have shown, to put *duo* for *bini* in all its uses. Either of Servius’s alternatives is possible here, and I feel like supplying *uterque* with *crispans*, or making *crispans* a singular in agreement with *Aeneas et Achates*, the dual implied in the preceding verse; else *bina* will merely be the usual pair of spears. Virgil has many uses of the multiplicative for the cardinal with the additional idea of union or connexion of some kind, so prominent in its primary use in: *una castra*.

In: *necte tribus nodis ternos, Amarylli, colores* (Buc. 8. 77) this idea of connexion is very plain; as it is in: *quid ternas*

(litteras)? a-m-o (Pl. Merc. 304), quia boves bini hic sunt in crumina (Pl. Pers 317), binas aut amplius domos continuare (Sall. Cat. 20. 11), Xerxis et imperio bina coisse vada (Prop. 2. 1. 22), habent quaedam voces binas formas ut cervus cerva (Varro, L. L. 8. 47), tigna bina . . . inter se iungebat (B. G. 4. 17. 3), uti . . . terna Medusaei vincirem guttura monstri (Ov. Met. 10. 21-2), Stygius canis, qui trina vasto capita concutiens sono regnum tuetur (Sen. H. F. 783-5). In: aequora bina suis oppugnant fluctibus Isthmon (Ov. Her. 4. 105) we have a picture of the two seas eager to unite and to beat down the narrow isthmus that blocks their union. Interesting is the return of trina in a use so closely related to that of trina castra, where it was the only form in use. In: caedit binas de more bidentes (Aen. 5. 96) the de more seems to justify binas; but we have: centum lanigeras mactabat rite bidentes (Aen. 7. 93). In: bina . . . pocula (Aen. 9. 263-4) the bina seems justified by their common history that Virgil gives us; but in the pocula bina novo spumantia lacte, and the crateres duo pinguis olivi (Buc. 5. 67-8) we have in duo merely a poetic variety for bina, making Servius's note: *bina* duo intelligible, as the use here of the distributive and the cardinal is parallel to that in bis bina and bis duo.

So in: septem ingens gyros, septena volumina traxit (Aen. 5. 85), septem numero, septenaque tela coniciunt (10. 329-30), centum cui bracchia dicunt, centenasque manus (10. 565-6), optet nunc bracchia centum centenasque in bella manus (Stat. Theb. 10. 294) we have not constantly the idea of a connected set in the multiplicatives to distinguish them from the cardinals. Such seems the case in: quattuor principes ferro interempti, trina bella civilia, plura externa ac plerumque permixta (Tac. Hist. 1. 2. 1-2), trinos soles . . . saepius videre (Plin. N. H. 2. 99), a Romanis quoque trinis bellis . . . lacessiti (Justin, 41. 1), an binis verbis respondeam (Apul. Apol. 103), trina elementa (Auson. Edyll. 11. 19), trina aenigmata (ib. 38), per trinas species trigonorum (ib. 50). Hence we understand the use already noticed of singulus for unus in Gellius and Augustine.

When objects are conceived of as thus connected and forming a set, it is not strange to find a collective singular taking the place of the plural; as we see in: terno consurgunt ordine remi (Aen. 5. 120), centenaque arbore fluctum verberat (ib. 10. 207-8), quae (dicta) trino iuvenis foro tonabas (Stat. Silv. 4. 9. 15), cessat centeni moderatrix iudicis hasta (ib. 4. 4. 43), amphora centeno consule facta minor (Mart. 8. 45. 4), hac mihi bis seno numeratur tessera puncto (ib. 14. 17. 1), gurgite septeno rapidus mare submovet amnis (Lucan, 8. 445), centeno gutture niti (Pers. 5. 6), (scrobes) non altiores quino semipede (Plin. N. H. 17. 11 (16). 80), bis bina cervice (Sedul. Carm. Pasch. 3. 90), ternaque te . . . Gratia . . . adflavit (Claudian, Laud. Ser. 88-9), trinum dicendi genus est (Auson. Edyll. 11. 66), and: et totiens trino cornix vivacior aevo; quam novies terni glomerantem saecula tractus vincunt aeripedes ter terno Nestore cervi (ib. 11. 12-14). We have binum used as a substantive in: (tetras intra se) bis binum tenet (Mart. Capella, 2. 107), and: bis binum locum tenet in ordine (Cassiodor. Inst. Div. 4).

This singular use of the multiplicative seems to take the place of the ordinal in: denaque luciferos luna movebat equos (Ov. Her. 11. 46), being 'the connected set of ten moons' used for 'the tenth moon'. We found binos used for bis in Pl. Bacch. 1050; for: bisque septenos greges deplanxit una (Sen. Herc. Oet. 1850-1) we might have expected: binos greges septem natorum, &c. The irregularity seems due to a poetic hypallage. In: ubiquomque denis hastis corpus transfigi solet (Pl. Most. 358) corpus seems the careless use of an abstract for corpora singula. To: septenos orbibus orbes impediunt (Aen. 8. 448-9) Servius's note is: septem scuta facta in unitatem connectunt; i.e. septenos limits, not the word orbes, but the phrase orbibus orbes. In:

Te duo diversa domini de parte coronant

Binaque sarta tibi binaque liba ferunt (Ov. Fast. 2. 643-4),

the offering does not consist, as one might expect from the union of duo with the distributive bina, of four garlands and four cakes, but is rather a fourfold offering of a garland and a cake from each dominus.

In: tribunis septem . . . obviam exercitui missis quina nomina principum seditionis edita sunt (Liv. 28. 26. 5) it seems plain from: haud plus quam quinque et triginta (sec. 2) and: vicit sententia lenior (sec. 3) that from tribunis septem septies we must understand quina nomina. Again in: (Tusci) in utrumque mare vergentes incolere urbibus duodenis terras (ib. 5. 33. 9), from utrumque we must understand duas with terras, and from duas supply bis with duodenis. In: tres equitum numero turmae, ternique vagantur ductores (Aen. 5. 560-1) the number of each turma is quite clear from the: pueri bis seni quemque secuti (v. 561), and terni is evidently for tres; as the three leaders are named and described immediately after. But the first impression conveyed by terni is inevitably that it is for ter terni, giving an immediate idea of over a hundred horse.

Strangest of all is the use of the distributive in:

tum pendere poenas

Cecropidae iussi, miserum! septena quotannis

Corpora natorum (Aen. 6. 20-22).

From other accounts it is plain that it was seven youths and seven maidens that the Athenians were bound to send to Crete. If in Cecropidae, really an old dual, a noun masculine in meaning but feminine in ending for the Romans, we have a duality of meaning 'the fathers and mothers of Athens', then from it we may imply bis with septena; but this is far from plain. Conington's note is: 'the story mentioned seven youths and seven maidens, but Virgil has chosen only to name the former'. He was probably guided to this not unlucky guess by the masculine inflexion in natorum. We have seen how a pair finds expression by the name of either of the pair; e.g. the Dioscuri either by Castor or by Pollux. So here the seven pairs are evidently expressed by one of each; whether it is the youth or the maid is not so clear; but the poets favoured the use of Pollux rather than Castor for the Dioscuri. We have to reserve the solution of the puzzle in: ibant octonis referentes Idibus aera (Hor. Sat. 1. 6. 75) for a later chapter.

Bini, terni, quaterni, quini are styled distributives in our Latin grammars, and in Greek we find no corresponding class of numerals. But the Glossaries translate bina by δισσά, a multiplicative, as do the Itala and Volgata (v. Thesaurus 2. 1902), confirming the theory I have developed above, and showing that the Romans themselves felt that these numerals were really multiplicatives. Evidently the distributive force that seems to us essentially characteristic of them arises from the ellipses I have indicated.

## XIX

### CONSTRUCTIO AD SENSUM

FAMILIAR to all students is the sense construction, the σύνταξις πρὸς σύνεσιν, where a collective noun singular in form, but conveying a sense of multitude or plurality, is constructed with a plural verb. We see it in:

αὐτὰρ ὀπίσσω

ἢ πληθὺς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν ἀπονέοντο (Il. 15. 304-5),

and: ἅμα δὲ ἔφ' ἡγενομένη καὶ ὁ ἄλλος στρατὸς ἀπέβαινον (Thuc. 4. 32. 2); in: civitati persuasit ut de finibus suis cum omnibus copiis exirent (Caes. B. G. 1. 2), and: inde pars per agros dilapsi, pars urbes petunt finitimas (Liv. 5. 40. 6). We have also thus constructed pronouns singular in form, but implying a plural, as in: ἔβαν οἰκόνδε ἕκαστος (Il. 1. 606) and: τότε μὲν δὴ ταῦτ' εἰπόντες ἀπῆλθον ἑκάτερος ἐπὶ τὰ προσήκοντα (Xen. Cyr. 5. 2. 22); in: loquere, uter meruisti culpam (Pl. Men. 779), ubi quisque vident, eunt obviam (id. Capt. 500-1), and: eodem die uterque eorum ex castris stativis . . . exercitum educunt (B. C. 3. 30. 3).

At times we have the verb in agreement with the subject in form, while an adjective or participle in the predicate, that should stand in agreement with the subject, or a following verb constructed with it, is pluralized by the meaning. So we have: τὸ δὲ στράτευμα ἐπορίζετο σῆτον ὅπως ἐδύνατο ἐκ τῶν ὑποζυγίων κόπτοντες τοὺς βοῦς καὶ ὄνους (Xen. Anab. 2. 1. 6), παντί τε τρόπῳ ἀνηρέθιστο ἢ πόλις καὶ τὸν Περικλέα ἐν ὀργῇ εἶχον (Thuc. 2. 21. 3), multumque remittit qui revocent (Aen. 10. 839-40), nec supplex turba timebat iudicis ora sui, sed erant sine vindice tuti (Ov. Met. 1. 92-3), ut quis ex longinquo revererat, miracula narrabant (Tac. Ann. 2. 24. 6).

Far more common is the parallel construction with τις in Greek, as we see it in: ἦ ἄρα δὴ τις, ὅσαι θεαὶ εἰς' ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ (Il. 18. 429), and: ἥσσόν τις ἐμοὶ πρόσειοι, δυσχερὲς ποιούμενοι (Thuc. 4. 85. 6), ἦ μάλα τις θεὸς ἔνδον, οἱ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν (Od. 19. 40), αὐχμηρὸς γέ τις ὢν καὶ ἀπὸ παντὸς περιουσίαν ποιούμενος θησαυροποιὸς ἀνὴρ· οὗς δὴ καὶ ἐπαινεῖ τὸ πλῆθος (Plat. Rep. 554 a). So, too, we find τις in a dependent clause, joined with a plural pronoun in the principal sentence, in: εἰάν τις φανερὸς γένηται κλέπτων ἢ λωποδυτῶν ἢ βαλαντιστομῶν . . . τούτοις θάνατός ἐστιν ἡ ζημία (Xen. Mem. 1. 2. 62), ἣν δὲ παρὰ ταῦτα ἀδικεῖν τις ἐπιχειρῇ, τούτοις Κῦρός τε καὶ ἡμεῖς πολέμιοι ἐσόμεθα (Xen. Cyr. 7. 4. 5).

So to a plural antecedent is joined a singular relative, which acquires a collective sense from a subjoined τις, as in:

ἄλλους μὲν γὰρ παῖδας ἐμοὺς πόδας ὥκους Ἀχιλλεὺς

πέρνασχε', ὃν τιν' ἔλεσκε, πέρην ἁλὸς ἀτρυγέτοιο (Il. 24. 751-2),

and in:

οἷτε καὶ ἄλλους

ἄνθρωπους πέμπουσιν, ὅτις σφέας εἰσαφίκεται (Od. 20. 187-8),

and: πάντας ἐξῆς, ὅτ' ἐντύχοιεν, . . . καὶ γυναῖκας κτείνοντες (Thuc. 7. 29. 4), and: ὅτινι ἐντυγχάνοιεν . . . πάντας ἔκτεινον (Xen. Anab. 2. 5. 32). So in archaic Latin we find at times a singular relative constructed with a plural antecedent, as in: fugitant omnes hanc provinciam, quoi obtigerat (Pl. Capt. 156-7) or in: viro, quouis mos maximest consimilis vostrum, ei se ad vos adplicant (Ter. Heaut. 392-3), where quouis is attracted in number to viro, though ei is its proper antecedent.

Often the idea of plurality in the pronoun leads to the assumption of a plural form by the pronoun itself, though it is primarily and properly singular, as in: ἕκαστοι ἔχοντες ξύλα καὶ οὗτοι (Herod. 2. 63), οὐκ ἂν ποίεοιεν τούτων οὐδέτερα (id. 7. 103. 4), palmas ponto tendens utrasque (Aen. 5. 233), primo impetu simul utraque cornua et Numidae et Carthaginienses pulsi (Liv. 30. 8. 7). This attraction is most easily traced in negatives, that imply the opposite. So we have: ἐκείνης τῆς νυκτὸς οὐδεὶς ἐκοιμήθη, οὐ μόνον τοὺς ἀπολωλότας πενθοῦντες, κτλ. (Xen. Hell. 2. 2. 3), where the οὐδεὶς implies πάντες with which πενθοῦντες is really in agreement. So with ἥρασσον in: εἴτ' ὀνειδέσιν ἥρασσον ἔνθεν κἄνθεν οὐ τις ἔσθ' ὃς οὐ (Soph. Ajax 724-5). But οὐδεὶς, which in older Greek is used only in the singular, and in Homer only in the neuter singular except in the phrase: τὸ ὄν μένος οὐδενὶ εἴκων, in later Greek develops a plural οὐδένες. So we read: ἄρχουσι δὲ οὐδένες ἐτι αὐτῶν ἄλλ' αὐτονόμους ἀφίᾳσι (Xen. Lac. Rep. 3. 1), οὔτε γὰρ ἦν πρεσβεία πρὸς οὐδένας ἀπεσταλμένη τότε τῶν Ἑλλήνων (Dem. de Cor. 23), οὐδένων εἰσὶ βελτίους (id. Olyn. 2. 17) with which compare: οὐδενὸς βελτίους (Plat. Prot. 324 d).

So we find μηδένες developed, too, in: φοβούμενοι εἰ μηδένες ἄλλοι ἢ αὐτοὶ πολεμήσοιεν τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις (Xen. Hell. 5. 4. 20). In Latin the use of nulli for nullus is very common; e.g. ut nulli supersint de inimicis (Cic. Marcell. 21. 7), ante Iovem nulli subigebant arva coloni (Virg. Geo. 1. 125), quis est enim, qui nullis officii praeceptis tradendis philosophum se audeat dicere? (Cic. Off. 1. 5. 2). In English the authorities for 'none of us were present' seem quite as weighty as those for 'none of us was present', though 'none' is short for 'no one'; and the plural seems the result of attraction of the verb by the plural 'us'. So in the οὐδένας τῶν Ἑλλήνων quoted from Demosthenes. Herodotus uses not οὐδεὶς, but οὐδαμός (= oude-sm-mos), and usually makes it plural, as in: οὐδαμοὶ Ἰώνων (1. 18), οὐδαμοῖσι τῶν νῦν σφέας περιουκρόντων (1. 57). So with μηδαμός in: μηδαμοῖσι ἄλλοισι Ἰώνων (1. 143), μηδαμοὺς τῶν προσοίκων (1. 144), where the plural seems the result of attraction by the following genitive.

So in: οὐ δεινὰ πάσχειν δεινὰ τοὺς εἰργασμένους (Eur. Or. 413) and: δῆλα γὰρ ὅτι σύμμαχοι βασιλέος γινόμεθα (Herod. 9. 11) δεινόν and δῆλον seem to have been attracted to δεινὰ and δῆλα by the following plurals δεινὰ and σύμμαχοι. So, too, in: οὐκ ἂν ποίεοιεν τούτων οὐδέτερα (Herod. 7. 103). We have similar attraction, though not now through dependent genitives, but through preceding plurals, in: δεῖξαι αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὐκ Ἰῶνες τάδε εἰσὶν (Thuc. 6. 77) and: οὓς οὐ παραδοτέα τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἐστίν, οὐδε δίκαις καὶ λόγοις διακριτέα . . . ἀλλὰ τιμωρητέα ἐν τάχει καὶ παντὶ σθένει (Thuc. 1. 86. 3); just as we have attraction for gender in: τὸν πολλὸν τοῦ χρόνου (Herod. 1. 24), πολλὴν τῆς χώρας (Xen. Cyr. 3. 2. 2), οὗτος παρ' ἐμοὶ τὸ οὔνομα τοῦτο δίκαιός ἐστι φέρεσθαι (Herod. 1. 32 fin.). We seem to have a like attraction in the common phrase: ἀδύνατά ἐστι ταῦτα ποιεῖν. The only case of a like attraction in Latin I have met with is the 'nota tibi' in:

Frater ut Aeneas pelago tuus omnia circum

Litora iactetur odiis Iunonis iniquae,

Nota tibi (Aen. 1. 667-9),

where the figure, formally Greek, does not follow exactly any of the patterns we have quoted. Probably the agreement is with the pericula Aeneae implied in: frater ut omnia circum litora iactetur.

But if attraction by the following ταῦτα is the primary reason for the use of ἀδύνατα noticed above, evidently the feeling soon develops that ἀδύνατα is a stronger and more emphatic form for ἀδύνατον, and we have here a use parallel to the Latin use of quia for quod. This we seem to have in: δήμου τε αὖ ἄρχοντος ἀδύνατα μὴ οὐ κακότητα ἐγγίνεσθαι (Herod. 3. 82), Ἀπόλλων τάδ' ἦν (Soph. O. T. 1329), κοῦτοι γυναικὸς οὐδαμῶς ἡσσητέα (id. Antig. 678), where attraction plays no part in the change. Indeed we have the opposite in: μέγα ποιούμενος ταῦτα (Herod. 3. 42) and: εὐπετές τε αὐτοῖσι ἔφη ταῦτα γίνεσθαι (id. 9. 90), where in the use of the invariable predicate we have another mode of emphasis. We seem to have this use in the common form of question: τί οὖν ταῦτά ἐστιν; (Xen. Anab. 2. 1. 22), and: τί οὖν δὴ ἐστιν

ἅπτα εἶπεν ὁ ἀνὴρ πρὸ τοῦ θανάτου; (Plat. Phaedo 57 a). But in such uses of nullis as we have in: *te adhuc a nullis nisi ab Siculis potuisse cognosci* (Cic. Div. Caecil. 28. 9), *intellegitis enim nullis hominibus quemquam tanto odio, quanto istum Syracusanis, et esse et fuisse* (Verr. 2. 2. 15. 5), *multaque saecula postea sic viguit Pythagoreorum nomen ut nulli alii docti viderentur* (Tusc. 1. 38. 16) we have attraction on the same lines as in Greek.

To: *multumque remittit qui revocent* (Aen. 10. 839-40), Servius's note is: *hoc pro 'saepe'*. I prefer to translate here: 'he sends many a one to recall him'; but in such examples as: *multum sunt in venationibus* (B. G. 4. 1) or: *in agmine atque ad vigiliis multus adesse* (Sall. Jug. 96. 3) Servius's translation seems quite suitable. We have the opposite in: *memini, tametsi nullus moneas* (Ter. Eun. 216), *Philotimus non modo nullus venit, sed ne per litteras quidem . . . certiores facit me quid egerit* (Cic. Att. 11. 24. 4), *ab armis nullus discederet* (ib. 15. 22), a use that seems to me to take its simplest shape in: *ex quo suffragia nulli vendimus* (Juv. 10. 77-8). We seem to have a parallel use of non nullus in:

*Sic ego tam sancti custode reludor amoris;*

*Ex illo felix non mihi nulla fuit* (Prop. 2. 29. 41-2).

The editors have all chosen to read *nox* with the worse manuscripts instead of *non*, which is the reading of all of any value. The resultant meaning is impossible in view of *hesterna nocte* in the first verse; and so as a rule they try to divide the poem into two poems, and in this, seeing that the poem naturally falls into two parts, the revelry of the evening and the repentance of the morning, they have some apparent success. But Cynthia's success in convincing her lover of her chastity was surely far more likely to render her propitious than cruel to him; and if we follow the best manuscripts, with *ex illo* implying *lusu* from *reludor*, we may translate: 'as a result of that sport of hers my mistress has turned quite propitious to me', *felix fuit* being a poetic expansion for *favit*.

In Latin the verb is usually in the plural when it has two or more subjects joined by *et*, as in: *et Q. Maximus, . . . et L. Paullus, . . . et vester Gallus, et M. Cato . . . eis temporibus fuerunt* (Cic. Fam. 4. 6). But we often find, also, two subjects connected by *cum* with a plural verb. Gellius quotes from an oration of Cato: *si sponsionem fecissent Gellius cum Turio* (14. 2. 26), and we read in Terence:

*Syrus cum illo nostro consusurrant* (Heaut. 473).

Nepos has: *Demosthenes cum ceteris . . . in exilium erant expulsi* (Phoc. 2); but Cicero gives us only one example: *Sulla cum Scipione . . . leges inter se condicionesque contulerunt* (Phil. 12. 27. 11); neither Caesar, Velleius, nor Tacitus offers an example. Virgil has: *cana Fides et Vesta, Remo cum fratre Quirinus iura dabunt* (Aen. 1. 292-3); and Ovid:

*Litora cum plausu clamor superasque deorum*

*Implevere domos* (Met. 4. 735-6),

and:

*Ilia cum Lauso de Numitore sati* (Fast. 4. 54).

Sallust has it repeatedly, as in: *at Romae Lentulus cum ceteris . . . constituerant* (Cat. 43. 1), *Bocchus cum peditibus . . . aciem invadunt* (Jug. 101. 5). Livy offers several examples, as: *ipse dux cum aliquot principibus capiuntur* (21. 60. 7). But in both we find examples with the singular, as: *ibi Iugurtha cum plurimis erat* (Sall. Jug. 101. 6) and: *illa . . . iusta acies cum ducibus, cum ordinibus media urbe in forum processit* (Liv. 26. 46. 7). Interesting is Ovid's verse: *fors eadem Ismarios Hebrum cum Strymone siccant* (Met. 2. 257), recalling Virgil's: *septenos orbibus orbes* (Aen. 8. 448).

The corresponding construction with *μετά* is rare; I have noted: *Δημοσθένης μετὰ τῶν συστρατηγῶν . . . σπένδονται Μαντινεῦσιν* (Thuc. 3. 109. 2), *Ἀλκιβιάδης ἐκ Σάρδεων μετὰ Μαντιθέου . . . εὐπορήσαντες νυκτὸς ἀπέδρασαν εἰς Κλαζομενάς* (Xen. Hell. 1. 1. 10), *πολυτελῶς Ἀδώνια ἄγουσ' ἐταῖρα μεθ' ἐτέρων* (Diph. apud Athen. p. 292 d). It is not found with *σύν*, nor with *λαβών* or *ἔχων*, to my knowledge; but Servius evidently thinks that in: *ipse uno graditur comitatus Achate* (Aen. 1. 312) we have a variety for: *ipse cum Achate uno gradiuntur*, making the *bina* in v. 313 short for *bis bina*. Rare is the use of a plural verb in Latin with two subjects joined by *an*, as we find it in: *Roma an Carthago iura gentibus darent, ante crastinam noctem scituros* (Liv. 30. 32. 2), and: *tuque dubitas Cimberne Annius an Veranius Flaccus imitandi sint tibi?* (Suet. Aug. 86. 3).

We find Plautus constructing the plural of the imperative with the singulars quis and aliquis, as in: Simoni me adesse quis nuntiate (Pseud. 1284), aperite aliquis (Merc. 131), heus aliquis actutum huc foras exite; illinc pallium mi ecferte (Merc. 910-11), aperite atque Erotium aliquis evocate ante ostium (Men. 674). These are evidently to be connected with the syntax in:

Ibitis Aegaeas sine me, Messala, per undas (Tib. 1. 3. 1),

or:

ἢ περ ἄν ὑμεῖς

νῆα παρὰ γλαφυρὴν ἰθύνετε, φαίδιμ' Ὀδυσσεῦ (Od. 12. 81-2),

which give a starting-point for the use of vous in French and you in English as a singular.

When we recall how readily we pass from the use of the indicative with quin to that of the imperative with it, as we see them in: i: quid stas, lapis? Quin accipis? (Ter. Heaut. 831-2), and in: quin tu uno verbo dic (And. 45), we are not surprised to find the indicative coupled with the imperative here, too, in: datin soleas, atque me intro actutum ducite? (Pl. Truc. 631). In: heus foras exite hue aliquis; duce istam intro mulierem (Epid. 398-9) we have the second plural exite coupled with the second singular duce. We have aliquis joined with the second singular of the present subjunctive in: exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor (Aen. 4. 625); but as a rule aliquis or quis is joined with the third singular here, as in: aliquis dicat (Ter. And. 640).

But we read in Plautus: si quis me quaeret, vocatote aliqui (Stich. 67) 'if any one asks for me, you shall call me, some of you'; and when we compare this: vocatote aliqui with: aliquis foras exile cited above, we see at once that its singular will be: vocato aliquis, and understand why the Romans used vocato for the third person as well as for the second. From: hoc tu facito cum animo cogites (Ter. Ad. 500) we get: hoc aliquis facito cum animo cogitet, where facito has passed to the third person. That dato was primarily second person, seems plain from the structure; it is the second singular imperative da + tod, the ablative singular neuter of the definite article, which is still plain in isto, and it means 'give from this on'. Its transference from the second to the third person seems a natural consequence from the usual construction of aliquis with the third person. Its use for the third person seems old; we read in a law referred to as 'of Romulus': si nurus, sacra divis parentum estod (Bruns, Fontes, p. 7. 13). The second plural datote is formed from the second singular dato on the analogy of date, and the third plural from the third singular dato, following the analogy of dat to dant in the indicative.

That this transfer of the second person to the third is pro-ethnic is clear from its presence in Greek and Sanskrit, and in both it seems due to similar causes. Parallel to dato in form is the Sanskrit dhattāt, a form which is usually second singular, as in: draviṇe 'ha dhattāt 'bestow riches here', but which is also used as a third singular in: bhavān prasādam kurutāt 'may your honour do this favour'. It is also used occasionally for the second plural, the second dual, and the first singular (Whitney, 571 a and b).

In Greek we have a form parallel to dato in φερέτω, which is usually a third singular. But we read:

ἴτω τις εἰσάγγελε Τειρεσίας ὅτι ζητεῖ νιν (Eur. Bacch. 173-4),

'go, some one, announce that Tiresias is seeking him', where ἴτω τις is an exact parallel to vocato aliquis. So, too, in:

στειχέτω τις ὥς τάχος  
ἐλθὼν δὲ θάκουσ τοῦδ' ἴν' οἰωνοσκοπεῖ  
μοχλοῖς τριαίνου κἀνάτρεψον ἔμπαλιν  
ἄνω κάτω τὰ πάντα συγγέας ὁμοῦ,  
καὶ στέμματ' ἀνέμοις καὶ θυέλλαισιν μέθες (ib. 346 ff.).

The use of τις for σύ in:

τοῦτ' εἰς ἀνίαν τοῦτοπος ἔρχεται τι (Soph. Aj. 1138),

and in: κακὸν ἦκει τινί . . . δώσει τις δίκην (Ar. Ran. 552-4) makes it easier to understand the use of τις with the second person. Its transference to the third is intelligible from such uses as: καὶ μηδεὶς γε ὑμῶν ἔχων ταῦτα νομισάτω ἀλλότρια ἔχειν (Xen. Cyr. 7. 5. 73), or: εἴ τινες ὑμῶν . . . μήτ' ἀπογνώτω μηδὲν μήτε καταγνώτω πρὶν ἀκούσῃ (Aeschin. Ctes. 60).

We have a parallel to the use of aliquis with the second imperative in Attic, where τις, or πᾶς, or πᾶς τις is used with the second singular of the present imperative; as in: ἴσχε· θάρσει πᾶς . . . παῖε, παῖε πᾶς τις ἄν . . . ἴσχε πᾶς τις . . . ἴσχε πᾶς

δόρυ . . . ἔρπε πᾶς κατ' ἵχνος αὐτῶν (Eur. Rhes. 681 ff.), or:

ἄγε νῦν ἄγε πᾶς (Ar. Pax 512),

or:

χώρεϊ δεῦρο πᾶς ὑπηρέτης·

τόξευε, παῖε, σφενδόνην τίς μοι δότω (Ar. Av. 1186-7),

(where we may note the use of δότω as a second singular), and in: φύλαττε πᾶς (ib. 1190). We may conjecture that the use of ἄν with παῖε is due to the association between the imperative and the optative with ἄν in the apodosis of conditional sentences, where for: εἰ τοῦτο ποιοῖς, ἀμαρτάνοις ἄν we may say: εἰ τοῦτο ποιεῖς, ἀμάρτανε. We have often the infinitive used for the imperative, courteously giving a bare signification of the act to be done, as in: ἔκδοτε καὶ τιμὴν ἀποτινέμεν (Il. 3. 459), or: νεκρὸν Ἀχαιοῖσιν δώσω πάλιν, ὥς δὲ σὺ ρέζειν (Il. 22. 259), and in return we have the imperative used for the infinitive in: ὥστε μὴ λίαν στένε (Soph. El. 1172), or: ἐγὼ νῆ Δί' ἐρῶ καὶ γράψω δέ, ὥστε, ἄν βούλησθε, χειροτονήσατε (Dem. 129. 83 b). So, if ἀμάρτανε is used for ἀμαρτάνοις ἄν, we may get ἀμάρτανε ἄν, ἀμάρτανε being felt as equivalent to ἀμαρτάνοις. Speijer notes that the imperative in Sanskrit is used in dubitative questions (Skt. Syn. p. 276); and we read in Plato: τί οὖν; ὃ πολλάκις ἐρωτῶ, κείσθω νόμος ἡμῖν καὶ τύπος ἐκμαγεῖόν τε τρίτον τοῦτο, ἢ πῶς δοκεῖ; (Legg. 801 d). Behind the indefinites τίς and quis lie older interrogatives; so that in παῖε πᾶς τίς ἄν we have 'let all strike; who in that case will?'; or in: ἴτω τίς 'you shall go; who will?' or in: quis nuntiate 'who of you announce?' or in: vocatote aliqui 'ye shall call; who of you will?'.

Often in Greek we find the second singular imperative joined with a following plural imperative, or indicative, or subjunctive, or with two substantives joined by καί as its subjects. We read: ἀλλ' ἄγε μῖνεντε πάντες (Il. 2. 331), but: ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' οἱ ἔξ πρῶτον ἀκοντίσας (Od. 22. 252), εἰπέ μοι, τί φειδόμεσθα τῶν λίθων, ᾧ δημόται (Ar. Acharn. 319); φέρε, στήσωμεν ἡμέων αὐτῶν βασιλέα (Herod. 1. 97), but: φέρετε, τούτους ἀνευρόντες συγγέειν πειρᾶσθε αὐτούς (id. 4. 127), ἴδ' οἶον, ᾧ παῖδες, προσέμειξεν ἄφαρ τοῦπος τὸ θεοπρόπον ἡμῖν (Soph. Trach. 821-2), εἰπέ μοι, ᾧ Σώκρατες τε καὶ Ἰππόκρατες, ὥς τίνι ὄντι τῷ Πρωταγόρᾳ ἐν νῶ ἔχετε χρήματα τελεῖν (Plat. Prot. 311 d), εἰπέ μοι, ἔφη, ᾧ Σώκρατες τε καὶ ὑμεῖς οἱ ἄλλοι . . . πότερον παίζετε ταῦτα λέγοντες; (Euthyd. 283 b).

It is in similar use in Latin with age and cave, as in: age igitur intro abite (Pl. Mil. 928), age eamus ergo (ib. 78), age, alter istinc, alter hinc, adsistite (Rud. 808), cave dirumpatis (Poen. 117), facite illic homo . . . siet, . . . cave quisquam, &c. (Men. 992-4), agedum conferte nunc cum illis vitam P. Sullae (Cic. Sull. 72. 26), age nunc iter expediti latronis cum Milonis impedimentis comparate (Mil. 55. 21), age nunc illa videamus, iudices (Rose. Am. 105. 36), age sis nunc de ratione videamus (Tusc. 2. 42. 18), agedum, inquit, dictatorem . . . creemus (Liv. 2. 29. 11), procedat agedum ad pugnam (id. 7. 9. 8), mittite agedum legatos circa omnes Asiae urbes et quaerite (id. 38. 47. 11), huc age adeste (Sil. 11. 169). The dum affixed to age we shall consider later; it is suffixed to agite, in: agitedum clamorem . . . tollite (Liv. 3. 62. 4), or: agitedum . . . obvios sternite (id. 7. 33. 10); and agite is used just like age in: agite et cuncti laetum celebremus honorem (Aen. 5. 58).

Most grammarians are inclined to associate this irregularity with the use of these imperatives as interjections, a species of adverb and so indeclinable, as Monro puts it. But we have ἄγετε and φέρετε so used in Greek as well as ἄγε and φέρε, and so with agitedum and agite in Latin as well as agedum and age. The form of the so-called second singular of the present imperative seems worth consideration. As we see it in voca, vide, fer, ἄγε, φέρε, it is the root or stem of the verb and nothing more; there is nothing in it to mark person or number, tense or mood. When -to(d) is added, as in vocato, we get a tense mark and a future imperative; and then voca is partially relegated to the present. And when -te is added, as in vocate, we have a second plural, and then voca is partially relegated to the singular. But that for age and cave in Latin this is not wholly the case, we have just shown; there the old form is often used for the plural as well. To begin with, this root form was probably used as a general imperative covering all persons and both numbers and tenses, and merely designating in the simplest form the act to be done, as does the infinitive when used as an imperative, such infinitives, for example, as we find used as imperatives in κλέψον and κλέψαι. When the forms vocato and vocate were evolved, this old and general form was not at once strictly confined to its later function of a second singular, but in verbs that were in very common use, like ago or ἄγω, it still continued to be used as a general imperative.

When the plural was once evolved, the command was at times represented as directed to the leader of a band, or to some one of their number, as in: νῆα . . . ἰθύετε, φαίδιμ' Ὀδυσσεῦ (Od. 12. 82), or: προσέλθετ', ᾧ παῖ, πατρί (Soph. O. C. 1104), or:



χωρεῖτε τοῖνυν, ὦ Διόνυσ', εἴσω. τί δαί;  
ἵνα ξενίσω σφῶ πρὶν ἀποπλεῖν (Ar. Ran. 1479-80),

or: ἴτ', ἔφη, ὑμεῖς, ὦ Ἥριππίδα, καὶ διδάσκετε (Xen. Hell. 4. 1. 11). It is extended to the indicative in: ὦ τέκνον, ἦ παρέστον; (Soph. O. C. 1102), or: Ἀντίνο', οὕτως ἔστιν ὑπερφιάλοισι μεθ' ὑμῖν δαίνυσθαι (Od. 2. 310-11), or: Τιμόσθηνες, ὑμμε δ' ἐκλάρωσεν πότμος Ζηνὶ γενεθλίῳ (Pind. Ol. 8. 19-20), or: καθῆσθαι μοι δοκεῖ εἰς τὸ Θησεῖον πλεούσαις (Ar. Eq. 1311-12). We have the opposite in: ξεῖνοι, μὴ δῆτ' ἀδικηθῶ σοι πιστεῦσας καὶ μεταναστάς (Soph. O. C. 174-5). But from the majority we derive the use of the vocative for the first only in naming a number of persons addressed, as in:

Ζεῦ πάτερ, Ἰδηθεν μεδέων, κύδιότε, μέγιστε,  
Ἥελιός θ' ὅς πάντ' ἐφορᾷς καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούεις (Il. 3. 276-7),

a construction found in Sanskrit as well.

The use of the imperative as an interjection seems rather a result of its lack of concord than the cause of it. In Latin some imperatives, that have passed to other functions, are interesting here. Take *vel*, the 2nd sing. pres. imperative of *volo*, which seems to have passed to an adverb in: *Heus, pax, te tribus verbis volo. Vel trecentis* (Pl. Trin. 963-4), where it seems to me that we can still recover something of its primary force. In: *vel tu me vende vel face quid tibi libet* (Pers. 398) it has passed to a conjunction, when it is regarded as another form of *ve*, the Greek and Sanskrit *va*, cf. *a* and *ab*. So *eme*, the imperative of *emo*, is shortened to *em* in: *em, serva* (Ter. Ad. 172) and: *em tibi hominem* (Pl. Capt. 540), and regarded as an interjection. So both *esto* and *ἔστω* are used as adverbs.

Still more interesting is the adverb that has taken on the form of an imperative. Herodian gives us *δεῦρω* as the old form, which Dindorf adopted in Il. 3. 240; for in this form it is clearly parallel to *ἄνω* and *κάτω*. It is made up, according to Prellwitz, of *δε -υ -ρω*, where the *δε* is that in *οἴκαδε* and in *quamde*, being a reduced form of the *-do* in *quando* and in *donec*, the Latin cognate of our 'to'. The *υ* is the *υ* in *οὔτος*, being a reduced form of *αὔ* 'again'. For the shortening to the usual form *δεῦρο*, compare *ἄμᾱ* with the Doric *ἀμᾶ*. It is found coupled closely with the imperative, just as were the invariable imperatives with which we were just dealing; compare *δεῦρ' ἴθι* (Il. 3. 130) with *βάσκ' ἴθι* (Il. 2. 8). It is felt as equivalent to *ἄγε* in: *δεῦρ' ἐς τοὺς φύλακας καταβήκομεν* (Il. 10. 97) and in: *δεῦρο παρὰ Σωκράτη* (Plat. Theaet. 144 d). Consequently when it is coupled with *ἄγετε* we find it attracted to: *δεῦτε ἄγετε* (Il. 7. 350). Then the use of *δεῦτε* is extended, as in: *δεῦτε φίλοι* (Il. 13. 481), and it is coupled with the singular, as in: *δεῦτ' ἄγε* (Od. 8. 11), where it takes the place and plays the part of the significant imperative, which *ἄγε* is used to introduce. This last use led Buttmann to regard it as a contraction for *δεῦρ' ἴτε* and Monro to claim *δεῦρο* as the second singular imperative, of which *δεῦτε* was the second plural.

## XXI

### USE OF THE INFINITIVE FOR THE IMPERATIVE

THIS use is plainest and most easily traced in Greek. There we have it used alone, as in: *αἴθι μένειν* (Il. 10. 65), or co-ordinate with an imperative, as in: *ἔρχεσθον κλισίην . . . Ἀχιλλῆος . . . ἀγέμεν Βρισηίδα* (Il. 1. 322-3), and with a future indicative in: *εὐνάσω ἐξεῖης· σὺ δ' εὐ κρίνασθαι ἐταίρους* (Od. 4. 408). It is used in a prohibition in: *μὴ δὴ μοι ἀπόπροθεν ἰσχύμεν ἵππους* (Il. 17. 501), and is repeated in this use in: *ἀλλ' εἴ οἱ φάσθαι πυκινὸν ἔπος ἢδ' ὑποθέσθαι καὶ οἱ σημαίνειν* (Il. 11. 788-9). It is joined with an imperative in the third person in: *τεύχεα συλήσας φερέτω κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας, σῶμα δὲ οἴκαδ' ἐμὸν δόμεναι πάλιν* (Il. 7. 78-9) and evidently stands for *δότω*, and its subject is in the accusative in: *Ζεῦ ἄνα, Τηλέμαχόν μοι ἐν ἀνδράσιν ὄλβιον εἶναι* (Od. 17. 354). In the general prayer: *Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἦ Αἴαντα λαχεῖν* (Il. 7. 179) it seems used for the optative; and in *αἶ γάρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ . . . οἷος Νήρικον εἶλον . . . ἐφεστάμεναι καὶ ἀμύνειν ἄνδρας μνηστῆρας* (Od. 24. 376-81) it is of the first person. Its use is not confined to Homer; we read: *γυμνὸν σπείρειν, γυμνὸν δὲ βοωτεῖν, γυμνὸν δ' ἀμάειν* (Hes. Opp. 391-2), *ὦ Ζεῦ, ἐκγενέσθαι μοι Ἀθηναίους τίσασθαι* (Herod. 5. 105); *πειθεσθε οὖν . . . καὶ παραστῆναι* (Thuc. 6. 34. 9), *οἳ δ' ἰκάνομεν, φάσκειν Μυκήνας τὰς πολυχρύσους ὀρᾶν* (Soph. El. 8-9), *ἀκούετε λεῶ, τοὺς γεωργοὺς ἀπιέναι κτλ.* (Ar. Pax 551), *οἱ ἀπόστολοι . . . τοῖς . . . ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν, χαίρειν* (Acts 15. 23). A survey of the few examples I have selected shows how vain it is to try to account for this use of the infinitive through the influence of a previous imperative, as Monro tries to do for Homer. In a very large

number of examples there is no imperative preceding, and where it does, it may come long before, as in the example quoted from Thucydides.

But this use of the infinitive is very old, and certainly was usual among the primitive Indo-Germanics. It is present in the German branch, and is in constant use in Germany to-day in such phrases as *Schritt fahren*, *Rechts gehen*. Whitney speaks of the use of the infinitive in Sanskrit without a copula that has quite nearly the value of an imperative, as in: *tān nāi 'varī kartavāi* (R. V.) 'that must not be done so' (Gram. 982 d); and adds 'The infinitives in -dhyāi and -ṣaṇi . . . are those in which the imperative value is most distinctly to be recognized'. For Zend, Reichelt (*Awest. El.* 703) gives me many examples of the use, mostly for the imperative, but in one case in union with an optative, and with optative meaning as in Homer. Any account of its use must be founded on the nature and structure of the infinitive itself rather than on a chance connexion with a preceding imperative. And such is the account Apollonius Dyscolus gives us of this idiom, as we shall see.

It is natural to think that so old and usual an idiom must have been present in early Latin, as well as in Greek. There are but two direct examples of its use that I can cite; though it seems to me that its presence is one of the most prominent facts in the language, when we try to account for the modal uses of the Latin infinitive. In Valerius Flaccus we read: *tu socios adhibere sacris* (3. 412), usually set down as a Hellenism. But in: *quod superest, sufferre pedes properate laborem* (Prop. 3. 21. 21) the Itali and Baehrens change *sufferre* to *sufferte*. Servius gives us: *si vobis audentem extrema cupido certa sequi* (Aen. 2. 349-50), but adds that some read *audendi*, others *audenti*; *sed neutrum procedit. Ergo 'audentem' legendum est*. The most difficult reading of the three is *audendi*; and while it is hard to see how it arose out of *audentem*, it seems easy to trace the easy reading *audentem* from *audendi*. A scribe finding it hard to translate *audendi* here, as does Servius, might write *audenti*, as we are told was the case, and make it depend on *sequi*, as though it were for *obsequi*. But it is not for *obsequi* here, and so *audenti* would be corrected to *audentem*, a reading easy to understand. But if we restore *audendi*, we must punctuate: *si vobis audendi extrema cupido certa, sequi* 'if you have a settled desire to dare the worst, follow'; where *sequi* is the infinitive for the imperative. I have no recollection of the idiom in Plautus, which goes to show that it had become very rare. But in: *hic tamen hanc mecum poteras requiescere noctem* (Buc. 1. 79) the easiest explanation is to make *requiescere* an imperative, and treat *poteras* as parenthetic. When we compare the oblique in: *quae se inhoneste optavit parere hic ditias potius quam in patria honeste pauper viveret* (Ter. And. 797-8) with the direct in: *potius quam venias in periculum . . . dividiom face* (Adelph. 240-1), plainly, just as *viveret* is the oblique correspondent to *venias*, so *parere* corresponds to *face*, and is an infinitive used imperatively balancing *viveret*, which is a subjunctive used for an imperative.

But we have in Latin an idiom by no means rare, which when it occurs in Greek, has been always explained as dependent on this use of the infinitive for the imperative. We read: *ἃ δειλοί, πόσ' ἴμεν; τί κακῶν ἱμείρετε τούτων;* (Od. 10. 431); where the person of *ἱμείρετε* forbids our taking *ἴμεν* as the first plural, and: *ὃ βασιλεῦ, κότερον λέγειν πρὸς σὲ τὰ νοέων τυγχάνω, ἢ σιγᾶν ἐν τῷ παρόντι χρόνῳ* (Herod. 1. 88), where *λέγειν* or *ἴμεν* seems a repetition of the infinitive by the speaker in reluctant response to a command usually implied. It is much more common in Latin, where in: *mene incepto desistere victam* (Aen. 1. 37) it is evidently an indignant protest by Juno against the command imposed on her by fate. In her anger she repeats incredulously the command conveyed to her, as though she had not heard aright, just as does Croesus in the example cited from Herodotus; and so the idiom indicates plainly that the command was conveyed by the infinitive, not the imperative. So, too, in: *servom antestari? vide* (Pl. Curc. 623), *tantum laborem capere ob talem filium* (Ter. And. 870), *quid enim sedere totos dies in villa ista?* (Cic. Att. 12. 44. 2). We find the idiom in the second part of:

*Mene salis placidi voltum fluctusque quietos*

*Ignorare iubes? Mene huic confidere monstro?* (Aen. 5. 848-9),

where Virgil explains it in the sense I have indicated by supplying *iubes* with it in the first part. But in the great majority of examples of the idiom it passes to the expression of an exclamation at a shocking misfortune, as in: *mene Iliacis occumbere campis non potuisse!* (Aen. 1. 97-8) or: *huncine solem tam nigrum surrexe mihi!* (Sat. 1. 9. 72-3). That the interrogation and not the exclamation is the older force here seems plain when we have this form transferred to indirect, as we find it in: *existimabant . . . postremo quid esse levius aut turpius quam auctore hoste de summis rebus capere consilium?* (B. G. 5. 28, fin.), or: *sententia quae censebat reddenda bona . . . nam aliter qui credituros eos, non vana ab legatis super rebus tantis adferri?* (Liv. 2. 4. 3-4). For plainly *esse* or *credituros* here has been transferred from such uses of the infinitive indirect as we have just given. Naturally the subjunctive is also used in such cases, as in: *docebat*

etiam . . . id eis eripi quis pati posset? (B. G. 1. 43), or: legati . . . rogaverunt . . . eane meritos crederet quisquam, &c. (Liv. 7. 20. 3-5).

In: poscere fata tempus (Aen. 6. 45-6) have we a complex or a simple sentence? Those who regard Skt. davane, or Greek δοῦναι as the primary and typical form of the infinitive, and treat it as the dative of a noun, 'for the giving', will regard it as a simple sentence. But we have also the Skt. kartum, the Latin creatum, apparently an old accusative, 'for the making', and this gives what is termed the infinitive proper in both Sanskrit and Umbro-Oscan. We have, thirdly, a form without any case-ending, and showing the infinitive stem only, as in δόμεν, or the Ionic ιδέειν (probably old ιδέφεν), giving us the usual Greek infinitive ιδέειν; and this may well be the oldest of the three. It is true that, if we except first supines, Latin infinitives seem all of the first class, the datives. But in Greek active forms like ἀγέμεν or μένειν seem most usual when used as imperatives; in Homer they are in ending the same as the German forms schreiten, fahren; and gerade stehen is closely parallel to αὐθι μένειν.

To return to our question: Is not: melius non tangere (Hor. Sat. 2. 1. 45) a complex sentence, being composed of two: non tangere. Melius erit? And so with: poscere fata. Tempus est. There cannot be much doubt that: me licet unda ferat (Prop. 2. 26. 44) is a complex sentence; what of: me licet undam ferre? Is it not for: me undam ferre. Licet? We compare with: me undam ferre 'let the wave bear me' the Homeric: Αἶαντα λαχεῖν 'let Ajax win', or Hesiod's γυμνὸν σπείρειν. When we compare these with: οὐ δ' ἐν κρίνασθαι, it is evident that the accusative with the infinitive is not primary, but a later development to be paralleled with that in: volo te venire, which again is complex for: te venire, volo 'do thou come, it is my wish'. And so: quid vis faciam? (Ter. Eun. 1054) seems complex for: quid faciam? Quid vis? a use of three for four. We have the two constructions confused in: mene vis dem ipse in pedes? (Pl. Capt. 121), showing how lightly the Roman passed from one to the other.

Of course this shows us the real nature of our modal infinitive, if it is true; and to me all seems to point in this direction. Monro (Hom. Gram. 241) thinks we may connect the use of the infinitive for the imperative with the use of the infinitive to imply *fitness* or *obligation*. This, pointing to such uses as we have in: ἔστι μὲν εὔδειν (Od. 15. 392), ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥρη εὔδειν (Od. 11. 330-1), οὐ γὰρ ἔοικ' ὀτρυνέμεν (Il. 4. 286), ἔμε δὲ χρὴ γήραϊ . . . πεῖθεσθαι (Il. 23. 644-5), modal infinitives all, is plainly parallel with the course we are following. But Monro thinks of explaining the use for the imperative from such constructions by the ellipse of ἔστι or χρὴ, which is explaining the simple from the complex. He is embarrassed, because he sees this mode of explanation does not help with the German use in Schritt fahren. Is it not more reasonable to try to explain the complex from the simple sentence?

When we turn to Apollonius Dyscolus (Synt. III. 14), we read: 'I believe that Homer, following his custom of avoiding imperative modes of expression, introduces the infinitive for the imperative, as a general form of the verb, into which, as I have just shown, all special moods can be converted'. In III. 13 he had shown that the infinitive is a general form lying at the base of all moods; so that in περιπατῶ we have ὀρισάμην περιπατεῖν, in περιπατοῖμι, ἠδξάμην περιπατεῖν, in περιπάτει, προσέταξα περιπατεῖν. His 'general form of the verb' corresponds closely with our usual definition of the infinitive as the form of the verb which gives its simple meaning, without reference to number or person. This form, called in Latin infinitivum, in Greek ἀπαρέμφατον 'with no παρεμφάσεις or accessory meanings', would naturally be, not the case form δόφεναι, which is a dative, but the simple stem form δόμεν or ἔμμεν or ιδέειν; which may approximate very closely in meaning to the root form da, or voca, or fer, that we found to be the old universal forms for command, out of which dato, or vocate, or ferunto developed. Just what additional meaning the stem-forming suffixes -μεν or -φεν bring to the root, I do not know; and until we know this, we cannot accurately determine the relation of da or δός to δόμεν; but they seem to have been very much alike.

Brugmann (Gr. Synt. 170) thinks that a satisfactory explanation of the union of πρὶν with the infinitive, already fully developed in Homer, has not yet been found. Monro's (Hom. Gram. 236) difficulty with πρὶν δόμεναι (Il. 1. 98) 'before the giving' seems to be his feeling that πρὶν should take an ablative, not a dative. But in: πρὶν ἐλθεῖν νῆας Ἀχαιῶν (Il. 9. 403) ἐλθεῖν is neither a dative nor an ablative; Apollonius felt it to be, not a noun, but the general form of the verb, and we know that in Greek, even in Attic Greek, what the Greek grammarian called the πρόθεσις, the Latin grammarian the praepositio, was not a preposition in our sense of the word. Dionysius Thrax finds the πρόθεσις . . . ἐν τε συνθέσει καὶ συντάξει (18); i.e. he feels that σύν is as much a preposition in συντίθημι as in σύν θεῶ. Far less can we treat πρὶν as a preposition in our sense of the word in considering the early union of sentences which joined πρὶν with the infinitive. Perhaps δόμεναι is properly regarded as a noun; but is δόμεν a noun or a verb? Certainly ἄγε and fer, which seem its

nearest parallels in syntax, can hardly be regarded as nouns. I suppose that roots, as such, belong to a time in the history of language when the distinction between the noun and the verb was not yet developed.

Let us take first the easier construction of *πρίν* with the negative, as in:

τὴν δ' ἐγὼ οὐ λύσω πρίν μιν καὶ γῆρας ἔπεισιν  
ἡμετέρῳ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ (Il. 1. 29-30),

‘her I will not release; sooner shall old age come upon her in our home’, where the adverbial use of *πρίν* is evident. So in Il. 18. 283, also Od. 13. 427; 15. 31. We turn to its use with the infinitive in:

οὐδέ κεν ὥς ἔτι θυμὸν ἐμὸν πείσει Ἀγαμέμνων,  
πρίν γ' ἀπὸ πᾶσαν ἐμοὶ δόμεναι θυμαλγέα λώβην (Il. 9. 386-7),

‘but not even so shall Agamemnon any longer persuade my mind. Sooner let him pay me back all the bitter despite’, where by taking *δόμεναι* as equivalent to an imperative in parataxis, we get exactly the sense we want, leading us to ‘till he have paid back’, the usual translation. So in:

οὐδ' ὃ γε πρίν Δαναοῖσιν ἀεικέα λοιγὸν ἀπόσσει,  
πρίν γ' ἀπὸ πατρὶ φίλῳ δόμεναι ἐλικώπιδα κούρην (Il. 1. 97-8),

‘nor will he before remove the loathly pestilence from the Danaans. Let Agamemnon first give back to her father the bright-eyed maid’. And in:

ὦ Κίρκη, τίς γάρ κεν ἀνὴρ, ὃς ἐναΐσιμος εἴη,  
πρίν τλαίῃ πάσσασθαι ἐδητύος ἡδὲ ποτῆτος,  
πρίν λύσασθ' ἐτάρους καὶ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι ἰδέσθαι; (Od. 10. 383-5),

‘O Circe, what man, who would be righteous, would endure first to take meat and drink? Sooner let him view his companions face to face, and set them free’. In all four examples cited the principal clause has a negative expressed or implied, and has either a future verb, or a verb in the optative used as a future. The indicative used in the dependent clause of the first is clearly a voluntative future, coming very close to the meaning of the imperatives for which infinitives are used in the remaining three.

But for this imperative force we have subjunctives substituted in:

μήτηρ δ' οὐ με φίλη πρίν γ' εἶα θωρήσσεσθαι,  
πρίν γ' αὐτὴν ἐλθοῦσαν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι ἰδῶμαι (Il. 18. 189-90),

‘and my mother does not permit me to arm myself sooner. Sooner must I see her plainly coming’. Monro sees this parataxis in:

οὐδέ μιν ἀνστήσεις, πρίν καὶ κακὸν ἄλλο πάθῃσθα (Il. 24. 551),

‘you will not raise him. Sooner shall you suffer some new evil’. He thinks that ‘the subjunctive was directly modelled on the existing use with the infinitive, that *πρίν πάθῃσθα* simply took the place of *πρίν παθεῖν*, when a more definite conditional force was wanted’. It is quite simple to substitute the subjunctive for the imperative, and for the infinitive used as an imperative; we have here a parallel to the Latin *licet venire* and *licet venias*. The ‘simple’ substitution of a subjunctive for an infinitive not so used might call for further explanation. But we can understand the transference of this subjunctive to the optative after a past tense, as in:

οὐκ ἔθελεν φεύγειν, πρίν πειρήσασθαι Ἀχιλλεύς (Il. 21. 580).

We find the infinitive used for the imperative with *πρίν* in both the principal and dependent clauses in:

Ζεῦ κύδιστε, μέγιστε . . .  
μὴ πρίν ἐπ' ἡέλιον δύναι καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἐθεῖν,  
πρίν με κατὰ πρηνὲς βαλέειν Πριάμοιο μέλαθρον (Il. 2. 412-4).

‘O Zeus most glorious, most great . . . let not the sun go down thereon, nor darkness come on. Sooner let me have cast to ground Priam’s palace’. So, too, in:

μή μοι πρίν ἰέναι, Πατρόκλεες ἱπποκέλευθε,  
νῆας ἐπὶ γλαφυράς, πρίν Ἑκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο  
αἵματόεντα χιτῶνα περὶ στήθεσσι δαΐξαι (Il. 16. 839-41),

‘come not sooner to me, Patroclus driver of steeds, to the hollow ships. Sooner shall thou have rent about his breast the gory tunic of man-slaying Hector’. We have, to parallel this, a voluntative future in the principal, and an infinitive in the

dependent clause in:

οὐ γὰρ πρὶν πολέμοιο μεδήσομαι αἱματόεντος,  
πρὶν γ' υἱὸν Πριάμοιο δαΐφρονος, Ἴκτορα δῖον,  
Μυρμιδόνων ἐπὶ τε κλισίας καὶ νῆας ἰκέσθαι (Il. 9. 650-2),

‘for not sooner will I take thought of bloody war. Sooner let noble Hector, wise Priam’s son, come to the huts and ships of the Myrmidons’. And so, too, in:

οὐ σε πρὶν κτεριῶ, πρὶν γ' Ἴκτορος ἐνθάδ' ἐνεῖκαι  
τεύχεα καὶ κεφαλὴν, μεγαθύμου σοῖο φονῆος (Il. 18. 334-5),

‘not sooner will I bury thee. Sooner let me bear hither the arms and head of Hector, thy high-hearted slayer’. I might also translate ‘let me bury’; the parallel shows how closely equivalent to the infinitives cited above are the voluntative futures I have just quoted.

But the future proper and the voluntative future find expression in Greek by the same tense, and by the same forms. When such is the case, it need not surprise us that the infinitive, which is equivalent to a voluntative future, should likewise assume the meaning of the future proper. In:

μὴ πρὶν παύειν χεῖρας ὁμοίου πολέμοιο,  
πρὶν κατὰ Ἰλίοφι κλυτὰ τείχεα λαὸν ἐέλσαι  
Τρωϊκόν, ὃς κε φύγησι (Il. 21. 294-6),

‘hold not thy hand from hazardous battle. Sooner shall thou have pent the fleeing Trojan host within Ilion’s renowned walls’, we have still the imperative force in both clauses. But in:

οὐδέ τις ἔτλη  
πρὶν πιεῖν, πρὶν λείψαι ὑπερμενεί Κρονίωνι (Il. 7. 480-1),

‘nor did any endure sooner to drink. Sooner must he make libation to sovereign Zeus’, we have in πιεῖν a future proper, but in λείψαι an imperative. In:

οὐδέ τι γυῖα  
πρὶν κάμνει, πρὶν πάντας ἐρωῆσαι πολέμοιο (Il. 19. 169-70),

‘nor does a man at all feel weary in limb, before all give back from the battle’, we have a gnomic present in the principal, and a future in the dependent clause, though in that future the older voluntative sense seems not wholly lost. In:

πρὶν γάρ τοι πολύμητις ἐλεύσεται ἐνθάδ' Ὀδυσσεύς,  
πρὶν τούτους τόδε τόξον ἐύξοον ἀμφαφύωντας  
νευρήν τ' ἐντανύσαι διοῖστευσαί τε σιδήρου (Od. 19. 585-7),

‘for, lo! the many-counselled Ulysses will come hither, before these men, for all their handling of the polished bow, will have strung it and shot the arrow through the iron’, where we note that the principal clause is not negative; we have a future proper in the principal clause, with two infinitives in the dependent no longer voluntatives, but futures proper. And so in:

στῆτ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ λαὸν ἐρυκάκετε πρὸ πυλάων  
πάντη ἐποιχόμενοι, πρὶν αὐτ' ἐν χερσὶ γυναικῶν  
φεύγοντας πεσέειν, δῆϊοισι δὲ χάρμα γενέσθαι (Il. 6. 80-2),

‘stand there, and ranging the host every whither rally them before the gates, ere yet they fall fleeing into their women’s arms, and become a joy to the foe’, we pass to a use of πρὶν with a future that implies prevention. In:

οὐδ' ὅσα φασὶν  
Ἴλιον ἐκτῆσθαι, εὖ ναιόμενον πολίεθρον,  
τὸ πρὶν ἐπ' εἰρήνης, πρὶν ἔλθειν υἷας Ἀχαιῶν (Il. 9. 401-3),

‘what wealth men say the well-peopled city of Ilios was possessed of in yore in peaceful days, before the sons of the Achaeans came’, where the future is related to a state of things now past, and itself designates an event now past, though in the future at the time marked by the verb in its principal clause; of course the future sense is obscured somewhat for the hasty reader. In:

ἀλλ' ἔπευ· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἔστιν ἀποσταδὸν Ἀργείοισι  
μάρνασθαι, πρὶν γ' ἢ κατακτάμεν ἢ κατ' ἄκρης

Ἴλιον αἰπεινὴν ἐλέειν κτάσθαι τε πολίτας (Il. 15. 556-8),

‘but follow close; for no longer may we wage war with the Argives in guise aloof; sooner must we either slay them, or they will capture lofty Ilios from its summit down and slay the citizens’, where we have an imperative joined with a future by ἢ . . . ἢ. In:

ἀτὰρ οὐ μὲν σφῶϊ γ’ οἴω  
πρίν γ’ ἀποπαύσεσθαι, πρίν γ’ ἢ ἕτερόν γε πεσόντα  
αἵματος ἄσαι Ἄρηα (Il. 5. 287-9),

‘but I deem ye twain will not sooner cease. Sooner else must one or other have fallen and glutted Ares with his blood’, we have a future joined with an imperative. In:

μηδὲ πρίν ἀπόπαυε τεὸν μένος, ἀλλ’ ὅπότε’ ἂν δῇ  
φθέγγεσθαι ἐγὼν ἰάχουσα, τότε σχεῖν ἀκάματον πῦρ (Il. 21. 340-1),

‘nor sooner stay thy rage. Only whensoever I shall cry aloud, then check the unwearying flame’, we have πρίν with an imperative coordinated with τότε and an infinitive, a construction that should make it plain that such infinitives are used as imperatives. In:

ἀλλ’ ὅμοσον μὴ μητρὶ φίλῃ τάδε μυθήσασθαι  
πρίν γ’ ὅτ’ ἂν ἐνδεκάτῃ τε δωδεκάτῃ τε γένηται (Od. 2. 373-4),

‘but swear not to tell those things sooner to my mother. Whenever it will be the eleventh or twelfth morning (then shalt thou tell her)’, and in:

ἢ τοι ἔφην γε  
οὐ πρίν μνηθιμὸν καταπαυσέμεν, ἀλλ’ ὅπότε’ ἂν δῇ  
νῆας ἐμάς ἀφίκηται αὐτὴ τε πτόλεμός τε (Il. 16. 61-3),

‘yet in truth I said I would not sooner cease from my wrath. But whenever to my own ships would come the war-cry and the battle (then I would cease)’, evidently the clauses parallel to τότε ἔχειν, as involving repetitions of verbs already expressed, have been omitted, and must be supplied in determining the value of πρίν μυθήσασθαι or πρίν καταπαυσέμεν.

I read in Sallust: nam idem velle atque idem nolle, ea demum firma amicitia est (Cat. 20. 4). But in Martial’s well-known epigram beginning: vitam quae faciant beatiorem . . . haec sunt (10. 47) his list, starting with res . . . relictas, non ingratus ager, &c., ends with:

Quod sis esse velis, nihilque malis;  
Summum nec metuas diem nec optes,

where from the example in Sallust one would expect infinitives, not subjunctives. But when I recall the equivalence of licet ire and licet eas, the use of the subjunctive for the infinitive used as an imperative is clear at once. So in:

Omnibus idem animus, scelerata excedere terra,  
Linqui pollutum hospitium et dare classibus Austros (Aen. 3. 60-1),

the explanation of excedere, linqui, dare, as imperatives that define animus is much clearer to me, than their definition as explicative infinitives setting forth that purpose.

With this use of the infinitive in view I understand its use with iubeo and impero. With iubeo in poetry I have (1) the use with the dative of the person bidden and the accusative of the command in: non haec miserae sperare iubebas (Catull. 64. 140), (2) the accusative with the infinitive parallel to Αἴαντα λαχεῖν in: haec ubi nos praecepta iubent deponere dona (Aen. 6. 632), (3) with the subjunctive equivalent to the imperative in: magna dicione iubeto Carthago premat Ausoniam (Aen. 10. 53-4), (4) with the subjunctive with ut in: tu deinde iubeto ut certet Amyntas (Buc. 5. 15) ‘Thy bidding shall be: Would that Amyntas may compete’. Of these four constructions prose has adopted the second as the easiest and plainest. With impero in poetry we have four constructions closely parallel: (1) flectere iter sociis imperat (Aen. 7. 35-6), (2) tolli miserabile corpus imperat (Aen. 11. 59-60), (3) letoque det imperat Argum (Ov. Met. 1. 670), (4) Apollo mihi ex oraculo imperat ut ego illic oculos exuram (Pl. Men. 840-1). The use of the mere subjunctive with impero seems late and rare, as imperator was not primarily the commander-in-chief, but rather the quartermaster (induparare), he who gets into the camp the provisions for the soldiers. Here, too, prose has selected the syntax best fitting his dignity, the subjunctive with ut, the form adapted to request rather than command.

POSTGATE (I.-G.F. 4. 255) has shown that the omission of *se* in a construction like: *summasque minatur deiecturum arces* (Aen. 12. 654-5) is probably due to analogy with: *altero (gladio) te occisurum ait* (Pl. Cas. 692-3) ‘with one sword he says he will kill thee’. Here *occisurum* is not yet the future participle, but is the old invariable future infinitive *occisuresom* ‘to be for the slaying’, out of which the future participle was later developed. Probably this future infinitive was originally constructed with verbs like *spero* and *promitto* in phrases such as: *spero venturum* ‘I hope to come’ and: *promittebat daturum* ‘he promised to give’, where *daturum* would be exactly parallel to *ποιήσεν* in *ἔφη ποιήσεν*. Neither *spero* nor *promitto* was originally a verb of saying; but *polliceor* is, being a compound of *liceor* ‘I bid at auction’. Through it would arise a syntactic syncretism between *spero* and *promitto* on the one hand, and *aio* and *dico* on the other; we should have from this: *aio te occisurum*, following: *aio te errare*; and with *spero*, following *aio te victum esse*, *spero hostium copias ibi occupatas futurum* (cf. Quadrig. apud Gell. 1. 7. 9). Indeed with *spero*, when the subject of the infinitive was other than that of the principal verb, that subject was expressed, as we see in: *est quod speremus, deos bonis bene facturum* (Quadrig. ap. Gell. 1. 7. 9). From a syncretism of this syntax with: *dico illos profectos esse* we should get: *dico illos profectos esse*, and: *spero deos bonis bene facturos esse*, the regular classical constructions. But we get also, according to Gellius, *dixerunt omnia ex sententia processurum esse* (Val. Ant. ap. Gell. 1. 7. 10), where we have the influence of the older form swaying the resultant form to *processurum*. Indeed Gellius read in Cicero: *fiducia . . . quocumque venerint, hanc sibi rem praesidio sperant futurum* (Verr. 2. 5. 167. 65), where all our editors read *futuram*. Gellius supports his reading by a citation from C. Gracchus: *credo ego inimicos meos hoc dicturum*, and from Laberius: *non putavi hoc eam facturum*. That his authority is worth more than the testimony of our manuscripts, I think there can be no doubt.

In like fashion from a syncretism of: *aio facturum* with: *aio illum profectum esse* would issue *aio profectum*, cf. *testor . . . vitavisse* (Aen. 2. 432-3), and *nos abiisse rati* (Aen. 2. 25); and from *aio (me) profectum esse*, formed after *aio (illum) profectum esse*, would result by attraction: *aio profectus esse*, as in: *ait fuisse navium celerrimus* (Catull. 4. 2), or: *uxor invicti Iovis esse nescis* (Od. 3. 27. 73), or: *vir bonus et sapiens dignis ait esse paratus* (Ep. 1. 7. 22). Following *ait fore bonus*, where *fore* is like *esse* a present infinitive in form, we should have *ait venturum* transformed to *ait venire* and so we should have *sperat venire*, or: *hoc sperem Italiam contingere caelo* (Aen. 5. 18), or: *operam dare promittitis* (Pl. Trin. 5).

At first sight: *aio profectus esse* does not look like Latin; but when we compare: *quas hodie adolescens Diabolus ipsi daturus dixit* (Pl. Asin. 634), *visura et quamvis numquam speraret Ulixen* (Prop. 2. 9. 7), *non aliter caeco nocturni turbine Cori scit peritura ratis* (Stat. Theb. 7. 791-2), *quoad summos illi promitterent honores habituri mihi* (Apul. Met. 7. 14), we see examples of the syntax in all periods of older Latinity. If Latin allows of *dicturus dixit* as well as *se dicturum dixit*, we may expect to find corresponding irregularities in oblique. And I note:

quam sedem somnia volgo

Vana tenere ferunt, foliisque sub omnibus haerent (Aen. 6. 283-4),

where we have the figure of three for four, i.e. *tenere-ferunt*, *haerent*, for *tenere-ferunt-haerere-ferunt*; and I find in Tacitus: *validissimos equitum incurrere latus, Stertinum cum ceteris turmis circumgreditergaque invadere iubet; ipse in tempore adfuturus* (Ann. 2. 17. 1) and: *at si auxilia et socii adversum abscedentes legiones armarentur, civile bellum suscipi: periculosa severitas, flagitiosa largitio; seu nihil militi, seu omnia concedentur, in ancipiti res publica* (Ann. 1. 36. 2-3).

Plautus’s *daturus dixit* seems to have been extended by analogy to the perfect infinitive at times, as in: *pulsata indignis saepe queror manibus* (Prop. 1. 16. 6), *sensit medios delapsus in hostes* (Aen. 2. 377), *gaudent perfusi sanguine fratrum* (Geo. 2. 510), *quo nunc Turnus ovat spolio gaudetque potitus* (Aen. 10. 500). Probably the analogy of these led Virgil from: *intentique ora tenebant* (Aen. 2. 1) to: *defixique ora tenebant* (Aen. 8. 520); or from: *infert se saeptus nubila* (Aen. 1. 439), or: *sese tulit obvia* (Aen. 1. 314), to: *tectusque tenet se* (Aen. 10. 802).

In: *quia, qualiacumque leguntur ista, saluator scribere non potuit* (Mart. 1. 70. 17-18) *saluator* is evidently short for: *salutaturus usque adesset*. This use of the nomen agentis for the future participle seems pro-ethnic. Mr. Postgate (Class. Rev. 5. 301 and I.-G.F. 4. 252) has given reasons, as we have seen, for thinking *venturus* a late development from the

invariable infinitive *venturum*. To the question: How did the idea expressed by the future participle thus evolved find expression before it was developed? the answer seems plain: By the *nomen agentis*. We find it so used in prose as well, as in: *ipse Hannibal, qua turris mobilis . . . agebatur, hortator aderat* (Liv. 21. 11. 7), and it occurs repeatedly in Tacitus, as in: *rector iuveni et ceteris periculorum praemiorumque ostentator* (Ann. 1. 24. 3), *neque legatus aut tribunus moderator adfuit* (Ann. 1. 49. 3). Turning to Sanskrit we find the cognate *nomen agentis* used with or without the verb 'to be' as a periphrastic future: *data* (= Latin *dator*) is 'he will give', and *dataras* (= Latin *datores*) 'they will give', but *datāsmi* (= Latin *dator sum*) is 'I shall give' and *datāsthas* (= *datores estis*) 'you will give' (Whitney, Skt. Gram. 942-4). The obvious solution of this coincidence in syntax seems to be the reference of both uses to a pro-ethnic use of *dator* in the sense of the later *daturus*.



# III

## L A T I N P O E T I C D I C T I O N

### XXIII

#### POETIC DICTION

WHEN we turn from Caesar or Cicero to Virgil or Horace, we feel at once the marked difference between the diction of prose and that of poetry. At first we are inclined to regard prose as much the simpler and less ornate; for we are apt to forget that *ornatus* is a later form of *ordinatus*. We do best here to begin by ascertaining and comparing the primary meanings of the words ‘prose’ and ‘verse’.

‘Prosa’ is an assimilated feminine of *prorsus*, short for *provorsus* ‘straightforward’. A similar assimilation gives us *pessum* for *persum* and *rusus* for *rursus*. *Versus*, older *vorsus*, is the past participle of *vorto* ‘I turn’, which has become a noun of the fourth declension, as have *adventus*, *auditus*, *conventus*, *gestus*, *gressus*, *haustus*, and many others. So numerous are the past participles thus converted, that, though the older nouns of the fourth are mostly feminine or neuter, our grammarians speak of nouns of the fourth in *-us* as masculine, and treat the feminines as exceptions. But a comparison with Greek makes it easier to see why nouns like *nurus* and *socrus* should end in *-us*. These past participles seem first to have appeared among nouns as neuters of the second declension. Servius (ad *Aen.* 10. 689) notes of *monitis*, that while Persius (1. 79) used *monitus* as the acc. pl., we have not a dative either singular or plural of the fourth. And we find words like *senatus* and *tumultus* partly of the second, partly of the fourth; i.e. the transference to the fourth is not yet complete. The word ‘versus’ indicates that the sentence does not go straight on as in prose, but, after completing a definite series of long and short syllables, turns back to repeat itself, or to complete another of a definite series. Often the closing syllables of the first verse have their sound reflected in that of a following verse; and this we call ‘rhyme’. This effect, characteristic of modern verse, is almost as common in the prose as in the verse of the Greeks and Romans. As an example of rhyme in Latin prose I might cite Augustine’s comment on the words of Peter: ‘*bonum est nos hic esse*’; *in monte requiescere cupiebas; descende laborare, praedica veritatem, habe caritatem; et sic pervenies ad aeternitatem, ubi invenies securitatem*.

Even more significant for our purpose of distinction than the root-words in *prosa* and *versus* are the endings *-a* and *-us*. The words are adjectives primarily, and the nouns to be supplied with them are, for *prosa*, *oratio*, and for *versus*, *sermo*. *Sermo* is the talk we hold with our fellows in the parlour or on the street, easy and unconstrained, without careful choice of words or constructions. *Oratio* is the style of speech we strive to attain when we ascend the rostra to instruct or entertain a select audience. ‘The applause of listening Senates to command’, you must have at your command a style of speech at once clear, dignified, and elegant; every word should at once convey to your hearers its proper meaning; and all your words must be chosen and connected in a way that will enhance the respect of your hearers for you and for themselves. To master such a style is the most difficult, and perhaps the highest, of literary achievements; and any degree of excellence in it comes later among Greeks and Romans than the development of poetic diction. Homer composed his verse so long before Herodotus, the father of prose, that the latter found it difficult to determine his date; and Fabius Pictor, who wrote the oldest history of Rome, finding no prose style developed in Latin, wrote it in Greek, though in his day Plautus was already delighting the Romans with his comic verse and Naevius thrilling them with his Saturnians.

Of all peoples we know, the Romans were the most successful in prose; their language was more clear and direct, if less flexible, than Greek; and at an early date they introduced into their prose certain conventional rules, some of them artificial, which tended to enhance its clearness and dignity. These usually took the shape of distinctions and prohibitions. ‘You must use a preposition with the ablative of place, but not with that of time’ is a rule very conducive to clearness of meaning. ‘You must not use the infinitive to express purpose’ is a rule that every Roman orator and writer

strove to observe in oratio, while he disregarded it in sermo and versus. Indeed, in the oldest examples of this use of the infinitive, as in: volo venire, or: statim redire constituit, the orator was unmindful of this rule; for in them the sense of purpose had been obscured, and the relation had become modal.

In prose you must use the infinitive with its subject expressed after verbs of hoping or promising; while Virgil writes: hoc sperem Italiam contingere caelo (Aen. 5. 18) or: cur mea dicta neget duras demittere in aures? (4. 428). With verbs of perceiving and of telling in prose you will use the infinitive, and not ut with the subjunctive; and nothing will tend to deface your Latin composition so much as a tendency to write: dico ut erres, or: video ut venias. But we have Horace writing: vides ut alta stet nive candidum Soracte (Od. 1. 9. 1-2) and Pliny: dixi utrique parti ut postulationum suarum libellos darent (Ep. 10. 81. 5). True, these are not the idioms forbidden, though they are related, and the avoidance of them in good prose is too invariable not to be the result of purposed choice. As we have already shown with iubeo and impero, of a number of constructions admitted freely in poetry one was selected for prose, evidently to promote clearness of expression; and the rest were rejected, among them at times the old and genuine mode of expressing the idea. For 'in good time' Plautus uses temperi, tempore, in tempore, ad tempus, and suo tempore, of which the old locative temperi seems the genuine mode; Terence has only tempore, in tempore, and ad tempus. That this selection was largely the work of a learned and cultured coterie, the circle of the Scipios and the Aemilii, seems probable. Plautus is the favourite of the common people, Terence the protégé of the circle of the Scipios; and of all archaic Latin writers he stands nearest to Cicero in style.

Of all the self-imposed conventions that mark off Latin prose style from that of Latin verse, that forbidding the use of the infinitive to indicate purpose or result seems most striking. Horace will write: omne cum Proteus pecus egit altos visere montes (Od. 1. 2. 7-8), or: metus tradam protervis in mare Creticum portare ventis (Od. 1. 26. 1-3), or: niveus videri (Od. 4. 2. 59), or: durus componere versus (Sat. 1. 4. 8); and this use of the infinitive to mark the purpose of an act or the result of a condition seems proper to its primary form. It was evidently just as common in Latin sermo as it is in Greek prose; and its banishment from Latin prose is one of the strangest *tours de force* in literary syntax. In poetry we have the opposite, e.g. the subjunctive with sino, that in prose requires an infinitive, in: vacua sine regnet in aula (Geo. 4. 90) and: sine vivat ineptus (Ep. 1. 17. 32).

Poetic style has its conventions too, though they commonly lead to the disregard of any fixed rule. It feels the majesty of what is ancient in phrasing as well as in subject-matter, and so tends to favour archaic diction. The passive voice is a late development in language; and it has adopted as its past participle a form of adjective that was formed as freely from noun stems as from verb stems, and was once active as well as passive in meaning. We have alatus 'provided with wings', as well as amatus 'affected with love'. In poetry we find this participle used at times in an active sense, like the Skt. gatas 'having come', in: vestigia . . . titubata solo (Aen. 5, 331-2), cessatum ducere somnum (Ep. 1. 2. 31), quo sanguine cretus (Aen. 2. 74). That such participles as the Skt. gatas were once common in Latin, seems clear from such substantives as adventus and conventus, which were once past participles active. We find in poetry ignarus active in: non ignara mali (Aen. 1. 630) but passive in: ignarum Laurens habet ora Mimanta (10. 706); and caecus is active in auri caecus amore (1. 349), but passive in saxis . . . caecis (3. 706). So we have pendere for pendere in Lucretius 1. 361 and trahere for trahi (id. 1. 397).

In Plautus we find the subjunctive present frequently used for the unreal present, and the imperfect subjunctive for the past unreal. Terence writes: tu si hic sis, aliter sentias (And. 310) 'if you were I, you would think differently'; and Ennius: nam si curent, bene bonis sit, male malis, quod nunc abest (Fab. 210, M.); and even Cicero: eius igitur mortis sedetis ultores, cuius vitam si putetis per vos restitui posse, nolitis (Mil. 79. 29). So Plautus has the imperfect: utinam te di prius perderent, quam periisti ex patria tua (Capt. 537), where classical Latin uses the pluperfect. In this archaic Latin agrees with Homeric Greek; for siem, later sim, is the Greek optative εἴην, and Homer uses the optative for the prodosis and apodosis of the unreal, where later Greek uses the imperfect or aorist indicative with εἰ and ᾔβν. We read in Virgil:

Continuoque ineant pugnas et proelia temptent,  
Ni roseus fessos iam gurgite Phoebus Hifero  
Tingat equos noctemque die labente reducat (Aen. 11. 912-14),

and with the imperfect in:

tu quoque magnam  
Partem opere in tanto, sineret dolor, Icare, haberes (Aen. 6. 30-1).

Doubtless this use of the present and of the imperfect for the imperfect and pluperfect subjunctive in expressing the unreal, does, as Madvig tells us, give a vivid force to the diction, but in producing that effect Virgil is not devising a new syntax, but resorting to a construction characteristic of archaic Latin, a construction not yet quite obsolete even in the prose of his day. It may seem strange that this old use of the pres. subj. for the unreal present is never joined in syntax with the impf. subj. used later in the same sense, especially in poetry where variety is aimed at. And we find them so joined in: *nam si primordia rerum commutari aliqua possent ratione revicta, incertum quoque iam constet, &c.* (Lucr. 1. 592-4); but editors change *possent* of the manuscripts to *possint*. Again in: *nisi terminet alterum eorum, simplice natura pateat . . . nec mare nec tellus . . . possent horai sistere tempus* (l. 1012-16) we have them co-ordinated in the apodosis; but editors assume a loss of two verses between v. 1013 and v. 1014. Cf. also: *est combustus . . . volarit* (Prop. 2. 30. 29-30).

Andrew Lang tells us how Sir Walter Scott, in writing down the Ballad of Otterbourne from Mrs. Hogg's dictation, ventured to change a word to save the grammar. The old lady dictated thus the words of the dying Douglas:

For I have dreamed a dreary dream  
Ayont the isle of Skye;  
I saw a dead man won a fight,  
And methinks that man was I.

But Scott for 'won' wrote 'win'. From a comparison of Latin with Greek oblique it becomes plain that primarily direct narration was transferred to oblique with the smallest possible change. So here the Douglas in expressing in sub-oblique what he saw in his dream, says 'a dead man won a fight'. The old lady was using antique syntax; and was justified in her remark to Sir Walter that in changing 'won' to 'win' he had spoiled her ballad. So in Latin the indirect question, when it was not a dubitative or a rhetorical, but a real question, primarily put the verb in the indicative, just as it is in direct. So Virgil:

Vidisti quo Turnus equo, quibus ibat in armis  
Aureus (Aen. 9. 269-70),

and again in:

subigitque fateri  
Quae quis apud superos, furto laetatus inani,  
Distulit in seram commissa piacula mortem (Aen. 6. 567-9),

and in: *viden ut geminae stant vertice cristae?* (ib. 6. 779), and in a passage which has occasioned difficulty:

ne quaere doceri  
Quam poenam, aut quae forma viros fortunave mersit (Aen. 6. 614-5).

Far more common in Horace and Virgil than the archaic construction just mentioned is that commonly called the *Accusativus Graecus*, though it is not a Latin imitation of a Greek idiom, but found also in Umbro-Oscan. We have good examples of it in: *inscripti nomina regum . . . flores* (Buc. 3. 106-7) 'flowers that have the names of kings inscribed on them', *perque pedes traiectus lora tumentes* (Aen. 2. 273) 'having thongs passed through his swollen feet', *laevo suspensi loculos tabulamque lacerto* (Sat. 1. 6. 74). This use of an accusative governed by a passive participle, as in: *caeca mentem caligine Theseus consitus* (Catull. 64. 207-8), or by a finite form of a passive verb, as in: *Androgei galeam . . . induitur* (Aen. 2. 392-3), while common in classical poetry, is not found in Cicero or Caesar, Quintilian or Pliny. It appears in Livy, and is common in the later prose of Seneca and Tacitus, which is more and more subject to the charm of Virgil. In its old Latin uses it is confined to the senses of clothing or piercing, but its use is extended later, as in: *miles . . . multo iam fractus membra labore* (Sat. 1. 1. 5), or: *aram posuit casus suos in marmore expressam* (Tac. Hist. 3. 74. 2). Owing probably to the close relation between the present and past participles of deponent verbs we have this idiom extended to the present participle, as in: *flaventem prima lanugine malas . . . Clytium* (Aen. 10. 324-5), or: *deum cingentem viridi tempora pampino* (Od. 3. 25. 19-20).

But while classical poetry as a rule inclines to archaic idiom, often when it turns to represent the chat or sport of the day, we find in it the newest fashions of Roman speech. Two friends meet on the street; *unde et quo?* (Sat. 2. 4. 1) is their mutual greeting. One of them asks a favour: *si me amas* (Sat. 1. 9. 38) or: *amabo* (Catull. 32. 1) is their form of request, and: *amo te* (Ter. Phorm. 54) or: *bene facis* (Ad. 601) their form of thanks. One asks after the health or welfare of a passing friend: *quid agis, dulcissime rerum?* (Sat. 1. 9. 4) or of an absent acquaintance: *quid mihi Celsus agit?* (Ep. 1. 3.

15). In taking leave: *num quid vis (aliud)?* (Sat. 1. 9. 6) ‘can I be of (further) service?’ paves the way for: *vale* ‘good-bye’. The vivid shouts of the competitors in Virgil’s boat-race: *litus ama . . . pete saxa*, and such phrases as: *qui subiit palmae* (Aen. 5. 346) ‘who came next to the winner’, or: *locum tendunt superare priorem* (5. 155) ‘they strive to win the lead’, or: *radit iter laevum interior* (5. 170) ‘he shaves an inner course on the left’, have little of the archaic about them, and are instinct with all the vim and vigour of to-day’s ball game. Curiously modern, too, is: *extremam . . . imponit . . . manum* (7. 572-3) ‘she gives it the finishing touch’.

But the scene to which the poet transports us is often very different from this; he tells us of the deeds and sufferings of heroes of ancient days; and strange and vague is the light through which they move. This vagueness of effect is partly attained by the omission of prepositions, a class of words developed to give clearness to the relations of ideas.

Dionysius tells us that the preposition is used either in composition or in syntax; modern grammarians know it only in syntax. Here it is often omitted in poetry where it would be expressed in prose. In: *devenere locos laetos* (Aen. 6. 638) it is omitted with the accusative of goal, as though it were the name of a town, as it is with the ablative of starting-point in: *caelo venere volantes* (Aen. 6. 191). So with the ablative of place in: *caeloque Ereboque potentem* (6. 247), or: *viridi sedere solo* (6. 192). In: *scalis habito tribus sed altis* (Mart. 1. 117. 7) we have the ablative of interval, ‘three flights up’, used for the local ablative: *tertio in tabulato* ‘on the third floor’. In return we find the preposition used with the ablative of cause in: *mollibus in pueris aut in puellis urere* (Epod. 11. 4) or: *qui stupet in titulis* (Sat. 1. 6. 17); or with the ablative of manner in: *horridus in iaculis* (Aen. 5. 37) or: *in taetro tabescat odore* (Lucr. 3. 581) or: *corbis in imposito pondere messor eram* (Prop. 4. 2. 28). The omission of the preposition used in composition, which is still more promotive of this vagueness of effect, as in: *hominem paulatim cernimus ire* (Lucret. 3. 526), where *ire* is for *perire*, like ‘pass’ for ‘pass away’, I shall have to reserve for a later chapter.

Different seems the reason for the use of *ire* for *venire* that we see in: *nec vero Alciden me sum laetatus euntem accepisse lacu* (Aen. 6. 392-3), and in: *vos celsis mine primum a navibus itis?* (2. 375). Here we have the use of the general term for the special: *ire* is the verb denoting motion in any direction used for *venire* denoting motion in our direction. We have the use in Plautus: *ere, unde is?* (Cist. 776), and in Terence: *sed eccum Syrum ire video* (Ad. 361). In Greek βαίvo, the cognate of *venio*, seems to have taken on this general meaning; though in: Ἦρη, τίττε βέβηκας; (Il. 15. 90) the primary force of *venire* is clearly visible. While in Plautus *revenire* is the usual verb for ‘to return’, it is found only twice in Cicero and never in Virgil. *Redire*, the corresponding compound of *ire*, has taken its place. This seems to be due to the opposition we see in: *itque reditque viam totiens* (Aen. 6. 122). It is plain enough that such a use of the general for the special will promote the vagueness of effect aimed at by the poet; and we find uses of it in: *usque ad aquam* (Buc. 9. 9) for *usque ad fluvium*, *aurave distinctos educit verna colores* (Catull. 64. 90), where *colores* is for *flores*, *magno discordes aethere venti* (Aen. 10. 356), where *aether* seems the larger sphere of which *aer* is a part, *possit parvos educere natos* (Aen. 8. 413), where *educere* ‘to rear’ is used for *educare*.

But far more interesting in Latin poetry seems the opposite use of the special for the general. This is the use that at once occurs to Servius, when he meets *itis* for *venitis* in Aen. 2. 375; he cites from Terence: *nisi eo ad mercatum venio* (Ad. 231), where *venio* is used for *eo*. So we read in Tacitus: *eo furoris venere* (Ann. 1. 18. 2) ‘so far did they go in their madness’. In: *venit medio vi pontus* (Aen. 3. 417) the prose form would be: *in medium vi magna pontus iniit*. Very often the name of a special tribe is substituted in poetry for the name of the whole nation, as in: *non ego sanius bacchabor Edonis* (Od. 2. 7. 26-7), where *Edonis* is for *Thracibus*. We have *cornua* the special for *arma* the general term in: *irasci in cornua temptat* (Aen. 12. 104) ‘he stirs his wrath for the fight to come’; for *arma* is a usual metonymy for *bellum*, which we find in the first verse of the Aeneid. To: *pelle Libystidis ursae* (Aen. 5. 37) Servius’s note is: *aut re vera; aut ferae Africanae, id est, leonis aut pardi*. We understand Servius’s doubt, when we recall that Pliny said there were no bears in Africa; his feeling is that *ursa* here is not used in its proper sense, but in a general sense for *fera*. So in: *gaude, Crasse, nigras si quid sapis inter harenas* (Prop. 4. 6. 83) the ‘sands’ of the Euphrates are sands only in this poetical sense; for its banks are alluvial. They are qualified as black partly for this reason, partly to suggest to the reader the *fusca regna* to which Crassus now belongs. We have here, then, a use of the special for the general, of *harena* for *solum*.

As we shall see, Servius believes that for *detexit* Virgil uses its opposite *textit* (Aen. 10. 424), just as all Latin poets for *depopulari* use *populari*; of course it will be easy to use for ‘land’ a word that usually means ‘water’. We have already in Catullus: *sive quae septemgeminus colorat aequora Nilus* (11. 7-8), where *aequora* is ambiguous; it may refer to the waters of the Mediterranean, but is more probably the black flats of Egypt. Interesting is Virgil’s use of *aequora* in:

Quos patre Benaco velatus harundine glauca

Mincius infesta ducebat in aequora pinu (Aen. 10. 205-6).

At first sight Mincius seems to be bearing the Mantuans on its waters to the sea (ad aequora). But their destination is not the sea, but the field of battle, where they are to meet Turnus and Mezentius; and Mackail rightly translates: 'led to battle in his advancing pine'. Only so can we understand the force of infesta pinu, modelled on infesta hasta, and presenting the ship as a dart hurled to the battlefield. And we read in the same book: sic toto Aeneas desaevit in aequore victor (v. 569), and in v. 214 Virgil calls the waters of the Tiber down which they sail: campos salis, an expression that involves the use of the special term salis for the general aquae. But in the use of aequor for land as well as water and the use of solum for mare in: vastis tremit ictibus aerea puppis, subtrahiturque solum (Aen. 5. 199) we have the beginnings of oxymoron, a figure to be considered later.

The words in most common use in prose are words which once had a substantive force of their own, a force now almost entirely lost, so that now they merely serve to indicate the relations of the objects in question. As types of such words we may select the preposition *de*, the conjunction *et*, the pronoun *is*, and the verb *est*. They are, so to speak, the windows in a prose sentence, letting in light on the relations of its parts; and words like *is* and *est* have so far lost their old substantival force that they may be likened to colourless and transparent windows through which the meaning of the sentence becomes clear in the light of common sense. We feel the need of such words when we aim at presenting our ideas clearly and definitely, which should be the especial aim of good prose. But poetry is not content with this; in it the relations of the objects in question are presented in a light coloured by the fancy of the bard; and for this there must be found to take the place of such colourless terms as 'is' or *est* words richer in representative force and comparing with them as do the richly coloured panes of some Gothic cathedral with the clear windows of our private dwellings. Or else, what also happens, these words must be coloured with light reflected from more picturesque words associated with them in poetic diction, so that they assume a colour and meaning they do not possess in prose.

We have already spoken of the frequent omission of prepositions in poetry like *de* or *in* or *cum*. This omission is most usual when the preposition is used in a later or derived sense, as in: unus *de* his hominibus, for the older: unus horum hominum, or when *de* is used with the sense of about, as in: *de* ceteris senatui curae fore. In the primary sense of 'down from' in space, or 'proceeding from' as source or cause *de* is in frequent use in poetry.

Conjunctions are not so readily omitted, but *que* and *atque* are in common use for *et*, as in: Tereaque Harpalycumque et Demophoonta Chrominque (Aen. 11. 675), or: Imbrasidas, Glaucon atque Laden (12. 343), or: matres atque viri defunctaque corpora vita magnanimum heroum (6. 306-7). *Que*, the oldest copulative, is the most common, as we see it in: Chloreaque Sybarimque Daretaque Thersilochumque (12. 363); no doubt its short quantity makes it most convenient in a dactylic verse. But we have the usual modern form of omission appearing in: silvas armenta virosque (12. 688). Of course the omission of any conjunction is the oldest form; and we have this often, as in: das nummos, accipis uvam, pullos, ova, cadum temeti (Hor. Ep. 2. 2. 162). When *et* is used, it is often for *aut*, as in: aut corpora saltu subiiciunt in equos et strictis ensibus adsunt (Aen. 12. 288), or for *nec*, as in: nec prolem Ausoniam et Lavinia respicit arva (4. 236), or for *atque* (our 'as'), as in: haec amem necesse est et Verianolum meum et Fabullum (Catull. 12. 17), or for *cum* in: et terram Hesperiam venies (Aen. 2. 781), or for *nam* in: et saeva Iovis sic numina pellunt (11. 901), or for *quamquam* in: et dona ferentes (2. 49). Strange seems the use of *seu . . . seu* for *utrum . . . an* in: dubii seu vivere credant sive extrema pati (Aen. 1. 218-19), a use followed by Livy in: haud dubius rex seu patrum seu plebis animos periclitaretur (1. 42. 3) and by Tacitus in: iuxta periculoso ficta seu vera promeret (Ann. 1. 6. 6). So we have *ut* for *quanto* in: ut melius (Od. 1. 11. 3) and for *quam* in: non Liber aequae (quatit), non acuta sic geminant Corybantes aera, tristes ut irae (Od. 1. 16. 9) and in: non secus in iugis . . . ut mihi devio (Od. 3. 25. 12).

The use of the pronoun 'is' in its usual prose sense is rare in poetry. In: cernere ne quis eos (Aen. 1. 413) and: ab ea (7. 63) it is emphasized by its position just before the caesura; and in: quae mihi reddat eum vel eo me solvat amantem (Aen. 4. 479) the *eum* has this emphatic position and affects the neighbouring *eo*. Elsewhere we have either the emphatic *isque*, as in: idque audire sat est (Aen. 2. 103), or it is used for *talis*, as in: ea frena furenti concutit (6. 100), or it stands for a genitive, as in: ea cura (3. 505), for cura eius rei perficiendae.

So for *esse* the poets often use verbs that denote the various forms of existence appropriate to the context; the subject does not merely exist, he is standing, or sitting, or lying, or coming, or going, or staying, or acting, or turning, or dwelling, or told of, or living, or growing. Or, if *est* is used, it is often for *fit*, or for *stat*, or for *manet*, or for *potest*, or for *habitat*, or for *liceat*, or with the dative for *habet*, or in the perfect for *periit*, as in: fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium (Aen. 2.

325), or it is rendered emphatic by its position, as in: *est omnia quando iste animus supra* (11. 509).

In Greek the verb ‘to be’ is formed wholly from the root *es-*, and shows only an aorist, a present, and a future tense. In Sanskrit it has gone a step farther, and from the root *as-* (= *es-*) has developed a perfect. In Latin it has the full complement of moods and tenses, but only those tenses we find developed in Greek are from the root *es-*; the perfect tenses are formed from the root *fu-* to grow or become. So *fuit*, which we have just seen with the meaning: *non iam est* ‘it exists no longer’, must also have meant at times the exact opposite, as it developed from its primary sense ‘it has come to be’ to the sense ‘it is’. This force comes out clearly in some uses of *fuerat* for *erat*, ‘it had grown to be’, and hence ‘it was’. So in: *natorum Tyrrhi fuerat qui maximus*, *Almo* (Aen. 7. 532), *illi fuerat Saturnia nomen* (8. 358), *piscosae cui circum flumina Lernae ars fuerat pauperque domus* (12. 519). So we have *fuerint* for *sint* in: *hic tibi ne qua morae fuerint dispendia tanti* (3. 453). We have *fuit* in its old sense for *factum est* in: *usque ad illam (defectionem) quae Nonis Quintilibus fuit regnante Romulo* (Cic. Rep. 1. 16). *Fio*, the present in use for *factus sum*, seems an assimilation from *fuio*, where the *i*, like that in *capio*, is a mark of the present. Just as *capio* had not yet this *i* when from it the compound *occupo* was formed, so *fuat* is formed, not from *fuio*, but from an older *fuo*. Plautus uses *fiat* for *esto* in *Amph.* 770 and *Most.* 1038; and *fit* seems for *est* in Aen. 10. 153. The active form *deficit* seems for *deest* in: *tenent Danaï, qua deficit ignis* (2. 505). In return we have *esse* used for *fieri* in: *nymphasque e navibus esse iusserat* (10. 221), *sed fatis incerta feror si Iuppiter unam esse velit Tyriis urbem Troiaque profectis* (4. 111), *cum faber incertus scamnum faceretne Priapum, maluit esse deum* (Sat. 1. 8. 3). So too in the beginning of Sat. 2. 3 to *quid fiet?* (v. 4) answers *nil est* (v. 6), clearly for *nil fit*. As auxiliaries for the perfect tenses of the passive at times for *sum*, *eram*, and *ero* we have *fui*, *fueram*, and *fuiro*, evidently with this older meaning of ‘I have come to be’ and so ‘I am’.

In French too the verb ‘to be’ is in use in all its moods and tenses; but here in addition to tenses derived from *fu-* we have for *erat* *était* for *estabat*, a later form of *stabat*, and for the past participle, for which the Roman used *factum* usually to be supplied, the French has *été* for *statum*. Evidently in later Latin *esse* was joined with *stare*. To: *Strophades Graio stant nomine dictae* (Aen. 3. 210) Servius’s note is: *stant sunt*. In: *tanta stat praedita culpa* (Lucr. 5. 199) *stat* seems for *est*; and in: *quin ubi transmissae steterint trans aequora classes* (Aen. 3. 403) *transmissae steterint* seems for *transmissae sint*. In:

*Flecte vias hac qua madidi sunt tecta Lyaei*

*Et Cybeles picto stat Corybante tholus* (Mart. 1. 70. 9-10),

one feels that Martial might have written *stant* and *est* with like propriety. So, too, in:

*non tua sunt duro praecordia ferro*

*Vincta ec in tenero stat tibi corde silex* (Tib. 1. 1. 63-4),

*stat* serves better than *est* to emphasize the idea of hardness. In:

*omnino finem non esse secandis*

*Corporibus faciunt neque pausam stare fragori* (Lucr. 1. 746-7),

*esse* and *stare* seem used for poetic variety. To: *omnis in Ascanio cari stat cura parentis* (Aen. 1. 646) Servius’s note is: *stat modo est*. In: *stat magni nominis umbra* (Luc. 1. 135) *stat* is probably poetic for *restat*, though it comes very near *est* in force. In: *sedesque adstare relictas* (Aen. 3. 123) Servius explains *adstare* as *esse sub hoc*; in: *quis feret uxorem, cui constant omnia?* (Juv. 6. 166) *constant* seems merely a strengthened *sunt*, ‘who has all things in full possession’; and in: *nunc qua ratione quod instat confieri possit* (Aen. 4. 115) *instat* seems ‘is beginning to be’. So in: *vides ut alta stet nive candidum Soracte* (Od. 1. 9. 1) *stet* is not exactly *sit*, but rather for *exstet*, as in *stat ferrea turris ad auras* (Aen. 6. 554), and gives the meaning of ‘towers on high’, or ‘is plain to view’; which is how the existence of *Soracte* impresses the spectator from the *Janiculum*; and it has much the same force in: *stat cruor in templis* (Luc. 2. 103). We have this meaning of ‘arise’, but in a figurative sense, in: *stant belli causae* (Aen. 7. 553) and: *altis urbibus ultimae steterae causae cur perirent* (Od. 1. 16. 19). We have *esse* for *stare* in: *speravimus ista, dum fortuna fuit* (Aen. 10. 43 and 3. 16) and:

*Et sublata volantis ungue Prognos*

*In nido seges est hirundinino.* (Mart. 11. 18. 19-20.)

The verb *stare* is of such importance in Ennius and Virgil that I may be excused a little fuller treatment of it. It may be considered from two points of view, as denoting either posture or position. As posture it is natural to think of *stare* as opposed to *sedere*, as we see it in: *hi stant ambo, non sedent* (Pl. Capt. 2). We see this opposition in: *mediisque sedent convallibus arva* (Luc. 3. 380) as opposed to *stet* . . . *Soracte*. But *sedere*, as well as *stare*, is opposed to *ambulare*, as is

clear from: *si non ubi sedeas locus est, est ubi ambules* (Pl. Capt. 12); and so *sedere* is often only a stronger *stare*. So of birds perching in:

*Alitis . . .*

*Quae quondam in bustis aut culminibus desertis*

*Nocte sedens serum canit importuna per umbras* (Aen. 12. 862-4),

to which Gesner notes: *aves etiam pedibus nixae tamen sedere dicuntur*. So we find many uses of *stat* parallel with those of *sedet*, as in: *celsa sedet Aeolus arce sceptrum tenens* (Aen. 1. 56) or: *principis angusta Caprearum in rupe sedentis* (Juv. 10. 93), parallel with: *ad undam stat lacrimans* (Geo. 4. 356) or: *nullam nisi olenti in fornice stantem* (Sat. 1. 2. 30). We have it transferred to the sea in: *fluminis intrastis ripas portuque sedetis* (Aen. 7. 201), but: *stant litore puppes* (6. 901). So both are opposed to *nare* in: *tempus fuit quo navit in undis, nunc sedet Ortygie* (Ov. Met. 15. 336-7) and: *cum Phoebus linquens stantem se vindice Delon* (Prop. 4. 6. 27). It is opposed to motion in: *his dictis sedere minae* (Sil. 10. 623), *sedit rabies* (Stat. Theb. 10. 823), *sedeant spectentque Latini* (Aen. 12. 15); as is *stare* in: *veluti stet volucris dies* (Od. 3. 28. 6) and: *cum placidum ventis staret mare* (Buc. 2. 26) and: *stant mihi cum domina proelia dura mea* (Prop. 3. 5. 2). It is opposed to all activity in: *meliora deos sedet omnia poscens* (Geo. 3. 456) and: *sedit qui timuit ne non succederet* (Hor. Ep. 1. 17. 37), and in: *quid agitur? statur* (Ter. Eun. 271) ‘How goes it?’ ‘Nothing doing’. *Sedet* is used for *certum est* in: *si mihi non animo fixum inmotumque sederet* (Aen. 4. 15), as is *stat* in: *stat casus renovare omnes* (2. 750). In Aen. 4. 15 *sederet* is very close to *esset*, owing to its union with *fixum inmotumque*; and to: *Turnus sacrata valle sedebat* (9. 4) Servius notes: *ut Asper dicit, ‘erat’*.

*Stare* is not merely the opposite of *cadere*, as we see it in: *securus cadat an recto stet fabula talo* (Hor. Ep. 2. 1. 176), but of *iacere*; and we see this opposition emphasized in the arrangement of the verse:

*Canities inculta iacet, stant lumina flammae* (Aen. 6. 300).

*Iacet* is often like *stat* merely of position, as in: *patriam . . . sub sole iacentem* (Geo. 2. 512), or: *Sicanio praetenta sinu iacet insula* (Aen. 3. 692); but, unlike *stat*, it is thus used of lands rather than of living persons. More commonly it is used of earth, or sea, or snow lying still and undisturbed, as in: *neu segnes iaceant terrae* (Geo. 2. 37), *postquam iacuit planum mare* (Juv. 12. 62), *cum nix alta iacet* (Geo. 1. 310). It may denote low-lying land, as does *sedere*, as in *Thapsumque iacentem* (Aen. 3. 689), where Servius explains: *paene fluctibus par*; or a plain on the mountain top, as in: *in vertice montis planities ignota iacet* (Aen. 11. 527), where the oxymoron is purposed.

When transferred to persons *iacere* is used of the slain, as in: *saevus ubi Aeacidarum telo iacet Hector* (Aen. 1. 99), or of the sick, as in: *cum tristi morbo defessa iaceres* (Tib. 1. 5. 9), or of those neglected and contemned, as in: *pauper ubique iacet* (Ov. Fast. 1. 218). We have the opposite of this in Ennius’s noble verse:

*Moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque* (Ann. 426, M.),

and in:

*Quo vobis mentes, rectae quae stare solebant*

*Antehac, dementes sese flexere viae* (Ann. 204-5, M.),

and turning to trees, that stand erect on the earth’s surface:

*longique cupressi*

*Stant rectis foliis et amaro corpore buxum* (Ann. 265-6, M.).

So Virgil:

*Stant et iuniperi et castaneae hirsutae;*

*Strata iacent passim sua quaeque sub arbore poma* (Buc. 7-53-4).

We have the same opposition clearly marked in:

*Cui nec arae patriae domi stant,*

*Fractae et disiectae iacent. Fana flamma deflagrata,*

*Tosti alti stant parietes* (Enn. Fab. 166-7, M.).

When we compare: *tantum campi iacet* (Geo. 3. 343) with: *fulvae nimbus harenae tollitur* (Geo. 3. 111), we feel that *iacet* is used of the field in its normal, peaceful state. When we turn to: *stant pulvere campi* (Enn. Ann. 314, M.) *stant* seems of fields, whose dust no longer lies quiescent, but is surging and tossing to the skies. Such a field seems to Ennius no longer to lie, but to be up and standing erect.

Servius has no doubt of the meaning of: *stant lumina flamma* (Aen. 6. 300). *Stant* horrent is his note. Evidently Charon's eyes bicker with flame like Lucretius's: *claraeque coruscis fulguribus . . . taedae* (5. 295-6). But is he explaining the genuine reading? For Acron (ad Hor. Od. 1. 9. 1) read: *stant lumina flammae*. Donatus, however (ad Ter. And. 699), reads *flamma* like Servius. When we turn to the manuscripts we have a different story. Of the six manuscripts Ribbeck thinks worth specifying, four had *flammae*, and only two *flamma*. Of the four, two had the *e* of *flammae* crossed out; and of the two, one had *e* added to *flamma* by a later hand. So that the testimony of the best codices is strong for *flammae*.

Though *flammae* seems at first sight the more difficult reading, it is easy to understand it here, and it offers the variety of meanings in which Virgil delighted. Virgil imitating Ennius's: *stant pulvere campi* gives us: *iam pulvere caelum stare vident* (Aen. 12. 408). Servius explains *stare* here as *plenum esse*, the explanation usually given for Ennius's *stant*, but adds: *alii 'stare' constare intellegunt, ut significet 'pulvere caelum constat'*, and this seems the right account. Virgil wishes to transfer Ennius's *stare* from the earth to the sky, and finds he can do so by using it for *constare* in poetic style. In this sense it naturally takes an ablative of material. And so Servius adds: *id est, (caelum) in pulverem versum est, et quasi totum ex pulvere est*, from which we see that his sense: *plenum est* is closely related to *constat*. *Plenum* may take an ablative, but usually governs a genitive; and if we read with the majority of the best manuscripts: *stant lumina flammae*, it is natural to take *stant* here too as for *plena sunt*.

But the scholars of the time, excepting Acron, read *flamma*. It is quite possible that Virgil left both readings, between which he had not himself reached a final decision. The juxtaposition of *iacet* and *stant*, making *stant* seem for *horrent*, favours the reading *flamma*. But the genitive is much more vivid; and we find that, while scholars favoured *flamma*, the ordinary reader called for *flammae*, which is what we should expect. The codices, of course, give the text favoured by the mass of readers. The expression becomes very picturesque if we interpret: 'his eyes are eyes of flame'. But the reader may take *flammae* as a predicate nominative: 'his eyes are flames'. Virgil, unlike Horace, would surely have chosen to please the mass of his readers, and *stant lumina flammae* would have been his final choice.

In: *stat sentibus fundus* (Lucil. 5. 5, M.) Donatus (ad Ter. And. 699) seems right in taking *stat* for *horret*, which is clearly its force too in: *interea stat sentibus pectus* (Lucil. 5. 4, M.). Ennius uses *horrere* of weapons standing erect in: *densantur campis horrentia tela virorum* (Ann. 316, M.), and in: *sparsis longis hastis campus splendet et horret* (S. 14, M.) 'glitters and quivers', at which verse, according to Servius (ad Aen. 11. 601), Lucilius made mock, saying it should have been 'horret et alget' 'quivers and shivers'. We notice Virgil's transfer of epithet in: *tum late ferreus hastis horret ager* (Aen. 11. 601); what can *ferreus ager* be? When a field bristles with spears of iron, it may be described as a field of iron. In: *stat ferri acies mucrone corusco stricta* (Aen. 2. 333) Servius thinks that *stat* is for *horret*, or else it is transferred from *stantibus armatis*; and in: *stat ductis sortibus urna* (Aen. 6. 22) he thinks *stat sortibus* is for *horret sortibus*, much as: (apes) *pennis coruscant* (Geo. 4. 73). To me it seems rather for: *non iam vertitur*; the lots have been drawn, and the urn no longer turns.

Nonius (422. 32, M.) quotes from the *Medea* of Accius (413, R.): *mare cum horreret fluctibus*. From this we can understand the meaning of Catullus's *nuntius horribilis* (84. 10). Arrius has been exasperating the ears and minds of the Romans by his aspirations, such as *chommoda* for *commoda* and *hinsidias* for *insidias*; but he has gone east with Crassus, and now all ears have a rest. But suddenly there comes a *nuntius horribilis*, a bit of news making your hair stand on end: *Ionios fluctus, postquam illuc Arrius isset, iam non Ionios esse sed Hionios*. Evidently the waves have been so aspirated by Arrius that they are now *magis solito asperatae*. We have a similar confusion of vowels, when Servius explains: *turrigeraeque urbes* (Aen. 10. 253) as: *quas terra gerit*. Catullus thinks the aspiration of the Etruscan Arrius so violent and perverse as to give a new roughness to the waves of the Adriatic, which he has just crossed. It is as if the tendency to aspirate of our own 'Arry were to prove so infectious as to give a new roughness to the Straits of Dover.

We have *stare* used to denote position in: *si propius stes* (A. P. 361), *quorum statuae steterunt . . . in Rostris* (Cic. Phil. 9. 4. 2), *et primo haud impares stetero acies* (Liv. 26. 44. 3). Here it seems the opposite of *ire* and *venire*, and often equivalent to *haerere* and *manere*. Its use is close to *manere* in: *stare loco nescit* (Geo. 3. 84), where the prose would be: *manere in loco nescit*. We may compare: *pacto stas* (Liv. 9. 11. 2) and: *stare conventis* (Cic. Off. 3. 95. 25) with: *at tu dictis, Albane, maneres* (Aen. 8. 643). So in: *bene apud memores veteris stat gratia facti* (4. 539) *bene stat* is for: *firma manet*. Cf. also: *Troiaque nunc staret, Priamique arx alta maneres* (2. 56). In: *mole sua stat* (10. 771) and: *stat sua cuique dies* (10. 467) *stat* is for *fixa est*. In: *in ducibus stabat spes et victoria* (Sil. 17. 400) it is for *defixa est*, or *dependet*.

Like *stare* in: *sed abi intro; noli stare* (Pl. Mil. 1129) or: *i: quid stas, lapis?* (Ter. Heaut. 831), is *haerere* in: *paulum*



adspectu conterritus haesit continuitque gradum (Aen. 3. 597), attonitis haesere animis (5. 529), Hectoris Aeneaeque manu victoria Graium haesit (11. 290). So haeret is used for fixus est in: hic terminus haeret (4. 614) and: soloque immobilis haeret (7. 250), and for manet in: inceptoque et sedibus haeret in isdem (2. 654) and: qua spe gelidis in nubibus haeres (12. 796). It is used as a passive of teneo in: haesere caeno fossisque impedimenta (Tac. Ann. 1. 65. 4) and: haeret pede pes (Aen. 10. 361), and for the passive of retineo in: vox faucibus haesit (2. 774).

Stare in the sense of position approaches nearly the sense of esse in Cicero's: a se potius quam ab adversariis stare (Inv. 1. 81. 43), in Plautus's: hinc stas, illim causam dicis (Men. 799) and Virgil's: Iuppiter hac stat (Aen. 12. 565). But manere and haerere are rather for semper esse, as in: natura manet sine pondere inanis (Lucr. 1. 363) or: hi in oculis haerebunt (Cic. Phil. 13. 5. 3). In return est is for manet in: est hic, est animus lucis contemptor (Aen. 9. 205).

Clueo (older cluo = κλύω) is used in Latin like audio as a passive of dico or nomino, as in Ennius's: nostra Latinos per populos terrasque poemata clare cluebunt (Ann. 3, M.) or Lucretius's: per gentes Italas hominum quae clara clueret (1. 119), where however in union with the cognate clara it approaches the sense of esse. In Lucretius it seems often to have this force: as in: quaecumque cluent (1. 449), quae nondum clueant ullo temptata periclo (1. 580), inter se nota cluere (2. 351). Vivo seems for sum in: ecquis me hodie vivit fortunatior? (Ter. Eun. 1031), purus et insons (ut me collaudem) si et vivo carus amicis (Sat. 1. 6. 70), viveret in terris te si quis avarior uno (Ep. 2. 2. 157). In return we have esse for vivere in:

Ostendent terris hunc tantum fata neque ultra  
Esse sinent (Aen. 6. 870).

With a predicate implying position we have stare used for esse; with a predicate implying motion ire is often so used. Servius's note to:

sed non felicibus aequae

Tum comes auspiciis caro datus ibat alumno (Aen. 11. 32-3),

is: ibat pro ierat according to Thilo and Hagen. This is pure nonsense, and is apparently a scribe's blunder for: ibat pro erat. So in: ibis ab excusso missus in astra sago (Mart. 1. 3. 8) we have in missus ibis a more picturesque missus eris. We have a like use of the verb ire, but not now as an auxiliary, in: nuntius ibis Pelidae genitori (Aen. 2. 547) and in: quibus ibat in armis aureus (9. 269), si non tanta quies iret frigusque caloremque inter (Geo. 2. 344), non tutior ibis Homero (Prop. 2. 34. 45), animo tam procul ibit amor (3. 21. 10), non ibo inulta (Sen. Her. Oet. 282), ite alacres et spiritus pleni (Curt. 4. 14. 25), non dabitis murum sceleri; qui vindicet, ibit (Claudian de IV Cons. Hon. 109). It seems rather for fieri in: incipit res melius ire quam putaram (Cic. Att. 14. 15. 2), nec miror ista sic ire (Sen. Ep. 1. 5. 8), and: sic eat (Luc. 2. 304 and 5. 297). It is used for ferri in: postquam omnia fatis Caesaris ire videt (Luc. 4. 144); and in: solus ego in Pallanta feror (Aen. 10. 442), where Servius carelessly explains feror as ferri debeo, it is evidently for ire debeo. Just as in French we have j'ai été for je suis allé, so here we have fuisse for ivisse in: quod ferar in partes ipse fuisse tuas (Prop. 3. 9. 60). Gellius (1. 7. 16) quotes from Cicero: cum vestros portus . . . in praedonum fuisse potestatem sciatis (Leg. Man. 33. 12), where the change to potestate in the manuscripts is easy to understand. We have in Petronius: fui enim hodie in funus (42), and in Suetonius: nec prius surrexisse ac militibus in conspectum fuisse (Aug. 16. 2).

When we turn to Italian we find venire used for essere in forming the passive voice. So in Latin we have venire in periphrasis with the appropriate noun to give the passive of verbs that have no passive form in use. For the passive of suspicari we have: in suspicionem venire (Cic. ad Q. Fr. 1. 1. 14. 4), of periclitari, in periculum venire (Caes. B. C. 1. 17. 2), for odisse, ne in odium veniam (Cic. Fin. 2. 79. 24). Modelled on these we have alternatives for the passive in: in dubium venire (Liv. 3. 13. 7), for dubitari, in cruciatum venire (Caes. B. G. 1. 31. 2), in contemptionem venire (ib. 3. 17. 5). Close to this seems its use for fieri in: in proverbium venit (Liv. 40. 46. 12). Not far removed is the use for nasci in: hic segetes, illic veniunt felicius uvae (Geo. 1. 54) and: (arbores) sponte sua veniunt (Geo. 2. 11). Similar is the use of ire for crescere in Cato; donicum in semen videris ire (R. R. 161. 3).

We have venire used as a more picturesque esse in: dummodo morata recte veniat, dotatast satis (Pl. Aul. 239), non impune illa rogata venit (Prop. 1. 5. 32), non tamen haec ulli venient ingrata legenti (id. 2. 34. 81), gratior et pulcro veniens in corpore virtus (Aen. 5. 344), pelagine venis erroribus actus (6. 532), rebusque veni non asper egenis (8. 365), nam venio moriturus (10. 881), cum fletu nox vigilanda venit (Tib. 1. 2. 76), canem illum invisum agricolis sidus venisse (Sat. 1. 7. 26), tarda venit dictis difficilisque fides (Ov. Fast. 3. 350), quaerens quibus mortifera veniat

(Sen. Med. 687-8), *muneribus venit tegula missa tuis* (Mart. 7. 36. 4). In: *se satis ambobus Teucrisque venire Latinisque* (Aen. 7. 470) *satis venire* seems for *parem fore*. We have *venire* with nouns for *esse* in: *nam tu solacia praebes; tu curae requies, tu medicina venis* (Ov. Trist. 4. 10. 118), and: *quaenam tot divis veniet nurus* (Claudian de IV Cons. Hon. 647). As in all those uses, so in the uses of *venturus* for *futurus* its primary meaning persists, as we see in: *ventures nautis prodentia ventos* (Aen. 10. 99), and: *idem venturos tollemus in astra nepotes* (3. 158), to which Servius's note is: *venturos plus est quam si dixisset 'futuros': nam quasi eos iam esse significat*. In: *veniens Marsorum montibus Umbro* (Aen. 10. 544) *veniens* is for *qui venerat*, the opposite in meaning of *veniens* in: *veniens in aevum* (Od. 3. 5. 16).

So *esse* is used for *venire* in: *numero mihi in mentem fuit dis advenientem gratias pro meritis agere atque adloqui* (Pl. Amph. 180), as Gellius notes (1. 7. 17), where: *in mentem fuit* is clearly for: *in mentem venit*. Not so clear is: *ecquid in mentem est tibi, patrem tibi esse?* (Pl. Bacch. 161), where *est* seems for *adest*, often used as a perfect of *advenire*, as in: *vesper adest* (Catull. 62. 1) or: *atque utinam rex ipse noto compulsus eodem adforet Aeneas* (Aen. 1. 576), where *adforet* is plainly for *advenisset*, though Servius carelessly says it is for *adveniat*. Plain seems *esse* for *venisse* in: *ut certior fieret quo die in Tusculanum essem futurus* (Cic. Att. 15. 4. 2). It seems for *convenire* in: *senatus hodie fuerat futurus* (ib. 4. 17. 4). In: *fluminaque Haemonio comminus esse viro* (Prop. 3. 1. 26), where most editors change *esse* to *isse*, disregarding the manuscripts, *esse* is probably for *venisse*.

When we compare the diction of Latin prose with that of Latin poetry we see at once how much greater is the role of the noun in the latter. To the frequent and constant use of verbs in Latin prose is due its vibrant, elastic strength and pliancy. When we substitute nouns for verbs we get a vague cloud-like grandeur of effect far removed from the vivid reality of prose. We might compare: *tibi imperanti semper parebo* with: *numquam frustrata vocatus hasta meos* (Aen. 12. 95), or: *sic respondet* with: *sic ore vicissim orsa refert* (Aen. 11. 123-4). Poetic diction tends to the substitution of nouns for verbs, which we find so prevalent in English prose, when compared with that of Cicero or of Caesar. So in: *impudens Orcum moror* (Od. 3. 27. 50) for *mori moror*, or: *dedidicit iam pace ducem* (Luc. 1. 131). Very often instead of a single verb like *amplexabitur* we have a verb with a noun like: *dabit amplexus* (Aen. 1. 687). So instead of *vovit* we have *vota facit* (11. 50), instead of *regnabat*, *regna habebat* (1. 346), instead of *gemet*, *aget gemitus* (6. 873), instead of *dicit*, *dictis it* (10. 448), instead of *liceat mihi*, *sit mihi fas* (6. 266), instead of *quibus valde intereram*, *quorum pars magna fui* (2. 6), instead of *nec dis placet*, *nec dis amicum est* (Od. 2. 17. 2). Of course these follow the analogy of older phrases usual in prose like *poenas dare*, *vela dare*, *iura dare*, *vitam agere*, *vota reddere*, *cordi esse*, *curae habere*.

Of auxiliaries thus used *dare* is the most common in Virgil; to cite some examples, we have for *pariet*, *partu dabit* (Aen. 1. 274), for *cecinere*, *cantus dedere* (1. 398), for *cedunt*, *dant locum* (2. 633), for *lacrimavit*, *lacrimas dedit* (4. 370), and so *dicta dabat* (5. 852), *fugam dedit* (7. 24), *cursum dedit* (10. 870), *saltum dedit* (12. 681), *ruinam dant* (11. 614), *excidio daturum* (12. 655), *milia multa daret leto* (5. 806). Of verbs which have arisen from such phrases we might mention *mando*, *vendo*, and *credo* (cf. Skt. *śrad-dha*).

Less usual is a like use of *ago*, though in older Latin it must have been very common in such phrases; as is clear from verbs like *levigo*, *litigo*, *mitigo*, *iurgo*, and *purgo*. Of the phrases found with it most belong to prose diction as in: *gemmas agant* for *geminant* (Varr. R. R. 1. 30), *animam agere* for *mori* (Cic. Fam. 8. 13. 2), *bellum agere* for *bellare* (Caes. B. G. 3. 28, Herz), *laborem agere* for *laborare* (Cic. Fin. 2. 105. 32), *crimen agere* for *criminari* (Verr. 2. 4. 48. 22), *curam ago* for *curo* (Liv. 6. 15. 11). In the poets I note: *maximas nugas agis* (Pl. Asin. 91), *vitam . . . agebat* (Geo. 2. 538), *agit acri remige* (Aen. 5. 116). In: *nullo discrimine agetur* (Aen. 1. 574) we seem to have the passive of *nullo discrimine habeo* (10. 108).

Verbs like *significo*, *amplifico*, *honorifico*, *magnifico*, *horrifico*, *terrifico* are derived from older phrases, such as we see in: *facimus meritosque novamus honores* (Aen. 8. 189). So we have *vota facit* (11. 50), *vela facit* (5. 281), *indicium faciet* (Geo. 2. 246). We have: *fecere ruinas* (Lucr. 1. 740) but: *dabant . . . ruinas* (id. 5. 1329), *dedit . . . ruinam* (Aen. 2. 310); *nomen . . . fecere* (Geo. 4. 272) but: *nomen dedit* (Aen. 1. 248). In: *fecere pedem* (Aen. 5. 830) we have the equivalent of *vela dabant* (Aen. 1. 35); and *faceret pretium* (Mart. 1. 85. 7) is plainly for *emeret*, where *facere* is for *dare*. *Fit sonitus* (Geo. 4. 79) is the passive of *sonitum . . . dedere* (Aen. 10. 488), *fit gemitus* (Aen. 6. 220) of *gemitum dat* (1. 485). Parallel to: *date volnera lymphis abluam* (Aen. 4. 684) is: *tu facito . . . sis memor* (12. 438); and to: *dedit esse deas* (10. 235) is: *nati coram me cernere letum fecisti* (2. 539), where the use of *facere* with the infinitive instead of *curare* with *ut cum subiunctivo* gives a curiously modern effect. Servius transfers this idiom to his prose in: *di . . . Aeneam huc venire fecerunt* (ad Aen. 4. 45), and it is the regular idiom in modern French. Different is the force of the

infinitive in:

Fecerat et viridi fetam Mavortis in antro

Procubuisse lupam (Aen. 8. 630-1);

here fecerat seems for fecerat videndam, and Virgil uses procubuisse for procubantem; for the infinitive or present participle can be used with like sense after videre.

In: nunc te mea dextera bello defensum dabit (Aen. 12. 437) we have a parallel to: habeat victos (ib. 17) i.e. in 'it will defend' to 'let him conquer'. The idiom with habeo is much more common in prose, as in: pecunias magnas collocatas habent (Cic. Leg. Man. 18. 7), de Caesare satis hoc tempore dictum habeo (Cic. Phil. 5. 52. 19), ut . . . scaphas ad litus adpulsas habeant (B. C. 2. 43), qui omnia . . . domita armis habeat (Liv. 7. 32. 9). In: persuasum habet, notum habet, exploratum habet, compertum habet, cognitum habet, it is virtually the French perfect with avoir. But it is rare in poetry, where the use with dare is the common one. Besides: regna . . . habebat (Aen. 1. 346) I notice: spem si quam . . . habuistis (11. 308), imperium . . . habebit (9. 449), numen habere maris (10. 221), arma Latinus habeto (12. 192) 'Latinus shall command the army'. In: tu quoque magnam partem opere in tanto . . . haberes (Aen. 6. 30-1), as in: quorum magna pars fui (2. 6), we have poetic substitutes for interesses and intereram. We seem to have the opposite of this dissolution in: te patrios miscere iuvat cum coniuge census (Mart. 4. 75. 3), where miscere seems substituted for communes habere.

We read: sit numine vestro (Aen. 6. 266) for: per vos liceat, non opis est nostrae (1. 601) for: non possumus, and: vestro . . . in numine Troia est (2. 703) for: vos Troiam tuemini. In: longe illi dea mater erit (12. 52) longe erit 'will be afar' seems to be poetic for aberit 'will fail to aid'. We note: naribus duces (Od. 4. 1. 21-2), auribus accipere (Lucr. 4. 982), addidit ore (Aen. 2. 593). In: discrimina costis per medium qua spina dabat (Aen. 10. 382-3) dabat discrimina is for discernebat, and we have a passive of this in: tenui discrimine leti esse suos (10. 511-12), which would be in prose: minimum abesse quin sui perirent. But in: (cum) esset . . . aequalis Mars utriusque diu (Mart. Ep. Lib. 29. 2) we have a poetical equivalent for: cum uterque aequo Marte diu certaret.

So in: non lacrimis hoc tempus (Aen. 12. 156) lacrimis is for lacrimare; and in: subtracta sibi quaereret arma dolor (Mart. 1. 42. 2) dolor is for Portia dolens. In: lacrimis iamque peractus eras (Mart. 7. 47. 6) lacrimis is for nobis lacrimantibus. While dolor is here subjective, in: postquam primus amor deceptam morte fefellit (Aen. 4. 17) amor is objective, being for: is quem primum amavit. So in: castigant . . . moras (4. 407) for: eos qui morabantur; fletus fert . . . refertque soror (4. 437) for: flentis mandata; equitum levia . . . arma (11. 512) for: equites leviter armatos. While Virgil in: medio . . . campo (Geo. 3. 466) follows the prose construction and treats medio as an adjective, in: castrorum et campi medio (Aen. 9. 230) he uses medio as a noun, and in: medio sermone (= sermone interrupto) (4. 277) and fugae medio (11. 547) we have medio in both taking the place of a past participle.

We have nouns for a subjunctive with ut in: missio saepe viris magno clamore petita est (Mart. Ep. Lib. 29. 3). So too in: suadent somnos (Aen. 2. 9). In: nescis dominae fastidia Romae (Mart. 1. 3. 3) fastidia is for: quantum fastidia, and in: temptatum aditus et quae mollissima fandi tempora (Aen. 4. 293-4) aditus is clearly for: quam eam adiret. So we have nouns used for infinitives after verbs of hearing or knowing in: coniugis audisset fatum cum Portia Bruti (Mart. 1. 42. 1), where coniugis fatum is for: coniugem periisse; veterem . . . agnovit amicum (Aen. 3. 82) for: amicum olim fuisse. So after verbs of hoping, promising, or refusing in: sperare salutem (1. 451), praesens . . . minatur exitium (12. 760-1), canitiemque sibi et longos promiserat annos (10. 549), cursumque recusant (12. 747), and after a modal verb in: rebellionem coeptavere (Tac. Ann. 3. 40. 1). In: ego nec tumultum nec mori per vim metuam (Od. 3. 14. 14-15) we have a noun coupled with an infinitive, as we have in: iram miserantur inanem amborum et tantos mortalibus esse dolores (Aen. 10. 758-9). In: fugae studio (Aen. 4. 400) fugae is for fugiendi, and in: quem tum vates Cassandra moveret? (3. 187) vates is for vaticinando. In: satis prospectum urbanae servituti (Tac. Ann. 1. 46. 4) we have a poetic expression for: urbi in servitutem redigendae satis esse provisum. In: exim promptum quod multorum intimis questibus tegebatur (ib. 3. 36. 1) we have Tacitean brevity for: deinde id prolatum est quod ante multi clam querendo secretum tenebant. So: intersint . . . patris lacrimis (Aen. 11. 62) is a poetic brevity for: patri lugenti lacrimando consentiant.

It seemed to me as a boy that our phrase 'with fire and sword' had a great advantage over Cicero's: vi et armis (Sest. 78. 36) or even: vim et ferrum (ib. 79. 37), and Virgil has the same feeling, for he writes: qui face Dardanios ferroque sequare colonos (Aen. 4. 626); and Tacitus strengthens the phrase in: igne et caedibus perfidiam ultus est (Ann. 2. 8. 4). In: hos successus alit (Aen. 5. 231) or: successu exsultans (2. 386) our schoolboy meets a familiar word that he has

sadly missed in Caesar and Cicero. He wastes no time over the propriety of Virgil's use of *viam* in: *fata viam inveniunt* (Aen. 3. 395), or of *modi* in: *haud ignara modi* (10. 247), and greets *visus* as an old friend in: *rite secundarent visus* (3. 36) 'might duly aid my plans'. He feels no need of explanations about: *Danai puellas* (Od. 3. 11. 23), but when he comes to Virgil's use of: *melio rem animam* (Aen. 5. 483), he may doubt Virgil's eminence in theology. But in: *humum semel ore momordit* (11. 418), if he is fortunate enough to have this reading presented to him, he will probably master the sense without the aid of Servius. My Clarendon Press text reads *simul*, following Ribbeck; but of his six manuscripts cited three give *semel*, one *semul*, one *simul* corrected to *semel*, and one only *simul*. Servius read *semel*, and his note is: *semel cito confestim*, i.e. *qui tota mortis celeritate consumptus est, quasi nihil ultra passurus*. *Volnerati enim solent vel terram vel arma mordere, ne dolorem eorum indicet gemitus*. Evidently *semel* is for: *semel tantum, non bis*, and to Servius: *humum semel ore momordit* means: *vita confestim excessit*; showing that to the Roman *terram momordit* had a second meaning corresponding to our figurative sense of 'bit the dust'.

Very familiar to us seems *sub te in: nos tumidum sub te permensi classibus aequor* (Aen. 3. 157), where in prose we expect *te duce*. The phrase is probably elliptical, and was parallel to: *sub te . . . magistro* (Aen. 8. 515). *Sub* here is rather a preposition than an adverb; while in such phrases as: *grato . . . sub antro* (Od. 1. 5. 3) 'below in the pleasant grot', or: *Acheronte sub imo* (Aen. 11. 23) 'in Acheron's lowest depth, down below', it is still a mere adverb. Familiar too seems: *sine ictu* (2. 544) for *nullo vulnere dato*. Prose favours *nullo* or *nullis* in many phrases where we have *sine* in verse, as in: *sine nomine corpus* (2. 558) for *nullo honore cadaver*. Quite familiar too seems: *ante annos animum . . . gerens* (9. 311), where there is an ellipsis of *sapientiore*, the prose being: *animum gerens sapientiore quam pro annis*. For this use of *ante* for *magis quam* we may compare: *ante omnes stupet ipse Dares* (5. 406) and: *ante alios inmanior omnes* (1. 347).

The simplicity of Ennius, who in: *saxo cere comminuit brum* (Ann. 552, M.) 'he smashed his head with a rock' tried by this disposition of *cerebrum* to represent to his readers the result of the catastrophe, finds a gentler echo in: *seque gregari* (Lucr. 1. 452). In: *Argi nempe soles subire letum* (Mart. 1. 117. 9) the like disposition of *Argiletum* seems intended to indicate the close relation common between the initial and final words of the verse. In: *quadrupedumque putrem cursu quatit ungula campum* (Aen. 11. 875) we have this relation between pairs of words at the beginning and end; and in: *quadrupedante putrem sonitu quatit ungula campum* (8. 596), a like correspondence of pairs indicates that *quadrupedante*, transferred in syntax to *sonitu*, belongs in sense to *ungula*. The repetition in: *repetens iterumque iterumque monebo* (3. 436) serves to heighten the force of *iterum*, while the enhancement of the effect in: *nam thermis iterumque iterumque iterumque lavatur* (Mart. 2. 14. 13) recalls Virgil's use of: *alterum in alterius* (Aen. 2. 667) for three persons. So with the position of *inter* in: *latus inter et ilia* (10. 778); while that of *adventu* and *abitu* in: *adventu manet incolumis natura abituque* (Lucr. 1. 457) and of *demum* in: *nam solido vincunt ea corpore demum* (id. 1. 486) has a like effect. Fine is the effect of the spondaic close in: *ex infinito iam tempore subsidendo* (id. 1. 995).

## XXIV

### LONGE LATEQUE

WE noticed in our last paragraph how Virgil in two of his most striking verses had arranged the words so that a pair at the beginning of each should correspond to a pair at the end. This tendency to arrange words in pairs, very evident as it is, would be still more so, were it not that a pair is so often expressed by one of its members; just as we found the *Dioscuri* named by either *Castor* or *Pollux*. From this ellipsis arise the figures of *synecdoche* and *metonymy*, the most common in poetry, and so those whose nature and origin it most concerns us to trace.

Whether we turn to Latin prose or poetry, we find a notable tendency, growing with the growth of emotion, to the expression of objects and qualities in related pairs. Turn for a moment to Plautus, where in the *Captives* *Ergasilus* enters in triumph:

Iuppiter supreme, servas me, measque auges opes.  
Maximas opimitates opiparasque offers mihi,  
Laudem lucrum, ludum iocum, festivitatem ferias,  
Pompam penum, potationis saturitatem, gaudium (vv. 768-771).

In Terence, Menander's faithful imitator, we often have a threefold arrangement of ideas, in which he is especially followed by Horace. This is joined with the arrangement into pairs of which we are speaking in:

perpulisti me, ut homini adulescentulo  
In alio occupato amore, abhorrenti ab re uxoria  
Filiam ut darem in seditionem atque in incertas nuptias,  
Eius labore atque eius dolore gnato ut medicarer tuo (And. 828-31).

When we turn to Cicero, this is prominent, but often further developed in the union of two pairs into four, as in:

Saxa et solitudines voci respondent, bestiae saepe inmanes cantu flectuntur atque consistunt: nos, instituti rebus optimis, non poetarum voce moveamur? Homerum Colophonii civem esse dicunt suum, Chii suum vindicant, Salaminii repetunt, Smyrnaei vero suum esse confirmant, itaque etiam delubrum eius in oppido dedicaverunt: permulti alii praeterea pugnant inter se atque contendunt (Arch. 19. 8). Caesar in his descriptions shows the same tendency, as in:

Cum bellum civitas aut inlatum defendit aut infert, magistratus, qui ei bello praesint, ut vitae necisque habeant potestatem, deliguntur. In pace nullus est communis magistratus, sed principes regionum atque pagorum inter suos ius dicunt controversiasque minuunt (B. G. 6. 23. 4-5).

Let us turn to Virgil:

Iam gravis aequabat luctus et mutua Mavors  
Funera: caedebant pariter pariterque ruebant  
Victores victique, neque his fuga nota neque illis (Aen. 10. 755-7),

and to Horace:

Laurea donandus Apollinari,  
Seu per audaces nova dithyrambos  
Verba devolvit numerisque fertur  
Lege solutis;  
Seu deos regesque canit, deorum  
Sanguinem, per quos cecidere iusta  
Morte Centauri, cecidit tremendae  
Flamma Chimaerae (Od. 4. 2. 9-16),

and to Propertius:

Tarda Philoctetae sanavit crura Machaon,  
Phoenicis Chiron lumina Philyrides,  
Et deus exstinctum Cressis Epidaurius herbis  
Restituit patriis Androgeona focis (2. 1. 59-62),

where the Ciceronian tendency to fourfold structure is very marked; as it is in less degree in Ovid:

At Silenus abest; titubantem annisque meroque  
Ruricolae cepere Phryges, vinctumque coronis  
Ad regem traxere Midan; cui Thracius Orpheus  
Orgia tradiderat cum Cecropio Eumolpo (Met. 11. 90-3).

In Livy it seems far more carefully developed than in Caesar or Cicero, as we find it in: at enim pauci quidem sunt, sed vigentes animis corporibusque, quorum robora ac vires vix sustinere vis ulla possit. Effigies immo, umbrae hominum, fame frigore, inlucie squalore enecti, contusi ac debilitati inter saxa rupesque; ad hoc praeusti artus, nive rigentes nervi, membra torrida gelu, quassata fractaque arma, claudi ac debiles equi: cum hoc equite, cum hoc pedite pugnaturi estis; reliquias extremas hostium, non hostem habebitis (21. 40. 8-10). It is hardly less evident in Sallust's less laboured periods: quae res Marium cum pro honore quem adfectabat, tum contra Metellum vehementer accenderat. Ita cupidine atque ira, pessimis consultoribus, grassari, neque facto ullo neque dicto abstinere, quod modo ambitiosum foret; milites, quibus in hibernis praeerat, laxiore imperio quam ante habere; apud negotiatores, quorum magna multitudo Uticae erat, criminose simul et magnifice de bello loqui (Jug. 64. 4-5). So L. Seneca: quemadmodum radii solis contingunt quidem terram, sed ibi sunt, unde mittuntur: sic animus magnus et sacer et in hoc dimissus, ut propius quidem divina nossemus, conversatur quidem nobiscum, sed haeret origini suae: illinc pendet, illuc spectat et nititur, nostris tamquam melior

interest (Ep. Mor. 4. 12 (41). 5). But in Tacitus we seem to reach the crowning development of this tendency, as we see it in: *haud perinde Germanos volnera, luctus, excidia quam ea species dolore atque ira adfecit. Qui modo abire sedibus, trans Albim concedere parabant, pugnam volunt, arma rapiunt; plebes primores, iuventus senes agmen Romanum repente incursant, turbant. Postremo deligunt locum flumine et silvis clausum, arta intus planitie et humida* (Ann. 2. 19). I have selected these specimens from the twelve *Di Maiores* of Latin letters to show how they develop the union of these pairs, now weaving them in combinations of three, now of four, as we shall be led to do in tracing their ellipses, and the figures to which they give rise.

One of the most common pairs we find in Latin is: *longe lateque* ‘far and wide’. Virgil has it in full three times, once in his youthful poems: *longe lateque per orbem* (Cir. 16), once in the *Georgics*: *longe saltus lateque vacantes* (3. 477), once in the *Aeneid*: *longe lateque per urbes* (6. 378). In his numerous uses of the phrase he expresses it usually by *late*, as in: *loca nocte tacentia late* (Aen. 6. 265), *late circum loca sulpure fumant* (2. 698), *populum late regem* (1. 21), *late loca milite complent* (2. 495); less often by *longe*, as in: *resonantia longe litora misceri* (Geo. 1. 358), *auro ductores longe effulgent* (Aen. 5. 133), *longeque refulget* (8. 623), *Asia longe pulsa palus* (7. 701). It is used by Cicero in the order: *late longeque* as well (Balb. 13. 5), and abbreviated in: *bellum . . . tam late divisum* (Leg. Man. 31. 11). But the abbreviation is more usual in poetry; for the excellence of poetic diction consists rather in its power of suggesting ideas to the mind than in a full and clear expression of them.

The same is true of the adjectives *longus* and *latus*; it is very common both with us and in Latin to express the idea of extension by one of its two dimensions. So Virgil gives us: *latos Haemi pinguescere campos* (Geo. 1. 492), *latis otia fundis* (2. 468), *templa . . . latis inmania regnis* (Aen. 4. 199), *ingentem lato dedit ore fenestram* (2. 482), *aeris in campis latis* (6. 887). We have predicative uses of it tending to adverbial in: *latos vastant cultoribus agros* (Aen. 8. 8) ‘far and wide they lay waste the farmers’ fields’. So too in: *Sigaea igni freta lata relucent* (2. 312), *alius latum funda iam verberat amnem* (Geo. 1. 141), *latum reget aequus orbem* (Od. 1. 12. 57), *latam dives habebat humum* (Ov. Fast. 5. 280), *patet in curas area lata meas* (Ov. Her. 1. 72). In: *(murus) latius quam qua caederetur ruebat* (Liv. 21. 11. 9) we have a metonymy of *latius* for *longius*.

While I read in Horace: *latumque per aequor* (Ep. 1. 2. 20) and: *effusi late maris* (Ep. 1. 11. 26), I read also: *dum longus inter saeviat Ilion Romamque pontus* (Od. 3. 3. 37), and: *meliusne fluctus ire per longos fuit?* (Od. 3. 27. 43). So: *ex aethere longo* (Aen. 7. 288) we should translate ‘from the wide sky’, and: *reboant silvaeque et longus Olympus* (Geo. 3. 223) ‘both the broad woods and the wide sky return the roar’. So: *longa procul longis via dividit invia terris* (Aen. 3. 383) is ‘a long stretch of pathless way across broad lands sunders afar’. In:

Ut saepe ingenti bello cum longa cohortes  
Explicuit legio, et campo stetit agmen aperto,  
Directaeque acies, ac late fluctuat omnis  
Aere renidenti tellus (Geo. 2. 279-82),

while both *longa* and *late* are abbreviated forms, the propriety of abbreviating by *longa* on the line of march and by *late* on the battlefield is evident. *Longus* and *longe* are often transferred to time, as in the common phrase: *longum tempus*. Servius explains: *nec longe* (Aen. 10. 317) as for: *nec multo post*, where evidently *longe* is one for a pair: *longe post*. In return for this use of *longe* for *diu* we have in Horace: *diu lateque victrices* (Od. 4. 4. 22-3) for *longe lateque*. We may compare with *nec longe* in Virgil: *longe et multum . . . antecellet* (Cic. Mur. 29. 13), where, as we shall see, the union in a pair of *longe* and *multum* explains Virgil’s use of *longe* for *multum*. So Horace’s use of *temporibus* for *rebus* in: *secundis temporibus dubiisque rectus* (Od. 4. 9. 35-6) is connected with his union of *diu lateque* for ‘far and wide’.

Cicero in his *Academics* gives us the following enumeration of opposites: *multa pauca, magna parva, longa brevia, lata angusta* (Acad. Prior. 2. 92. 29). From *longa* and *lata* let us turn to *brevia* and *angusta*. In: *(libellos) quos artat brevibus membrana tabellis* (Mart. 1. 2. 3) pages have two dimensions, and so *brevibus* must be short for *brevibus et angustis*. As we began with *lata*, let us start here with *angusta*. Just as *brevis* is for *parvus* in the example cited, so in: *angustis eiecta cadavera cellis* (Sat. 1. 8. 8) we have *angustis* for *parvis*. And so in: *rebus angustis animosus* (Od. 2. 10. 21), *angustis hunc addere rebus honorem* (Geo. 3. 290), *spes sibi quisque, sed haec quam angusta videtis* (Aen. 11. 309), *neque . . . intonet angusto pectore Callimachus* (Prop. 2. 1. 40), with which compare: *exiguo . . . e pectore* of himself (id. 4. 1. 59). So too in: *tutusque mensa capitur angusta cibus* (Sen. Thyest. 452), *cuncta ad rem publicam referri, qua tenui angustas civium domos* (Tac. Ann. 2. 33. 3), *quorum virtutibus obstat res angusta domi* (Juv. 3. 165). From such a union as *tenui angustas* seems to have arisen the metonymy of *angusta* for *tenuis* in: *angusta cantare licet videaris avena* (Mart. 8. 3. 21).

Angustus seems a metonymy for brevis in: angusti terminus aevi (Geo. 4. 206), angustis quod equum compescit habenis (Tib. 1. 4. 11), nec mihi solstitium quicquam de noctibus aufert, efficit angustos nec mihi bruma dies (Ov. Trist. 5. 10. 7-8), usque adeone angusta dies (Stat. Th. 1. 442), temporis angusti mansit concordia discors (Luc. 1. 98).

When we read in Horace: quia scilicet illis maiorem natura modum dedit, his breve pondus (Sat. 2. 2. 37), we are apt to notice only the coincidence with our English 'short weight'; but the contrast with maiorem here shows that breve is for parvum. So in: privatus illis census erat brevis, commune magnum (Od. 2. 15. 13-14), cena brevis iuvat (Ep. 1. 14. 35), qua brevis occultum mus sibi fecit iter (Ov. Fast. 2. 574), instruis impensa nostra sepulcra brevi (Her. 7. 188), aude aliquid brevibus Gyaris et carcere dignum (Juv. 1. 73). When we compare Martial's: frons brevis (4. 42. 9) with Horace's: angusta fronte (Ep. 1. 7. 26) evidently each is for brevis et angusta. So when we compare: scis in breve te cogi (Hor. Ep. 1. 20. 8) with: in parvum quendam et angustum locum concludatur (Cic. Leg. 1. 17. 5), or: res . . . adducta in angustum (Lael. 20. 5), or: ita hac re in angustum oppido nunc meae coguntur copiae (Ter. Heaut. 669) it is clear that breve is by metonymy for angustum.

We read: longe omnes multumque superabit (Cic. Verr. 2. 5. 115. 44), dicendi consuetudo longe et multum isti vestrae exercitationi ad honorem antecellet (Mur. 29. 13), cum longe multumque praestet mens atque ratio (Fin. 5. 40. 14). Servius (ad Aen. 5. 406: longeque recusat) says longe is for valde, and he is confirmed by Nonius (1. 545. 21, M.). Here longe would seem to be for longe et multum. Servius refers us to longe (Aen. 1. 13), which he says is for valde, which Charisius confirms (203. 17, K.); and whether we connect longe with contra or dives, it seems to require that meaning. To: errat longe (Ter. Ad. 65) Donatus notes: Melius est 'longe' simpliciter accipere, ut locale sit, quam valde. But in: longe mihi alia mens est (Sall. Cat. 52. 2), where Servius says longe is for valde, he seems right. So in: canitiemque sibi et longos promiserat annos (Aen. 10. 549) longos is short for multos et longos, though Servius says it is for multos. In: longe servet vestigia coniunx (Aen. 2. 711) Servius says longe is for valde; it cannot mean 'from a great distance', for we read: pone subit coniunx (v. 725) 'my wife follows close behind'. Evidently longe is here intended as a caution against her straying: 'let her observe closely the way I go'. So in:

miserere parentis

Longaevi, quem nunc maestum patria Ardea longe  
Dividit (Aen. 12. 43-5),

Servius takes longe as valde, joining it with maestum; we must not join it with dividit, he says; for Ardea is not far from Laurentum. We may notice in support of this, that dividit is in the next verse, while maestum and longe are the first and last words of the second colon of the verse, words often in close union in sense. In: multum inter se distant istae facultates, longeque sunt diversae (Cic. de Orat. 1. 215. 49) we have multum et longe distributed, i.e. longe in the second clause and multum in the first are both for longe et multum, as I shall show.

When we turn to comparatives we find often multum joined with them, evidently for longe et multum, as we shall see. We read: non multum est maius quam illud volgare ac forense (Cic. de Orat. 3. 92. 24), where manuscripts favour multum, hercle qui multum improbiores sunt quam a primo credidi (Pl. Most. 824), multum ad agendum difficiliorem (Quint. 9. 2. 68), multum est tersior (id. 10. 1. 94), multum graviora tulisti (Ov. Trist. 5. 11. 7), multumque coitur humani generis maiore in proelia damno (Luc. 2. 225), multum felicior exit (Stat. Theb. 6. 701), multumque aliis iactantior umbris (ib. 9. 559), multum uno maiora viro (Sil. 13. 708), multum hic robustior illo (Juv. 10. 197). In many of these examples some manuscripts read multo, the usual construction in classical Latin, but for that very reason multum, where it has good manuscript authority, should be retained.

But we find longe also with the comparative, as in: pedibus longe melior Lycus (Aen. 9. 556), longe cunctis longeque beator illa (Ov. Met. 4. 325), qui sum longe fortior (Phaedr. 3. 7. 6), uno (proelio) longe magis Pompeianis prospero (Vell. 2. 51 fin.), longe quam speraverat tumultuosior (id. 2. 74 init.), sed mihi longe magis orator probari in opere suo videtur (Quint. 10. 1. 70), utiliorem longe fore Euripidem (id. 10. 1. 67), longe maiore nisu clamavit (Petron. 9), Giton longe blandior quam ego (ib. 98), quod longe melius historici faciunt (id. 118). We can see from these examples that of the pair longe multumque multum was often taken for the comparative, being usually, however, changed to multo, the ablative of difference of measure, as fitting more closely with it. But just as we saw with longe lateque, at times it is longe, and not multum, that is retained with the comparative; and we even find this longe coupled with late in this connexion, as in: longe lateque rem meliorem facit (Dig. 4. 4. 39. 1).

With the superlative longe is usual in classical Latin. In: longi pars maxima luctus (Aen. 11. 214) Servius prefers longe

to longi; our editors are right in keeping longi as the more difficult reading, but it seems elliptical for longi pars longe maxima luctus, so that Servius was right about the meaning. Multo is also used with the superlative, and pretty frequently, as in: conspectus vester multo iucundissimus (Cic. Leg. Man. 1. 1), multo omnium nunc me fortunatissimum factum puto esse (Ter. Heaut. 842), multo sopor ille gravissimus exstat (Lucr. 4. 956), postera lux oritur multo gratissima (Sat. 1. 5. 39), multo pars maxima (ib. 2. 3. 82), ea regio eis temporibus multo putabatur locupletissima (Nep. Ages. 3. 1), multo elegantissimum poetam (id. Att. 12. 4). Hand says multum is found with the superlative once only, in: mater odorati multum pulcerrima turis (Grat. Cyn. 1. 133). Again we may trace this alternation of longe and multo with the superlative to the pair longe et multum.

We read in Cicero: multis meis et magnis laboribus et periculis (Sulla 5. 2), utilitates multae et magnae (Lael. 30. 9), accedunt eodem multa privata, magna eius in me merita (Phil. 13. 7. 4), atque haec in bello plura et maiora videntur timentibus (Div. 2. 58. 27), plurima et maxima proelia commemorare possem (Mur. 33. 16), iudicio plurimis maximisque in rebus probatissimus (Verr. 2. 2. 102. 42), ex plurimarum et maximarum appetitione concluditur (Fin. 4. 34. 13), plurimis et maximis voluptatibus (ib. 2. 63. 19). We have here, too, parallel to the use of multum (or multo) and longe with the comparative and superlative, the use with interest of magni, pluris (rarely maioris), and maximi or plurimi. In: tua plurima . . . pietas (Aen. 2. 429) plurima is probably by metonymy for summa, and in: culti iugera magna soli (Tib. 1. 1. 2) magna seems to be for multa et magna. For: at tibi curarum milia quanta dabit (Prop. 1. 5. 10) reminds us of: qui ab dis immortalibus tot et tantas res tacitus auderet optare, quot et quantas di immortales ad Cn. Pompeium detulerunt (Leg. Man. 48. 16). In prose we read magna pars, but in Horace: multaque pars mei (Od. 3. 30. 6); and so probably with: multa . . . aura (Od. 4. 2. 25). So magno pretio in prose, and magna pecunia (Cic. Att. 11. 3. 3), but: multa mercede (Geo. 2. 62). We all remember Iuppiter optimus maximus; in: vos haec facietis maxima Gallo (Buc. 10. 72) maxima is a metonymy for optima.

We read in prose: magnae virtutis (B. G. 2. 15), but: multa viri virtus (Aen. 4. 3), probably for: magnae et multae viri virtutes; and: magnam laudem (Cic. Off. 2. 45. 13), but: non sine multa laude (A. P. 281-2), for: multis et magnis laudibus. So in: magna illic imago tristium laetorumque (Tac. Ann. 2. 53. 3), where magna seems for magna et alta; 'many and profound were his reflections on victory and disaster'. For the use of magnus for altus and the opposite is not uncommon. To: iacet altus Orodes (Aen. 10. 737) Servius notes: *altus* magnus, ut: sic pater ille deum faciat, sic altus Apollo (10. 875), with which compare: eris mihi magnus Apollo (Buc. 3. 104). Probably Virgil substituted altus for magnus here to attain the oxymoron: iacet altus. We may further note: magnis montibus (Catull. 64. 280-1), magnum . . . Olympum (Enn. Ann. 1, M.), magna templa caelitum (Varr. L. L. 7. 2. 81), magna eloquentia (Cic. Tusc. 1. 117. 49), magnam laudem (Off. 2. 45. 13). It is for this reason that the superlative of magna in the last three examples is usually not maxima, but summa. Probably magnus is thus used for altus in: mari magno (Enn. Ann. 491, M.), aquae magnae bis eo anno fuerunt (Liv. 24. 9. 6); and we may compare: magna . . . voce (Sat. 1. 7. 31) with summa voce (1. 3. 7-8) and with altissimos sonos (Quint. 11. 3. 23). We find the union from which this confusion proceeds in: magni cuiusdam et alti viri (Cic. Tusc. 5. 31. 10). For parvus and paucus I have noted only: in parvo tempore (Lucr. 5. 106) for brevi; and: responsum paucis ita reddidit heros (Aen. 6. 672), out of which may arise Hyginus's: paucum tempus.

Very common is the pair we find in: exitus quidem omnium unus et idem fuit (Cic. Div. 2. 97. 47), in qua omnes sentirent unum atque idem (Cat. 4. 14. 7), ferar unus et idem (Hor. Ep. 2. 2. 200), haec ut cera liquescit uno eodemque igni (Buc. 8. 80-1), una eademque via (Aen. 10. 487), uno eodemque tulit partu (12. 847). We have the pair distributed in: non semper idem floribus est honor vernis, neque uno Luna rubens nitet voltu (Od. 2. 11. 9-11), where idem is for unus et idem, and uno for uno et eodem. It is much easier to trace the expression of the pair by unus than by idem; we note this in: quia quasi una aetas erat (Pl. Capt. 20), nam parentum iniuriae unius modi sunt ferre (Ter. Heaut. 205), illa cum uno tempore audisset (Cluent. 28. 9), ille sinistrorsum, hic dextrorsum abijt; unus utrique error (Sat. 2. 3. 50), rege incolumi mens omnibus una est (Geo. 4. 212), aestuat ingens uno in corde pudor mixtoque insania luctu (Aen. 10. 871). Harder to distinguish is the use of idem for unus et idem, but it seems evident in: idem omnium gemitus (Tac. Ann. 3. 1. 5). In: his amor unus erat (Aen. 9. 182) the ellipsis is involved with the idea of reciprocity, and we may solve it: hi inter se uno et eodem amore fovebant.

We read: ille volat simul arva fuga simul aequora verrens (Geo. 3. 201) and: cum simul terra simul mari bellum impellitur (Tac. Agr. 25) 'alike by land, alike by sea'; for simul seems a shortened form of simile. In these examples we have the older form of the construction, and at times one of the pair is omitted, either the first, as in: salve, simul autem vale (Pl. Merc. 830), or the second, as in: Cymothoe simul et Triton (simul) (Aen. 1. 144). So in: (adpetitus animi) et



oderit se et simul diligit (Cic. Fin. 5. 28. 10) the first is omitted, in: simul aliquid audiero, scribam ad te (Att. 8. 11 fin.) the second. But when the pair is coupled as simul atque simul, or simul et simul, in the Latin we know usually either the first or second is omitted, as in: ut, simul atque posita sit causa, habeant quo se referant (Cic. de Orat. 2. 117. 27). We know that in dissolving a complex sentence into its components we usually change their order; so we have here: habeant quo se referant simul; atque simul posita causa est.

We know that along with: simul atque simul ‘alike, thereto somehow alike’ there was also in use: simul et simul ‘alike, further alike’, but the latter is rarer. We have it in: ego hic esse et illic simitu haud potui (Pl. Most. 792), nunc operam potestis ambo mihi dare et vobis simul (id. Men. 1099). We read in Tacitus: privatam gratiam statim mereare, statim recipias (Ann. 1. 28. 7), and recognize in statim . . . statim a pair like simul . . . simul, and interchanged as we see in: simul accepi a Seleuco tuo litteras statim quaesivi e Balbo per codicillos, quid esset in lege (Cic. Fam. 6. 18 init.). I read: semen statim cum spargitur, statim obruendum est (Pallad. Apr. 3. 3) I find too: (simul) cum simul ‘(alike) what time alike’ in: ad portum hinc abii mane cum luci simul (Pl. Merc. 255), which seems short for: ad portum hinc abii mane simul, cum luci simul sol oriebatur. We have here the conjunction cum in juxtaposition with the locative luci, ‘when at dawn’. But in Latin the locative is fused very early with the ablative; and we have here a starting-point for the use of cum as a preposition, ‘when at dawn’ passing into ‘along with dawn’; just as we have it in: intro abi tu cum istac simul (Pl. Cist. 770), where istac passed from the nom. ‘when she’ to the ablative ‘with her’. And so in: quas (res) tecum simul didici (Cic. Acad. Post. 1. 3. 1) for; quas res tu (simul didicisti) cum simul didici. Of course in like fashion with simul we must treat its opposite: secus . . . secus.

It is easy to substitute ut ‘when’ for cum in Latin, and so for simul cum we get simul ut, as in: omne animal, simul ut ortum est, se ipsum diligit (Cic. Fin. 2. 33. 11). Cum and ut are both joined with primum; and it is not strange to find simul and simul atque also joined with it, as in: simul ac primum ei occasio visa est (Cic. Verr. 2. 1. 34. 13), simul primum magistratu abiit (Liv. 6. 1. 6), unde simul primum me dimisere Philippi (Hor. Ep. 2. 2. 49). It would be natural to expect simul ubi too; and when the best manuscripts give us: simul ubi conspexit (Liv. 4. 18. 7), though it seems a ὅπου γεγραμμένον, I feel like adopting the reading.

But the omission of the second simul has given rise to the idea that in: quo simul mearis (Od. 1. 4. 17) simul is for simul atque. But it is rather an ellipse such as we see in: simul inflavit tibicen, a perito carmen (simul) agnoscitur (Cic. Acad. Prior. 2. 86. 27), or: hic simul argentum repperit, cura sese (simul) expedit (Ter. Phorm. 823), or: nostri simul in arido constiterunt, in hostes impetum (simul) fecerunt (B. G. 4. 26). Neither Servius, nor Acron, nor Porphyrio has thought it necessary to explain the syntax.

We have aequae . . . aequae in: aequae pauperibus prodest, locupletibus aequae (Hor. Ep. 1. 1. 25), aequae discordiam praepositorum, aequae concordiam subiectis exitiosam (Tac. Agr. 15). We find aequae et in: nisi aequae amicos et nosmet ipsos diligamus (Cic. Fin. 1. 67. 20); and aequae . . . quae in: (quod) aequae neglectum pueris senibusque nocebit (Hor. Ep. 1. 1. 26). Like simul it is joined with atque, cum, and ut, and owing to its close connexion with the comparative it is also joined with quam, as in: nihil aequae eos terruit quam praeter spem robur et colos imperatoris (Liv. 28. 26. 14). Just as in: quae (amicitia) incepta (simul) a parvis cum aetate adcrevit simul (Ter. And. 539) the pair simul . . . simul is represented by the second term, so in: (et) haec amem necesse est et Veraniolum meum (Catull. 12. 16-17) et seems for et . . . et, and assumes the force of atque ‘as’ in translation. The Itali changed this et to ut, which change Baehrens and Robinson Ellis were inclined to follow.

We read: nam qualis quantusque cavo Polyphemus in antro (Aen. 3. 641) and: nam aut ipsius rei natura qualis et quanta sit quaerimus (Cic. Tusc. 3. 56. 23). We find: quali fide, quali pietate existimatis esse eos? (Cic. Font. 21. 10), but: qui tanta virtute atque integritate fuit (ib. 29. 13); and: haud equidem tali me dignor honore (Aen. 1. 335), but: deae donis et tanto laetus honore (8. 617). In: ac primum quanta innocentia debent esse imperatores, quanta deinde in omnibus rebus temperantia, quanta fide, quanta facilitate, quanto ingenio, quanta humanitate! quae breviter qualia sint in Cn. Pompeio consideremus (Cic. Leg. Man. 36. 13) we shall best understand the meanings of quanta and qualia, if we think of quanta as short for quali et quanta, and of qualia as for qualia et quanta. So in: Poenorum qualis in arvis saucius ille gravi venantum vulnere pectus tum demum movet arma leo (Aen. 12. 4-6) and in: qualis Hyperboreis Aquilo cum densus ab oris incubuit (Geo. 3. 196), while in: qualis mugitus, fugit cum saucius aram taurus (Aen. 2. 223) and in: qualis ubi ad terras abrupto sidere nimbus it mare per medium (12. 451) qualis seems a metonymy for quantus. We read: conservare urbes tantas atque tales (Cic. N. D. 3. 92. 39); and see that in: Eupolin Archilochum, comites educere tantos (Sat. 2. 3.

12) tantos is short for tantos et tales. So with tales in: si duo praeterea tales Idaea tulisset terra viros (Aen. 11. 285). We have the pairs in distribution in: qui tanti talem genuere parentes? (1. 606).

We read in Cicero: quam brevi tempore quot et quanti poetae . . . exstiterunt! (Tusc. 4. 5. 2) and: ad horum omnium iudicia tot atque tanta (Pis. 97. 40). We have already cited: tot et tantas res . . . quot et quantas (Leg. Man. 48. 16). So in: quis umquam tantis opibus, tantis rebus gestis fuit, qui se populi Romani . . . patronum dicere auderet? (Phil. 6. 12. 5) and: heu quianam tanti cinxerunt aethera nimbi? (Aen. 5. 13) tanti seems for tot et tanti. Still more frequent are such uses of quanti, as in:

Quantae tum scindunt hominem cuppedinis acres

Sollicitum curae, quantique perinde timores! (Lucr. 5. 45-6).

We read in Statius: O quantae pariter manus laborant! (Silv. 4. 3. 49) and: et quantos (annos) ego Delium poposci! (ib. 152); and in Valerius Flaccus: heu socii quantis complerunt litora monstris! (3. 261), and in distribution: quot mihi post lacrimas, post quanta piacula patrum serus ades! (2. 563), where quanta is for quot et quanta. In: at tibi curarum milia quanta dabit! (Prop. 1. 5. 10) and: quanti tum iuvenes, quantae sprevere pudorem spectandi studio matres! (Claudian, de III Cons. Hon. 126) quanti is for quot, a metonymy evidently resulting from such uses as we cited above. In Sidonius Apollinaris we read in distribution: suffragia tot sunt, quanta legit mundus (Carm. 2. 21-2).

This use seems to have found a further support in: et quantum est hominum venustiorum (Catull. 3. 2), where we have for quot a collective quantum. This is common in the Comedy, as in: o mihi quantum est hominum optimorum optime (Pl. Capt. 836) and: o omnium quantum est qui vivunt homo hominum ornatissime (Ter. Phorm. 853). Propertius joins it with tam multa in:

Tam multa illa meo divisa est milia lecto

Quantum Hypanis Veneto dissidet Eridano (1. 12. 3-4).

We have the opposite in Lactantius: vocavit discipulos quaerens quantos secum cibos gestarent (4. 15. 17), where quantos cibos is for quantum cibi. In Tertullian we have: nec tamen tantos inveniunt verba discipulos, quantos Christiani factis docendo (Apol. 50 fin.), where we have quanti for quot; and tanti for tot in: si Tiberis ascendit in moenia . . . statim: Christianos ad leonem! Tantos ad unum? (ib. 40 init.). And I read in Ducange that in mediaeval Latin the pair tanti . . . quanti is used for tot . . . quot; quot is found only in such unions as quot diebus, quot mensibus, while tot is nowhere used.

In French tant is the regular word for 'so many'. While the ordinal is quantième and quantes is joined with fois at times for 'how many times', 'how many' is combien (= quam bene), But combien is often 'how much', and its use for 'how many' is probably parallel to the development from quantum of quanti for quot. The use of bene in: bene doctum leads quite naturally to its use in: bene nummatum (Hor. Ep. 1. 6. 38), equivalent to multis nummis praeditum. In this development it finds support in a parallel use of bonus. We recall: bonam atque magnam cenam (Catull. 13. 3), and: nam hic quoque bonam magnamque partem ad te adtulit (Ter. Eun. 123), sed bona magnaue pars servabat foedera casti (Lucr. 5. 1025), equestris quoque ordinis bona magnaue pars (Val. Max. 2. 9. 7). For this pair we have magnam in: cum . . . magnam partem noctis vigilasses (Cic. Div. 1. 59. 28), but bonam in: bonam partem sermonis (de Orat. 2. 14. 3); and bonam spem (Lael. 23. 7), but: cum spe magna (Rab. Post. 5. 2) and: sine magna spe (Tusc. 1. 32. 15). So too in: bona pars hominum (Hor. Sat. 1. 1. 61), vocis accedet bona pars (Od. 4. 2. 46), melior quoniam pars acta diei (Aen. 9. 156).

## XXV

### SYNECDOCHE AND METONYMY

I HAD thought of treating synecdoche and metonymy in separate chapters; but I find it impossible. Harkness in his school grammar defines synecdoche as the use of the part for the whole, or of the whole for a part, or of the special for the general, or of the general for the special. Metonymy, he says, is the use of one name for another naturally suggested by it; and he adds: by this figure the cause is often put for the effect, or the effect for the cause, the property for the possessor, the place or age for the people, the sign for the thing signified, &c. But I find that synecdoche is only another name for the expression of a pair by one of its terms, and that metonymy, the expression of one of the terms by the other, is an almost constant consequence of synecdoche. When we name the Dioscuri by Pollux in Od. 3. 29. 64, we have synecdoche; when

we name Castor by Pollux in Geo. 3. 89, we have metonymy. The steps by which metonymy issues from synecdoche are not wholly clear to me; but the use of Castores for Castor and Pollux evidently assumes that we may call Pollux Castor.

My experience is that the two figures are often confused. Let us turn to: *contigimusque manum, qua concidit Ilia tellus* (Aen. 11. 245) 'the hand, by which the land of Troy fell'. We should at once say, we have here a metonymy of tellus for urbs. Servius's note is: ἐμφατικῶς dixit pro 'urbs Ilia', nam terra non concidit, sed civitas Ilium. But behind this use of tellus for urbs, we probably have terra et urbs parallel to Virgil's: *urbes arvaque* (Aen. 1. 549-50). If this is right, then we have here tellus for the urbs et tellus which constitute the civitas: a synecdoche, not a metonymy. But we may imagine a student, not versed in the use of tropes, who would emend tellus to turris, just as Ribbeck, influenced by a note of Servius, changed arva to arma. Servius's note is to urbes, and is: *arma latenter minatur*.

We find Bentley emending in like fashion, and with even less justification, through a failure to understand such figures. Horace writes:

Tutus bos etenim rura perambulat;  
Nutrit rura Ceres almaque Faustitas (Od. 4. 5. 17-18).

What grace or favour, he asks, has the repetition *rura . . . rura*? is it not *rus merum*? Already Tanaquil Faber, from a like feeling, had changed *rura* to *prata* in v. 17. But there the sense is plain and sound. The sore spot is in: *nutrit rura Ceres*. *Quid enim, amabo, est 'nutrire rura'?* *Rura sunt arva, prata, campi, saltus, &c., pro varia terrarum forma et situ. Quis vero mortalium nutrirī dixit res eiusmodi?* One can appreciate here the prosaic common sense of Bentley in its hopeless task of reading a poet, even so careful and discreet a poet as Horace. Even by trope can anything be said to be nursed, he asks, except what is capable of growth and increase, as e.g. trees, crops, fruits, or as hate, love, war, fire, and the like? Just fancy, I might add, the farmer nursing his two-acre field, in the hope that it will grow to a hundred acres! *Quid multa?* In *rura* there is an erasure in the codex Graevii, above which *ru-* appears. *Rura* is evidently the work of a second hand; and Bentley has little doubt that Horace wrote here *farra*, not *rura*; and in his text I read: *nutrit farra Ceres*. Neither Acron nor Porphyrio explain *rura*, but Porphyrio indicates the text thus: *nutrit r. C. a. Faustitas*; and from *r.* we may assume that he read *rura*, not *farra*. But, as we shall see, *rura* here may well be a poetic shortening for the Ciceronian *terrae fruges*, and so a metonymy.

Gellius (18. 5) relates how during a summer holiday at Puteoli, in company with a rhetor, Antonius Julianus, he went to hear an ἀναγνώστης give readings from Ennius in the theatre. After the reading, as Julianus was leaving the theatre, he expressed his opinion that if the reader had had a teacher that cost him anything, he would not have read:

Denique vi magna quadrupes ecus atque elephantī  
Proiciunt sese (Enn. Ann. 249-50, M.)

but quadrupes eques, as Ennius wrote. And to the wondering questions of some standing by, what quadrupes eques could be? he replied: I could wish that you had read Ennius with care as did Virgil, who imitating this verse of Ennius wrote *equitem* for *equum* in:

Frena Pelethronii Lapithae gyrosque dedere  
Impositi dorso atque equitem docuere sub armis  
Insultare solo et gressus glomerare superbos (Geo. 3. 115-17).

Furthermore, that *equitare* is used both of the rider and of the horse as he steps beneath the rider, is clear from:

Quis hunc currere eum nos atque equitare videmus,  
His equitat curritque; oculis equitare videmus,  
Ergo oculis equitat (Lucil. Inc. 70-2, M.).

Not content with these confirmations of Ennius's usage Julianus went on to examine a copy of his poem, *Lampadionis manu emendatum*, and found *eques*, not *ecus*, in the passage in question.

Macrobius too (Sat. 6. 9. 8-11) quotes the verses in the same words, and in a discussion of Virgil's verses he makes Servius say: 'You have this question arising from your disregard of the old style of speech. For since our age has revolted from Ennius and the old writers, we are ignorant of much that would not escape us, if the style of the ancients were familiar to us. For the old writers, just as they called the man seated on the horse *eques*, so they gave the name *eques* to the horse that bore the man'. Probably there are no verses of the ancients whose text is better accredited than the verses of Ennius and of Virgil quoted by Gellius.

Of the verses of Virgil Julianus says (Gell. l.c.): in quo loco 'equitem', si quis modo non inscite ineptique argutior sit, nihil potest accipi aliud nisi 'equum'. It is a censure that falls upon all our modern editors since Heyne, who notes: cur eques non insultare dicatur, qui et incedere, decurrere. The rider is said to advance, who causes his horse to advance; why should he not be said to paw the ground, who causes his horse to do so? Thrice and four times happy editors! who understand Virgil so much better than did the Romans themselves. But they have not ventured on an explanation of Ennius's quadrupes eques. I should add Servius's note to Virgil's equitem: *equitem* equum: pro equo rectorem posuit. Et aliter: hic 'equitem' sine dubio equum dicit, maxime cum infert 'insultare solo', et *sub armis* id est insidente armato. Could anything be more explicit? Virgil calls the horse 'equitem' and the armed rider 'arma'.

Let us compare Conington: 'An old gloss . . . gave equitem the sense of equum on the strength of a doubtful passage in Ennius (Ann. 7. Fr. 9), an anomaly which, if justified, would only produce a platitude. Here, as in Hor. Epod. 16. 12: "Eques sonante verberabit ungula", the rider is evidently said to do what the horse does. So "sub armis" points to the weight on the horse'.

I question not merely the clearness of Conington's note, but its truth of intention. Why does he speak of a doubtful passage in Ennius? It is attested by Gellius, Nonius, Macrobius, and Servius. And it is not the only passage where Ennius uses eques for equus. I read:

It eques et plausu cava concutit ungula terram (Enn. Ann. 485, M.),

'the horse proceeds, and his hollow hoof shakes the earth with its beat', where the connexion favours the translation of eques as for equus. Let us turn to the verses cited by Conington from Horace:

Barbaras heu cineres insistet victor et urbem

Eques sonante verberabit ungula (Epod. 16. 11-12),

'the victorious barbarian, alas! will trample the ashes, and the horse with sounding hoof will beat the city'. Is not he inept argutior, who will translate here: 'The horseman with sounding hoof, &c.'? About his inscitia we shall see in a moment.

The use of eques for equus need not have puzzled our English critics so much. We all know the old English use of horse for horsemen. Murray (Vol. V, p. 394) quotes Hall's Chronicles: King Henry with a few horse in the night came to the Tower of London, and Robertson's America l. 157: The body consisted only of two hundred foot, twenty horse, and twenty Indians. And with this collective use is to be connected the use of 'hoss' in the Western States for cavalryman, as seen in the invitation 'Step up this way, old hoss, and liquor'.

Where in English we use horse for horseman—the stranger use, it seems to me,—in Latin we have equitem for equum and equum for equitem. For eques and equus constitute a pair; and for this pair eques is very often used, especially in the plural equites, which is the cavalry and included equi as well. Livy always uses magister equitum; but I read in Ennius:

Vel tu dictator vel equorum equitumque magister

Esto vel consul (Ann. 346, M.).

We have here equorum equitumque, which Livy shortens to equitum, just as Horace shortened longus et latus sometimes to longus, sometimes to latus. So for this pair we have usually equites, but at times equi, as I shall show. Later in the singular comes eques for equus, and equus for eques. In the use of equites for equi et equites we have synecdoche, in that of eques for equus or vice versa, metonymy.

Equi is used for equites by Cicero in: cum his, viris equisque, ut dicitur, si honestatem tueri et retinere sententia est, decertandum est (Off. 3. 116. 33), fore ut omnes inflammati odio, excitati dolore, armis viris equis Dec. Bruto subveniamus (Phil. 8. 21. 7), nunc cum confecta sunt omnia, dubitandum non est, quin equis viris (obviam Caesari eamus) (Fam. 9. 7). Livy has: quacumque ibant equis virisque longe ac late fuso agmine immensum obtinentes loci (5. 37. 5); Nepos gives us: equis, armis, viris, pecunia totam locupletavit Africam (Ham. 4), and Florus: aderant Rhodii, nauticus populus, qui navibus a mari, consul a terris omnia equis virisque quatiebat (2. 7. 8). Equis virisque is evidently a colloquial expression for 'with horse and foot', felt as equivalent to summis viribus, and in it equi is for equi et equites. Parallel to it is the use of equites virique for horse and foot in: terrebant ex adverso hostes omnem ripam equites virique obtinentes (Liv. 21. 27. 1), the common use of equites.

Virgil gives us: utque acres concussit equos, utque impulit arma (Aen. 8. 3) where Mackail translates: 'when he spurred his fiery steeds, and clashed his armour'. But this hardly seems in agreement with the preceding or following verses; and

Servius's note is: hoc ad equites pertinet. The pair: equi virique occurs repeatedly; did Virgil shorten this to equi? We shall show that arma is often for bellum; does Virgil intend a second meaning here 'he thrilled horse and foot to keen ardour, and urged on war'?, a verse now quite in harmony with the context. Moreover in: semper equos atque arma virum pugnasque canebat (Aen. 9. 777), where the obvious translation is: 'ever he sang of steeds, of arms of heroes, and of battles', following the uses above we should have as a second meaning: 'ever he sang of armies, of the wars of heroes and their battles', a statement of the epic theme far more in consonance with the verses of Homer and Virgil.

In the mouth of one of his favourite soldiers of the tenth legion Caesar puts the words: plus quam pollicitus esset Caesarem facere: pollicitum se in cohortis praetoriae loco decimam legionem habiturum ad equum rescribere (B. G. 1. 42 fin.) 'he was enrolling them in the cavalry'. The phrase seems a bit of soldiers' slang, and is explained if we take equum as collective for equos used as above for equites. In: equites sequi iubet sese iterque accelerat, . . . At illi itinere totius noctis confecti subsequi non poterant (B. C. 2. 39 fin.), while equites seems for horsemen, illi (equites) seems rather for the horses. In: testes equestrium fratrum in lacu, sicut ostenderant, statuae consecratae, qui anhelis spumantibus equis atque fumantibus de Perse victoriam eadem die, qua fecerant, nuntiaverunt (Min. Fel. 7. 3) editors have corrected anhelis to anhelī, as being naturally of the riders, while spumantibus was of the steeds. But the manuscripts give anhelis; and probably the phrase anhelis spumantibus equis is an example of the use of three for four, being short for: anhelis equitibus spumantibus equis, a shortening that becomes easy when equites is used for equi.

There can be no doubt that equus is used for eques in Horace's verses:

Sive quos Elea domum reducit  
Palma caelestes pugilemve equumve  
Dicit (Od. 4. 2. 17-19),

where Porphyrio's scholium begins: utrum Castorem et Pollucem significat, an generaliter. Of course Pollux is pugil, but Castor is eques, not equus. Then in Propertius we have:

Ite agite, expertae bello date lintea prorae  
Et solitum armigeri ducite munus equi (3. 4. 7-8),

where his armigeri equi, like Virgil's bipes equus (Geo. 4. 389), makes it clear that he has Ennius's quadrupes eques in mind. Equi is evidently collective here for equitum, 'lead the wonted service of the armed horse'. But in v. 17 of the same poem we have:

Tela fugacis equi et bracati militis arcus,

where equi seems for equitis. We have also in his elegies:

Quot sine aqua Parthus milia currat equus (4. 3. 36),

where Scaliger corrected equus to eques, relying on a passage of Dio Cassius which tells of the dry climate of the Parthians and how they could ride many miles without stopping to slake their thirst. Most scholars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries adopted his emendation; and Burmann thought he had read eques in the Codex Livineius. Lachmann showed this was not so, and rightly restored equus, the manuscript reading; for equus rhymes with Parthus. But if equus is used for eques, all difficulty vanishes, and emendation is unnecessary.

Gellius was a friend of Fronto and of Herodes Atticus; and it was probably not long after a.d. 150 that he had the adventure at Puteoli of which he speaks. Macrobius was consul in Africa in a.d. 400. It seems clear that the literati at both these dates regarded the use of eques for equus as a curious and antique literary idiom that in their day had passed out of popular use, and was known only to scholars. It is true that we read in Martial: equitis . . . culus aheni (11. 21. 1), but Martial is a scholar and a literary virtuoso. If this idiom were really remote from popular use from the second to the fifth century, it is curious to find it flourishing in popular use in the sixth. I suppose the solution is that the literary circles during these centuries paid little or no attention to popular usage of Latin.

Gregory of Tours brings his story of the Franks down to the year a.d. 591; and its Latinity seems to justify Dr. Pfister's statement that he wrote in the vernacular of his day. In the third book of his Historia Francorum, in the latter part of its tenth chapter, I note that he uses: assumptis equitibus—stratis equitibus—sumptis reliquis equitibus secum—relictis equitibus—tum motis equitibus discesserunt: in these examples, five in all, eques is plainly for equus. In: audiunt pedibulum equitum currentium it may be claimed that equitum is for horses and riders; when they heard the tramp they suspected this, but did not know. We have also in the chapter: custos equorum [bis]—cum equos ad claudendum adduxeris—deducat equos—cum equi urinam proiicerent—five uses of equi in its proper sense. I noted also: ascensis

equitibus (ch. 18); and Bonnet (p. 284) gives me: misit pueros suos cum equitibus et plaustis (2. 24), where Migne reads equis, and ascenso equite (2. 12), He calls the use a synecdoche, but it is rather a metonymy. He tells me (p. 740. 1) that Gregory uses five terms for 'horse': equus, eques, caballus, sonipes, and cornipes; that he uses equus sixteen times, and that his uses of eques and caballus together come to a little more (p. 205. 3). We have evidently here an idiom not confined to literary Latin, but usual in the popular Latin of over eight centuries, from Ennius to Gregory of Tours. While the literary expert of Puteoli wondered at Ennius's quadrupes eques, probably every muleteer in the street would have understood it.

Parallel to equi et equites seems currus et equi, a pair we find in: sustineas currum ut bonus saepe agitator equosque (Lucil. inc. 155, M.), currus et quattuor ausus iungere equos (Geo. 3. 113-14), diversos ubi sentit equos currumque referri (Aen. 12. 495), currumque et equos et lora regebat (ib. 624), egit equos volucrumque currum (Hor. Od. 1. 34. 8), iret alter consul sublimis curru multiugis, si vellet, equis (Liv. 28. 9. 15). We have the terms distributed in: frustra retinacula tendens fertur equis auriga, neque audit currus habenas (Geo. 1. 513-14), and in Aen. 12. 350-2, where currus in v. 350 and equis in v. 352 plainly stand for the pair. Equi is for currus et equi in: cum (sol) invectus equis altum petit aethera (Geo. 3. 358) and: quattuor hic invectus equis (Aen. 6. 587) et saepius. So too with equi for currus, as in: iunctos conscendebat equos (Aen. 12. 735-6). Following this use Horace gives us: impositus mannis (Ep. 1. 7. 77) 'riding in a gig'; and in v. 98, following this use, he has pes as the diminutive of decempeda. We have currus for currus et equi in: domitantque in pulvere currus (Aen. 7. 163), currus effreno impetu effugit aciem (Sen. Agam. 944), and currus for equi in: infrenant alii currus (Aen. 12. 287), si verbere saevo Palladia stimulet turbatos aegide currus (Luc. 7. 569-70), et proculcantes moderantum funera currus (Stat. Theb. 10. 741), stimulabat in aequare currum (Sil. 16. 366). From the use of currus for equi, it is easy to explain the use of currūs for a single chariot, found in three of the four examples quoted; it is extended to other uses of currus, and thence to bigae, trigae, quadrigae. In Greek ἵπποι is used for the chariot; perhaps the plurals ὄχλα and ἄρματα must be treated in the same way.

In dealing with the language of a people like the Romans, a pair of words like bellum et arma will attract notice. We find it very often, as in: non belli atque armorum fuerunt (Cic. Marcell. 14. 5), nec bello maior et armis (Aen. 1. 545), ad bellum atque arma incitantur (Liv. 1. 27. 3), belloque et armis (Tac. Hist. 4. 52. 3), bello cogendus et armis (Stat. Theb. 12. 165). In his note to the first words of the Aeneid: arma virumque cano, Servius tells us: per arma autem bellum significat, et est tropus metonymia. It is hardly necessary to multiply examples of this trope, common in prose as in verse. We have synecdoche in: silent leges inter arma (Cic. Mil. 10. 4), Ennius . . . numquam nisi potus ad arma prosiluit dicenda (Hor. Ep. 1. 19. 7), ab externis armis otium fuit (Liv. 3. 14. 1); metonymy in: nec post arma ulla rebelles Aeneadae referent (Aen. 12. 185), a fine Actiaci belli ad ea arma quis Servius Galba rerum adeptus est (Tac. Ann. 3. 55. 1). In return we have bellum or bella for arma in: positus . . . bellis (Aen. 1. 291, Hor. Ep. 2. 1. 93), poterat deponere bellum (Ov. Met. 8. 47), rapiendi tempora belli (Luc. 5. 409), spargatque per aequora bellum (id. 2. 682), ut . . . bellum pacis caritate deponerent (Tac. Hist. 2. 37), sumpsere universi bellum (Agr. 16), with which compare: nam bellum atque arma . . . sumenda sunt (Sall. Or. Phil. 2).

Arma is usually derived from the root ar-, to join or fit (cf. ἀρᾶρισκω), and primarily meant the defensive armour fitted to the body; so Varro derives it ab arcendo (L. L. 5. 115). Servius in a note to: arma viri (Aen. 4. 495), which he identifies with the ense relictum of v. 507, says: arma gladium dicit abusive; proprie enim arma sunt quae armos tegunt, hoc est scutum; and he cites: at Lausum socii exanimem super arma ferebant (10. 841). But Festus, though he adopts the same derivation, says: arma proprie dicuntur ab armis, id est humeris, dependentia, ut scutum, gladius, pugio, sica: ut ea, quibus procul proeliamur, tela (dicuntur) (3, M.). We read in Cicero: arma esse nominibus suis, alia ad tegendum, alia ad nocendum (Caecin. 60. 21). If arma were primarily defensive, the name was extended later to weapons of attack as well. In: quaerere conscius arma (Aen. 2. 99) it seems to denote means of assailing Sinon as well as of defending Ulysses. Servius (ad Aen. 8. 249): omni quod iaci potest telum vocatur ἀπὸ τοῦ τηλόθεν; and again (ad 9. 507): ostendit telum vocari omne quod iacitur. But in: at non hoc telum, mea quod vi dextera versat (9. 747) Virgil uses telum for ense (cf. v. 749); so that we have here a further extension of the meaning of telum. We read: rex impius aptat tela (Stat. Theb. 11. 500). When we meet: arma ac tela (dicuntur) pro bello (Cic. de Orat. 3. 167. 42) we have at once the clue to this confusion, which arises from the use of arma or tela for arma ac tela. So we have arma used in: tum demum arma movet leo (Aen. 12. 6); and we have cornua used for arma (= bella) in: taurus . . . irasci in cornua tentat (12. 103-4), where with bella we supply futura, 'he essays to rouse his wrath for wars to come'.

We read of Chloereus: spicula torquebat Lycio Gortynia cornu (Aen. 11. 773); but in v. 774: aureus ex umeris erat arcus.

Had he two bows? or is the arcus hanging from his shoulders a metonymy for pharetra? for what is the use of a bow of gold? We find the union arcus et pharetra in: arcum et pharetram et sagittas sumpsero (Pl. Trin. 725) and: arcus pleneque pharetrae (Ov. Pont. 1. 2. 83). When we compare: umeris de more habilem suspenderat arcum venatrix (Aen. 1. 318) with: virginibus Tyriis mos est gestare pharetram (v. 336), we may take arcum as a metonymy for pharetram in v. 318, or take both as by synecdoche for arcum et pharetram.

Very usual is the union auro et ostro, as in: regali conspectus in auro nuper et ostro (A. P. 228), ostroque insignis et auro (Aen. 4. 134), vestes auroque ostroque rigentes (11. 72), auro volitant ostroque superbi (12. 126). We have an older form in: emit auro et purpura (Pl. Most. 286), and: purpurei cristis iuvenes auroque corusci (Aen. 9. 163). Ostro seems for auro et ostro in: victor ego et Tyrio conspectus in ostro (Geo. 3. 17) and: ut regius ostro velet honos leves umeros (Aen. 7. 814); and auro for auro et ostro in: ut se ferret in auro (Aen. 11. 779).

In: orantes veniam (Aen. 1. 519) venia is 'pardon', but the Trojans had not wronged Dido or her people. Servius explains it as pacem, and adds: propter incendium navium; from v. 525 it is clear that the Tyrians were threatening to burn their ships. We have a second note from Servius: venia quidem pro culpa petitur, sed nunc beneficium; aliqui tamen veniam pro impunitate accipiunt, &c., from which it is plain that the ancients too found difficulty in 'veniam'. But we have the pair in: pacem veniamque impetrare a victoribus (Liv. 37. 45. 7) and: pacem ac veniam peto (Cic. Rab. 5. 2). So we may assume that veniam is here a metonymy for pacem, and that in: tu modo posce deos veniam (Aen. 4. 50) and: pacemque per aras exquirunt (v. 56) we have synecdoche for pacem et veniam. So in: veniamque rogantes (11. 101) and: pacem me exanimis . . . oratis? (v. 110), which describe the same act. In: votis precibusque iubent exposcere pacem (3. 261) probably pacem is a metonymy for veniam.

To: iustae quibus est Mezentius irae (Aen. 10. 716) Servius's note is: quibus quasi odium est. Livy gives us: efferati odio iraque (5. 27. 10), giving me the clue to Virgil's metonymy. I read: ut erat recens dolore et ira (Tac. Ann. 1. 41. 5) and: necdum etiam causae irarum saevique dolores exciderant animo (Aen. 1. 25). And so I understand that dolor in: duris dolor ossibus ardet (Aen. 9. 66) and in: illa furens acrique accensa dolore (11. 709) is for: dolor et ira. We have this pair distributed in: quos iustus in hostem fert dolor et merita accendit Mezentius ira (8. 500-1), where we have a double metonymy, of dolor for ira, and ira for dolor, parallel to that in: auras suspiciens hausit caelum (10. 898-9). In: necdum antiquum saturata dolorem (5. 608) we have a metonymy of dolorem for iram that recalls the association of ira with dolor and odium in Horace's verses:

qui non moderabitur irae  
Infectum volet esse dolor quod suaserit et mens,  
Dum poenas odio per vim festinat inulto (Ep. 1. 2. 59-61),

where to prevent undue repetition he has brought in a new metonymy of mens for ira, following the analogy of θυμός. He uses the same metonymy in: compesce mentem (Od. 1. 16. 22).

But with amor, odium and ira is present another association, that of opposites. We recall Terence's: amantium irae amoris integratiost (And. 555), Catullus's: odi et amo (85. 1), Horace's: oderunt peccare boni virtutis amore (Ep. 1. 16. 52), and Virgil's: duri magno sed amore dolores polluto (Aen. 5. 5-6), with which we may compare Ovid's: spreto totiens iratus amore (Met. 7. 375) and Seneca's: sed magnus dolor iratus amor est (Her. Oet. 451-2). With these in view we understand the use of amor in: sic omnes amor unus habet discernere ferro (Aen. 12. 282), and the use of ira for amor by metonymy in: subit ira cadentem ulcisci patriam et sceleratas sumere poenas (2. 575-6), where ira seems to be: amor patriam ulciscendi ex ira ortus. In: et quisquis amores haud metuet dulces, haud experietur amaros (Buc. 3. 109-10) amaros (amores) would seem to be for curas amaras.

We meet another interesting case of association of opposites, when we compare: vitamque volunt pro laude pacisci (Aen. 5. 2 30) with: letumque sinas pro laude pacisci (12. 49). Heyne explains: scil. pactione et damus aliquid et accipimus; utrumque pacisci designare potest; ideoque et vitam pacisci quis et mortem potest, illam reddendam, hanc ferendam. In: dum vernat sanguis, dum rugis integer annus (Prop. 4. 5. 59) annus seems used for aetas, and sanguis for vita, as it is in: quibus integer aevi sanguis (Aen. 2. 639-40) and: laudem ut cum sanguine penset (Ov. Met. 13. 192). We see the association of sanguis with vita in: cum (Epaminondas) una cum sanguine vitam effluere sentiret (Cic. Tusc. 2. 59. 24). Hence the metonymy of vita for sanguis in: est animus nobis effundere vitam (Ov. Her. 7. 181). But while sanguis seems for vita in: poenas cum sanguine poscunt (Aen. 2. 72), it is rather for mors in: nec soli poenas dant sanguine Teucris (2. 366).

Sanguis is still more closely associated with caedes, which we find used for it in: *respersum iuvenem fraterna caede* (Catull. 64. 181), *alta tepefaciet permixta flumina caede* (id. 360), *semperque recenti caede tepebat humus* (Aen. 8. 196), *virgo caede madentes ultima caelestium terras Astraea reliquit* (Ov. Met. 1. 149). So in: *iamque aderit multo Priami de sanguine Pyrrhus* (Aen. 2. 662) we have in: *multo de sanguine* a picturesque metonymy for: *atroci de caede*. Interesting is the union of caedes and sanguis in: *pugnatum ingenti caede utrimque, plurimo sanguine* (Liv. 2. 64. 5); when we compare it with: *multa utrimque volnera, multa passim caedes est* (id. 4. 28. 7) and with: *multa utrimque cadunt, plures volnera accipiunt* (id. 7. 8. 1), it seems that *ingenti caede* is for *multis occisis*, and *plurimo sanguine* for *plurimis volneratis*. While caedes primarily meant a blow or stroke, as we see in: *ut ilex . . . per damna per caedes ab ipso ducit opes animumque ferro* (Od. 4. 4. 57-60), as a rule caedes is equivalent to: *ictus mortiferus*, as we see it in: *telumque in caede reliquit* (Sil. 7. 614). While we read: *pugnam caedesque petessit* (Lucr. 3. 648) and: *en age, miles, in pugnam et caedes* (Sil. 15. 445), it is clear from: *me sequimini ad caedem, non ad pugnam* (Liv. 5. 44. 7) and: *iam non pugna, sed caedes erat* (Curt. 4. 15. 32) that the Romans admitted no confusion in a matter so vital; and we find that *committere caedem* (Ov. Her. 14. 59) is entirely different in meaning from *committere pugnam*.

From *formosus* we conclude that 'beauty' is the primary meaning of *forma*; the meaning it presents in: *di tibi formam (dederunt)* (Hor. Ep. 1. 4. 6), *spretaeque iniuria formae* (Aen. 1. 27), *eximia forma pueros* (Cic. Tusc. 5. 61. 21), (*virgines*) *quasdam forma excellentes* (Liv. 1. 9. 11). How does it come to have the usual meaning? We find it in union with species in: *speciem ac formam . . . gerit eius imago* (Lucr. 4. 51), *tum fingit formam quandam et speciem deorum* (Cic. N. D. 1. 37. 14), *quorum in adulescentia forma et species fuit liberalis* (Cael. 3. 6), *quanta religione fuerit eadem specie atque forma signum illud* (Verr. 2. 4. 129. 58). In consequence we have *forma* taking on the meaning of species et forma, sometimes with an inclination to forma as in: *formaque ante omnes pulcher Iulus* (Aen. 5. 570), *quarum quae forma pulcerrima Deiopea* (1. 72). But sometimes it inclines to species, as in *mortalem eripiam formam* (9. 101) or: *aspicite, o cives, senis Enni imaginis formam* (Enn. Test. XLII, M.); and this class gives us the usual meaning of the word. Species too, primarily the look (\*specio) or appearance, takes the meaning of species et forma, inclining to forma, in: *est specie alia magis alia formosa et illustris* (Cic. de Orat. 3. 55. 14). So too in: *species auri frondentis* (Aen. 6. 208), *agro bene culto nihil potest esse . . . specie ornatus* (Cic. Sen. 57. 16), *speciem haberet honesti* (Off. 3. 2. 7). And it seems used by metonymy for forma in: *si fortunatum species et gratia praestat* (Ep. 1. 6. 49) and: *ducit te species* (Sat. 2. 2. 35). Perhaps the most noteworthy metonymy of forma for species is that in use in formal logic. We read in Quintilian: *speciem, quam eandem formam (Cicero) vocat* (5. 10. 62).

Contrary to Varro's view that *facere* comes from *facies*, we have every reason to think that *facies* comes from *facere*; it denotes the human face as prepared for human intercourse by washing, combing, shaving. Here we may notice the significance of the Latin word for 'razor', *novaculum* 'the little renewer'; cf. *faciemque novat* (Ov. Met. 15. 255). We read: *facies homini tantum, ceteris os aut rostra* (Plin. N. H. 11. 37. 51), *uretur facies, urentur sole capilli* (Tib. 1. 9. 15), *cura dabit faciem, facies neglecta peribit* (Ov. Ars 3. 105). We have it paired with forma in: (*metalla*) *in quamlibet formam et faciem decurrere rerum* (Lucr. 5. 1263), *conlaudato formam et faciem* (Pl. Mil. 1027), *quod tibi non facies solave forma dabit* (Ov. Ars 2. 108), *formam quidem ipsam . . . et tamquam faciem honesti vides* (Cic. Off. 1. 15. 5). So we have *facies* for *forma* in its secondary sense in: *nec pingues unam in faciem nascuntur olivae* (Geo. 2. 85), *curvata in montis faciem . . . unda* (4. 361); and in its prior sense of 'beauty' in: *insignis facie* (Aen. 9. 336) and: *non tibi Tyndaridis facies invisita Lacaenae* (2. 601), where Servius explains *facies* as *pulcritudo*. In: *forma quoque hinc sous debet filumque videri* (Lucr. 5. 573) *forma* seems to be for *facies* and *filum* for *os* 'the edge'. When Varro tells us: *proprio nomine dicitur facere a facie; qui rei quam facit imponit faciem* (L. L. 6. 78), he has especially in mind the shaping of coins by stamps or moulds. In that case in: *ex eis (silicibus) formae fiunt, in quibus aera funduntur* (Plin. N. H. 36. 22. 49) *forma* is short for *forma et facies*, as seen in: *formam et faciem honesti* (v. supra). Moulding seems primarily connected with coins, as we see from: *utendum . . . plane sermone ut nummo, cui publica forma est* (Quint. 1. 6. 3), and the *formae denariae* there stamped are, of course, *facies deorum imperatorumve*.

Out of the unions species et forma and forma et facies may arise the use of *facies* for species noticed by Servius in: *non ulla laborum . . . nova mi facies inopinave surgit* (Aen. 6. 103-4). We have it likewise in: *ne qua . . . hostilis facies occurrat* (Aen. 3. 406-7), *ad istam faciem est morbus qui me . . . macerat* (Pl. Cist. 69), *diversa omnium quae umquam accidere, civilium armorum facies* (Tac. Ann. 1. 49. 1), with which compare: *velut in urbe victa facies* (ib. 1. 41. 1). Species is commonly opposed to res, as in: *speciem prae te boni viri feras* (Cic. Off. 2. 39. 11) or: *scurrantis speciem praebere* (Hor. Ep. 1. 18. 2), and *facies* takes its place in this sense too in: *publici consili facie* (Tac. Hist. 2. 54. 3) and:



facie maioris vivere census (Juv. 7. 137). But I have found no such pair as facies et species. Perhaps the metonymy has arisen from the influence of the two pairs named above, as we are further led to conjecture from the following paragraph.

We find the pair in: nil extra numerum fecisse modumque (Hor. Ep. 1. 18. 59), and we have numerus for modus in: numerumque exsultant (Lucr. 2. 631). We have the pair in: prodest quorum in locum ac numerum pervenire velis, ab eis ipsis illo loco ac numero dignum putari (Q. Cic. Petit. Cons. 4. 1), and numerus for locus in: hostium se habiturum numero confirmat (B. G. 6. 6). We have the pair in: hominem ornatissimum loco, ordine (Verr. 2. 1. 127. 48), and we have locus for ordo in one of the commonest metonymies, as in: summo nati loco (Cic. Cat. 4. 16. 8), summo loco adulescens (Mur. 73. 35). But I have numerus for ordo in: carmina virgo digerit in numerum (Aen. 3. 446); and in: numero beatorum eximit virtus (Od. 2. 2. 18) numero seems for mimero et ordine. But I have not found the pair numerus et ordo, though it has no formal reason against its use, such as we see in the rhyming species et facies. It may exist, but if not, the metonymy seems the result of the complex of pairs: numerus et locus, locus et numerus, locus et ordo.

One of the most puzzling problems for the teacher in Latin syntax is the use of: in tempore for time and of: loco for place in direct opposition to the rule and to common usage with other temporal and local terms. Here we read: tempus et locus convenit (Liv. 1. 24. 2), tanta vis est et loci et temporis (Cic. Off. 1. 144. 40). Hence in: epistulae offendunt non loco redditae (Fam. 11. 16. 1) we may assume that loco is short for: tempore et loco and in: interea loci numquam quidquam facinus feci (Pl. Men. 446-7) loci is for temporis. And so in: tamen is ad id locorum talis vir (Sall. Jug. 63. 6). But in: in loco ego vero laudo (Ter. Heaut. 537) and: dulce est desipere in loco (Od. 4. 12. 28) in loco is short for: in loco et tempore; as is in tempore in: in tempore ad earn veni (Ter. Heaut. 364) and: ni . . . pedites equitesque in tempore subvenissent (Liv. 33. 5. 2). And just so in: quo cum consul ad tempus . . . venisset (38. 25. 3) ad tempus is short for ad locum et tempus, the union giving the idea we convey by 'fitting'. We read: apis Matinae more modoque (Od. 4. 2. 28), Carneadeo more et modo disputata (Cic. Tim. 1), si humano modo, si usitato more . . . peccasset (Cic. Verr. 2. 2. 9. 3), and in: tempus secum ipsa modumque exigit (Aen. 4. 475) we have tempus short for locum et tempus and modum for morem et modum.

When we turn to manus, we recall Propertius's benediction on the earliest Roman artist we can name:

At tibi, Mamuri, formae caelator ahenae,  
Tellus artifices ne terat Osca manus (4. 2. 61-2).

In:

Aut certe tabulae capient mea lumina pictae  
Sive ebore exactae, seu magis aere manus (3. 21. 29-30),

he is evidently using manus for artes. I read in Petronius: nam et Zeuxidos manus vidi (83), and in Martial: Mentoris haec manus est, an, Polyclite, tua? (8. 51. 2), and in Statius: vidi artes, veterumque manus variisque metalla viva modis (Silv. 1. 3. 47). From this union and that in Martial's:

Argenti genus omne comparasti  
Et solus veteres Myronos artes,  
Solus Praxitelus manum Scopaeque (4. 39. 1-3),

we get the metonymy of manus for artes. Virgil has it in: quale manus addunt ebori decus (Aen. 1. 592), if it is not rather a synecdoche for artes et manus. But in: et recidiva manu posuisssem Pergama victis (4. 344) manu has gathered additional force from the context and stands for ars bellica. Petronius introduces his verses on the civil wars thus: etiam si nondum recepit ultimam manum (118 fin.), where Servius explains: translatio a pictura, quam manus complet et ornat extrema. But Virgil shapes the figure thus: extremam Saturnia bello imponit regina manum (Aen. 7. 572-3); and in older Latin literature manus is far less associated with art than with arms. This association is not plain at first glance in: pacem orare manu, praefigere puppibus arma (10. 80), where one thinks of manu as for manum tendendo, recalling: manus ad Caesarem tendere (B. G. 2. 13. 2) and: supplexque manus ad litora tendit (Aen. 3. 592). But though manu and pacem are the last and first words of the first colon, probably the connexion of manu, the last word of the first, with arma, the last word of the second colon, is still closer, and Gesner is right in supplying armata with manu.

The association of manus with arma is plain in the Laws of the Twelve Tables in: si telum manu fugit (Tab. VIII) and: manu fustive si os fregit (ib.). Cicero gives us: non exercitu amisso nudus inservorum ferrum et manus incidisset (Tusc. 1. 86. 35), and Tacitus: ut rem ad mucrones ac manus adducerent (Agr. 36). We have the union distributed in: cum . . .

pugna iam in manus, iam ad gladios . . . venerat (Liv. 2. 46. 3). Still more common is the union found in: senatus iure optimo vim et manus intulisset (Cic. Cat. 1. 21. 8), praesidioque contra vim et manum comparando (Sest. 92. 42). We have such pairs as ferrum et manus, gladii et manus, vis et manus often shortened to manus with the meaning of weapons or blows, as in: manu cum hoste conflagrare (Cic. Off. 1. 81. 23), cum tribunus plebis populo concitato rem paene ad manus revocasset (Cluent. 136. 49), neque umquam ad manum accedere licebat (Nep. Eum. 5), ut paene uno tempore et ad silvas et in flumine et iam in manibus nostris hostes viderentur (B. G. 2. 19 fin.), qui tecta manu defendere possint (Aen. 12. 627), ubi ad manum venisset hostis (Liv. 2. 30. 12), libertique etiam ac servi patrono vel domino, cum voces, cum manus intentarent, ultro metuebantur (Tac. Ann. 3. 36. 1). In: ne qua manus se attollere nobis a tergo possit (Aen. 9. 321) manus seems a metonymy for vis.

In: quibus acer Eryx in proelia suetus ferre manum (Aen. 5. 402-3) Servius explains ferre manum as contendere. Ferre is probably poetic for conferre; and conferre manum is for boxers what conferre arma is for nations in: neque validiores opibus ullae inter se civitates gentesque contulerunt arma (Liv. 21. 1, 2). When we read of the boxers: inmiscuitque manus manibus, pugnamque lacesunt (Aen. 5. 429) and of armies: ubi miscuerint manus (Tac. Ann. 2. 15. 3), we naturally ask for the connexion between manus and pugna. Pugnus is the hand clenched to strike; Plautus gives us the old neuter form in: nam meumst ballista pugnum (Capt. 796), of which pugna is the old plural, which from its collective sense became later a feminine singular; for pugna means primarily a lot of fists or blows.

We need not then be surprised at the union manus et pugna that we find in: nonnumquam etiam res ad manus atque ad pugnam veniebat (Cic. Verr. 2. 5. 28. 11). Virgil has: conferre manum (Aen. 9. 44; 12. 345), but Lucretius: conferre manu certamina pugnae (4. 843); Livy gives us: impias inter nos conseramus manus (7. 40. 14), but: pugnam inter se consererent (32. 10. 8). We read: desiste manum committere Teucris (Aen. 12. 60), but: illam pugnam navalem . . . mediocri certamine et parva dimicatione commissam arbitraris? (Cic. Mur. 33. 15) and: pridie quam Siciliensem pugnam classe committeret (Suet. Aug. 96. 2). So in: quascumque urbes et agros manu ceperat (Sall. Jug. 5. 4) or: sunt (tibi) oppida capta multa manu (Aen. 12. 23) clearly manu is for pugna or bello. So in: in manibus Mars ipse, viri (Aen. 10. 280) in manibus is for: in pugna futura 'in the battle now imminent', non iam in votis (Serv.) 'no longer in your prayers'; and Mars ipse seems for victoria ipsa. In: si bellum finire manu (11. 116) Servius explains: *manu* internecone; potest enim et pace finire; here manu is for pugna in its deadliest form. So in: meruisse manu (2. 434), which Servius explains as: dimicasse, manu is clearly for pugna, as it is in: ipse manu mortem inveniam (2. 645), not for manu mea. In: si quas manus remisi cuique exegissem (Suet. Aug. 71. 3) 'if I had exacted from each the stakes I let go' we have a use of manus for matches or contests in sport closely allied with pugna in its primary meaning.

But you may ask: 'Does it make no difference whether for pugna we use the singular or the plural of manus?' We have: in manibus for in pugna (Aen. 10. 280), but manu for pugna (11. 116). Both seem for the pair manus et pugna; and for the pair Castor et Pollux we find in use Castor—Pollux—Castores—Polluces. For ira et dolor we had dolor (Aen. 9. 66), but dolores (5. 5; 10. 863). For currus et equi we have: curruque volans dat lora secundo (1. 156), but: ausus Pelidae pretium sibi poscere currus (12. 350). In: sollicitos Galli dicamus amores (Buc. 10. 6) sollicitos amores is poetic for: curam et amorem; and probably in: securus amorum germanae (Aen. 1. 350) amores is for: amor et dolor, the love and sorrow of Dido. We read: egressi superant fossas (9. 314), where it is clear from: castra . . . vallo fossaque XVIII peditum munire iubet (B. G. 2. 5 fin.) or: vallo atque fossa moenia circumdat (Sall. Jug. 23), that what Nisus and Euryalus crossed was not fossas, but vallum fossamque. Just as fratres is used for frater et soror, patres for pater et mater, here fossas is for vallum et fossam. So too in: institutae fossae magno impedimento fuerunt (B. C. 3. 46. 5). So too with the fossae Cluiliae (Liv. 2. 39. 5), which is also called by Festus Cloelia fossa. True, Virgil styles the ditch fossae even when the vallum is expressed in: et fossas implere parant ac vellere vallum (Aen. 9. 506), where he follows the analogy of: muro fossisque tenetur (10. 236), where fossis may well be for vallo fossaque; this use of the plural certainly gives amplitude and majesty to his phrase.

I have tried to trace the origin of a number of the older and more usual metonymies; one remains that has occasioned much difficulty. In: nam seu mobilibus veris inhorruit adventus foliis (Od. 1. 23. 5) editors observe that at spring's first arrival there are no leaves to greet her. Such a rendering as: 'if through the light-hung leaves has run the shudder of the spring's approach' seems more in the style of Stephen Phillips than of Horace. Muretus changed veris to vitis, and Bentley to vepris; but the text cited by both Acron and Porphyrio is the text of the manuscripts. In Horace's: grata vice veris et Favoni (Od. 1. 4. 1) we have the pair needed to make the passage intelligible; we have virtually the same union in:

It ver et Venus et Veneris praenuntius ante  
Pennatus graditur, Zephyri vestigia propter  
Flora (Lucr. 5. 737-9),

for Zephyrus is the Greek for Favonius. We read in Cicero: ver . . . cuius initium iste non a Favonio . . . notabat (Verr. 2. 5. 27. 10), and in Pliny: in principle (veris) Favonii hibernum molliunt caelum (2. 46). In the verse we have a spring day, not necessarily the first, when the budding leaves are stirred by the gentle Zephyr. Cf. also Hor. Ep. 1. 7. 13.

But in many cases, no doubt, no such union existed, from which the metonymy we meet can be derived. The use of one term of a pair to express the other, closely associated with it in thought, became so habitual to the popular mind, and to the mind of the poet, that in case of objects associated in thought the figure was formed, though no antecedent union of the objects in speech existed. It may be a mere chance that for the metonymy in: volnera dirigere et calamos armare veneno (Aen. 10. 140) I have no union tela et volnera to show. Far less probable is the union equus et fuga, though we have the resultant metonymy in: dimitte fugam et te comminus aequo mecum crede solo (11. 706); or the union regina et sceptrum for sceptrum in: sceptrum per Ionias fracta vehuntur aquas (Prop. 4. 6. 58). Some seem to come from a complex relation as we have seen: from the use of currus for equi we get by analogy the use of habenae for equi in: conversisque fugax aufertur habenis (Aen. 11. 713), and of currus for habenae in: nec tenui currus (Stat. Theb. 9. 656). In: classis Amisiae relicta laevo amne (Tac. Ann. 2. 8. 2) laevo amne is formed on the analogy of laeva ripa, an analogy originating from the pair ripa et amnis. Very easy by analogy are synecdoches such as we meet in: nec pinguis Gallicis crescunt vellera pascuis (Od. 3. 16. 35-6), me Castalia speculans ex arbore Phoebus (Prop. 3. 3. 13) for ex silva, and its opposite: viridemque ab humo convellere silvam (Aen. 3. 24).

## XXVI

### TELLUS TERRA

INTERESTING is the relation of terra to tellus. Tellus is rare in prose; when it is used there it is said to denote the globe or orbis terrarum, as opposed to terrae, the separate lands. But while Cicero writes: ea, quae est media et nona, tellus (Rep. 6. 17), he also writes: terram in medio mundo sitam (Tusc. 1. 40. 17). Servius in his note to: magno telluris amore (Aen. 1. 171) has: tellurem autem pro terra posuit; cum Tellurem deam dicamus; terram elementum. Compared with terra, tellus is the rarer word even in poetry; but it is far oftener used for terra, the element, than for the goddess. We read: omnis feret omnia tellus (Buc. 4. 39), tellus . . . glandem mutavit arista (Geo. 1. 7-8), fudit equum . . . tellus (ib. 13), adgeritur tumulo tellus (Aen. 3. 63), tellus inarata (Hor. Epod. 16. 43); and for the goddess too Terra is used more often than Tellus, vide Aen. 4. 178; 6. 595, Lucr. 5. 1402, Suet. Tib. 75. 1. Indeed Cicero asks: Terra ipsa dea est; . . . quae est enim alia Tellus? (N. D. 3. 52. 20). Varro knows a masculine form Tellumo, evidently formed on the analogy of homo.

While for a separate land terra is far the more usual, we have Gnosia tellus (Aen. 6. 23), debita tellus (7. 120), Iubae tellus (Od. 1. 22. 15), Pontica tellus (Ov. Pont. 4. 9. 115), but Pontica terra (ib. 114). We have: tellure sub ima (Aen. 6. 459), but: sub terras ibit imago (4. 654); and of the upper world: producit corpora tellus (12. 900), ostendent terris (6. 869). Terra appears in prose mostly in union with mare, but Ovid gives us: mare et tellus (Met. 1. 291). Etymologically terra seems the old neuter plural of an Italic word, seen in Oscan as *terum* 'a farm', and is to be connected with *torreo* and *tergeo*, of which it seems an assimilated form of the past participle *tersa* (cf. *ferre* and *\*ferse*). Tellus is less clear; but Walde relates it with *tabula*, and with the Attic *τηλία*, a board. Terra, then, will be the dry surface, the earth as opposed to the sea, while tellus will be the flat surface, the earth as opposed to the mountains, or the sky. Tellus is the rarer and more obscure word, found almost entirely in poetry; we may assume that it is the older word, to which terra, older *tersa*, was joined later as an epithet. For tellus terra, the union thus produced, one only of the pair was commonly expressed, usually the second, terra, but at times tellus. But you may ask: 'Where shall I find this union, tellus terra "the dry flat"?' I read in Varro: Iuppiter pater appellatur, Tellus Terra mater (appellatur) (R. R. 1. 1. 5). Terra here has been usually coupled with mater in translation; but Victorius saw from the structure of the preceding phrase, with which this is evidently parallel, that it must be joined with Tellus; and in his anxiety to avoid this unusual union he changed terra to vero.

In Tellus Terra we have a type of an older kind of union of substantives not connected by *et*. Though both *tellus* and *terra* remained substantives, apparently because this pair soon became rare, being commonly expressed by one of its terms, in other unions of this type one of the terms commonly becomes an adjective. But in older Latin this term, later felt to be an adjective, is still regarded as a substantive. Take for example *bipennis*, as we see it in: *ferro sonat alta bipenni fraxinus* (Aen. 11. 135), to which Servius's note is: *ferro bipenni; ad epitheton transtulit nomen proprium; nam bipennis per se plenum est et securim significat*. Servius feels that the noun is different from the adjective (Dionysius Thrax did not), but is surprised to find *bipennis*, which he feels to be a noun, here used as an adjective. Does Virgil feel it to be an adjective? From the frequent occurrence of *securis bipennis* in the Glossaries (vide Thesaurus ii, pp. 2001-2) we may conclude that this was the prose form of the union, for which Virgil and Horace substituted *ferrum bipenne* as a poetic form. We have this union distributed in: *ornum . . . ferro accisam crebrisque bipennibus instant eruere agricolae certatim* (Aen. 2. 627) and: *ut ilex tonsa bipennibus . . . ab ipso ducit opes animumque ferro* (Od. 4. 4. 57-60), where *ferro* is for *ferro bipenni* and *bipennibus* for *ferris bipennibus*. But for *securis bipennis* 'the double-bladed cutter' the second term *bipennis* is often used, and to Servius conveys the same meaning as the first term *securis*, which is also in frequent use.

We read: *cum saevum cupiens contra contendere monstrum* (Catull. 64. 101), but in v. 110: *sic domito saevum prostravit corpore Theseus*, where *saevum* is used for *saevum monstrum*. We have: *proiciet truncum summisso poplite corpus* (ib. 370), but: *truncumque relinquit sanguine singultantem* (Aen. 9. 332), where *truncum* is by synecdoche for *corpus truncum* 'a headless corpse'. But in: *illa quidem pugnat recto se attollere trunco* (Ov. Met. 2. 822) *truncum* is not a headless corpse, it is not even a corpse. Here by metonymy *truncum* is used for *corpus*. We read: *Parnasi vertice summo* (Catull. 64. 390), but: *saxi de vertice* (Aen. 2. 308); which is the older term for top, vertex or vertex summus? What does *vertex* mean in: *rapidus vorat aequore vertex* (Aen. 1. 117)? What but 'the hurtling turn (or whirl) of the main gulfs it down'? So the mountain top is *vertex summus*, the highest turn of its outline, shortened usually to *vertex*. In: *non flavo retinens subtilem vertice mitram* (Catull. 64. 63) *vertex* is used for the head, but we have: *nonne ab imis unguibus usque ad verticem summum?* (Cic. Rosc. Com. 20. 7), showing that in: *talos a vertice pulcer ad imos* (Hor. Ep. 2. 2. 4) a *vertice* is short for a *vertice summo*. This is confirmed by Cicero's use of *extremus vertex* for the pole (N. D. 2. 105. 41) but cf. *vertices* for the poles in Rep. 6. 20.

In: *postquam res Asiae Priamique evertere gentem* (Aen. 3. 1) it is hard for us to see how the union: *res publicas*, for which *res* stands here, could be regarded as a pair of substantives; but we might turn to: *caruit senatu; caruit publico* (Cic. Mil. 18. 7) or: *morem in publicum consulendi* (Plin. Ep. 9. 13. 21). The agreement of *publicus* with *res* is a long step towards the establishment of the epithet as a part of speech. The omission of this is to some extent made good by the context in: *nono die in iugum (summum) Alpium perventum est* (Liv. 21. 35. 4), *falcibus et messae ad lunam (plenam) quaeruntur ahenis pubentes herbae* (Aen. 4. 513), *videt Iliacas ex ordine pugnas (depictas)* (1. 456), *teneras turbavit ianua (patefacta) frondes* (3. 449), *Augusti avi memoria, (commemoratus) socer Drusus* (Tac. Ann. 1. 41. 3), *qui campis (extremis) adstiterant* (ib. 2. 17. 4). In the phrase: *ad unguem factus homo* (Hor. Sat. 1. 5. 32) we are glad of the help given us by *praesectum* (A. P. 294) and by Pers. 1. 65 as well as by the scholia of Acron, Porphyrio, and Servius (ad Geo. 2. 277). In: *numquam homini satis cautum est in horas* (Od. 2. 13. 14) the pair *horas singulas* is so commonly used that the omission is hardly felt. In: *avunculum (magnum) Augustum ferens* (Ann. 2. 43. 6) Tacitus feels that the relationship of Augustus to Germanicus is known to all his hearers.

But the noun, not the adjective, is the word more commonly omitted, as we saw in Tellus Terra. At times the omission is cleared up by the context, as in: *in dubiis (rebus) responsa petunt* (Aen. 7. 86), *in lento luctantur marmore tonsae (palmae)* (7. 28), *interea medium (mare) Aeneas iam classe tenebat* (5. 1), *caesis ut forte iuvenis (cruor) fusus humum viridesque super madefecerat herbas* (5. 330), *turrim in praecipiti (loco) stantem* (2. 460), *tranquillo (caelo) silet* (5. 127), *ego limis (oculis) specto* (Ter. Eun. 601), *ut limis rapias* (Hor. Sat. 2. 5. 53), *perfundit gelida* (ib. 2. 7. 91). Generally it is from a very common union that the noun is omitted, as: *in curuli (sella), stativa (castra), molaria (saxa), pluvia (aqua), (sol) oriens or occidens, magni (preti) constat*. When Tacitus writes: *iuncto ponte tramittit* (Ann. 1. 49. 6) the real nature of the phrase is obscured by the later meaning of *iungere* 'to join', and by such a syntax as we have in: *pontes et propugnacula iungunt* (Aen. 9. 170). When we compare with it: *ponte Ticinum iungunt* (Liv. 21. 45. 1) and: *aggere aut ponte iniecto* (26. 6. 2), we see that we have in Tacitus's phrase the older meaning of *iungo* 'I yoke', derived directly from *iugum*, and that the phrase is shortened from *flumine ponte iuncto*.

In the common use of *cuncti* for 'all' we have a like ellipsis. Festus tells us: *cuncti significat quidem omnes, sed coniuncti et congregati*. Walde thinks it for *conciti* 'called together'; in its meaning of 'all' it is evidently short for *omnes*

concordia. But in a union like *senatus cunctus*, it is not necessary to understand *omnis* or *totus*. The loss of *omnes* seems to have come very early; for we have no example left of the old union. But with the parallel word *universi* we have: *nam id genus hominum omnibus universis est adversum* (Pl. Trin. 1046), where the editors write, against the manuscripts, *hominibus universis*. But the phrase was imitated by Apuleius in: *talibus dictis universi omnes adsensere* (Met. 7. 5 init.).

Accius gives us: *cuncta fieri cetera imbecilla* (Carm. Fr. 14), copied by Augustine in: *ante cetera cuncta* (Civ. D. 11. 6). Now we understand the use of *cuncti* in: *ut ea cuncta optima (arma) levia prae illis putet* (Ace. Tr. 146), *haec Iovem sentire deosque cunctos* (Hor. C. S. 73), *e quibus unus amet quavis aspergere cunctos* (Sat. 1. 4. 87), *excipit Uranie, fecere silentia cunctae (Musae)* (Ov. Fast. 5. 55), *celsior at cunctis Bruti praetoria puppis* (Luc. 3. 535), *Zalaces cunctis narratur ephebis mollior* (Juv. 2. 164), where *cuncti* is plainly for *ceteri*, being short for *ceteri cuncti*.

For in many passages we read *ceteri omnes*, as in: *quod pol . . . ceteris omnibus factumst* (Pl. Poen. 1183), *cetera omnia quasi placentam facias* (Cato R. R. 77), *omnia sic avido complexu cetera saepsit* (Lucr. 5. 470), *sic praeter mundum cetera omnia aliorum causa esse generata* (Cic. N. D. 2. 37. 14), *cum hominum nostrorum prudentiam ceteris omnibus et maxime Graecis antepono* (de Orat. 1. 197. 44), *nam cetera cernit omnia* (Tib. 1. 2. 57), *cetera omnia ageret faceretque ut e republica duceret* (Liv. 22. 11. 2), *ceteris omnibus suadentibus* (22. 3. 8). Cicero gives us these examples of the use of *omnes* for *ceteri omnes*: *duo sola recentia ponam, ex quibus coniecturam facere de omnibus possitis* (Verr. 2. 5. 34. 13), *qui cum omnibus potius quam soli perire voluerunt* (Cat. 4. 14. 7), *haurire me unum pro omnibus illam indignissimam calamitatem* (Dom. 30. 11). And in: *ceu cetera nusquam bella forent* (Aen. 2. 438) evidently *cetera* is equivalent to *alia*.

How did it reach its usual meaning of 'the rest'? We have the two unions, *ceteri cuncti* and *ceteri omnes*, for which if *cuncti* or *omnes* is retained, it means, not 'all', but 'all the others'; if *ceteri* is retained, it means, not 'others', but 'all the others'. There is nothing in the word *ceteri* to lead us to this inclusive sense; in Greek this meaning is given, not by *ἕτεροι*, but by *οἱ ἄλλοι*. We find too: *ne reliquas fortunas omnes amitterent* (Verr. 2. 3. 121. 52), *res capitales et reliquas omnes iudicabant idem* (Rep. 3. 35), showing that *reliquos* in: *reliquos hos esse ex bello*, is for *reliquos omnes*.

We have *alii* in the poets and in some prose writers used as the equivalent of *ceteri*; as in: *ea libertas est qui pectus purum . . . gestitat; aliae res obnoxiosae nocte in obscura latent* (Enn. Fab. 377-8, M.), *ad fratrem modo captivos alios invisio meos* (Pl. Capt. 458), *si alia membra vino madeant, cor sit saltem sobrium* (Truc. 855), *quorum unus Homerus sceptrata potitus eadem aliis sopitus quietest* (Lucr. 3. 1038), *inde alias animas . . . deturbat* (Aen. 6. 411), *obstupere animis alii, sed Troius heros agnovit sonitum* (8. 530), *vinci animos, ubi alia vincantur, adfirmans* (Liv. 21. 12. 6), *ille potens; alii sordida turba iacent* (Ov. Am. 2. 2. 30), *mox desolatus aliorum discessione* (Tac. Ann. 1. 30. 4), *quod senatum invidia liberassem, qua flagrabat apud ordines alios* (Plin. Ep. 9. 13. 21). We find the union *alii omnes*, of which these are shortened forms, in: *quom . . . nos, Iuppiter, iuvisti dique alii omnes caelipotentes* (Pl. Pers. 755), *et hac re et aliis omnibus* (Ter. Ad. 925), *et quid factum vini, frumenti, aliarumque rerum omnium* (Cato R. R. 2. 1), *ecpendi longe opera ante alia omnia* (Lucil. 29. 16, M.), *tum Catilina polliceri tabulas novas . . . alia omnia* (Sall. Cat. 21. 2), *quamquam alia omnia incerta sunt* (Cic. Phil. 4. 13. 5); and *cuncta alia* in: *huic mulieri cuncta alia fuere praeter honestum animum* (Tac. Ann. 13. 45. 2).

The variations consequent on this union of *alii omnes* will be best exemplified in examining Virgil's treatment of *ante alios omnes*, used by him as a substitute for *maxime omnium*. We have the full expression in: *petit ante alios pulcerrimus omnes Turnus* (Aen. 7. 55). He transfers it to the comparative in: *scelere ante alios inmanior omnes* (1. 347). We have it shortened in: *ante omnes stupet ipse Dares* (5. 406), *nobis placeant ante omnia silvae* (Buc. 2. 62), *ante omnes exit locus Hippocoontis* (Aen. 5. 492), and *formaque ante omnes pulcher Iulus* (5. 570), where it is restored to the positive. It is shortened to *ante alios* in: *effugit ante alios* (5. 151), *Phyllida amo ante alias* (Buc. 3. 78), *ante alios . . . diligit ignes* (Aen. 8. 590), *cara mihi ante alias* (11. 537), *ante alios dilectus lapyx* (12. 391).

Its use is complicated with that of *omnium primus* or *unus* or *solus*, phrases also used as substitutes for *maxime omnium*. Of these we have *primus (omnium)* in: *primus ego in patriam mecum . . . Aonio deducam vertice Musas* (Geo. 3. 10); *unus (omnium)* in: *iamque adeo super unus eram* (Aen. 2. 567); *solus (omnium)* in: *quamvis solus avem caelo deiecit ab alto* (5. 542). Just as was *ante omnes*, so we find *unus (omnium)* coupled with the superlative in: *Rhipeus, iustissimus unus qui fuit in Teucris* (2. 426), cf. 7. 536. In: *primum ante omnes victorem appellat Acesten* (5. 540) and: *me vero primum dulces ante omnia Musae* (Geo. 2. 475) we have a coupling of *primum (omnium)* with *ante omnes (alios)*, each

phrase being the equivalent of *maxime omnium*; so that the doubling is parallel to that in *quamquam*. The form of *ante omnes* evidently favours this union with *primum*. Following the analogy of this union we have *sola* (*omnium*) joined with *ante alias* in: *fida ante alias quae sola Camillae* (Aen. 11. 821), and *una* (*omnium*) in: *o felix una ante alias Priameia virgo* (3. 321).

Last of all, and following the transfer of *ante alios omnes* to the comparative in Aen. 1. 347, we have *ante alios omnes* transformed to *magis omnibus*, the comparative phrase of which *maxime omnium* is the superlative, and with this is joined *unam* (*omnium*) in: *quam Iuno fertur terris magis omnibus unam posthabita coluisse Samo* (Aen. 1. 15) ‘which land alone (of all) Juno is said to have loved more than all lands, preferring it even to Samos’. The syntax in: *si nondum exosus ad unum* (*omnes*) *Troianos* (5. 687) is one common to prose and verse, and is probably for: *omnes ad unum* (*et ultimum enumeratos*). So in: *venit summa dies* (2. 324) *summa* seems short for *summa et ultima*. I have not found the pair, but the distribution in: *summa summarum in illa gloria fuit . . . Asiam ultimam provinciarum accepisse* (Plin. N. H. 7. 26 fin.) points to it; just as: *valet ima summis mutare* (Od. 1. 34. 12) points to: *superis deorum gratus et imis* (Od. 1. 10. 20). So with *suprema et ultima*, from which would spring such a use as: *in te suprema salus* (Aen. 12. 653). That in: *supremo te sole domi, Torquate, manebo* (Ep. 1. 5. 3) we have no such complex idea, but the simple one of ‘high noon’, we are taught both by the plain meaning of the epistle, and by the scholia of both Acron and Porphyrio.

Difficulty has been felt with: *si visurus eum vivo et venturus in unum* (Aen. 8. 576), which is poetic for: *si eum visurus sum et venturus in unum et eundem locum cum eo*. We may compare: *ante annos animum . . . gerens* (9. 311) with: *hosti ante expectatum positus stat in agmine castris* (Geo. 3. 348), where *ante expectatum* is for the prose *spe citius*. Curious is the ellipsis of *pluribus* in: *saepe decem vitiis instructor* (Hor. Ep. 1. 18. 25), which is made good by changing the adjective to the comparative.

We have already noted several omissions of the past participle, where the meaning is obvious from the context. To these we may add: *nos abiisse rati et vento* (*actos*) *petiisse Mycenae* (Aen. 2. 25), *positus novus exuviis nitidusque iuventa* (*novata*) (2. 473), *praecipites* (*actae*) *atra ceu tempestate columbae* (2. 516), *cum mihi se, non ante oculis tam clara* (*oblata*), *videndam obtulit* (2. 589), *quo magis inceptum peragat* (*coacta*) . . . *vidit . . . latices nigrescere sacros* (4. 452), *in medium . . . caestus proiecit, quibus* (*indutus*) *acer Eryx, etc.* (5. 402), *cum iam in orbem* (*coacti*) *pugnarent* (Liv. 21. 56. 2).

Zumpt notices how common in Latin is the omission of *facio* (Lat. Gr. 771), especially in short propositions giving an opinion on a person’s actions, and in the phrase: *finem facere*, e.g. in: *nihil per vim umquam Clodius, omnia per vim Milo* (Cic. Mil. 36. 14), *at stulte* (*Regulus*) (Off. 3. 101. 27), *ut et ipse nequid tale posthac* (ib. 1. 33. 11), *hoc quidem non belle* (Hor. Sat. 1. 4. 136), *quae cum dixisset, Cotta finem* (Cic. N. D. 3. 94. 40). So in idioms like *nihil aliud quam*, as in: *per biduum tamen nihil aliud quam steterunt parati ad pugnandum* (Liv. 34. 46. 7), *ac si nihil aliud, vulneribus suis ferrum hostium hebetarent* (id. 30. 35. 8). From such phrases it seems to have been transferred to *facere non possum* *quin*, and hence to *possum*, especially in poetry, where the ellipsis gives a vagueness of meaning and width of range dear to poetic diction, as in: *potes namque omnia* (Aen. 6. 117), *non omnia possumus omnes* (Buc. 8. 63), *possunt quia posse videntur* (Aen. 5. 231), *furens quid femina possit* (5. 6), *hactenus . . . potui* (11. 823), *possit quid vivida virtus* (11. 386). In: *quid non mortalia pectora cogis?* (3. 56) Virgil has transferred this ellipsis to *cogo*.

The use of *facere* with *possum* in poetry seems rare, and even in prose it is not common, though *facere non possum* *quin* seems the more usual form of the idiom for ‘I cannot help’; and we have in Cicero: *quoad eius facere poteris* (Att. 11. 12. 4). *Fieri non potest quin* is also the common form for the idiom for ‘it must be that’, and in poetry *fieri* is much more usual with *potest* than is *facere*, as in: *nil igitur fieri de nilo posse fatendumst* (Lucr. 1. 205), *quod fieri ferro liquidove potest electro* (Aen. 8. 402). But the omission of *factus*, the past participle of *fieri*, is one of the most common ellipses in Latin poetry, and has led to difficulty, as we shall see. It is perhaps due to the connexion of *fieri* with *esse* through *fui* and *futurus*. *Esse* has no past participle, and *fio* is inclined to follow it. Our English verb ‘is’ has adopted ‘been’, the past participle of *be*, cognate with *fieri*.

The following are examples of the omission of *factus* when joined with a noun: *viridem . . . frondenti ex ilice* (*factam*) *metam constituit* (Aen. 5. 129), *probat auctor* (*factus*) *Acestes* (5. 418), *hic victor* (*factus*) *caestus artemque repono* (5. 484), *nullo discrimine* (*facto*) (12. 770), *et modo formosa qui multa Lycoride Gallus mortuus inferna volnera* (*facta*) *lavit aqua* (Prop. 2. 34. 92), *post pugnam ad Trebiam* (*factam*) (Liv. 21. 15. 6), *orator publicae causae* (*factus*) (Tac. Ann. 1. 19. 5), *luce demum* (*facta*) (ib. 1. 39. 8), *globo* (*facto*) *perfringerent* (2. 11. 4), *haud proinde in crimine incendi*

(facti) quam odio humani generis convicti sunt (15. 44. 5). Its omission leads at times to the apparent use of an adverb as an adjective, as in: ignari . . . ante (factorum) malorum (Aen. 1. 198), gravibus superne (factis) ictibus (Tac. Ann. 2. 20. 3), sensit dux imparem (factam) comminus pugnam (2. 20. 4). Indeed in: dictaturae ad tempus sumebantur (1. 1. 1) we seem to have a use of two for four—for ad tempus factae ad tempus sumebantur.

The following are some of the examples I have noted of the omission of factus when joined with an adjective: insignis (factus) tota cantabitur urbe (Hor. Sat. 2. 1. 46), quod meretrice nepos insanus (factus) amica filius uxorem grandi cum dote recuset (Sat. 1. 4. 49), vivos et roderet ungues (factos rodendo) (Sat. 1. 10. 71), aspera (facta) nigris aequora ventis (Od. 1. 5. 6), deliberata morte (facta) ferocior (Od. 1. 37. 29), duplicem (factam) gemmis auroque coronam (Aen. 1. 655), iuvenem monstris pavidum (facti) effudere marinis (7. 780), fluctusque atros (factos) aquilone (5. 2), flammam . . . quae plurima (facta) vento corripuit tabulas (9. 536), postquam habilis (factus) lateri clipeus (12. 432), caeso moenia firma (facta) Remo (Prop. 3. 9. 50), with which compare: quamvis firmatus animo (Tac. Ann. 1. 6. 1). The verse:

Tu satius memorem Musis imitere Philetan (Prop. 2. 34. 31),

where I follow the reading of the Neapolitanus, long since recognized as the best codex, has given the editors trouble ever since Scaliger changed memorem Musis to the preposterous: Musis meliorem. We have had: Mimnermi, Meropem, tenerum, and Butler thinks it impossible to assign any meaning to memorem. But if we supply factum, we have: memorem factum Musis ‘inspired by the Muses’.

We have noted how Propertius uses firmus, where Tacitus has firmatus. So we have adjectives, evidently with factus to be supplied, used for past participles passive in: Scipiadas duos bello (Geo. 2. 170), durum a stirpe genus (Aen. 9. 603), adsis o placidusque iuvenis (4. 578), et placidi servate pios (3. 266), Cererique sacrum Polyboeten (6. 484), truncos inhonesto vulnere nares (6. 497), trunca manu pinus regit (3. 659), cava flumina crescunt (Geo. 1. 326), nuda genu (Aen. 1. 320), nudus membra Pyracmon (8. 425). We have the opposite use in: nudato capite (12. 312) and: sub rupe cavata (1. 310). We have: infrenis equi lapsu (Aen. 10. 750), where infrenis is plainly for infrenati. We have seen that eques is used for equus; and so we have in Livy: equites frenatos infrenatosque (21. 44. 1); and infrenus transferred to the horsemen in Virgil’s: Numidae infreni (Aen. 4. 41) ‘the Numidians who have no bridles’. On the same pattern from innumerati we get innumeri in: innumerae gentes populique (Aen. 6. 706), seminaque innumero numero . . . volitent (Lucr. 2. 1054), innumeram pecuniam circumdedit (Tac. Ann. 14. 53. 5). Curious is the aprosdoketon in Horace’s: nos numerus sumus (Ep. 1. 2. 27) ‘we don’t count’, but are merely counted. In: aequo animoque aedum magnis concede; necessest (Lucr. 3. 962) Munro has changed magnis, the reading of all manuscripts. Giussani prefers to read gnatis, found in the margin of the Cod. Bern.; but gnatis seems not an emendation, but an explanatory note. Probably, as v. 967 indicates, magnis here is for gnatis magnis factis.

We have, substituted for past participles, adjectives of different root but like meaning in: nunc cassum lumine lugent (Aen. 2. 85) and: aethere cassis (11. 104), where cassus is for privatus; in: gravi . . . saucia cura (4. 1) and: adversa sagitta saucius ora (12. 652), where saucius is for vulneratus; in: festosque dies de nomine Phoebi (6. 70), where festos is for sacratos; and: adytis cum lubricus anguis ab imis (5. 84), where lubricus is for lapsus. Such participles in -tus or -sus were once active in meaning as well as passive; we have still cretus (2. 74) and titubata (5. 332) to prove this for Latin. So with the adjectives substituted for them; we have caecus usually active, but passive in: vada dura . . . saxis . . . caecis (3. 706), being for occultis; gnarus usually active, but passive in: gnarum id Caesari (Tac. Ann. 1. 5. 4), being for notum; ignarus usually active, but passive in: mare magnum et ignara lingua commercio prohibebant (Sall. Jug. 18. 6); in: ignarum Laurens habet ora Mimanta (Aen. 10. 706) it seems to join both passive and active forces, ‘a stranger—unknowing and unknown’.

But in Aen. 5. 84 lubricus may well be short for lubrice lapsus; certainly in: udo turpia membra fimo (5. 358) turpia is for turpiter foedata. In: facilis iactura sepulcri (2. 646) facilis seems for facile ferenda; in: ager Tusco . . . proximus anni, longus in occasum (11. 317) longus for longe patens; in: minus est gravis Appia tardis (Hor. Sat. 1. 5. 6) tardis for tarde procedentibus; in: quo patre sit natus, num ignota matre inhonestus (Sat. 1. 6. 36) inhonestus for inhoneste natus; mors falsa (Mart. 7. 47. 9) falsa for false nuntiata, and in: hunc ego te, Euryale, adspicio? (Aen. 9. 481) hunc seems for hoc modo laniatum. No doubt on this shortening is propped the use of the adjective for the adverb in: hunc primo levis hasta Themillae strinxerat (Aen. 9. 576), where levis is for leviter; and in: Aurora socios veniente vocari primus in arma iube (10. 242); though in the latter hypallage seems involved, the shortening being for: primo veniente . . . primus iube. We have hunc for huc hunc in:

Dis equidem auspicibus reor et Iunone secunda

Hunc cursum Iliacas vento tenuisse carinas (Aen. 4. 46),

where Servius read huc; but in his note to Aen. 1. 534 he reads hunc. And in:

Hoc precor, hunc illum nobis Aurora nitentem

Luciferum roseis candida portet equis (Tib. 1. 3. 93-4),

we have hunc for huc. So in: hic cursus fuit (Aen. 1. 534) hic is plainly for huc; Servius suggests that it is 'pro illuc', which would be the prose equivalent. In: Anthea si quem iactatum vento videat (Aen. 1. 181) quem is for usquam.

We have the opposite construction in: unde genus Longa nostrum dominabitur Alba (Aen. 6. 766), where unde is for unde ortum; and in: per nudam infra (iacentem) glaciem (Liv. 21. 36. 6). We have an adverb taking the place of an adjective in the use of partim for alii; as in: partim galea clipeoque resultant inrita, deflexit partim stringentia corpus alma Venus (Aen. 10. 330). In: ergo nunc Dama sodalis nusquam est? (Hor. Sat. 2. 5. 101) nusquam seems short for nullus usquam; and so in: ceu cetera bella forent nusquam (Aen. 2. 438). In: numquamne ad se nisi filios familiarum venturos? (Tac. Ann. 1. 26. 5) numquam is short for nullos umquam. In: numquam hodie effugies (Buc. 3. 49) numquam seems for nullo pacto umquam; and so in: hodie numquam monstrabo (Ter. Ad. 570) and: numquam omnes hodie moriemur inulti (Aen. 2. 670).

But in: ne qua forent pedibus vestigia (porro) rectis (Aen. 8. 209) it is the adverb and not the participle that is omitted; and so it is with the verb in: quae sibi quisque timebat, unius in miseri exitium conversa (aequo animo) tulere (Aen. 2. 131). As a rule in such a union as sorte ductus, it is the verb that is retained. We read: fixusque (re decreta) manebat (Aen. 2. 650), sic te ut (morte) posita crudelis abessem? (4. 681), grege de intacto (stimulis) (6. 38), dum vastabant Pergama reges debita (fatis) (8. 375), nisi mutatum (in acetum) parcit defundere vinum (Hor. Sat. 2. 2. 58), milites (sorte) ducti (Liv. 21. 37. 2), regibus (vita) defunctis (Tac. Ann. 2. 42. 7). We have an adjective substituted for the participle in: saepius (inter se) discordes sunt (Tac. Ann. 2. 56. 1); and it is the opposite of this syntax that we find in: nequam (utilis) and frugi (utilis), where nequam and frugi have come to be regarded as adjectives, which give us comparatives nequior and frugalior.

But in: saepta armis (Aen. 1. 506), where armis is for viris armatis, we have the union of a participle and a noun shortened to a noun representing an idea related to that presented by the union and used for it by metonymy. So in: ut Chio nota si commixta Falerni est (Hor. Sat. 1. 10. 24), where nota is for amphora notata. From Virgil's: pervius usus (Aen. 2. 453) Tacitus has formed a noun pervium in: ne pervium illa Germanicis exercitibus foret (Hist. 3. 8. 3). The use of aequus for aequo animo in: quod adest memento componere aequus (Hor. Od. 3. 29. 33) seems closely connected with this syntax. Similar too seem: simul divom templis indicit honorem (Aen. 1. 632), where honorem is for: sacra ad divom templa honoranda; and: meritos aris mactavit honores (3. 118), where honores is for: victimas ad aras divom honorandas. Still further developed seems this syntax in: reliquias Danaum atque inmitis Achilli (1. 30), for: reliquias telis Danaum atque inmitis Achilli superstites.

So close is the relation between the present and past participles of deponent verbs that we need not be surprised to find the present participle also constructed in like syntax. And we have: oleo labente (perfusi) . . . nudati socii (Aen. 3. 281), where labente 'slipping' is used for lubrico 'slippery', or 'causing to slip', much as in: pallida Mors (Od. 1. 4. 13) pallida is used for atra or atrox with the force of 'causing paleness', and Horace's: tonsor inaequalis (Ep. 1. 1. 94) is the barber who cuts the hair uneven. We have: vina liquentia (Aen. 5. 238) for liquida, candentis vaccae (4. 61) for candidae, nigrantes terga iuencos (5. 97) for nigra habentes, ramum Lethaeo rore madentem (5. 854) for madidam, humentem . . . umbram (3. 589) for humidam. We have the opposite in: fluidum lavit inde cruorem (3. 663) for fluentem, and in: tum pavidae tectis matres ingentibus errant (2. 489), fugam trepidi celerare (3. 666), Palmumque fugacem (10. 697) for usque fugientem. In: stipendia militibus, agros emeritis largientur? (Tac. Ann. 1. 28. 6) militibus is short for militibus militantibus and emeritis for militibus emeritis—a good example of distribution. Of the union of a present participle with a substantive we have the participle omitted in: ter maestum funeris ignem lustrare in equis (sedentes) (Aen. 11. 190), gaudens popularibus auris (faventibus) (6. 817), locum tendunt superare priorem (habentes) (5. 155), per vada (vadentes) (Lucr. 1. 200). We have the opposite in: (bovum) mugientium (Hor. Epod. 2. 11), qua colla (in equo) sedentis lucent (Aen. 11. 692), (cuiquam) quaerenti (8. 212). We have in: haec celerans (1. 656) a shortening for: celeriter ferens.



## XXVII

### PROLEPSIS

BUT it is not merely *factus* ‘that has become’ that is often omitted; the ellipsis of *futurus* ‘that will become’ is also frequent. I read in Martial: *qui scribit . . . puero liquidas aptantem Daedalon alas* (4. 49. 5), where my editor tells me that *liquidus* is proleptic; when I supply *futuras* with *liquidus* I have at once a full expression of the meaning. Very plain is the same ellipsis in: *mox Italus Mnesteus* (Aen. 5. 117), to which Servius’s note is: *subaudis ‘futurus’*. Virgil gives us: *bello caduci* (6. 481) for: *bello occisi*; but in: *si mora praesentis leti tempusque caduco oratur iuveni* (10. 622) *caduco* seems for *casuro*. So in: *Chalcidicaque levis tandem super astitit arce* (6. 17) we must supply *futura* with *Chalcidica*, as the settlement was later than even Aeneas’s time.

We read in Horace: *te triste lignum, te caducum in domini caput inmerentis* (Od. 2. 13. 11). When we compare this with Cicero’s: *vitis quidem, quae natura caduca est* (Sen. 52. 15) or: *bacae glandesque caducae* (Lucr. 5. 1363) ‘dropping berries and acorns’, we see in all three an ellipsis of *futurus*, but this *futurus* is in Horace voluntative, a sense we see constantly associated with the pure future sense in both Greek and Latin futures. To: *et gener auxilium Priamo Phrygibusque ferebat* (Aen. 2. 344) Servius’s note is: *gener dicitur et qui est et qui esse volt*, and we see that here with *gener* we must supply the voluntative *futurus*, as *futuri voluntative* is to be supplied in: *aegram nulli quondam flexere mariti* (4. 35). In: *huc periture veni* (11. 856) *periture* is ‘doomed to die’, but in: *moriturus et ipse* (11. 741) *Tarchon* does not perish in the battle. In: *oriturque miserrima caedes* (2. 411) *caedes* is short for: *pugna et caedes*; and in: *nulli tota morerentur in urbe* (2. 439) *morerentur* is short for: *pugnarent et morerentur*. These are examples of synecdoche; *moriturus* is here an expressive metonymy for *pugnaturus*, ‘bent on battle though it involve death’.

We read: *sacra Dionaeae matri divisque ferebam auspiciis (futuris) coeptorum operum* (Aen. 3. 20) ‘who were to direct the voyage begun’ and: *iuvenumque prodis publica (futura) cura* (Hor. Od. 2. 8. 8) ‘your appearance will turn the heads of all our youth’. In: *cernimus adstantes nequidquam lumine torvo Aetnaeos fratres* (Aen. 3. 677) *nequidquam* seems short for: *nequidquam fratri profuturos*. In: *homines tantos . . . pedibus qui pontum per vada possent transire* (Lucr. 1. 200) ‘men so great that on foot they could cross the sea by wading’ *per vada* seems short for: *per vada futura vadentes* ‘wading through what would prove mere shallows to men of their size’. So in: *speculantur aquas (futuras) et nubila caeli* (Geo. 4. 166).

To: *portantur avari Pygmalionis opes pelago* (Aen. 1. 363) Servius’s note is: *quas Pygmalion iam suas putabat*. This effect is achieved by the purposed omission of *futuras*, which gives us the figure we call prolepsis—a figure closely analogous to the *προκατάληψις* or *πρόληψις* by which the rhetor strives to anticipate the arguments of his opponent. So in: *hi proprium decus et partum indignantur honorem ni teneant* (Aen. 5. 229), though the prize is not yet won, the use of *partum* interferes with our supplying *futurum* with *decus*. We see now how Servius comes to feel that *gener* is used not only of the actual son-in-law, but of the prospective one as well. In: *promissam eripui genero; arma impia sumpsit* (Aen. 12. 31) *Latinus* declares the war an impious one; for though the wedlock is not yet consummated, Aeneas is already received into his family, and is no longer a mere suitor. But in: *ardentem generum moritura tenebat* (12. 55) and: *coniuge praerepta* (9. 138) with *mariti* in Aen. 4. 35, we do well to accept the omitted *futurus* in its voluntative sense. Other like examples are: *ereptae magno inflammatus amore coniugis . . . Orestes* (3. 331) and: *frondentesque ferunt remos* (4. 399).

From: *sponsi Penelopae* (Hor. Ep. 1. 2. 28) it is plain that we have here a variety of metonymy where *sponsi* is substituted for *proci* (= *sponsi futuri* with a voluntative sense). We have metonymies involving prolepsis in: *gravidam imperiis . . . Italiam* (Aen. 4. 229), where *gravidam* implies *parituram*; *nullis ille movetur fletibus, aut voces ullas tractabilis audit* (4. 439), where *tractabilis* implies: *fore ut commoveretur*; *caecique ruunt* (12. 279), where *caeci* is for: *securi periculi futuri*. In: *magnum reginae sed enim miseratus amorem* (6. 28) no doubt the average Roman reader, feeling that the wife was held loco filiae, was satisfied to put the king’s daughter in locum coniugis. But the relation is Cretan, not Roman, and Virgil is perhaps thinking of the Corona Ariadnae which Ovid describes as (caelo) specie remanente coronae (Met. 8. 181).

In:

Andromache manesque vocabat

Hectoreum ad tumulum, viridi quem caespite inanem

Et geminas, causam lacrimis, sacraverat aras (Aen. 3. 303-5),

we must understand *tumulum Hectoreum futurum*, as it will only become Hector's with the coming of his manes, and *causam futuram lacrimis*, as she hoped to bewail him there. The second is voluntative as it is in: *causam (futuram) discordiae* (Tac. Ann. 1. 27. 1). We have the ellipsis of *futurus* transferred to the object of the verb in: *faciles (futuras) venerare Napaeas* (Geo. 4. 535) giving us the equivalent of a result clause; as we see in: *steriles exurere Sirius agros* (Aen. 3. 141), where *steriles* is for: *ut steriles fiant*; in: *quis indomitas tantus dolor excitat iras?* (2. 594), *sublimem pedibus rapuit* (5. 255), *id rebus (perituris) defuit unum* (12. 643), where *perituris* is implied in *exscindi*, and the clause is for: *id defuit unum ut res nostrae pessum irent*. So too in: *quos Elea domum reducit palma caelestes (futuros) pugilemve equumve* (Od. 4. 2. 18) and: *non equus impiger curru ducet Achaico victorem* (Od. 4. 3. 6) 'to victory'. But when the *futurus* thus transferred has the voluntative force, as in: *deflexit partim stringentia corpus alma Venus* (Aen. 10. 331) for: *ut corpus modo stringerent*, and: *placatam Eurydicen vitula venerabere caesa* (Geo. 4. 547) for: *ut placetur*, it is purpose clauses that result. As we have shown, the use of *hortator* for *hortaturus* in: *comes additur una hortator scelerum Aeolides* (Aen. 6. 529) is different in origin, though it lent support to this syntax.

We read: in . . . *notos vocem vertere procellae* (11. 798), where with *vocem* we may supply either: *ibi perituram*, or: *eis auferendam*. The ellipsis of the gerundive is more common than that of the future participle. At times the context plainly indicates the verb to be supplied, as in: *arma amens capio, nec sat rationis in armis (capiendis)* (2. 314) and: *nec Drances potius, sive est haec ira deorum (luenda), morte luat, sive est virtus et gloria (tollenda), tollat* (Aen. 11. 443-4). In: *quae moenia clausis ferrum acuant portis in me exscidiumque meorum* (8. 386), at first one thinks of converting: in *me exscidiumque meorum* to: in *me meosque exscindendos*. But *Venus* is a goddess and cannot be destroyed; it is *meorum*, not *me*, that depends on *exscidium*; so we must supply: in *me petendam meosque exscindendos*. As a rule the gerundive to be supplied belongs to a verb found in frequent union with the noun in question, as in: *bello (committendo) dat signum* (11. 474), *ardet in arma (conserenda)* (12. 71), *non cassa in vota (perficienda) vocavit* (12. 780), *aliae victu (parando) invigilant* (Geo. 4. 158), *custodem in vincla (iniciendum) petivit* (Aen. 6. 395), *cedat amicitiae Teucrorum (conciliandae)* (11. 321), *peto requiem spatiumque furori (leniendo)* (4. 433), *frigida bello (gerendo) dextera* (11. 338), *iaculo (iaciendo) celerem* (9. 178), *insidiis (locandis)* (9. 237), *corpora (reficienda) curamus* (3. 511), *se . . . gentes aeterna in foedera (servanda) mittant* (12. 191), *cessas in vota (facienda)* (6. 51). We have in Tacitus: *faciendis castris* (Ann. 2. 21. 4), where we might expect *struendis*.

Very often the general sense of the context at once suggests the verb to be supplied, as in: *paci (petendae) medium se offert* (Aen. 7. 536), *nec spes iam restat Iuli (recipiendi)* (1. 556), *arcemque adtollere tectis (defendendis)* (3. 134), *consurgit Turnus in ensem (adigendum)* (12. 729), *pronus pendens in verbera (exercenda)* (10. 586), *plurimus in Iunonis honorem (augendum) aptum dicet equis Argos* (Od. 1. 7. 8), *clipeos ad tela (depellenda) sinistris protecti obiciunt* (Aen. 2. 443), *sed fama classis amissae ut Germanos ad spem belli (novandi) . . . erexit* (Tac. Ann. 2. 25. 1), *sed referendum iam animum ad firmitudinem (reddendam)* (ib. 3. 6. 3), *veniam ordinis (abdicandi) ob paupertatem petenti* (ib. 1. 75. 5). History helps us in: *non . . . Achilles talis in hoste fuit Priamo (excipiendo)* (Aen. 2. 541) and: *Antonique graves in sua fata (perpetranda) manus* (Prop. 3. 9. 56).

More involved is: *ficto pectore fatur* (Aen. 2. 107), where with *ficto* we may supply: *ad mala consilia condenda*, and in: *quem pellis ahenis (et) in plumam (imitandam compositis) squamis auro conserta tegebat* (11. 771). Two gerundives are to be supplied in: *nullum memorabile nomen (pariendum) feminea in poena (sumenda) est* (2. 583), where the first is suggested by the second; and so in: *ut novissimi in culpam (subeundam), ita primi ad paenitentiam (obeundam) sumus* (Tac. Ann. 1. 28. 7). Easier is the problem in: *ante oculos (videnda) interque manus (tractanda) sunt omnia vestras* (Aen. 11. 311). In: *plures ad curas vitam produxero* (Ann. 3. 24. 4) *ad curas* seems short for: *ad res curandas*. In: *biiugi . . . ad frena leones* (Aen. 10. 253) Servius explains *ad frena* as for *frenati*. No doubt the primary force was: *ad frena trahenda*; but just as *puer ad cyathum (replendum)* came to mean 'cupbearer', like the *puer ab cyatho* of the inscriptions, and then all feeling for the understood gerundive was lost, so here by its analogy the feeling for the gerundive with *ad frena* also disappears.

In Dido's words: *si mihi non animo fixum inmotumque sederet* (4. 15) we feel that her emphasis is rather on the future than on the past; and that *inmotum* is short for: *inmotum et immobile*. So in: *simillima proles indiscreta suis* (10. 392) *indiscreta suis* must mean 'that their friends had not distinguished and could not distinguish'. In: *eripe me his, invicte, malis* (6. 365) *invicte* must mean 'invincible', i.e. capable of achieving anything no matter how difficult. The past participle here presents the same meaning which in: *nemo nisi victor pace bellum mutavit* (Sall. Cat. 58. 15) is given by the perfectum logicum; Aeneas never has been and so never can be defeated. So in: *te docilis magistro . . . Amphion*

(Od. 3. 11. 1) docilis is for docilis et doctus.

In: nobilis et fama multis memoratus in oris (Aen. 7. 564) we have a figure that we will examine more fully later. Each word of the pair nobilis et memoratus itself stands for a pair; so that the pair is short for nobilis notusque et memorabilis memoratusque, the four terms being represented by the first and last, as we saw in: Pollucis . . . Cyllarus (Geo. 3. 89). So too in: indepressus et inremediabilis error (Aen. 5. 591) and: ardet inexcitata Ausonia atque immobilis ante (7. 623).

In: dives inaccessos ubi Solis filia lucos adsiduo resonat cantu (7. 11) inaccessos seems short for inaccessos et inaccessibiles, and so with inrupta in: quos inrupta tenet copula (Od. 1. 13. 18). But in: genus indocile ac dispersum (Aen. 8. 321) it seems that indocile is a metonymy for indoctum; and in: deus abscondit prudens Oceano dissociabili terras (Od. 1. 3. 22) the context requires for dissociabili the sense of dissociato. So in: saepe trans finem iaculo nobilis expedito (Od. 1. 8. 12) nobilis seems for notus, while in: nobile Pallanteum (Aen. 8. 341) nobile has the double force indicated above. So too in: inobservabilis error (Catull. 64. 115) and: soloque immobilis haeret (Aen. 7. 250). But in: solus ubi in silvis Italidis ignobilis aevum exigeret (7. 776) ignobilis is not ignoble, but is used for ignotus. So subtilis (6. 414) is for sutus, and tortile (7. 351) for tortum; the bark that can be sewed is sewed, and the gold that can be twisted to a necklace is so twisted. We have the opposite in: conspectus (8. 588) for conspicuus, and in: quadrifidam (7. 509), qui findi partes possit in quattuor (Serv.). We have seen how labens can be used for lapsus; so we have volatile ferrum (8. 694) for volans ferrum, and volubile buxum (7. 382) for volvens buxum. In: quod missile libro (10. 773) missile seems for mittendum; and in return: volvenda dies (9. 7) is for dies volvens, or, as Servius tells us, for volubilis.

We read: terruit auster euntes (Aen. 2. 111), where euntes is plainly for ituros. Servius explains it as for: ire cupientes, and compares: cum canerem reges et proelia (Buc. 6. 3), where the subjunctive is voluntative. This solution hardly satisfies him, however; for he adds: et est figura Graeca, ubi statuisse aliquid pro incohone habetur. We are reminded of Clearchus, who, before he joined Cyrus, was put to death by the Spartan magistrates, but made the march to Cunaxa notwithstanding: ἐθανατώθη (Xen. Anab. 2. 6. 4); but this has rather to do with the aorist. It is only in the Iliad that εἶμι has the future εἶσομαι; in Attic it has no future, but is itself a common future of ἔρχομαι. This use seems very old, going back to a time when the present tense was still used for present and future time for verbs. Of all verbs the verb 'to go' seems to have been the slowest to develop a future; we still in English use its present as a future tense; Latin has, it is true, developed ibo, but for its future participle Virgil uses ituras twice (Aen. 6. 680 and 758), and euntes twice, here and in: nec nos via fallit euntes (Aen. 9. 243). Forbiger would add: prosequere . . . euntem (12. 73), where, however, euntem is present in relation to prosequere, and: nec vero Alciden me sum laetatus euntem accepisse (6. 392), where eunteni is for venientem. But in Aen. 9. 243 it seems for ituros; Mackail translates 'nor shall we miss the way we go'; and it seems for: nec nos ituros fallet via qua eundum erit.

As we have seen, in the Comedy and in Virgil eo is used for venio, as in: vos celsis nunc primum a navibus itis? (2. 375). In: cum primum Iliacas Danaï venistis ad oras (2. 117) Servius explains venistis as for venire velletis. It is plainly for venturi fuistis 'you purposed to come'. So in: externi veniunt generi (7. 98); just as the Greek εἶμι is used for ibo, so here veniunt is for venient, and is so written in most of the best codices; cf. Serv. ad loc. Ovid has: Graia iuvenca venit (Her. 5. 118); and for other verbs of motion we find Virgil using the present for the voluntative future, as in congredior (Aen. 12. 13) 'I will go', sequor omina tanta (9. 21) 'I am resolved to follow such omens', sequimur te sancte deorum (4. 576). In: terras capere aut captas iam despectare videntur (1. 396) capere seems short for eligere capturi 'choose for alighting'.

Closely associated in use with ire is comes, a term of the greatest importance for the Romans from the social standpoint, and destined to develop into a tide of nobility for the Romance peoples. When we read in its context: comites Catulli (11. 1) we feel that futuri should be supplied; and so in: arma deosque parant comites (Aen. 2. 181) and: hos cape fatorum comites (2. 294). But the close association of comes with ire makes it probable that there was no such ellipsis here for the Roman; just as euntes could be used for ituri, so comes might imply iturus. Comes was used not merely to express the younger soldier under the guidance of the elder, as Euryalus with Nisus; but it was used of the elder soldier assigned to guide and protect the son of his leader, as Epytides with Iulus. Under the later emperors it is already a title of honour, as in: comes rei privatae (Amm. 22. 3. 7), comites sacri stabuli (Cod. Just. 12. 11. 1), comes Africae (Symm. Ep. 4. 48). We may ask what comes stabuli could mean; the answer is found in: custodem ad sese comitemque impubis Iuli Epytiden vocat (Aen. 5. 546), or: et pueri custos adsiduusque comes (Mart. 11. 39. 2), haec comes, haec custos, haec proxima mater haberi (Claudian Rapt. Pros. 3. 176). In: comes stabuli, comes is short for custos et comes, and as

in: Pollucis (Geo. 3. 89) Castoris is really meant, so here comes has the sense of *custos* rather than of *comes*. So the Constable of France is really the King's *Magister Equitum*.

Just as the ellipsis of *futurus* is frequent, so we find *fore* omitted, as in: *moneret . . . cum dura proelia (fore) gente* (Aen. 11. 48), *quo mitius (fore) Romanum imperium speraretur* (Ann. 2. 56. 4), *quem . . . aequiorem sibi (fore) sperabat* (ib. 3. 8. 1), *impune (sibi fore) putans* (Aen. 12. 728). We find the present infinitive of verbs of motion used for the future in: *nunc iuvenem imparibus video concurrere fatis* (12. 149) and: *has audax sperat sibi cedere virtus* (Luc. 9. 302); and a verb denoting the result of coming so used in: *victi parere fatentur* (Aen. 12. 568) 'the conquered own they are on hand', for 'they will be on hand'; for *pareo* seems to be 'I am on hand', the neuter of *paro* 'I get on hand'.

Caesar's uses of the infinitive in: *quae imperarentur facere dixerunt* (B. G. 2. 32. 3), *qui polliceantur obsides dare* (ib. 4. 21), seem extensions of this last use. With *spero* too we often have the infinitive with *posse* used as a substitute for the future infinitive, as in: *nostrasne evadere . . . sperasti te posse manus?* (Aen. 9. 561), *mene efferre pedem, genitor, te posse relicto sperasti?* (2. 657), *dissimulare etiam sperasti, perfide, tantum posse nefas, tacitusque mea decedere terra?* (4. 305-6). We have the two constructions co-ordinate in: *scilicet id magnum sperans fore munus amanti, et famam exstingui veterum sic posse malorum* (6. 526-7). But we have just seen how *decedere* can be written for *decedere posse*; and to: *totumque moved mutarive putas bellum* (10. 627) Servius's note begins: *deest posse*. This may well be what has happened in: *hoc sperem Italiam contingere caelo* (5. 18), *desine fata deum flecti sperare precando* (6. 376), *haec se carminibus promittit solvere mentes quas velit* (4. 487).

This seems the natural place to deal with anachronism in the poets, especially as the Latin critics call it *prolepsis*. Not that it is the same as *prolepsis*, which is a figure of syntax, while anachronism is an error in chronology. Servius's note to: *passim . . . armenta videbant Romanoque foro et lautis mugire Carinis* (8. 361) is: *sed et hic prolepsin facit; nam postea sic (i.e. Carinae) dictum est*. To: *sceptra Palatini sedemque petit Euandri* (9. 9) his note is: *Palatini prolepsis est*. To: *ast legio Aeneadum vallis obsessa tenetur* (10. 120) he writes: *prolepsis; nam legionis nomen Troiani temporis non fuit*. But in his note to: *ipse Quirinali lituo parvaque sedebat succinctus trabea, laevaue ancile gerebat Picus* (7. 187-9) he does not speak of *prolepsis*; for the name *Quirinus* is used of Mars as well as of Romulus, and though the *ancilia* preserved in Rome were said to date from Numa's time, the form of the shield and its name may have been older. But to these *prolepses* we may apply the words of Hyginus (Gell. 10. 16. 8): 'To the poet himself it is granted as a rule to use certain expressions *κατὰ πρόληψιν* *historiae* when speaking in his own person, just as Virgil knew of the "Lavinian town" and of the "Chalcidic citadel"'. But in: *Laviniaque venit litora* (Aen. 1. 2) Servius preferred the reading *Lavina*, and traced the name to *Lavinus*, a brother of *Latinus*; he adds: *quamvis quidam superfluo esse prolepsin velint*. In: *Chalcidica . . . arce* (6. 17), though the city of *Cumae* was founded long after the Trojan war, the temple of *Apollo* was said to be older; and the *prolepsis* here is of the name only and is in the words of the poet, as is *Carinis*.

Of *Hippolytus* Horace tells us: *infernus neque enim tenebris Diana pudicum liberat Hippolytum* (Od. 4. 7. 25-6); but Virgil (Aen. 7. 761 ff.) makes *Diana* recall him to the upper world, where secluded in Italian woods he lives as *Virbius*. To this we may apply the note Servius wrote to Aen. 6. 618, *frequenter enim variant fabulas poetae*. So with: *Protei columnas* (11. 262); the Pillars of *Hercules* at *Gades* and those in *Pontus* are taken as western and eastern bounds of the Mediterranean system of seas; and we have here a southern bound formed on analogy of these, and associated with *Proteus*. By *Proteus* Virgil seems to have meant the god whom *Tacitus* presents as the real *Hercules* (Ann. 2. 60. 3); but here again we are dealing with myth. This is not so certain of *Dido*; indeed nothing seems very certain about her. Servius's account (ad Aen. 1. 267) places the founding of *Carthage* seventy years before that of *Rome*, and so two hundred and seventy years after the fall of *Troy*. But her story had been connected with that of *Aeneas* by the genial poet *Naeivius*, and *Ennius* had adopted the legend, which thus became a household tale with the Romans. Probably the nearest approach to truth we have here is what we read in *Justin* (18. 6. 6), where there is no mention of *Aeneas*, and *Elissa* burns herself to avoid the proposals of *Iarbas*.

In: *et socii amissi petierunt aethera pennis* (Aen. 11. 272) Virgil makes *Diomede* relate a metamorphosis of his followers, which on the commonly accepted account took place after *Diomede's* death from their grief at the loss of their king. Servius says (ad 11. 271): *hoc loco nullus dubitat fabulae huius ordinem a Vergilio esse conversum*; but we are still dealing with myths. When in: *atque iterum in Teucros Aetolis surgit ab Arpis Tydides* (10. 28) the goddess *Venus* pleading *Aeneas's* cause before *Jupiter*, represents as close at hand an event that was never to happen, the case is more serious. But *Venus* is pleading a cause; and Virgil seems to have thought it a still more serious violation of the

probabilities to attribute unblemished veracity to a causicus. We have already dealt with the apparent flagrant self-contradiction in Aen. 6. 618.

In Gellius (10. 16. 14) Hyginus is made to cite from Virgil:

Eruet ille Argos Agamemnoniasque Mycenae  
Ipsamque Aeciden, genus armipotens Achilli,  
Ultus avos Troiae, templa intemerata Minervae (Aen. 6. 838-40).

The templa intemerata is interesting; though it is the oldest citation of the verse we have, it finds no place in any of our editions. Hyginus wants to throw v. 839 out of the Aeneid. He thinks that Aecides is Pyrrhus. But the prophecy of Anchises seems to me quite correct here; Aecides is King Perseus (cf. Prop. 4. 11. 39-40); and the avenging victor is Aemilius Paullus. Hyginus's error arose from his failure to see the figure of hendiadys in v. 838, through which Greece is named by Argos and Mycenae, one by two; just as the apparent violations of history in Od. 4. 4. 17-18 and 4. 8. 15-20 are due to a failure to perceive the opposite figure.

Far more serious seemed to Hyginus the prolepsis in: portus . . . require Velinos (Aen. 6. 366). Virgil puts the words in the mouth of Palinurus, and the town of Velia was not founded till about 600 years after his death. How could he already know the name? and how was Aeneas to find a town that was not to come into existence for 600 years? But the victory of Paullus, which Anchises foretells to Aeneas, was won three centuries later, and Palinurus was a shade as well as Anchises, though it is true he had not as yet had Anchises' time or opportunities for working out the future. But if shades cannot as such foretell the future, what is to become of our faith in necromancy? Servius too speaks of the prolepsis here as vitiosissima, because it is not the statement of the poet himself but of Palinurus; but he adds: quamquam alii ad divinandi scientiam referant, quasi ab umbra dictum. There is no such excuse for Catullus's Ariadne; she is still alive when the poet puts in her mouth the words: Idomeneosne petam montes? (64. 178). Idomeneus was the grandson of Minos, and was yet unborn when his aunt used his name to designate her native island. The enormity of the prolepsis seems to have had its effect on the spelling of the manuscripts; but Robinson Ellis's reading seems the only reasonable one; the name of Idomeneus was commonly used in literature to designate Crete.

The reasonable feeling about such anachronisms seems to be that, while they are improper in serious prose, they are not out of place in poetry; and the editors who write Idaeos or Sidonios to avoid the prolepsis just mentioned, fail to see the difference between prose and poetic diction. Tacitus's prose is highly poetic, and often Virgilian in diction; in: per quae egeritur humus aut exciditur caespes (Ann. 1. 65. 10) he disdains to call a spade a spade. In his account of Augustus's will (Ann. 1. 8. 3) editors are wrong in inserting the clause: urbanis quingenos. He spurns such painful accuracy, just as did Mr. Mantalini, who, when arrested on a suit of £1,527 4s. 9½d., replied: 'The halfpenny be demd'.

I read in Horace:

‘Forum putealque Libonis  
Mandabo siccis, adimam cantare severis.’  
Hoc simul edixi (Ep. 1. 19. 8-10).

Edixi tamquam praetor, adds Orelli; and I am shocked at finding Horace dare to speak as praetor poetarum while Virgil is still alive. It is true that in Od. 1. 32. 1 the vulgate text gives: poscitur; but the best manuscripts and both Scholiasts read: poscimus, which is Bentley's reading. I find that here too the majority of manuscripts give edixit, as do most of the manuscripts of Porphyrio; Acron has: edixit, al. edixi. Courbaud (Horace, p. 319) is amply justified in condemning the reading edixit as implying a lack of taste and modesty inconceivable in Horace. Who, then, is the speaker? is it Ennius? and does the poet in: puteal Libonis make him foretell the construction of this monument by Scribonius Libo some twenty years after his death? We do not know for certain that it was this Scribonius Libo who constructed this puteal; but even if we did, puteal Libonis is the name in common use for it, and to expect scrupulous chronological accuracy in the words Horace assigns to the jovial Ennius seems a mistake.

## XXVIII

PROXIMUS ARDET UCALEGON

To a union consisting of a noun and an adjective we have often a parallel equivalent consisting of a noun and a genitive depending on it. For *amore tuo* Virgil gives us: *amore tui* (Aen. 12. 29). Classical prose favours the adjective, but in poetry and in silver Latinity the genitive, which gives greater emphasis to the person, becomes more usual. The opposite seems true of *patris* and *patrius*; *patris* is usual in prose, but *patrius* is often used for *patris* in Virgil, as in: *patrius amor* (Aen. 1. 643) 'love of his followers', where it stands for a subjective genitive; in: *patriae pietatis* (10. 824) 'love of his father', where it is for an objective genitive; in: *patriae pietatis* (9. 294), where both subjective and objective are combined. He does not use *paternus* so often; but we see it in: *arte paterna* (8. 226) 'through his father's art', and: *regnis paternis* (3. 121) 'from the realms of his fathers'. *Paternos* (Prop. 3. 9. 37) is 'of her sons', and *patrio* (2. 7. 20) 'of descendants'. We have *fraternus* in: *fraterna caede* (Aen. 4. 21) 'murder by a brother's hand', where it is subjective, and: *mortis fraternae* (9. 736). In: *fraterna morte* (Geo. 3. 518) it is extended to a member of the same herd. The use of *erilis* for *eri* or *erae*, so characteristic of the Latin comedy, is rarer in golden Latinity; but we read: *gressumque canes comitantur erilem* (Aen. 8. 462) and: *nisi erile mavis carpere pensum* (Od. 3. 27. 63). In: *tu si hic sis, aliter sentias* (Ter. And. 310) *hic* is for *ego*; cf.: *hunc hominem velles si tradere* (Sat. 1. 9. 47). In: *tu Maximus ille es* (Aen. 6. 845) the use of *ille* helps us to understand that of *ille* for *tu* in oblique. We see words usually nouns becoming adjectives in: *venator canis* (12. 751), *cognomine terra* (6. 383), *advena exercitus* (7. 38), *Tros Aeneas* (12. 723). We read: *Romula tellus* (6. 877), *Romulae gentis* (Od. 4. 5. 1), *pubes Dardana* (Aen. 5. 119), *Alpheia flumina* (Geo. 3. 180), *Sirius ardor* (Aen. 10. 273), *manus Ausonia* (8. 328), *ignes Rutulos* (9. 129), *Lavinia arva* (4. 236), *Latium annum* (Ov. Fast. 1. 1. 1), *Thracius equus* (Aen. 9. 49). We have the opposite use of *Thraca* for *Thracia* in: *gemit ultima pulsu Thraca pedum* (12. 335).

Very frequent is the use of an adjective formed from a proper noun instead of its genitive, as in: *Herculei sacri* (Aen. 8. 270), *Herculea umbra* (8. 276), *laudes Herculeas* (8. 288), *Circaeum iugum* (7. 799), *stirpis Achilleae* (3. 326), *coniugis Hectoreae* (3. 488), *Priameia virgo* (2. 403), *Ixionii rota orbis* (Geo. 4. 484), *Agamemnoniae phalanges* (Aen. 6. 489). Turning to common nouns we have: *animos agrestes* (7. 482) for *animos agrestium*, the adjective standing for a genitive plural; and so in: *multa caede* (1. 471), *praesentia ora* (3. 174), *victricia arma* (3. 54), *semiviro comitatu* (4. 215), *captivo sanguine* (10. 520), *sanguine sacro* (5. 78), *crudelia limina* (3. 616), *dente invido* (Od. 4. 3. 16). We have past participles thus used in: *caeso sanguine* (Aen. 11. 82), *manes sepultos* (4. 34), *fessos artus* (3. 511), *sceleratas poenas* (2. 576), *scelerato ex sanguine* (12. 949). While Virgil does use *hostilis* for *hostis* or *hostium*, as in: *hostilis facies* (3. 407), *terram hostilem* (10. 489), he finds *inimicus* a far more forceful and telling adjective for this use, as we see in: *castra inimica petunt* (9. 315) the enemy's camp, destined to prove fatal to them; and so in: *inimica nomina* (11. 84), *inimicis ignibus* (8. 375). We have an adjective from a different stem from the genitive in: *inania regna* (6. 269) for *umbrarum*, *infelix vates* (3. 246) for *malorum*, *infernus sedes* (8. 244) for *inferorum*, *plumoso aucupio* (Prop. 4. 2. 34) for *avium*.

But at times the collective meaning of the plural genitive would find expression in a genitive singular; and in: *quadrupedante sonitu* (Aen. 8. 596) we have the adjective standing for a genitive singular of this kind; and so in: *sapientem pascere barbam* (Sat. 2. 3. 35) and: *feminea in poena* (Aen. 2. 584). But in the last example it is a particular woman, Helen, that is really meant; and so in: *hostilem ad tumulum* (3. 322) Achilles is meant, and in: *moribunda ora* (Prop. 3. 7. 56) Paetus. But: *miser hiatus* (ib. 52) is for: *os hians miseri iuvenis*; as *fortia corpora* (Aen. 8. 539) is for: *corpora fortium virorum*, and *vicinum funus* (Sat. 1. 4. 126) for: *mors vicini hominis*. So: *merentes poenas* (Aen. 2. 585) is for: *poenas feminae merentis*, i.e. Helen, and: *vivo amore* (1. 721) for: *amore vivi viri*, i.e. Aeneas. In: *ingentem atque ingenti volnere victum* (10. 842) *ingenti volnere* is for: *ictu ingentis viri*, again Aeneas. So: *Gallica ora* (Od. 1. 8. 6) is for: *ora Gallicorum equorum*; *strictam aciem* (Aen. 6. 291) for: *aciem stricti ensis*; *postera tempestas* (Sat. 1. 5. 96) for: *posterius diei tempestas*; *piae terrae* (Prop. 3. 7. 9) for: *cadaveri pii filii*. And so with the demonstratives: *ea signa* (Aen. 2. 171) is for: *eius rei signa*; *ea cura* (Ann. 2. 24. 5) for: *eorum cura*; *has poenas* (Aen. 7. 595) for: *huius sceleris poenas*; *cursu illo* (7. 383) for: *cursu illius buxi*; *quo gemitu* (2. 73) for: *cuius gemitu*.

The appositive of the possessive adjective is put in the genitive, as in: *cum mea nemo scripta legal volgo recitare timentis* (Sat. 1. 4. 23). So in: *litora fraterna Erycis* (Aen. 5. 24), *Erycis fines fraterni* (5. 630), though here Eryx, and not frater, is treated as the appositive. But in: *sola militis commoda* (Tac. Ann. 1. 26. 5), which follows this analogy, *sola* is treated like the possessive and *militis* is a collective, giving: *militum solorum commoda* as the real meaning of the phrase. Of the pair thus got in: *sola militis*, the first term only is expressed in: *Areo iudicio* (Ann. 2. 55. 2) for: *Arei pagi iudicio*. We read: *sed fratres egregie concordēs et proximorum certaminibus inconcussi* (Ann. 2. 43. 7), where: *fratres*

... inconcussi is shortened for: *fraterna amicitia inconcussa*, the opposite of the last example. So we have: *hoc auro* (Aen. 7. 245) for: *hac aurea patera*; *flagrantem pinum* (7. 397) for: *flagrantem pineam facem*; *vina* (9. 319) for: *pocula vini*.

Virgil often uses the ablative for the genitive, as in: *fuso crateres olivo* (Aen. 6. 225), *vis alto vulnere tardat* (10. 857), *ore orsa* (11. 124). So in: *ipse volans tenues se sustulit ales ad auras* (5. 861) the adjective *ales* plainly stands, not for *alarum*, but for *alis*. So in: *eo me solvat amantem* (4. 479) Virgil gives us a poetical variety for: *eius me solvat amore*. In: *ferreus somnus* (10. 745) *ferreus* is not for *ferri*, but for *ferro datus*; just as in: *conubia nostra* (4. 213) *nostra* is for: *nobiscum*, in: *propinquis nuntiis* (Ann. 2. 58. 1) *propinquis* is for: *ex propinquo adlatis*; in: *vipereum crinem* (Aen. 6. 281) *vipereum* is not 'such as vipers have', but *viperis constitutum* 'made up of vipers'. The adjective in: *rotat ensem fulmineum* (9. 442) seems for: *fulminis fulgore et velocitate*. And so in: *vagina . . . eripit ensem fulmineum* (4. 580), where the force seems proleptic. In: *hanc (silicem) . . . dexter in adversum nitens concussit* (8. 237) *dexter* is for *dextra manu*. In: *aequius huic Turnum fuerat se opponere morti* (11. 115) *huic* seems for: *hac manu oblatae*; as in: *his mecum decuit concurrere telis* (11. 117) *his* is for: *hoc in campo coniectis*. Just as we had *flagrantem pinum* for *flagrantem pineam facem*, here we have in: *qua spe Libycis teris otia terris?* (4. 271) *otia teris* for: *tempora otio teris*.

But we have the accusative also used for the genitive in such constructions as: *certus iter* (5. 2) with which compare: *certus eundi* (4. 554), *ego pretium ob stultitiam fero* (Ter. And. 610), *non nihil ad verum conscia terra sapit* (Prop. 2. 13. 42), *avidum . . . in tempora faenus* (Luc. 1. 181), *neque pol consili locum habeo neque ad auxilium copiam* (Ter. And. 320), *gens ferox et ingeni avidi ad pugnam* (Liv. 7. 23. 6). So: *auras invecta tenebat* (Aen. 7. 287) seems for: *cursum per auras invecta tenebat*; and: *frueris posteritate tua* (Mart. 7. 47. 10) for: *frueris gloria tua apud posteros*.

We have seen how the genitive of the owner or possessor often is expressed by an adjective in poetry. Of the remaining Latin genitives most are partitive in meaning, and we find those with the nouns on which they depend substituted for nouns with adjectives in agreement in poetry, and in prose at times, when the adjective expresses number or extent. Virgil gives us the prose form: *medio in antro* (Aen. 3. 624), but: *aulai medio* (3. 354) and: *castrorum et campi medio* (9. 230). These probably follow the analogy of: *in praerupti montis extremo* (Sall. Jug. 37. 4); and when we compare this with: *extremo . . . sub fine laborum* (Geo. 4. 116) we see that Sallust's: *in extremo* is probably shortened for: *in extremo fine*. The adjective thus converted to a noun is found most commonly as a neuter plural, as in: *angusta viarum* (Aen. 2. 332), *per opaca locorum* (2. 725), *ardua terrarum* (5. 695), *scriptorum quaeque* (Sat. 2. 3. 2); and it is often a superlative, as in: *pelagi extrema* (Aen. 8. 333), *in ultimis laudum* (Liv. 30. 30. 4), *proxima maris* (Tac. Ann. 3. 1. 3).

This neuter plural is so much the rule that we find it joined in apposition with the masculine plural in: *ductores Danaum . . . prima virorum* (Lucr. 1. 86); and in: *tibi cuncta tuorum parebunt* (Stat. Silv. 3. 3. 197) *cuncta tuorum* is clearly for *omnes tui*. *Summa* passes easily from a neuter plural to a feminine singular; for it is in the final sum that we attain to the highest figures. So it is a stage in this passage when we find Ovid in: *summa ducum Atrides* (Am. 1. 9. 37) making *summa* the appositive of a singular noun. But we find the adjective thus converted to a noun in the singular in: *sancta dearum* (Enn. Ann. 72, M.) and: *asperrimo hiemis* (Tac. Ann. 3. 5. 2). For superlatives governing a masculine genitive the masculine singular or plural is the more common, as in: *haud Ligurum extremus* (Aen. 11. 701), *extremi . . . hominum Morini* (8. 727). In: *multos Danaum* (2. 398) and: *multos illustrium Romanorum* (Ann. 3. 6. 1) the sense of degree in the adjective is lost, and we have mere poetic periphrases.

In such constructions the adjective is syntactically a noun; and we see it passing into a noun, when Tacitus writes: *provisu periculi* (Ann. 1. 27. 2) for: *provisu periculo*. And we often have nouns implying a high degree of quality taking the place of superlatives in this syntax. Just as in English, so from the beginnings of Latin literature we find *flos* used for optimum, as in: *ea tempestate flos poetarum fuit* (Pl. Cas. 18), *inde flos salis fiet* (Cato R. R. 88. 2), *in ipso Graeciae flore* (Cic. N. D. 3. 82. 33), *flos veterum virtusque virum* (Aen. 8. 500). So for pessimum we find *scelus*, as in: *scelus viri* (Pl. Truc. 621), *abine a me, scelus (feminae)?* (Bacch. 1176), *ubi illic est scelus qui perdidit me?* (Ter. And. 607), *artificis scelus* (Aen. 11. 407). The metonymy of *scelus* for *homo pessimus* is so usual that Terence joins *illic* and *qui* with it as though it were a masculine substantive.

We read: *Paegnium, deliciae pueri, salve* (Pl. Pers. 204), *flos delibatus populi Suadaeque medulla* (Enn. Ann. 353, M.), and by analogy we find in like syntax nouns chosen to express a high degree of the quality they imply in: *non mihi esse P. Lentuli somnum, nec L. Cassi adipem, nec Cethegi furiosam temeritatem pertimescendam* (Cic. in Cat. 3. 16. 7) 'neither need I fear the sleepy Lentulus, nor the fat Cassius, nor that rash madman Cethegus'. So in: *P. Clodi furor* (Mil. 3. 2),

labor domus (Aen. 6. 27), urbis opus (5. 119), specus volneris (9. 700), oris hiatus (11. 680), minae murorum (4. 88), rotarum lapsus (2. 236), velorum alas (3. 520), astrorum ignes (3. 585), stipitis gravidis nodis (7. 507), maris pontus (10. 377), loricae moras (10. 485), regum colla minacium (Od. 2. 12. 12), blanditiae rosae (Prop. 4. 6. 72), militiae flagitia (Ann. 1. 27. 1). To the noun is joined an adjective with a strong comic effect of oxymoron in: satis spissum filum mulieris (Pl. Merc. 755). We have a like syntax in: Teucrum inertia corda (Aen. 9. 55) and: inmania pondera baltei (10. 496). We have this union paralleled with the ordinary prose idiom in: cum tales animos iuvenum et tam certa tulistis pectora (9. 249) ‘such youthful courage and hearts so resolute’.

But at times the noun thus constructed indicates extent just as does the adjective in: in extremo montis. So in: iuga silvarum (6. 256) ‘the wooded heights’, imo barathri gurgite (3. 421), caeli suspectus (6. 579), septem discrimina vocum (6. 646). At times it becomes a periphrasis, serving merely to denote a quality in the object described, as in: ardentes oculorum orbes (12. 670), aequore campi (7. 781), litoris oram (3. 396), auri metallum (8. 445), habitu vestis (8. 723), Ixionii rota orbis (Geo. 4. 484). When we come to uses like: donum virgae (Aen. 6. 409) or: Medorum hostes (Prop. 3. 9. 25) we have a parallel to multos Danaum, giving us a genitive of definition like vox insaniae, or urbem Patavi (Aen. 1. 247). In: triginta magnos volvendis mensibus orbes (1. 269) we have a fine poetic periphrasis for triginta annos, arising from the substitution for annos of magnos volvendis mensibus orbes, where volvendis mensibus is probably a use of the ablative for the genitive. That magnus orbis gave the Roman the same idea as annus is clear from Lucretius’s words: multis solis redeuntibus annis anulus in digito tenuatur (1. 311), where to the ‘circles of the sun’ is opposed the ‘circlet on the finger’. We have the opposite of this syntax in: res animos incognita turbat (Aen. 1. 515) ‘the uncertainty of their state disturbs their minds’, as in: omni arte magistra (8. 442) for omnis artis praeceptis, and in: urbs capta ‘the capture of the city’, missus Hannibal in Hispaniam (Liv. 21. 4. 1) ‘the sending of Hannibal into Spain’.

Writing of: quisquis ingentes oculo inretorto spectat acervos (Od. 2. 2. 24) Professor Tyrrell (Latin Poetry, p. 190) thus censures Horace’s use of acervos: ‘Heaps of what? Of treasures, of course say the commentators. But Horace has not written “heaps of treasures”; he has only written “heaps”’. But if the Romans of Horace’s day habitually shortened auri acervos to acervos, then Horace was merely following usus, quem penes arbitrium est et ius et norma loquendi; and this usus Professor Tyrrell should have known. Horace uses acervus again in: addit acervo (Sat. 1. 1. 33), quid habet pulcri constructus acervus? (1. 1. 44), at suave est ex magno tollere acervo (1. 1. 51), cur . . . carae non aliquid patriae tanto emetiris acervo? (2. 2. 105), ex modico quantum res poscet acervo tollam (Ep. 2. 2. 190). It is true that he writes: aeris acervus et auri (Ep. 1. 2. 47), but where we should expect acervus auri, he has simply acervus. The scholiasts Acron and Porphyrio do not think it necessary to add a word of explanation of this use of acervus, showing how clear and obvious it was to them. Virgil too gives us: magnum alterius frustra spectabis acervum (Geo. 1. 158); Tibullus has: composito securus acervo despiciam dices despiciamque famem (1. 1. 77); Juvenal: e pleno tollatur semper acervo (6. 364); and Ovid: de multis grandis acervus erit (Rem. Am. 424), caeco . . . ademit acervo (Met. 1. 24). True, Juvenal writes: ingens stabat acervus nummorum, Spartana chlamys, conchyliis Coa, etc. (8. 100 ff.) giving a formal and detailed list. Cicero writes: qui tantos acervos pecuniae capiat (Leg. Agr. 2. 59. 22), tanti acervi nummorum (Phil. 2. 97. 38). But this is rhetorical prose, which follows a higher standard than the sermo plebis. Speaking generally, we read: acervus frumenti, farris, turis, armorum, lapidum, caesorum, but not auri; then we have simply acervus. And what is our word ‘treasure’ but θησαυρός ‘a store’? Treasures of what? Of gold, of course; but we too habitually omit the word ‘gold’.

How am I to translate: sed ruinae maximae modo iumenta cum oneribus devolvebantur (Liv. 21. 33. 7)? What is: ruinae maximae modo? ‘Ganz wie wenn Gebäude zusammenstürzen’ explains Weissenborn; but he reads maxime, following a second hand. He cites: ruinae modo turbabantur (Liv. 44. 41. 7) of the crumbling of a phalanx, and: deturbati ruinae modo praecipitantur (Tac. Hist. 4. 71. 6) of a hostile array hurled downhill. It is also associated with mountains in: inenarrabilis labor descenditibus cum ruina iumentorum sarcinarumque (Liv. 44. 5. 1). But where shall I find ruina used for ruina domus or ruina aedium? Deiphobi dedit amplam ruinam . . . domus (Aen. 2. 310) points to the opposite, as does: ea lapsa . . . ruinam cum sonitu trahit (2. 465). I turn to Catiline’s words: incendium meum ruina restinguam (Sall. Cat. 31 fin.); ruina here looks at first sight like ruina omnium. Horace gives me: si fractus inlabatur orbis, impavidum ferient ruinae (Od. 3. 3. 8), which looks formidable. When on: suspensa graves aulaeas ruinas in patinam fecere (Sat. 2. 8. 54) there follows: nos maius veriti (v. 57), what does Horace mean by maius, of which the fall of the curtains gave warning? What but an earthquake? with which the ruina domus, of which the Comm. Cruq. speaks, would be involved. Interesting here is Virgil’s: caeli ruina (Aen. 1. 129), and especially Servius’s note: id est tonitribus, quorum sonus similis est ruinis. What can Servius’s ruinae be but earthquakes? and in the mountains the avalanche is the phenomenon



that corresponds most nearly to the earthquake of the plains. Sir Wm. Smith thinks that: *nivis casus* (Liv. 21. 35. 6) is an avalanche; but this is a snowfall in the usual sense. Among the Alps avalanches are frequent, not in autumn or winter storm so much as at noonday in the heat of summer sunshine. I think we must translate: but like a mighty avalanche were rolled down beasts of burden with their loads. *Ruina* is a poetic term primarily for *terrae motus*.

But what of the syntax *ruinis* for *ruinarum* sono so obvious in Servius's note? One of the most usual ellipses in Latin is that of *aedes* in: *ad Dianae* (Ter. Ad. 582), *ad Vestae* (Sat. 1. 9. 35), *ad Castoris* (Cic. Mil. 91. 33), *prope Cloacinae* (Liv. 3. 48. 5). In Livy we read: *ubi nunc Vicae Potae est* (2. 7. 12), where the use of the genitive as subject of *est* was so distasteful to Madvig that he supplied *aedes*. While in Greek this construction subsisted long both for proper and common nouns, in Latin, while it was preserved longer for names of Gods, the genitive of names of men was early changed to suit the syntax of the context. So in: *ab Andriast ancilla haec?* (Ter. And. 461), if we followed the Greek syntax, we should write: *ab Andriae*, not: *ab Andria*, for: from the house of the Andrian woman. We have the like adjustment in: *Mysis ab ea egreditur* (And. 226), where *ab ea* is for: *ab eius aedibus*, in: *a me nescio quis exit* (Heaut. 510), *quisnam hinc ab Thaide exit?* (Eun. 545), *a fratre quae egressast meo* (Phorm. 732). Donatus's note to And. 461 has led to confusion here; it reads: *simpliciter dixit 'ab Andria est' pro 'Andriae est'; nam ex usu sic dicere solemus*. But when we look for examples of the use of *ab* with the ablative for the genitive in Terence's Latinity, we find none. When we compare with this note Donatus's note to Phorm. 732: '*a fratre*' pro '*a domo fratris*', we see that an *ab* has fallen out before *Andriae*; the note should read: '*ab Andria est*' pro '*ab Andriae est*'.

We have seen how Terence, when it was the shrine of a god, wrote: *ad Dianae*, but when it was the house of a mortal, *ab Andria*. But we find Virgil writing not only: *proximus ardet Ucalegon* (Aen. 2. 312), but: *formidatus nautis aperitur Apollo* (3. 275), where *Apollo*, too, is for *Apollinis aedes*, and: *attollit se diva Lacinia contra* (3. 552) '*opposite rises the fane of Juno Lacinia*'. The analogy that led to this seems to take the poets of the time further in two directions: (1) it is extended from the shrine or house to the territory or occupation of the person; (2) it is extended to places and lifeless objects generally, becoming rarer as it is so extended.

So from: *ab Euandro castris ingressus Etruscis* (Aen. 10. 148), for: *ab Euandri oppido*, we proceed to: *tum Cererem corruptam undis Cerealiaque arma expediunt* (1. 177), where *Cererem* is for *Cereris fruges*, or to: *et tandem Turnum experiatur in armis* (7. 434), for: *vires Turni experiatur bello*, or to: *extremus galeaque ima subsedit Acestes* (5. 498), for *sors Acestae*; *nil praeter Calvum et doctus cantare Catullum* (Sat. 1. 10. 19), for *carmina Calvi et Catulli*; *manet sub Iove frigido* (Od. 1. 1. 25), for *Iovis caelo frigido*; *magnum aequabunt ista Camillos iudicia* (Prop. 3. 9. 31), for *magnum iudicia Camillorum*; *at memor ille matris Acidaliae paulatim abolere Sychaeum incipit* (Aen. 1. 720), for *memoriam Sychaei*. From the name of a class like the *Camilli* to a nation the transfer is easy; and we have: *Teucrum arma quiescant et Rutuli* (12. 78); *profectio Hannibalis in Oretanos* (Liv. 21. 11. 13), for: *in Oretanorum fines*; *at Cappadoces in formam provinciae redacti* (Ann. 2. 56. 4), for: *civitas Cappadocum*. From this the transition to local names is easy, as in: *Hesperium Siculo latus abscidit* (Aen. 3. 418), for: *Siculo latere*; *ut Chio nota si commixta Falerni est* (Sat. 1. 10. 24), for: *ut Chii nota*, etc.; *ubi non Hymetto mella decedunt viridique certat baca Venafrum* (Od. 2. 6. 14-16); *mare omne in Austrum cessit* (Ann. 2. 23. 3), for: *in Austri potentiam*.

But this idiom passes from proper to common names. We read: *quo tempore Vesta arsit* (Ov. Fast. 6. 437), but: *ubi sedulus hospes paene . . . arsit* (Sat. 1. 5. 71) for: *hospitis taberna*. So we have: *ille ducem haud timidus vadentem passibus aequat* (Aen. 6. 263), for: *ducis passus*; *nunc aequali tecum pubesceret aevo* (3. 491), for: *cum tuo aevo*; *nunc tertia palma Diore* (5. 339), for: *victor tertiae palmae* (i.e. *tertio loco*); *nec bonus Eurytion praelato invidit honori* (5. 541), for: *invidit ei, qui honore sibi praelatus esset*; *neque adversus externos militem quaeri* (Tac. Ann. 1. 69. 4), for: *studia militum excitari*. And so for persons in: *numquid ego illi imprudens olim faciam simile?* (Sat. 1. 4. 136), for: *illius facti*; *longe mea discrepat istis et vox et ratio* (1. 6. 92); *unde ego mira descripsi praecepta haec* (2. 3. 33), for: *cuius ex ore*; *octo aquilae . . . imperatorem advertere* (Ann. 2. 17. 2), for: *imperatoris animum*; *nisi quos corpora equorum eodem inlisa toleraverant* (2. 24. 2), for: *quorum vitam*; *hunc loquitur grato plurimus ore cliens* (Mart. 7. 63. 8), for: *huius nomen*.

We read in Horace:

Purae rivus aquae silvaeque iugerum  
Paucorum et segetis certa fides meae  
Fulgentem imperio fertilis Africae

Fallit sorte beator (Od. 3. 16. 29-32).

Bentley was on the right line when he simplified this to: *ager meus Sabinus fallit proconsulem Africae sorte beator*; but he found a comparison between *ager* and *proconsul* impossible, and changed *fulgentem* to *fulgente*. But the English use of Leicester for Robert Dudley might have enlightened him. We noticed that in English we use horse for horseman, but not horseman for horse; while the Roman uses horseman for horse as well as horse for horseman. So the Roman says: *Ucalegon proximus ardet*, when he means the house of Ucalegon, and he uses *ager Horati* here, when he means *dominus agri*, Horace himself. We say: ‘among the nobles of Elizabeth’s day Leicester was the most unhappy’ but we do not say: ‘Robert Dudley was the next town to be laid waste’. If the comparison had been between Horace and Africa, instead of the farm and the proconsul, Bentley might have been more fortunate.

In: *pastorem ad baculum possum curare* (Prop. 4. 2. 39) what can *pastorem curare* mean? Most editors emend to: *pastor me ad baculum possum curare*, on the principle, apparently, that, if we can’t translate what the ancients wrote, we can at least emend it to something that we can translate. Even this poor satisfaction they have hardly attained here; for: ‘as a herdsman I am able to bend to the staff’ does not seem brilliant. Could the statue of Vertumnus ‘bend to the staff’? When we compare the passage with: *quin tu tuam rem cura potius quam Seleuci* (Pl. Mil. 951), or: *stultitiae videbatur alienam rem periculo suo curare* (Sall. Jug. 83. 1), and recall the use of *imperatorem* for *imperatoris animum* in Ann. 2. 17. 2, or *hunc* for *huius nomen* in Martial 7. 63. 8, we may see that *pastorem* could be for: *rem pastoris* ‘the office of the herdsman’. This is not the place to deal with: *ad baculum*, though *pastorem ad baculum* is parallel to our ‘shepherd with his crook’. Returning to the manuscript reading, for we have no evidence that Propertius wrote *aught* but this in this verse, we may translate: ‘I can play the part of the herdsman with his staff’, which fits the context.

We read in Propertius:

et nova flamma

Luxit in obliquam ter sinuata facem (4. 6. 30).

Here: *in obliquam facem* is short for: *in speciem obliquae facis*, and we translate: ‘and a strange flame he flashed forth curving thrice into the appearance of a torch held aslant’—a description of the lightning flash in its zig-zag course that has no equal to my knowledge. We have like uses of this idiom in: *fit strepitus tectis vocemque per ampla volutant atria* (Aen. 1. 725) for: *vocis sonum*; *quem falsa sub prodicione Pelasgi . . . demisere neci* (2. 83) for: *falso sub crimine prodicionis*; *labat ariete crebro ianua* (2. 492-3) for: *arietis crebro ictu*; *non laudis amor nec gloria cessit pulsa metu* (5. 394) for: *non laudis amor nec gloriae amor*, a use of three for four, as are many others of the examples we have quoted. In: *lucosque sub alta consulit Albunea* (7. 82) it is not the name of the shrine, but that of the Sibyl, that is omitted; and *lucos* is not short for *lucos Sibyllae*, but is a metonymy for *Sibyllam*.

## XXIX

### ILICET EXTEMPLIO

WE read: *extemplo Aeneae solvuntur frigore membra* (Aen. 1. 92), to which Servius notes: *extemplo ilico, statim. Et est augurum sermo. Templum enim dicitur locus manu designatus in aere, post quem factum ilico captantur auguria. Then to: se tollit ad auras* (Aen. 2. 699), *verbum augurum, qui visis auguriis surgebant e templo. Unde est extemplo. Again to: extemplo turbati animi* (8. 4), *extemplo* aut subito aut re vera ex ipso templo, id est post divina arma commota (vide v. 3). This seems confirmed by the syntax of *extemplo* in Naevius’s verse: *extemplo illo te ducam, ubi non despuas* (apud Gell. 2. 19. 6), and in: *quom extemplo ad forum advenero, omnes loquentur* (Pl. Capt. 786), *is adornat veniens domi extemplo ut maritus fias* (Epid. 361), *extemplo Libyae magnas it fama per urbes* (Aen. 4. 173). We learn then that *extemplo* means ‘of a sudden’, or ‘at once’; after the Augur has laid out his *templum* in the sky and has viewed the auspices, the ceremony being thus complete, he dismisses those assembled by a formula of which *extemplo* was a part, and probably the conclusion. It is natural to think that this formula was: *ilicet extemplo* ‘you may go from the templum’. *Extemplo* is very common in Plautus, less usual in Terence; Virgil has it sixteen times, Cicero twice only, Horace and Caesar not at all.

In: *credidi esse insanum extemplo ubi te appellavit Tyndarum* (Pl. Capt. 559) the union *extemplo ubi* seems short for *extemplo ubi extemplo*, where *ubi extemplo* would be equivalent to *ubi primum*, and the whole phrase to *simul atque*

(simul). And in: *eaque extemplo ubi ego vino has conspersi fores . . . aperit ilico* (Curc. 80) it is plain that *extemplo ubi* is felt as equivalent to *simul atque (simul)*. But in: *utque impulit arma, extemplo turbati animi, simul omne tumultu coniurat trepido Latium* (Aen. 8. 4) *extemplo* and *simul* are both simple in use, being equivalents with the force of *statim*. We have *simul* paired with *extemplo* in like fashion in: *extemplo, simul pares esse coeperint, superiores erunt* (Liv. 34. 3. 2). In: *extemplo teli stridorem (audiit), aurasque sonantes audiit una Arruns, haesitque (una) in corpore ferrum* (Aen. 11. 863) we probably have the full form of the sentence. So too in: *dixit (extemplo) et extemplo . . . sensit medios delapsus in hostes* (2. 376).

But we saw that *extemplo ubi* is equivalent at times to *ubi primum*, and so we have *extemplo* used with the same meaning as *primum* or *primo* in: *et prudentiam quidem, non vim dictatoris extemplo timuit* (Liv. 22. 12. 6), where Hertz changes *non vim* to *novi*, and Weissenborn brackets it. But it has this meaning in: *nox inlataque fallunt lumina, et extemplo latuit mensura iacentum* (Stat. Achill. 2. 88) and in: *erubescit: quid respondeat, nescit; quid fingat extemplo non habet* (Cic. Ros. Com. 8. 3). So, as is natural, we find *cum extemplo* for *cum primum* in: *ne tu me ignores, quom extemplo meo ex conspectu abcesseris* (Pl. Capt. 434), *quom extemplo ad forum advenero, omnes loquentur* (ib. 786), *et saepe*.

Very interesting is *quam extemplo*, the reading of the manuscripts in: *nam qui amat, quod amat quam extemplo saviis sagittatis percussus est, ilico res foras labitur, liquitur* (Pl. Trin. 242), *quam extemplo hoc erit factum* (Mil. 1176). The editors of course change it to *quom extemplo*. But beside *quom* in Latin we have the later and stronger form *quando*, which in archaic and classical Latin has superseded it as the interrogative in direct and oblique. What is this but *quamdo* ‘up to what time?’ where the -do is the do- in *donec*, and the de in *quamde* (Lucr. 1. 640) ‘up to what point?’, ‘how much?’. As *quam* is ‘to what degree?’, *quamde* seems ‘up to what degree?’. We have the feminine adjective in *alias* ‘at another time’; in *quam extemplo* the *quam* seems ‘to what time?’ for which *quando* is ‘up to what time?’ We have also *tam* for ‘up to that time’ in: *tam modo* (Pl. Trin. 609), the Praenestine for *tantum modo*.

To: *ilicet obruimur numero* (Aen. 2. 424) Servius’s note is: *ilicet* confestim, mox. Sane apud veteres ‘ilicet’ significabat sine dubio ‘actum est’. Origo autem significationis inde descendit: olim iudex ubi sententiam dixerat, si dare finem agendis rebus volebat, per praeconem dicebat ‘ilicet’ hoc est ‘ire licet’, id est acta et finita res est; and he cites in illustration: *em tibi, rescivit omnem rem, id nunc clamat, ilicet* (Ter. Ad. 791), *actum est, ilicet, periisti* (Eun. 54). To: *ilicet* (Phorm. 208) Donatus’s note is: *semper ‘ilicet’ finem rei significat, ut actum est*; and he adds: *ilicet per syncopam; sic iudices de consilio demittebantur, suprema dicta cum praeco pronuntiasset ‘ilicet’, quod significat ire licet*. Hand quotes Scaliger (ad Varron. 6. 2): *extemplo* verbum est sacrorum, ut *ilicet* iudiciorum. And yet Servius (ad Aen. 6. 231) tells us that the *novissima verba* closing the ceremony of burning the dead were *ilicet*. Legal proceedings with the Romans were an outgrowth of sacral ceremonial; so we may conjecture that of the phrase *ilicet extemplo*, *ilicet* was transferred to proceedings in a court of law, and the formula used in closing a case there was: *actum est, ilicet*.

That Servius and Donatus were right in making it a shortened *ire licet* seems certain. The strong accent on the first syllable led to the loss of e in the second, and r was assimilated to the following l. But Charisius (p. 200, K.) writes: *ilicet nunc pro ‘ilico’, id est statim; antiqui pro ‘eas licet’*. Schneider thought that *ilicet* was for *i licet*. We have noticed that the infinitive with *licet* is primarily an infinitive used as imperative, and for this the subjunctive is a common equivalent. The real nature of *ilicet* seems plain in: *ilicet parasiticae arti maximam malam crucem* (Pl. Capt. 469), *ilicet vadimonium ultro mi hic facit* (Epid. 685), *ilicet. quid hic conterimus operam frustra? quin abeo?* (Ter. Phorm. 208).

It is also used with the sense of ‘all is lost’, as in: *ilicet: mandata eri perierunt una et Sosia* (Pl. Amph. 338); *periit opinor. actum est, ilicet, me infelicem et scelestam* (Cist. 684-5). Clearly *ilicet* with the sense of *actum est* is a metonymy resulting from the shortening of *actum est, ilicet*. We have it again in full in: *actumst, ilicet, peristi* (Ter. Eun. 54), and shortened in: *ipsast; ilicet; desine; iam conclamatumst* (ib. 347).

Charisius (p. 200, K.) cites from Afranius: *an tu eloquens ilicet?* and explains *ilicet* as *subito vel extemplo*; i.e. of the phrase *ilicet extemplo*, *ilicet* is here used with the force of both terms, usually expressed by *extemplo*. This seems its meaning in classical poetry, as in: *fugit ilicet ocior Euro* (Aen. 8. 223), *fractas utinam tua tela sagittas ilicet (aspiciam)* (Tib. 2. 6. 16), *ilicet igne Iovis lapsisque citatior astris tristibus exsiluit ripis* (Stat. Theb. 1. 92). The word is rare even in Latin comedy; Virgil has it five times, Cicero never.

*Ilico* belongs to the Comedy and to classical prose, as its quantity, *īlīcō*, allows it no place but in iambic or trochaic verse. Servius in his note to *ilicet* (Aen. 2. 758) says that *ilico* like *ilicet* means the same as *confestim*; *sed metri ratione*

variantur. Many of its uses in the Comedy show the phrase in its primary meaning, which approaches: *eo ipso in loco*. So in Naevius's verse: *septimum decimum annum ilico sedentes* (ap. Non. p. 518, M.), *cum quo irent nesciebant, ilico manserunt* (Hemina ap. Non. l.c.), *heus tu, asta ilico* (Pl. Trin. 1059), *tandem ilico adesdum* (Mil. 1030). Nonius gives us *ilico* with the sense of *illo in*: *sed quam longe est, cum isti ilico* (Turpil. ap. Non. l.c.), where *isti ilico* must be for *istum in locum*. This is the use of the locative, so common in Sanskrit, to denote limit of motion, which we see in: *adveniens domi* (Pl. Epid. 361) and: *procumbit humi bos* (Aen. 5. 481). For place Tacitus seems to return to its primary force in: *castra metari in loco placuit* (Ann. 1. 63. 7); but he uses it for time in: *reus ilico defendi postulabat* (ib. 13. 52. 2).

To: *otiose nunc iam ilico hic consiste* (Ter. Ad. 156) Donatus has this note: *ilico modo locum, non tempus significat*. At first sight one feels like taking *modo* here for *hic*—it is often for *nunc*—and taking the note to mean that *ilico* must here be joined with *hic*. But to: *missast ancilla ilico obstetricem arcessitum ad eam* (Ter. And. 514) he says: *ilico* quod Graeci dicunt *ὠτόθεν*, nam loci significatio est, etiam brevitatem temporis notans. But *ilico* here, which he would take as *inde*, the opposite of Turpilius's use, is plainly temporal, just as in: *percussit ilico animum* (And. 125) and in Pacuvius's verse: *repudio auspicium; regrediendumst ilico* (ap. Non. l.c.), *ipse hinc ilico conscendit navem* (Pl. Rud. 62), *fugere e conspectu ilico* (Ter. Hec. 182). Its transition from place to time is natural and easy, as we see in: *te certo heri huc advenientem ilico salutavi* (Pl. Amph. 714), where we may translate *ilico* either 'on the spot' or 'immediately'. We find *ilico* coupled with *extemplo* in: *quam extemplo hoc erit factum . . . ibi tu ilico facito ut venias . . . huc* (Pl. Mil. 1176-7), *tristes ilico, quom extemplo a portu ire nos cum auro vident, subducunt lembum* (Bacch. 303-5). It is coupled with *continuo* in: *nam postquam audiui ilico ex meo servo illam esse captam, continuo argentum dedi* (Epid. 563-4). And like *extemplo* it takes the meaning of *primum in*: *qui aequom esse censent nos a pueris ilico nasci senes* (Ter. Heaut. 214), *scivi equidem in principio ilico nullam tibi esse in illo copiam* (Pl. Epid. 324).

We have already noticed the union: *ilico hic* (Ter. Ad. 156); we have it again in: *ilico ante ostium hic erimus* (Caecil. ap. Non. l.c.). We saw: *ibi ilico* (Mil. 1176), found again in: *quin ibi ilico adsit* (Merc. 362). We have also: *istic sta ilico* (Merc. 910) and: *ilico intra limen istic adstate* (Most. 1064), *ibidem ilico puer abs te cum epistulis* (Cic. Att. 2. 12. 2). Here we have four unions equivalent in meaning to: *in hoc loco*, *in eo loco*, *in isto loco*, and: *in eodem loco*, and pointing clearly to the primary force of *ilico*.

In *enimvero*, *enim* is from the stem *eno-* 'that' (cf. Skt. *anena*), of which it seems a locative; and the phrase was perhaps primarily shortened from *enimvero tu dixisti* 'in that saidst thou truly'. Hand's painstaking treatment of the phrase is vitiated by his failure to see that *enim* and *vero*, standing both at times for *enimvero*, will have the same meaning. It is just as though in Talleyrand's maxim: *trop de zèle*, we failed to recognize that *trop* is short for *pas trop*.

We find *immo enimvero* in: *Pa. Incommode hercle. Ch. Immo enimvero infeliciter* (Ter. Eun. 329), *immo enimvero ego sum, inquam, Orestes* (Pacuv. 365, R.), *immo enimvero corpus Priamo reddidi* (Ace. 667, R.). More usual is *immo vero*, as in: *Pam. Nescis, Parmeno, quantum hodie profueris mihi. . . Par. Immo vero scio, neque hoc imprudens feci* (Ter. Hec. 875-7), *non igitur patria praestat omnibus officiis? Immo vero; sed ipsi patriae conducit pios cives habere* (Cic. Off. 3. 90. 23). But we have *immo enim* with the same meaning in: *Ch. Orandi iam finem face. . . Si. Immo enim nunc cum maxime abs te postulo atque oro* (Ter. And. 821-3), *Ch. Duras fratris partes praedicat. Pa. Immo enim si scias . . . magis id dicas* (Eun. 354-6). We have also *immo* for *immo vero* in: *An. Ubi? domin? Ch. Immo apud libertum Discum* (Eun. 608), *Dor. Hae quid ad me? Tox. Immo ad te adtinent et tua refert* (Pl. Pers. 497). We have *vero* with like meaning in: *Dixisti enim non auxilium mihi sed me auxilio defuisse. Ego vero fateor me quod viderim mihi auxilium non deesse, idcirco illi auxilio pepercisse* (Cic. Planc. 86. 35). We have then *immo enim vero*, *immo enim*, *immo vero* with the same meaning; and for *immo vero* either *immo* or *vero* with this same force—indicating successive uses of one for a pair. When, as in: *Dem. Tunc es adiutor nunc amanti filio? Lib. Sum vero* (Pl. Asin. 58), *vero* indicates simply assent, its use is probably simple, and not the result of shortening.

Hand (2, p. 405. 2) tells us that *enim vero* is used for *tum vero*. We read: *tunc enim vero deorum ira admonuit* (Liv. 2. 36. 6), *enim vero tum Latini gaudere facto* (2. 22. 6), and then: *tum vero ingentem gemitum dat pectore ab imo* (Aen. 1. 485). In: *cum gladii abditi ex omnibus locis deverticuli protraherentur, enim vero manifesta res visa iniectaeque Turno catenae* (Liv. 1. 51. 8) Duker wished to change *enim vero* to *tum enim vero*; and in: *enim vero conclamant bonum ut animum haberent* (24. 31. 1) Hand thinks *enim vero* for *tum enim vero*. These indicate *tum enim vero*, *tum vero*, and *enim vero* with the same meaning.

We read: *sed enim vero cum detestabilis altera res et proxima parricidio sit, quid ad deliberationem dubii superesse?*

(Liv. 45. 19. 14), then: *sed enim oikovouía si perturbatio est, tibi assignato* (Cic. Att. 6. 1. 8), and: *sed enim gelidus tardante senecta sanguis hebet* (Aen. 5. 395). So in: *mox Rhescuporis egredi fines . . . et resistenti vim facere, cunctanter sub Augusto . . . enim vero audita mutatione principis inmittere latronum globos* (Ann. 2. 64. 6) *enim vero* is probably for *sed* by metonymy, as Schwartz assumed it to be, being shortened from *sed enim vero*.

We read: *ceteri tribuni militum nihil contradicere. At enim vero Sergius Verginiusque . . . primo deprecari ignominiam, deinde intercedere* (Liv. 5. 9. 3). Then: *Ca. Ita faciam. Meg. At enim nimis longo sermone utimur* (Pl. Trin. 806), *Att. Adsentior, quoniam omnis haec in religione versatur oratio. M. At vero, quod sequitur, quomodo aut tu adsentire, aut ego reprehendam, sane quaero* (Cic. Leg. 2. 34. 14). Here *at enim vero*, *at enim*, *at vero* evidently bear the same meaning. And as we shall see, *at* is used for *at enim*.

Just as we had *tum enim vero* and *enim vero tum*, so we find *enim vero* and *verum enim*, as in: *verum enim metuo malum* (Ter. Phorm. 555). We have *certe enim* in: *certe enim hic nescio quis loquitur* (Pl. Amph. 331). But if *verum* is thus equivalent to *vero*, which denotes assent, whence comes the adversative meaning which *verum* almost always shows? The force of assent is plain in: *tum Brutus . . . sed tu orationes nobis veteres explicabis? Vero, inquam, Brute* (Cic. Brat. 300. 87). But just as *vero* shortened from *immo vero* shows a strong adversative force, so we find *verum* with this force in: *merito maledicas mi, si non id ita factum est. Verum haud mentior, resque uti facta dico* (Pl. Amph. 572-3). In a very few cases we find *verum* with the meaning of assent, as in: *Ct. Men quaerit? Sy. Verum* (Ter. Ad. 543), *So. Facies? Ch. Verum* (Heaut. 1013). But we find *verum tamen*, giving the adversative force usually conveyed by *verum*, in: *consilium capit primo stultum, verum tamen clemens* (Cic. Verr. 2. 5. 101. 39), *nam quom pugnabant maxime, ego tum fugiebam maxime. Verum quasi adfuerim tamen adsimulabo, atque audita eloquar* (Pl. Amph. 200). Most usual, however, is *tamen* with this meaning, as in: *nec satis digna quoi committas primo partu mulierem. Tamen eam adducam?* (Ter. And. 231), *hic haedos depone; tamen veniemus in urbem* (Buc. 9. 62). *Tamen* consists of the same accusative that we have in *tam* with the preposition *en* (= *in*) suffixed, and means ‘up to that point’, or ‘for all that’. We have the two forms in *tametsi* and *tamen et si*, evidently with the same meaning. The pair: *verum tamen* ‘in truth for all that’ is expressed commonly by *tamen*, but often by *verum*, which, standing for *tamen* by metonymy, will have its adversative force.

*Cum maxime* in many of its uses has been a puzzle to scholars. In some it presents no difficulty, as in: *quom secundae res sunt maxime, tum maxime meditari secum oportet* (Ter. Phorm. 241), *qui cum maxime fallunt, id agunt ut viri boni esse videantur* (Cic. Off. 1. 41. 13), and in *Sosia’s* words: *nam quom pugnabant maxime, ego tum fugiebam maxime* (Pl. Amph. 199) ‘when they were in the hottest of the fight, then I was in the hottest of my flight’. Nor in such uses as: *immo enim nunc quom maxime abs te postulo* (Ter. And. 823) is it difficult to find the meaning. For if we asked *Sosia*: *quando maxime fugiebas?* his answer would be: *tum quom maxime pugnabant. Sed quando maxime timebas? Non tum, sed nunc quom maxime cum ero rem disputo; qui timeam ne meae inertiae poenas mihi sit dandum. And so in Terence’s: nunc cum maxime postulo* ‘now it is when most of all I ask’. In: *haec cum maxime loqueretur, sex lictores circumsistunt* (Cic. Verr. 2. 5. 142. 54) *nunc* is implied in *haec*.

We have seen how *extemplo* is used for *ilicet extemplo*, *tamen* for *verum tamen*, *enim vero* for *tum enim vero*. So for *nunc cum maxime* we have *cum maxime* in: *atqui quom maxime volo te dare operam ut fiat, verum alia via* (Ter. Heaut. 788), where clearly: *quom maxime volo* means ‘now most of all I wish’. The meaning is still more obvious in: *hoc quod futurum dico, cum maxime fit, et pars eius magna iam facta est* (Sen. Ep. 120. 18), where Erasmus wanted to write *nunc cum maxime*. So in: *verum tamen antiqua neglegimus: etiamne ea neglegemus quae fiunt cum maxime? quae videmus?* (Cic. Har. Resp. 32. 15) ‘which are happening just now before our eyes’. Here Hand feels that *cum maxime* must be for *nunc cum maxime*. In: *quae passus est reus . . . quae cum maxime patitur* (Quint. 6. 1. 23) ‘what he is suffering just now’, Spalding will not admit Ernesti’s change to *tum*, but holds that the ellipsis is rather of: *eo quando quidque agitur tempore*; as the phrase is general—in *universum proposita*. While it is general, it is expressed as an absolute present, and such changes are not formed as Spalding supposes, but unconsciously and in the *sermo plebis*. Very clear seems the meaning in: *quia nemo nostrum novit nisi id tempus, quod cum maxime transit* (Sen. de Ben. 3. 3. 3) ‘the time which is just now passing’. The phrase here too is general, but is plainly for *nunc cum maxime*. For further examples see Cic. Verr. 2. 4. 82. 38; Tac. Hist. 1. 29 and 84; 4. 65. Priscian says that *cum maxime* is the Greek *ἐπεί μάλιστα*. In: *cum maxime haec in senatu agerentur, (tum) Canuleius pro suis legibus . . . ita disseruit* (Liv. 4. 3. 1) and: *cum maxime haec imperator . . . agerent, (tum) tubae cornuaque ab Romanis cecinerunt* (30. 33. 12) *tum* is to be supplied as indicated.

But in: *cum maxime haec dicente Gaio, puer . . . delapsus est* (Petron. 54. 1) the principal verb is in a past tense, and

cum maxime is for iam cum maxime. So too in: surgentibus cum maxime partibus honesta specie praetenderentur (Tac. Hist. 3. 4. 4) and: litora et lacus Campaniae cum maxime peragrantem (Ann. 3. 59. 4) ‘when he was just now strolling along the shores and lakes of Campania’.

From iam cum maxime the transition is easy to tum cum maxime; but we have already derived this phrase from Plautus’s verse, and though we meet it first in Livy, it is probably older than iam cum maxime. We read: castra amissa esse et tum cum maxime ardere (Liv. 40. 32. 1) ‘the camp was lost and was just then on fire’. See also Liv. 33. 9. 3; 43. 7. 8; Curt. 5. 7. 2. We have cum maxime for tum cum maxime in: fuit . . . vetus illa sapientia, cum maxime nascens, rudis (Sen. Ep. 95. 14) and: coeptantem cum maxime coniurationem disiecit (Tac. Ann. 4. 27. 2). Tum cum maxime does not seem to differ appreciably in meaning from tum maxime, which we read in: ne aut consulem tum maxime res agentem a bello avocarent (Liv. 27. 4. 2). See also Liv. 31. 18. 2; 7. 23. 6; Suet. Tib. 14. 4. We read: eo maxime tempore Abydum oppugnabat (Liv. 31. 14. 4), an extension of tum maxime. In: at vestis tamen illa sanguine madens ita repraesentavit imaginem sceleris, ut non occisus esse Caesar, sed tum maxime occidi videretur (Quint. 6. 1. 31) tum maxime seems to have the full force of tum cum maxime. If so, it would follow the same course of shortening that we see in: immo vero for: immo enim vero.

We read in Terence: amabat ut quom maxime tum Pamphilus (Hec. 115), to which Donatus’s note is: *cum maxime* pro nimis. But ut cum maxime is the phrase to be explained; and the meaning plainly is: Pamphilus was then in love to that degree in which he was when most in love. So in: domus celebratur ita ut cum maxime (Cic. ad Q. Fr. 2. 4. 6). We have cum maxime short for ut cum maxime in: quem armis oppressa pertulit civitas, ac paret cum maxime mortuo (Off. 2. 23. 7) ‘and obeys when dead as much as ever’. So in: video te, mi Lucili, cum maxime audio (Sen. Ep. 55. 11) ‘I hear you as clearly as when you were here’, intimos affectus meos tibi cum maxime detego (Ep. 96. 2) ‘as clearly as ever’.

We read in Terence: quin etiam insuper scelus . . . vestem omnem miserae discidit (Eun. 645). Quin etiam in its primary meaning ‘why not further now’ in longer clauses took on a force of asseveration ‘nay actually’, which we see here. We shall be content with a survey of its use in Virgil in its full and shortened forms. We have the full form in: quin etiam caeli regionem in cortice signant (Geo. 2. 269), ausus quin etiam voces iactare per umbram (Aen. 2. 768), quin etiam hiberno moliris sidere classem (4. 309), mortua quin etiam iungebat corpora vivis (8. 485). We have quin et in: quin et supremo cum lumine vita reliquit (6. 735) and: quin et avo comitem sese Mavortius addet Romulus (6. 778). We have quin only in: quin aspera Iuno . . . consilia in melius referet mecumque fovebit Romanos (1. 279), quin protinus omnia perlegerent oculis (6. 33), quin . . . idem orans mandata dabat (6. 115). We have etiam only in: dissimulare etiam sperasti, perfide, tantum posse nefas (4. 305), per scelus, ecce, etiam Troianis matribus actis exussit foede puppes (5. 793), ipse etiam Ascanius curvo direxit spicula cornu (7. 496).

We have: dicite, quandoquidem in molli consedimus herba (Buc. 3. 55) and: quandoquidem Ausonios coniungi foedere Teucris haud licitum (Aen. 10. 105). Quando in: fabor enim quando haec te cura remordet (1. 261) and: his se, quando ultima cernunt . . . parant defendere telis (2. 446) presents the same meaning. So with quandoquidem in: deos quaeso ut sit superstes, quandoquidem ipsest ingenio bono (Ter. And. 487), and with quando in: meus fac sis postremo animus, quando ego sum tuos (Eun. 196). This meaning of quando is so far removed from its usual temporal force, as in: Clit. Iam aderunt. Clin. Quando istuc erit? (Heaut. 238), that I am forced to regard in these passages quando as short for quandoquidem. I read in Cicero: quatenus autem sint ridicula tractanda oratori, perquam diligenter videndum est (De Orat. 2. 237. 58), but in Horace: mundus erit qua non offendat sordibus (Sat. 2. 2. 65), which Acron explains: quatenus non erit sordidus.

My attention has been called to saepe numero by my colleague, Prof. De Witt. Walde derives saepe from the root of saepio ‘I hedge’; but he does not discuss the question whether saepe or saepe numero is the older form. Saepe numero seems much more common in prose than saepe, and it is in prose that full forms are usually preserved. Is saepe here an imperative, as Prof. De Witt suggests? and is saepe numero ‘fence off from count’ and so ‘countless’, as Prof. De Witt suggests? Probably saepio, like capio, had an older form saepere for the infinitive. Lucretius’s use of cupiret (1. 71) is significant of the tendency here. Saepe, shortened from saepe numero, was regarded as an adverb and developed by analogy the comparison: saepius—saepissime, and later the rare adjectival forms: saepior and saepis.

Numero is not used for saepe numero, nor is quidem for quandoquidem, nor tenus for quatenus. But the use of numero as an adverb in archaic Latin is interesting. Gesner thinks that in: numero mihi in mentem fuit (Pl. Amph. 180) numero is for: opportune. Ribbeck says the Codex Palatinus has: nunc vero, and will emend to: nunc verbo (Coroll. ad Trag. Fr.

XV). But Nonius read *numero*, and tells us it is for *cito* (I. p. 571. L. M.). If it is for *opportune* it is probably shortened from *numero modoque*: cf. *nil extra numerum fecisse modumque* (Ep. 1. 18. 59). Nonius cites from Turpilius: *numquam nimis numero quemquam vidi facere, quom factost opus* (l.c.) and Festus (p. 170, M.) from Afranius: *perfalsum et abs te creditum numero nimis*, where *numero* is for *cito*. *Numero* seems the shortened form of *nimis numero* in: *neminem vidi qui numero sciret quique scito opust* (Naev. Trag. Fr. 61, R.), *en umquam numero matri faciemus volup* (Nel. Carm. 1, R.), *ne istum numero amittas subitum oblatum* (Acc. Trag. 144, R.), *numero te expugnat timor* (ib. 503, R.), *numero inepti pertimuistis cassam terriculam adversari* (Afran. 270, R), *numero ac nequiquam egi gratias* (ib. 312, R.), *numero huc advenis ad prandium* (Pl. Men. 287), *Py. Perii. Pe. Haud etiam: numero hoc dicis* (Mil. 1400), *Pa. Nimum saevis. Sy. Numero dicis* (Cas. 647), *o Apella, o Zeuxis pictor, cur estis numero mortui* (Poen. 1272). Varro (ap. Non. 352, M.) tells us that mothers in premature delivery prayed to *Numeria*, and to a child so born was given the name *Numerius*: *quod qui cito facturum quid se ostendere volebat, dicebat numero id fore*.

But in: *neque sat numero mihi videbar currere* (Turpil. 151, R.), *quid ita numero venit?* (Caecil. 2, R.), and perhaps in: *ac discedens numero venire ait adulescentem* (Varro ap. Non. l.c.) *numero* is simply for *cito*; as some think it is in: *quae cum causa Musarum esse dicuntur volucres, quod et . . . cymbalis et plausibus numero redducunt in locum unum* (Varro R. R. 3. 16. 7); though to me the context seems to point to the use of *numero* here for *numero modoque*: cf. *verae numerosque modosque ediscere vitae* (Ep. 2. 2. 143). This use of *numero* for *cito* is probably a shortening from *cito numero*, for which *cito* is the usual shortening, just as *continuo* is the usual shortening for *continuo cursu*.

For *sero* ‘too late’ we have *nimis sero* in: *tametsi incidamus oportet media, ne nimis sero ad extrema veniamus* (Cic. Phil. 2. 47. 19). But as *sero* in itself involves the idea of defect, the use of *sero* for *nimis sero* came probably very early. That of *cito* for *nimis cito* seems to occur first in the third century a.d., as in: *qui cito reorum causas audierat* (Capitol. Aurel. 24. 2). From *seuos* ‘the follower’, which we have in *heres secus*, and *pedisequus*, we get the adverb *secus* in the same way as *adversus* and *rursus*. This adverb, usually opposed to *recto* and *bene*, we find in: *etiam si secus acciderit* (Cic. Fam. 6. 21. 2). Such a union as we find in: *nobis aliter videtur: recte secusne, postea* (Cic. Fin. 3. 44. 13) points to *recto secus* ‘inferior to the right’ as the old form from which it is shortened; but I have not found it. The form *sequius* or *secius* or *setius* points still more clearly to an older *secius recto*, which seems implied in: *sed memet moror, quom hoc ago secius* (Pl. Cist. 692) or: *ratio talis sequius ceciderit* (Afran. 293, R.).

We have the union *tantum modo* ‘so much by measure’ or ‘fully as much’ in: *velis tantum modo, quae tua virtus* (Sat. 1. 9. 54), where the ellipsis of: *et tantum modo consequaris* is evident. The union seems to imply an ellipsis of *neque plus*, and corresponds to our ‘only’, as we see in: *unum hoc tantum modo neque praeterea quidquam notatum est* (Suet. Tib. 11. 3), *cum tantum modo potestatem gustandi feceris* (Cic. Rep. 2. 28), *pedites vero tantum modo humeris ac summo pectore exstarent* (Caes. B. C. 1. 62). We have it shortened to *modo* in: *potin ut semel modo, Ballio, huc cum lucro respicias?* (Pl. Pseud. 264), *uni modo gessi morem* (Most. 200), *hi unum modo quale sit suspicantur* (Cic. Orat. 28. 9); and to *tantum* in: *excepit unum tantum, scire se nihil scire; nihil amplius* (Cic. Acad. Prior. 2. 74. 23), *notus mihi nomine tantum* (Sat. 1. 9. 3); and so usually in *non modo* and *non tantum*. We have it with *si* in: *si modo est haec ars* (Cic. de Orat. 2. 157. 38), *si modo ego et vos scimus inurbanum lepido seponere dicto* (Hor. A. P. 272), *modo si licet ordine ferri* (Ov. Trist. 2. 263).

We have it negated in: *modo non monies auri pollicens* (Ter. Phorm. 68), which Donatus says is equivalent to *μόνον οὐ*. So too in: *equum . . . modo non vivum* (Val. Max. 8. 11. ext. 7) and: *modo non loquentibus signis aperte monstrabat* (Amm. 21. 14. 1). It has the meaning of ‘almost’, and seems short for *tantum modo non sed paene*, where we have the first part shortened to *modo non*, but taking by metonymy the meaning of the omitted second term *paene*. We have *tantum non* with the same meaning in: *nam cum vineae tantum non iam iniunctae moenibus essent* (Liv. 5. 7. 2), *tantum non statim a funere* (Suet. Tib. 52. 1). In: *peccare fuisset ante satis, penitus modo non genus omne perosos femineum* (Aen. 9. 141) *modo non omne* is clearly for *paene totum*.

We have: *tantum quod non* in: *tantum quod hominem non nominat, causam quidem totam perscribit* (Cic. Verr. 2. 1. 116. 45) ‘he all but names the man, the case in sooth he fully delineates’. We have the positive of this in: *tantum quod ex Arpinati veneram* (Fam. 7. 23. 1) ‘I was just come from Arpinum’, and: *tantum quod ultimam imposuerat Pannonico bello Caesar manum* (Vell. 2. 117), *de navi Alexandrina, quae tantum quod appulerat* (Suet. Aug. 98. 2), *Iuliam primum Marcello . . . tantum quod pueritiam egresso . . . dedit* (ib. 63. 1). Older than *tantum quod* seems *modo quod*, which the manuscripts give us in: *modo quod accepisti, haud multo post aliquid quod poscas paras* (Pl. Asin. 168) ‘you have just

got something; right after you get ready for a new request'. Goetz and Loewe have changed the reading to *modo quom*, as the phrase is isolated, but this method is most unsafe. Probably there existed a: *modo quod non*, but I have not seen it.

Donatus's note to: *modo dolores, mea tu, occipiunt primulum* (Ter. Ad. 289) is: *evidenter hic modo temporis praesentis adverbium est*. Priscian (18. 168, K.) to: *Ge. Modo apud portum . . . An. Meumne?* (Ter. Phorm. 198) says: '*modo*' dixit pro '*nuper*', and to: *modo ait, modo negat* (Eun. 714) pro '*nunc ait, nunc negat*'. We have: *advenis modo?* (Hec. 458) '*are you just now arriving?*' where *modo* seems short for *nunc modo*—a union that would be parallel to: *tempori modo* (Pl. Men. 1020) '*just in time*' or '*semel modo*' in: *nam ter sub armis malim vitam cernere quam semel modo parere* (Emn. F. 269, M.). Such pairs as we find in: *nunc quereretur eundem accusatorem . . . ac iudicem esse, modo vitam sibi eripi* (Liv. 8. 32. 9) or: *nam modo ducebam . . . pisces, nunc in mole sedens moderabar . . .* (Ov. Met. 13. 922) point to the existence of such a union; but they may arise from a syncretism of *nunc . . . nunc*, and *modo . . . modo*. True, Ribbeck reads *modo nunc* for *modo non* in Aen. 9. 141, following Ed. Ven. I, but against the manuscripts and the scholia of Servius, Charisius, Acron, Porphyrio, and Arusianus; but I have found no sound authority for *nunc modo* or *modo nunc*. In: *iam modo iam possim contentus vivere parvo* (Tib. 1. 1. 25) *iam modo iam* has been emended to *iam modo nunc*; but in: *iam melior iam* (Aen. 12. 179) and: *iam puto iam* (Ov. Trist. 1. 1. 44) we have parallels to *iam modo iam*, and there is no manuscript authority for the change.

But Tibullus's phrase *iam modo* may be the union that lies behind this use of *modo*. Interesting here is: *ilico hic ante ostium: tam modo, inquit Praenestinus* (Pl. Trin. 609), where evidently *tam modo* is Praenestine for *ilico*. Evidently the Praenestines used *tam modo* where Tibullus uses *iam modo*, which the Romans usually shortened to *modo*. We must take *tam* here in a temporal sense, as we took *quam* in Plautus's *quam extemplo*; it will mean '*up to this point of time*' and *tam modo* will be '*just now*'. *Nunc* is so often joined with *iam* in *nunc iam* that it is not surprising to find Terence's: *modo ait, modo negat* paralleled by Ovid's: *nunc huc, nunc illuc . . . curro* (Her. 10. 19) and Virgil's: *iamque hos cursu iam praeterit illos* (Aen. 4. 157).

In prose we have commonly the union *tum . . . tum* in this sense, as in: *aestus maritumi, tum accedentes, tum recedentes* (Cic. N. D. 2. 132. 53), (*qui*) *tamquam machinatione aliqua tum ad severitatem, tum ad remissionem animi, tum ad tristitiam, tum ad laetitiam est contorquendus* (De Orat. 2. 72. 17). So we have a union of *modo* and *tum* in this sense in: (*sol*) *modo accedens, tum autem recedens* (N. D. 2. 102. 40). Other such unions are: *nunc adiutor Decimi Bruti . . . mox eiusdem proditor* (Vell. 2. 63), *modo hos obsidebat montes, paullo post ad illos transgrediebatur* (Val. Max. 7. 4. 5), which help us to understand the future use of *modo* in: *domum modo ibo* (Ter. And. 594). Following the use of *modo* for *nuper*, as in: *qui modo felices inter numerabar amantes* (Prop. 1. 18. 7), we have *tantum* for *nuper* in: *serta procul tantum capiti delapsa iacebant* (Buc. 6. 16). The frequent use of *modo* in this sense has led to the extension of its meaning to considerable lapses of time, e.g. to nearly a century in: *modo enim hoc malum (i.e. avaritia) in hanc rem publicam invasit* (Off. 2. 75. 21).

We read: *nunc misero mihi demum exitium infelix, nunc alte volnus adactum* (Aen. 10. 849-50), where we have three for four, *nunc demum . . . nunc* for *nunc demum . . . nunc demum*. This may indicate the starting-point for the use of *enim* for *enim vero*, of *verum* for *verum tamen*, of *immo* for *immo vero*. The same is true for pairs like *nunc . . . nunc*, *modo . . . modo*, *tum . . . tum* and the like. In: *una omnes fecere pedem, pariterque sinistros, nunc dextros solvere sinus* (5. 830-1) it is plain that the pair *nunc . . . nunc* is expressed by a single *nunc*. So with *modo . . . modo* in: *interea cognitis insidiis Artabanus tardari metu, modo cupidine vindictae inardescere* (Ann. 6. 32. 2). Probably this ellipsis accounts for the construction of *dum*, as we commonly see it in: *dum civitas erit, (dum) iudicia fient* (Cic. Rosc. Am. 91. 32); for *dum* is an accusative of duration '*for the time*', or '*for that time*'; and we may translate Cicero's sentence: '*during the time our state will exist, during that time courts will be held*'. We say in English: '*the moment he comes, I go*', which is short for: '*the moment he comes, that moment I go*'. So: '*while we wait, he works*' is short for: '*the while we wait, that while he works*'. We have no longer *dum* expressed in the principal clause excepting as an enclitic, as in *exspectadum*; but its place is taken by an adverb of duration, as in: *ego hic tantisper, dum exis, te opperiar foris* (Pl. Most. 683), or by a temporal clause, as in: *Tityre, dum redeo, brevis est via, pasce capellas* (Buc. 9. 23). But in: *tu modo, dum lucet, fructum ne desere vitae* (Prop. 2. 15. 49) *modo . . . dum* seems the usual form of distribution of *dum modo . . . dum modo*.

We have this union *dum modo* '*exactly so long*' expressed once only in: *dummodo morata recte veniat, (dummodo) dotatast satis* (Pl. Aul. 239) '*exactly so long as she shall be of right character, (exactly so long) is she dowered enough*'. So in: *quare sit summa in iure dicundo severitas, dummodo ea ne varietur gratia* (Ad Q. Fr. 1. 1. 20. 7) '*wherefore*



(exactly so long) let there be the utmost strictness in administering justice; exactly so long let it be perverted by no favour'. It is shortened to *modo dum* in: *mea nil refert dum potiar modo* (Ter. Eun. 320) 'exactly the time I shall be master, exactly so long it will make no difference to me'. So in: *nec volgi cura tyranno, dum sua sit modo tuta salus* (Val. Flacc. 5. 265) 'the full while his own health is secure, exactly so long has the ruler no care for the common herd'. *Dum* is short for *dum modo* in: *dum ne tibi (seignior) videar, non laboro* (Cic. Att. 8. 11 b), *id faciat saepe, dum ne lassus fiat* (Cato R. R. 5. 4), *quidvis cupio, dum ne ab hoc me falli comperiar* (Ter. And. 902), *multa . . . bello passus, dum conderet urbem* (Aen. 1. 5), *vel patiare licet, dum ne contempta relinquar* (Ov. Her. 3. 81). We have *modo* for *dum modo* in: *manent ingenia senibus, modo permaneat studium et industria* (Cic. Sen. 22. 7), *Tertia aderit, modo ne Publius rogatus sit* (Fam. 16. 22), *modo Iuppiter adsit, tertia lux classem Cretaeis sistet in oris* (Aen. 3. 116), *o valeant fruges, ne sint modo rure puellae* (Tib. 2. 3. 67), *modo postulat ut secum stemus, modo ne intersimus armis, contentum ait se esse* (Liv. 32. 21. 5).

We have *dum* as an enclitic in the principal clause in: *adesdum; paucis te volo* (Ter. And. 29). In the second clause its place is taken by *paucis*, as we saw it replaced by *tantisper* in Pl. Most. 683. That it is for *dum modo* is probable, for we shall find *modo* used in exactly the same way. The meaning is 'I want you for a few minutes; give me your attention for that full time'. So in: *manedum sodes* (Hec. 844), *tangedum . . . idum, Turbalio, curriculo, adfer celeriter duas clavas* (Pl. Rud. 796-8), *sed vero sinedum petere* (Truc. 628). As is clear from the last two examples, it quickly tends to become the equivalent of our 'pray' or 'please'; and that is its usual meaning, especially in *agedum* and *cedodum*. This is because, when it is shortened from the pair *dum modo*, it may take the meaning of *modo* 'fully' by metonymy, as well as the meaning of *dum modo* by synecdoche.

We have *modo* used like the enclitic *dum* in: *cedo modo mihi vidulum istum* (Pl. Rud. 1127) 'give here to me for a time that trunk you have'. So in: *mane modo, etiam percontabor alia* (Men. 922), *sine modo ego abeam* (Pseud. 239), *tu modo, dum lucet, fructum ne desere vitae* (Prop. 2. 15. 49). In the first three examples *modo* seems to have the meaning of *dum* 'for a time', but it soon passes to a mere particle of entreaty, as in: *cave modo, ne gratis* (Pl. Asin. 5), *sequere hac modo* (Men. 562), *quin tu i modo* (Trin. 583), *vos modo, inquit, parcite* (Phaedr. 2. 8. 8), *modo fac . . . ne quid aliud cures hoc tempore* (Cic. Fam. 16. 11. 1), *tu modo posce deos veniam* (Aen. 4. 50). Being the second term of the union, it is used far more frequently than *dum*. *Agedum* is often a mere interjection, so we need not be surprised at finding *dum* in: *ehodum ad me* (Ter. And. 184).

We find *dum* joined to *etiam*, evidently with the meaning of *modo* 'fully', showing that it is short for *dummodo*; as in: *dissimulabo, hos quasi non videam, neque esse hic etiamdum sciam* (Pl. Mil. 992), *neque etiamdum scit pater* (Ter. Heaut. 229), where *etiamdum* means 'even now fully'. So in: *integra etiamdum domo sua* (Ann. 1. 3. 1), where all my editors emend to *tum*. In: *primumdum, si falso insimulas Philocomasium, hoc perieris* (Pl. Mil. 297) *primumdum* seems short for *primumdum omnium*, which we have in Pl. Trin. 98 'first of all and to the full'.

*Nedum* 'far less' or 'far more' presents a more complex problem. *Dum* here too seems to have the meaning 'to the full'. In: *satrapa si siet amator, numquam sufferre eius sumptus queat, nedum tu possis* (Ter. Heaut. 454) the contrast between the governor and the farmer Menedemus adds the idea of 'less' to *nedum*. Often the negative in the first clause is only implied, as in: *mortalia facta peribunt, nedum sermonum stet honor et gratia vivax* (A. P. 69), where in *peribunt non stabunt* is implied. When no negative is expressed or so implied in the first clause, *nedum* changes its meaning to 'far more', as in: *quae vel socios, nedum hostes victos terrere possent* (Liv. 45. 29. 2), *ornamenta etiam legioni, nedum militi satis multa* (Val. Max. 3. 2. 24 fin.). When by transposition *nedum* begins the sentence, as in: *nedum hominum humilium, ut nos sumus, sed etiam amplissimorum virorum consilia ex eventu, non ex voluntate, a plerisque probari solent* (Cic. Att. 9. 7 a init.) the meaning of *nedum* will depend on whether the following clause is positive or negative.

*Dum* seems to have its proper meaning of 'during the time' in *interdum* 'at intervals in the time', as in: *interdum gremio fovet* (Aen. 1. 718). In *vixdum necdum, nondum, nihildum, nullusdum, nemodum* it has the sense of 'for the full time', just as our 'yet', which we use to translate it, and the German *jetzt* (M.H.D. *je-zu-o*) seem to mean 'right up to now'. So in: *vixdum dimidium dixeram* (Ter. Phorm. 594) 'hardly through all the time I had, had I said the half', *necdum sua forma recessit* (Aen. 11. 70), *fuga ab nulladum parte erat* (Liv. 7. 33. 13).

In: *cuius modo rei nomen reperiri poterat, hoc satis esse ad cogendas pecunias videbatur* (Caes. B. C. 3. 32. 2) *modo* seems for *cumque*. In:

Quid iudicare cogitet livor modo,

Licet dissimulet, pulcre tamen intellego (Phaedr. 4. 21. 1-2)

quid . . . modo seems to be for quidcumque. We have the union modo cumque in: et clamant 'merito' qui modo cumque vident (Ov. Am. 2. 14. 40), and from the shortening of this union comes by metonymy the use of modo for cumque.

We have also modo suffixed to temporal adverbs that later become prepositions. We have postmodo 'some time after' in: me abs te inmerito esse accusatam postmodo rescisces (Ter. Hec. 208), inmeritis nocituram postmodo . . . natis fraudem (Od. 1. 28. 31), publicum in praesentia dedecus, postmodo periculum (Liv. 2. 43. 8), postmodo nativa conspiciere coma (Ov. Am. 1. 14. 56). Modo here is not the simple modo 'by measure' but the union dummodo 'for a full lapse of time', and postmodo is 'after the fulfilment of an interval'. Dum, being the accusative, is used to express interval, as is the accusative in: aliquot ante annos (Suet. Caes. 12), and as modo in postmodo expresses interval, for it too we have the accusative in postmodum, used repeatedly by Livy, as in: saepe ex iniuria postmodum gratiam ortam (1. 9. 15), ne postmodum flecti precibus . . . posset (2. 1. 9). To this we may relate praemodum, which Gellius (6. 7. 12) tells us Livius used in his Odyssey quasi admodum in: parcentes praemodum. He adds: quod significat 'supra modum' 'above measure'; but prae does not govern the accusative, and modum is for modo, so that praemodum will mean 'right in the front rank'.

We usually find propemodum 'right near', as in: propemodum quid illic festinet sentio (Pl. Trin. 615), verum propemodum iam scio, quid siet rei (Men. 764). All codices but the Ambrosian palimpsest give us: pol ego propemodo (Pseud. 276), and three of the best codices give: propemodo quis successisset (Liv. 24. 20. 11). This form was adopted by Ritschl as the reading of the best manuscripts in: Me. Tenes iam? Ca. Propemodo (Trin. 780). Brix has returned to propemodum as in his belief the older form, but the opposite is the truth, and we can understand propemodum only through the older propemodo.

Admodum is not: ad iustum modum, as Hand thought, but means 'quite' or 'just' being from modo 'exactly' and ad, which is still an adverb here, 'to the extent'. Jordanes for admodum usually writes ammodum, but the Thesaurus tells me he writes also ammodo (= admodo). So amodo is from the adverb a 'from there' and modo 'fully'. It is used in Christian writers and in the Vulgate to translate ἀπ' ἄρτι in: non me videbitis amodo, donec dicatis: benedictus qui venit in nomine domini (Matt. 23. 39), and to translate ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν in: amodo videbitis filium hominis sedentem a dextris virtutis dei (ib. 26. 64). The fact that amodo is not found as a second form of amodo, but that admodo is as a second form of admodum, leads plainly to the conclusion that modo is the older form of this suffix, a conclusion which confirms its connexion with the suffix dum, so strongly supported by the meaning of modo in postmodo and propemodo.

So with commodo and commodum, and at times with commode, where commodo and commodum are parallel to admodo and admodum; commode is another story. Com is the same word as quom, but is here used in the meaning in which it passes to the prepositions. Illa mecum exit is evidently a later way of saying: illa tum exit cum ego exeo; and the com in commodo will have the meaning expressed by tum . . . cum in our phrase; which is in English 'at the time'. Commodo and commodum will mean 'exactly at the time'. When we compare: et commodo eccum exit (Titin. 64, R.), ecce autem commodum aperitur foris (Pl. Mil. 1198), commode ipse exit Lesbonicus cum servo foras (Trin. 400), where only A has commodum, all other manuscripts commode, we see plainly that all three have the same meaning. Commodo, the oldest, is rare; Plautus has it in: incommoitate abstinere me apud convivas commodo conmemini (Mil. 644), and Macrobius in: commodo adsunt feriae (Sat. 1. 2. 1). Commodum is far more usual; and to: illa sese interea commodum huc advorterat (Ter. Eun. 343) Donatus's note is: tantum quod vel ipso eodemque tempore; and we can best catch its genuine meaning in: attrahitur Lollius commodum cum Apronius e palaestra rediisset (Cic. Verr. 2. 3. 61. 25) (commodum cum) 'at the very time when'. We have it also in: ad te hercle ibam commodum (Pl. Cas. 593), commodum ad te dederam litteras (Cic. Att. 10. 16. 1), quos Horus ingredienti commodum consecutus comitabatur (Macrob. Sat. 1. 7. 3). But in: ad aquam praebendam commodum adveni domum (Pl. Amph. 669) commodum is plainly the acc. sing. neut. of commodus, with the meaning 'opportune'. And in return we find commode, the usual bearer of this meaning, used with the meaning of commodum, 'just at the time' in: sed quos perconter commode eccos video astare (Rud. 309), emerseram commode ex Antiati in Appiam (Cic. Att. 2. 12. 2).

We have in:

vel dic quid referat intra

Naturae fines viventi, iugera centum an

Mille aret. 'At suave est ex magno tollere acervo.' (Sat. 1. 1. 49-51),

a clear instance of the use of *at* for the prose *at enim* or *at vero*.

In the noteworthy hyperbole:

portis alii bipatentibus adsunt

Milia quot magnis umquam venere Mycenis (Aen. 2. 331),

Servius's note is: *umquam* pro quondam, a translation neglected by our editors. Umquam is in itself indefinite; and is used either in a general sense, as in: quod si numquam oritur, ne occidit quidem umquam (Cic. Rep. 6. 25), or of the past, as in: quod nemo umquam homo antehac vidit (Pl. Amph. 566), or of the future, as in: cave posthac . . . umquam istuc verbum ex te audiam (Ter. Heaut. 1031). But the adverbs of time standing in union with umquam are often omitted, as is the way with pairs, e.g. in: mihi si umquam filius erit (ib. 217), where umquam is for umquam post, or in: plusque amat quam te umquam amavit (Pl. Epid. 66), where it is for umquam ante. In Aen. 2. 331 of the union umquam ante by metonymy umquam is used for ante. Hence Servius's note.

In a note to: verum hodie numquam monstrabo (Ter. Ad. 570) Donatus is in doubt whether hodie is superfluous, or numquam hodie is for nullo tempore huius diei. He compares: numquam omnes hodie moriemur inulti (Aen. 2. 670), to which Servius's note is: *numquam* pro non; and he further cites: numquam hodie effugies (Buc. 3. 49). Donatus's note to: Sy. Nilne in mentemst? Ct. Numquam quicquam (Ter. Ad. 528) is: *numquam quicquam*, παρέλκων pro numquam; id est non. Here we have the union numquam quicquam (= ne umquam quidquam), which in the passages just cited has been shortened in form to numquam, but in meaning to ne quidquam. In: numquam factumst (Pl. Amph. 700), numquam te patiar perire (Men. 1010), hic quidem me numquam inridebit (Capt. 657), numquam dum adero, hic te tanget (Ter. Ad. 157), vi numquam eo subiri potuit (Liv. 3. 23. 4) numquam seems to have the full meaning of the pair numquam quicquam, of which Donatus says: numquam habet plus negationis quam non (ad And. 384).

To: numquam etiam fui usquam quin me amarent omnes plurimum (Ter. Eun. 1092) Donatus has this note: et *numquam usquam* pro non usquam, id est nusquam. Hand compares with this: mobilis enim et inquieta homini mens data est. numquam se tenet (Sen. ad Helv. 6. 6), where numquam seems rather of place than of time. When we compare this with Donatus's note, we have an exact parallel to the shortening of ne umquam quidquam noted above, viz. a shortening of ne umquam usquam to numquam in form, but to nusquam in meaning. We may further compare: nusquam equidem quidquam deliqui (Pl. Men. 780), nusquam abero (Aen. 2. 620), where nusquam seems short for numquam usquam. In: quos numquam quisquam neque vocat neque invocat (Pl. Capt. 76) numquam seems short for numquam quoquam, and nusquam is used for nequoquam in: nusquam abeo (Ter. Ad. 246).

I need hardly dwell on the common use of one term for two in such pairs as tam . . . quam, tum . . . quom, is . . . qui. But it is well to recognize clearly how we express in English the resultant quam, which bears the meaning of the union tam . . . quam. We have this resultant in: concede huc, mea gnata, ab istoc quam potest longissime (Pl. Men. 834) 'withdraw hither, my daughter, from that man *the* farthest possible'. We do not translate this quam by a relative, but by a demonstrative. So in: huic mandat, ut exploratis omnibus rebus ad se quam primum revertatur (B. G. 4. 21) 'he instructed this man after examining everything to return to him *the* earliest (he could)'. And so with the relative in: quibus auditis liberaliter pollicitus (est) (l.c.) 'having heard them he made them generous offers'. And now we see that comodo (= quom + modo) means to us 'just at *the* time'.

But this expression of two related terms by one is so wide in its scope that I will be content with one or two examples more. We read: castra metari in loco placuit, ut opus et alii proelium inciperent (Ann. 1. 63. 7) for: ut opus alii et alii proelium inciperent. It was a like omission we assumed in: dum civitas erit, (dum) iudicia fient. It sometimes escapes the student, as in: si essent omnia mihi solutissima, tamen in republica non alius essem atque nunc sum (Cic. Fam. 1. 9. 21) for: non alius essem atque non alius nunc sum. It is plainer when we turn to the equivalent: idem sum atque (idem) semper fui. We find Tacitus resorting to other means of avoiding like repetitions, as in: commotis per haec mentibus et inter se suspectis (Ann. 1. 28. 8) for: aliis aliis suspectis; and in: cur abstinerit spectaculo ipse, varie trahebant (Ann. 1. 76. 6) for: alio alii trahebant.

Not that poetry is necessarily averse to repetitions, as Bentley assumed to be an almost constant rule. It is of the very essence of poetic diction that it follows no constant rule; its canon is the quest of variety. In:

Teque dum procedis Io triumphe!

Non semel dicemus, Io triumphe!

Civitas omnis, dabimusque divis  
Tura benignis.  
Te decem tauri, totidemque vaccae,  
Me tener solvet vitulus (Od. 4. 2. 49-54),

the use of *te* in two successive stanzas for two different persons, for Augustus the triumphant leader, and for Julius Antonius who with Horace is a spectator of the triumph, has presented difficulty to readers. It seems to Mr. Wickham 'unlike Horace's finished workmanship to put the same pronoun in an emphatic place in two consecutive stanzas, when the subjects to which it refers are wholly different'. But we have seen that the full and balanced expression of a pair, such as *tu . . . tu* referring to Augustus, is just what Latin poetry will usually avoid; and when we meet *te . . . te* balanced in such fashion, there is reason to suspect what is here the truth, that we have not a repetition. But I am laying down no rule; the threefold repetition of *tu . . . tu . . . tu* in Od. 3. 21. 13-17, all three referring to Bacchus, would at once refute it.

### XXX

#### TOLLO AND PUTO

Of all Latin verbs *tollo* presents the greatest variety in form and meaning. Its variety in meaning is evident in the famous pasquil on Nero:

Quis negat Aeneae magna de stirpe Neronem?  
Sustulit hic matrem, sustulit ille patrem (Suet. Ner. 39),

'the Trojan chief of old bore away his father, this prince of ours has made away with his mother'. It is interesting to see how the same verb comes to mean 'to save' and 'to destroy'. But this is merely the cumulation of a curious series of meanings.

The verb has a variety all its own in its inflexion too. Naturally we should expect to find as its principal parts: *tollo*—*tollere*—*tuli*—(*t*)*latum*. Persius has *tolli* for the perfect in: *sorbitio tollit quem dira cicutae* (4. 2), his periphrasis for Socrates. We find *tetuli* repeatedly, as in: *pedem nemo intro tetulit* (Pl. Most. 471), *tetuli ei auxilium* (Rud. 68), *ibo, hanc tetulero intra limen* (Cist. 650), *numquam huc tetulissem pedem* (Ter. And. 808), *incepti, dum res tetulit* (ib. 832), *ubi forte ita se tetulerunt semina aquarum* (Lucr. 6. 672), *ad Idae tetuli nemora pedem* (Catull. 63. 52), *si reditum tetulisset* (id. 66. 35). All examples of *tetuli* are in meaning perfects of *fero*, and *tuli* is almost always a perfect of *fero*, and not of *tollo*; it is used, however, as the perfect of *tollo* in Suetonius, as in: *ex Scribonia Iuliam . . . tulit* (Aug. 63), *qui . . . quattuor liberos tulerat* (Tib. 47), *ex ea novem liberos tulit* (Cal. 7). In: *caelo supinas si tuleris manus* (Od. 3. 23. 1) *tuleris* seems the poetic shortening for *sustuleris*.

Along with this use of *tuli* or *tetuli* as the perfect of *fero*, we notice the use of *tollo* for *fero* in: *Atlas . . . caeli qui sidera tollit* (Aen. 8. 141) and in: *adibo contra et tollam gradum* (Pl. Bacch. 535), with which compare: *fert . . . incommitata gradus* (Ov. Met. 7. 184) and: *quo tulerit gressum* (Lucr. 4. 681). We have *fero* for *tollo* et *fero* in: *cum castra moveri ac signa ferri iussisset* (B. G. 1. 39 fin.), *signa ferri ac sequi iubet armatos* (Liv. 10. 5. 1), with which compare: *sublatis signis ad Caesarem se contulerunt* (Vell. 2. 61. 2). So also in: *tuum nomen . . . cantantes sublime ferent ad sidera cycni* (Buc. 9. 29) and: *Atia . . . somniavit intestina sua ferri ad sidera* (Suet. Aug. 94. 4); with which compare: *clamores simul horrendos ad sidera tollit* (Aen. 2. 222), *tollemus in astra nepotes* (3. 158), *fatis ad sidera tolli* (12. 795). In *ferre pedem* and *ferre gressum* or *gradus*, *ferre* seems short for *tollere et ferre* 'to raise and bear onward', a union at times expressed by *tollere*, but usually by *ferre*. It seems that from this early union, no longer found in use, proceeded the union of *fero* and *tuli*; and that parallel unions like *sum . . . fui* in Latin and *go . . . went* in English, had a similar origin.

In: *tollo gradus*, *tollo* means 'I raise from the ground'; Walde connects it with *tolleno* a sweep or swing-beam. But when we have it in such unions as *tolli ad sidera* or *ad astra*, its meaning is intensified, and it is so common in this use that its perfect is *sustuli* 'I have raised on high'. It is now parallel, not with *fero*, but with *effero*; and we may compare: *ad caelum mehercle tollimus verissimis laudibus* (Cic. Fam. 15. 9. 1) with: *te summis laudibus ad caelum extulerunt* (ib. 9. 14. 1). At times *laudibus* is omitted, as in: *Daphnimque tuum tollemus ad astra, Daphnim ad astra feremus* (Buc. 5. 51-2), *sua in destruendo eo consilia extulit* (Ann. 2. 63. 4), *quod valet non solum ad augendum aliquid et tollendum altius dicendo* (Cic. de Orat. 3. 104. 26). We may further compare *tollo* in: *ni sapiens sic Nomentanus amicum tolleret* (Sat. 2.

8. 61), Sol in currum cum Phaethontem filium sustulit (Cic. N. D. 3. 76. 31), hac victoria sublatu Ambiorix (B. G. 5. 38. 1), ultro animos tollit dictis (Aen. 9. 127), tollitur in caelum clamor (11. 745) with efferro in: clamorem utrimque eferunt (Pl. Amph. 228), hic me magnifice efero (Ter. Heaut. 709), quos recenti victoria efferri sciret (B. G. 5. 47. 4), quorum animi altius se extulerunt (Cic. Rep. 3. 4. 3).

But efferro also means ‘to bear out for burial’, as in: tum tu idem optumumst loces eferendum: nam iam, credo, mortuost (Pl. Aul. 568); and to: ecfertur (Ter. And. 117) Donatus’s note is: efferri proprie dicuntur cadavera mortuorum. But Virgil writes: haec ubi deflevit tolli miserabile corpus imperat (Aen. 11. 59), pointing to an old union of tollo and efferro in this sense also.

But in: avectaque partim finitimos tollunt in agros urbique remittunt (11. 206) tollunt is rather for transferunt; and we have the union tollo et transfero in: tollitur ab atriis Liciniis . . . et trans Alpes usque transfertur (Cic. Quinct. 12. 3). We have tollo for tollo et transfero in: da dextram misero et tecum me tolle per undas (Aen. 6. 370), fotum gremio dea tollit in altos Idaliae lucos (1. 692), quem tollere in altos optabam primum montes (2. 635). Nonius (l. p. 669, L. M.) takes tulere in: unius in miseri exitium conversa tulere (Aen. 2. 131) as the perfect of transferre; it may be the poetic shortening for transtulere, but it seems rather to bear the sense of aequo animo tulere. We have also extollere used for transferre in: res serias omnes extollo ex hoc die in alium diem (Pl. Poen. 500), fugiam hercle aliquo atque hoc in diem extollam malum (Mil. 861), abi intro atque istaec adfer tamen; hodie extollat nuptias (Caecil. apud Non. 1. 470, L. M.); with which compare: se se in annum proximum transtulit (Cic. Mil. 24. 9), causa haec integra in proximum annum transferetur (Cic. Fam. 8. 9. 2). We find extollo used for tollo in: si nostram causam laudando extollemus (Auct ad Her. 1. 5 fin.), and so can understand this substitution of extollo for tollo in the union tollo et transfero.

In a fragment of Turpilius we read: ubi praeter se neminem vidit esse, tollit aufert (195, R.). We have tollo for tollo et aufero in: at tu quantum vis tolle (Ep. 1. 7. 16), partim vel tolleret omnes (ib. 1. 6. 44), erat quod tollere velles (Sat. 1. 4. 11), dapes iubet et sublata reponi pocula (Aen. 8. 175), tollite cuncta, inquit, coeptosque auferte labores (8. 439). So in: sive est virtus et gloria, tollat (11. 444), where Servius renders tollat by consequatur, Mackail by ‘win’, tollat seems for tollat et secum auferat. Striking is the contrast between: tollentem minas (Geo. 3. 421) ‘raising on high his threats’, where minas seems for dentem, and tolle minas (Aen. 10. 451) ‘away with threats’, tolle querelas (Ep. 1. 12. 3), sublatis dolis (Aen. 12. 26), where tolle seems a metonymy for aufer.

We seem to have an extension of this use in the union tollere et eripere, as in: tolle fuga Turnum atque instantibus eripe fati (Aen. 10. 624), nonne videntur hunc hominem ex rerum natura sustulisse et eripuisse? (Cic. Rosc. Am. 71. 26), with which we may compare rapere et ferre in: alii rapiunt incensa feruntque Pergama (Aen. 2. 374). Tollere seems to stand for this union in: sed stirpem Teucris nullo discrimine sacrum sustulerant (12. 770), avaritiam si tollere voltis, mater eius est tollenda, luxuries (Cic. de Orat. 2. 171. 40), ut exercitum religio tollat, te auctorem senatus retineat (Fam. 1. 1. 3). We have the parallel union tollere et delere in: cuius omnino rei memoriam omnem tolli funditus et deleri arbitror oportere (Quinct. 70. 21), deleatis ex animo suo suspicionem omnem metumque tollatis (Rosc. Am. 6. 2). We have tollo for this union in: id nomen ex omnibus libris tollatur (Att. 13. 44. 3), solem enim e mundo tollere videntur, qui amicitiam e vita tollunt (Lael. 47. 13), belli commercia Turnus sustulit ista prior iam tum Pallante perempto (Aen. 10. 533), cur non incolumi potius certamina tollo? (12. 39), etiam illuc pervenerint proverbium ut tollant anticum (Varro R. R. 2. 9. 9), probably the proverb: canis caninam non est (L. L. 7. 87). Extension from this is easy to: tollo occidendo; and tollo stands for this in: me truncus illapsus cerebro sustulerat (Od. 2. 17. 28), quia Drusum ferro, Metellum veneno sustulerat (Cic. N. D. 3. 81. 33). It was this use that Cicero really intended in: Caesarem laudandum et tollendum censebat, cum aliud diceret, aliud intellegi vellet (Vell. 2. 62 fin.).

We have the interesting phrase liberos tollere usual through all Latinity. We read in the first edition of Plautus: si quod peperissem, id educarem tollerem, bona sua med habiturum omnia (Truc. 399), a reading that seems best supported by manuscript authority, though Schoell wonders that critics have endured it so long, and which gives us the union tollere educare in poetic inversion, that seems the clue to this meaning of tollere. We have similar unions in: me genitor . . . Argolicum terrorem inter Troiaeque labores sublatus erudiit (Aen. 9. 203), si cui . . . validus male filius in re praeclara sublatus aletur (Sat. 2. 5. 46). For unions like these we find tollo used: of the parents in: quicquid peperisset, decreverunt tollere (Ter. And. 219), of the father in: is puerum tollit (Pl. Men. 33), uxorem duxi, natum sustuli (Quint. 4. 2. 42), of the father’s instructions in: verum quod erit natum tollito (Pl. Amph. 501), and of the mother in Pl. Truc. 399. We have tollere used by metonymy for educare in: tu illos duo olim pro re tollebas tua (Ter. Ad. 809). In: qui ex Fadia

sustulerit liberos (Cic. Phil. 13. 23. 10), sublato filio Nerone ex Agrippina (Suet. Ner. 5 fin.) it seems transferred from *tollo et educo* to *gigno*, and in: *quem serva Licymnia furtim sustulerat* (Aen. 9. 547) to *pario et tollo*, where *tollo* is short for *tollo et educo*. In: *tollite me, Teucri, quascumque abducite terras* (Aen. 3. 601) it is for *tollo et aufero*.

For the union *rapio feroque* noticed in Aen. 2. 374, we have *fero* in: *frustra retinacula tendens fertur equis auriga* (Geo. 1. 514), *omnia fert aetas, animum quoque* (Buc. 9. 51), *postquam te fata tulerunt* (5. 34). We read: *postquam res sociorum . . . ferri agique vidit* (Liv. 22. 3. 7), *ferri agique res suas viderunt* (38. 15. 10); we find *fero* used for this union in: *non feret quin vapulet* (Pl. Amph. 308), and *ago* in: *edepol ne illic pulcrum praedam agat* (Aul. 610). We have the union *ruo ago* in: *ceteros ruerem agerem* (Ter. Ad. 319); *ago* used for this in: *Demoleos cursu palantes Troas agebat* (Aen. 5. 265), and *ruo* in: *et ruit atram ad caelum picea crassus caligine nubem* (Geo. 2. 308). We read: *ceteris prae se fert et ostentat* (Cic. Att. 2. 23. 3), but: *laetitiam autem apertissime tulimus omnes* (ib. 14. 13. 2), *non liberalium modo disciplinarum prae se scientiam tulit* (Quint. 12. 11. 21). We read: *ita sui periculi rationes ferre ac postulare* (Cic. Verr. 2. 5. 105. 40), but: *dum licitum est ei dumque aetas tulit* (Ter. And. 443), *et ut aetas illa fert, sibi tamen non pepercisset* (Cic. Cluent. 168. 60); and we find the union distributed in: *ne aut gravioribus utar verbis quam natura fert, aut levioribus quam causa postulat* (Cic. Quinct. 57. 18). We may conjecture that *tulit* is short for *tulit peperitque* in: *aetas parentum peior avis tulit nos nequiores* (Od. 3. 6. 46), *Curium . . . utilem bello tulit et Camillum saeva paupertas* (1. 12. 42), *nec te conceptam saeva leaena tulit* (Tib. 3. 4. 90).

But we come to a different kind of union. We read: *inimici famam non ita ut natast ferunt* (Pl. Pers. 351), *eadem hoc quoque fama ferebat* (Ov. Met. 12. 200), and with *sermonibus* for *fama*: *haec omnibus ferebat sermonibus* (Varro) (B. C. 2. 17. 2). But we find this shortened to *fero* in: *quod fers cedo* (Ter. Phorm. 857), *quando et priores hinc Lamias ferunt denominatos* (Od. 3. 17. 2), *Ceres fertur fruges . . . mortalibus instituisse* (Lucr. 5. 14), *quem procul Aspis conspiciens ad se ferentem, pertimescit* (Nep. Dat. 4. 5), where with *ferentem* we must supply *aditum* or *cursum*. But a most usual formula here is *legem fero*, which we have in: *cum legem agrariam ferret* (Cic. Off. 2. 73. 21), with which *ad populum* is to be supplied, as we see from: *nihil . . . ad populum, nihil ad plebem latum esse dico* (Balb. 33. 14). The law proposed, but not yet carried is styled *rogatio*; and so we read: *dixit Sullam illam rogationem de se nolle ferri* (Sull. 65. 23). But we have: *quod Sulla ipse ita tulit de civitate* (Caecin. 102. 35), *nihil de iudicio ferebat* (Sull. 63. 22), *lato, ut solet ad populum, ut equum escendere liceret* (Liv. 23. 14. 2). So of the juror giving his verdict *sententiam ferre* is used in: *de quo vos sententiam per tabellam feretis?* (Cic. Verr. 2. 4. 104. 47), but *ferre* of the Emperor's verdict in: *paenitentia patiens tulit absolvi reum criminibus maiestatis* (Ann. 1. 74. 7). How much this shortening may affect the meaning of the verb, is best seen in a review of the history of *puto* 'I think'. Gellius (7. 5) discussing the relation of *putus* to *purus*, in opposition to Varro is inclined to derive *putus* from *puto* 'I prune', and not *puto* from *putus*; he thinks that *argentum purum putumque* in the Carthaginian treaty is silver pure and unalloyed, *emaculatam et aliena materia carens* (sec. 9). We have seen how from such unions as *purus putus* we get one word bearing at times the meaning of both, at times of the other term; so that it is easy to see how *putus* came to mean the same as *purus*, as Festus tells us it did (p. 217, M.). We do best to begin with the meaning *puto* shows in its compound *amputo*, and in: *vineas arboresque mature face incipias putare* (Cato R. R. 32. 1) or: *vitem . . . fingit putando* (Geo. 2. 407). In this sense we have *putare* joined with *lavare* in: *ne lana inquinetur, quominus vel infici recte possit, vel lavari ac putari* (Varro R. R. 2. 2. 18); from which union we have the resultant *putari* with the meaning of both in: *qui non reddet temperi (lanam) putatam recte* (Titin. 23, R.).

But its use in the phrase: *rationem puto* 'I clear up the reckoning' becomes the most usual of this class; we have this clearing up with the aid of the other party or parties to the account in: *putatur ratio cum argentario* (Pl. Aul. 527), *rationem cum domino (vilicus) crebro putet* (Cato R. R. 5. 3), *ut rationes cum publicanis putarent* (Cic. Att. 4. 11. 1), or with the subject himself, as in: *cum eam mecum rationem puto* (Pl. Cas. 555). But the items in the account are substituted for the account itself in: *dum haec puto, praeterii imprudens villam* (Ter. Eun. 632), *conliciares (tegulae) quae erunt pro binis putabuntur* (Cato R. R. 14. 4), *si denique hoc semper ita putatum est* (Cic. Div. 1. 84. 39), *multaque dura suo tristi cum corde putabant* (Aen. 8. 522). Then the items are omitted, as in: *mecum argumentis puta* (Pl. Amph. 592), *recte putas* (Ter. And. 141), *quis coegit eos falsum putare?* (Cic. Sen. 4. 2), where *puto* is equivalent to *aestimo*, I value, or consider, or think.

We read in Varro: *disputatio et computatio cum praepositione a putando, quod valet purum facere. . . . Sic is sermo in quo pure disponuntur verba, ne sit confusus atque ut diluceat dicitur disputare* (L. L. 6. 63). So we find *disputo* in: *ubi disputatast ratio cum argentario* (Pl. Aul. 529) with the same meaning as *putatur* in v. 527. Nonius (I. 602, M.) quoting from Ennius's Thyestes: *ibi quid agat secum cogitat, curat, putat*,—and from Caecilius's Exsul: *non haec putas, non haec*

in corde versantur tibi, tells us that *puto* is here for *disputo*. So too in: in meo corde . . . *eam rem volutavi et diu disputavi* (Pl. Most. 88), *quae sunt a me in secundo libra de oratore disputata de ridiculis* (Cic. Fam. 7, 32. 2), *quibus ex rebus breviter disputatis intellegi potest* (Off. 1. 161. 45) the primary force of *disputare* is evident. Only in such connexions as: *disputandumque de omni re in contrarias partes* (De Orat. 1. 158. 34), *opponuntur ab his qui contra disputant* (Rep. 1. 4. 3), *paucis cum esset in utramque partem verbis disputatum* (B. C. 1. 86. 3) does *disputare* take the meaning of our ‘dispute’, and the omission of *contra* or its equivalent is rare even in mediaeval Latin.

We find *computo rationem* also with the same meaning as *puto rationem* in: *dextera digitis rationem computat* (Pl. Mil. 204); and it has the same meaning with *rationem* omitted in: *compellarat (Deiotarum) hospitem praesens, computarat, pecuniam imperarat* (Cic. Phil. 2. 94. 37), *omnes opertis oculis bona sua computant* (Petron. 44), *nec dierum numerum ut nos, sed noctium computant* (Tac. Germ. 11. 2), (Nestor) *suos iam dextra computat annos* (Juv. 10. 249). But in: *si computes annos, exiguum tempus, si vices rerum, aevum putes* (Plin. Ep. 4. 24. 5) we feel how far *puto* in its later meaning has departed from the older sense still retained in *computo*. *Reputo*, *deputo*, and *imputo* show no example of the earlier use with *rationem*.

We read: *ut ratio redditur* (Pl. Men. 206) and: *reddunda in ratione* (Lucr. 1. 59), but: *possint tamen omnia reddi* (id. 1. 566) for: *possit omnium ratio reddi*, and in: *utrumque quid a vero iam distet habebis* (id. 1. 758) *habebis* is evidently for: *notum habebis*. In: *simul ultima signant* (Aen. 5. 317) *signant* seems for: *signant oculis*; Servius’s note is: *deest visu, ut Cicero: notat et designat oculis* (Cat. 1. 2. 1). He cites the same phrase in his note to: *sidera cuncta notat tacito labentia caelo* (Aen. 3. 515), but we do better here to compare: *haec ab hominibus callidis et peritis animadversa ac notata* (Cic. de Orat. 1. 109. 23), and to make *notat* for: *animadvertit et notat*. And in: *ora sono discordia signant* (Aen. 2. 423), where Servius’s note is: *signant* designant, we may take *signant* as short for *notant et designant*. We may compare: *tacitus vestigia lustrat* (11. 763) and: *quae sit me circum copia lustris* (2. 564) with: *vestigia . . . lumine lustris* (2. 754) and: *totum lustrabat lumine corpus* (8. 153). We may further compare: *quo tutior hospita lustris aequora* (3. 377), *mixtis lustrabo Maenala nymphis* (Buc. 10. 55), *arvaeque . . . lustrabat* (Geo. 4. 519), *vacua atria lustrat* (Aen. 2. 528) with: *lustrandum navibus aequor* (3. 385), *te lustrare choro* (7. 391), *lustrat equo muros* (9. 58).

Many unions of this kind are so usual that the verb readily suggests the omitted object to the reader. Such we find when we compare: *Perseus bellum iam vivo patre cogitatum in animo volvens* (Liv. 42. 5. 1), or: *multa cum animo suoolvebat* (Sall. Jug. 6. 2), or: *Fauni volvit sub pectore sortem* (Aen. 7. 254) with: *multa ipse secum volvens* (Sall. Cat. 32. 1), *per noctem plurima volvens* (Aen. 1. 305), *futura volvens non aliud repperit* (Ann. 1. 64. 7). So too in comparing: *quaeso animum advorte* (Pl. Pseud. 277) with: *paucis, adverte, docebo* (Aen. 8. 50), *octo aquilae . . . imperatorem advertere* (Ann. 2. 17. 2); in comparing: *quo tenderent cursum* (Liv. 23. 34. 5) or: *cursumque amens ad limina tendit* (Aen. 2. 321) with: *tendit gramineum in campum* (5. 286), *tendit quotiens in altos nubium tractus* (Od. 4. 2. 26); or: *transmittunt cursu campos* (Aen. 4. 154) with: *transmisit Lesbium* (Ann. 2. 54. i); or: *pauci tentoria ponunt* (Ov. Fast. 3. 527) with: *hic saevus tendebat Achilles* (Aen. 2. 29), *apud vexillum tendentes* (Ann. 1. 17. 4).

So we may compare: *ut cum uno aetatem degeret* (Ter. Phorm. 417) with: *potens sui laetusque deget* (Od. 3. 29. 42); *ut supremam falsa inter gaudia noctem egerimus* (Aen. 6. 514) with: *haud minus inquires Germanus spe . . . agebat* (Ann. 1. 68. 1); *incumbe in eam curam et cogitationem* (Cic. Fam. 10. 3. 3) with: *tum vero Teucri incumbunt* (Aen. 4. 397); *classem velis aptare iubebat* (3. 472) with: *classem aptent taciti* (4. 289); *colonias ab eis decemviris deduci iubet* (Cic. Leg. Agr. 2. 73. 27) with: *in quascumque velim pelago deducere terras* (Aen. 2. 800); *votisque deos venerabere seris* (7. 597) with: *nymphas venerabar agrestes* (3. 34). At times of the pair it is the verb that is omitted, as in: *quae tenuem aciem (instrui) pateretur* (Ann. 1. 64. 7), *quinquennio maturius quam per leges (liceret) quaesturam peteret* (Ann. 3. 29. 1), *vagum ac lascivientem per agros (palari) militem sineret* (Ann. 2. 55. 4), *statimque (sibi solverentur legata) flagitavit* (Ann. 1. 37. 1).

*Emo* means ‘I buy’; but in its compounds *adimo*, *demo*, *eximo*, *promo*, *sumo*, it means ‘I take’; and its root *em-* or *nem-* (cf. Germ. *nehmen*) points to this as its primary meaning. We see the reason for the meaning ‘to buy’, when we compare: *ego spem pretio non emo* (Ter. Ad. 219) with: *quanti eam emit* (Pl. Epid. 51) or: *emit hosce de praeda ambos de quaestoribus* (Capt. 34). It is plain that a first step in the omission of the noun is the substitution for it of a word of like meaning, e.g. *quanti* for *pretio*, and that in such substitution the verb retains its secondary meaning got from its association with *pretio*. We read: *militibus ac sagittariis in terram expositis* (B. C. 3. 23. 2), *expositis in terram multibus* (Liv. 24. 40. 9); then: *armatis in littora expositis* (37. 28. 8), *cum . . . mancipia in insulam . . . exponerent* (Suet. Claud.

25. 2), where *expono* assumes the meaning of *expono in terram*, as it does fully in: *socios de puppibus . . . exponit* (Aen. 10. 288), achieving the unexpected with many of them by landing them in the water. In: *quibus ex navibus cum essent expositi milites* (B. G. 4. 37. 1) the substitution of *ex navibus* for *in terram* has a like result for *expono*, giving the force of: *expono in terram*. Latin, like Sanskrit, frequently substitutes the locative for the accusative in such phrases; and we read: *legiones expositae in terra* (Vell. 2. 79. 4), *expositus in littore* (Suet. Caes. 4. 2). Virgil has this in: *informi limo glaucaeque exponit in ulva* (Aen. 6. 416), and with its aid gives us a fine oxymoron in: *viros mediis exponit in undis* (10. 305) ‘lands the men in the midst of the waves’.

In many cases the meaning of the context indicates the word to be supplied, as in: *accipiens (auribus) sonitum saxi de vertice pastor* (Aen. 2. 308), *gemitumque cadentem accipio* (10. 675), *nostram nunc accipe mentem* (1. 676), with which compare: *accipite ergo animis atque haec mea figite dicta* (3. 250). So in: *ingeminant (laudes) plausu Tyrii* (1. 747) or: *securim altior exurgens oranti (ictu) . . . congeminat* (11. 698). So we may compare: *in nullius umquam suorum necem duravit* (Ann. 1. 6. 3) with: *durat mentem senatumque rursum ingreditur* (Ann. 3. 15. 4). In: *sed iura fidemque supplicis (violare) erubuit* (Aen. 2. 542), *proceres plebemque iuxta (sibi) devinxerat* (Ann. 2. 56. 2), *nam suam aetatem vergere (ad occasum)* (Ann. 2. 43. 1), *eo promptior Caesar pergit introrsus (procedere)* (Ann. 2. 25. 4) the ellipses indicated seem clearly required by the context. So in: *Percennius et Vibulenus stipendia multibus (etiam militantibus), agros emeritis largientur* (Ann. 1. 28. 6), where the relation of the noun to the verb omitted makes the ellipsis easier; and so in: *noxque una Hannibali sine equitibus atque impedimentis (agenda erat et) acta est* (Liv. 21. 34. 9). Very striking in: *mandata Clementi centurioni quae perferret* (Ann. 1. 26. 1) is the use of *mandata* for: *mandata sunt mandata*; as is in: *motum ex Metello consule civicum* (Od. 2. 1. 1) the use of *motum civicum* for: *motum civicum motum*.

Very easy too seems the ellipsis in: *armatumque auro circumspicit (et videt) Oriona* (Aen. 3. 517), where the first verb we meet in the following verse is: *videt*. Easy to supply are the ellipses in: *in medium quaesita (et parta) reponunt* (Geo. 4. 157), *quocumque lectum (et pressum) nomine Massicum* (Od. 3. 21. 5), *sume superbiam quaesitam (et partam) meritis* (3. 30. 15), *tuos labores impune carpere (et edere) lividas obliviones* (4. 9. 34), *stantia non (sed ruentia) poterant tecta probare deos* (Mart. 1. 12. 12), *scrinia da magnis, me manus una capit (et habet)* (1. 2. 4), *teritur (et legitur) noster ubique liber* (8. 3. 4), *vix implet cocleam peracta messis (frugibus ablatis)* (11. 18. 23). Not very difficult are those in: *quae manent (et exspectant) culpas etiam sub Orco* (Od. 3. 11. 29), *ego illis mollior nec te feriam (et occidam)* (ib. 43), *quos . . . iam flammae tulerint inimicus et (percusserit et) hauserit ensis* (Aen. 2. 600). In: *ergo instauramus Polydoro funus* (3. 62) behind *instauramus*, which is here no longer ‘to establish’, but ‘to renew’, lies the pair: *renovavit et instauravit* (Cic. Verr. 1. 11. 4). Behind the *adserto* in: *annum . . . adserto qui sacer orbe fuit* (Mart. 7. 63. 10) lies the union: *vindicare et adserere* (Manil. 2. 815). More difficult is the syntax of *euhoie* in: *qui tum alacres . . . furebant euhoie bacchantes, euhoie capita inflectentes* (Catull. 64. 255), where probably *furebant* is short for *furentes clamabant*, and *euhoie* is the cognate object of *clamabant* thus implied. We may compare *euantes orgia* (Aen. 6. 517) which is for: *celebrantes orgia et euhoie clamantes*.

For it is not uncommon to find a participle coalescing with its verb to form a new verb bearing the meaning of both. So we have: *aequora tuta silent* (1. 164) for: *silentia iacent*; *ture calent arae* (1. 417) for: *fragrantes ardent*; *iam multi crudele caneant artificis scelus* (2. 124) for: *canentes praedicebant*; *furit aestus ad auras* (2. 759) for: *fertur furens*; *illa (arbor) usque minatur* (2. 628) for: *minans movetur*; *praedam pedibus circumvolat uncis* (3. 233) for: *circumvolans rapit*; *haec ubi deflevit* (11. 59) for: *deflens locutus est*; *pecuniam heredi properet* (Od. 3. 24. 62) for: *properans cogit*; *stupet Albius aere* (Sat. 1. 4. 28) for: *stupens tuetur*; *milia tum pransi tria repimus* (1. 5. 25) for: *repentes conscendimus*.

We have not participles, but adjectives omitted in: *fervet opus* (Aen. 1. 436) for: *fervidum agitur opus*; *flammasque ministrant* (1. 213) for: *ministri praebent*; and *gerundives* by a like easy transition in: *nunc etiam superare necessest corpora rebus* (Lucr. 1. 579) for *superando superesse*; *causas penitus tentare latentes* (Aen. 3. 32) for: *tutando exquirere*; *excudent alii . . . aera* (6. 847) for: *excudendo efficient*; *siccis oscula falle genis* (Prop. 4. 11. 80) for: *da fallendo*; *inludo cartis* (Sat. 1. 4. 139) for: *inludendo do versus cartis*.

Thence we pass to adverbs or equivalent ablatives, as in: *rapuitque in fomite flammam* (Aen. 1. 176) for: *raptim abstulit*; *campum eripi iubet* (Ann. 1. 63. 1) for: *raptim occupari*; *sumpsisse merentes laudabor poenas* (Aen. 2. 586) for: *cum laude dicar*; *aedes ululant* (2. 488) for: *ululatu resonant*; *tempora navali fulgent rostrata corona* (8. 684) for: *cincta rostris navalis coronae*; *multa cum libertate notabant* (Sat. 1. 4. 5) for: *nota adficiebant*. In: *maturate fugam* (Aen. 1. 137) for: *mature fugite*, and: *celerare fugam* (1. 357) for: *celeriter fugere*, we seem to have the inverted form that leads to this



shortening, which probably involves the same figure that we shall presently examine in the expression of four terms by two.

We pass on to the expression of the verb and its participial object by a single verb. We seem to have the inverted form leading to this in: *inventaque flumina monstrat* (Aen. 6. 8) for: *invenit et monstrat, servetis revocatum a morte Dareta* (5. 476), *exceptum comiter iuvenem sueta . . . liberalitate auget* (Ann. 3. 8. 2), *multos Angrivarii . . . redemptos ab interioribus reddidere* (Ann. 2. 24. 5), where the union of two verbs is converted into that of a verb with its object. We have a single verb used for this union in: *terram inter fluctus aperit* (Aen. 1. 107) for: *apertam ostendit*; *tres (naves) in saxa latentia torquet* (108) for: *tortas inmittit*; *aperit ramum* (6. 406) for: *apertum ostendit*; *noctes quas de me fatiges* (Prop. 4. 11. 81) for: *fatigatas degas*; *omnes composui* (Sat. 1. 9. 28) for: *conlectos posui*.

We must supply substantives instead of participles in: *omnium egenos urbe domo socias* (Aen. 1. 600) for: *socios accipis*; *faciem illius falle dolo* (1. 684) for: *sume falso dolo*; *et casum insontis mecum indignabar amici* (2. 93) for: *indignumolvebam animo*; *fugam . . . moliri* (2. 109) for: *molestam perficere*; *rite secundarent visus* (3. 36) for: *secundos darent*; *haud dubitanda* (3. 170) for: *in dubium vocanda*; *ipsi transtra novant* (5. 752) for: *nova faciunt*; *hastilia densat* (11. 650) for: *densa iacit*; *ne facundiam violentia praecipitaret* (Ann. 3. 19. 1) for: *praecipitem daret*; *qui scis eos nunc discordare inter se?* (Ter. And. 575) for: *se discordes praebere*.

We supply gerundives in: *artes quas doceat quivis eques atque senator* (Sat. 1. 6. 77) for: *docendas curet*; *corpora frangeret ad saxum* (Aen. 3. 625) for: *pelleret frangenda*; *et silvis aptare trabes et stringere remos* (1. 552) for: *aptandas . . . et stringendos detrahare*; and infinitives in: *nec saxa nec ullum telorum interea (inmitti) cessat genus* (Aen. 2. 468), *probare deos (esse)* (Mart. 1. 12. 12), *aurum Fabricius te tribuente volet (accipere)* (11. 5. 8), *se ortum . . . (probare) volebat* (Aen. 1. 626). Asconius tells us at the end of his preface to the Verrine orations, that it was usual for the orators of old to end their speeches with the word *dixi* (cf. Ter. Phorm. 437 and 439); and so: *dixerat* (Aen. 2. 621) is probably short for: ‘*dixi*’ *dixit*, or: ‘*dixi*’ *dicebat*.

## XXXI

### HENDIADYS

THUS far we have been busy with what Donatus (ad Ter. And. 230) calls the figure *δύο δι’ ἐνός*; we turn now to its opposite, the figure *ἐν διὰ δυσίν*, or, as we write it, hendiadys. Servius (ad Aen. 1. 61) thus defines it: *est figura ut una res in duas dividatur, metri causa interposita coniunctione ut alio loco; pateris libamus et auro* (Geo. 2. 192), *id est pateris aureis*. The phrase he is explaining is: *molem et montes*, which he takes for *molem montium*, and he evidently agrees with our later grammarians, who confine the figure to the forms of it found in: *pateris et auro* for *pateris aureis*, and *molem et montes* for *molem montium*; indeed he goes so far as to think of the *et* as having no meaning and being inserted merely for the metre. The manuscripts here make him name the figure ‘*endiadis*’; but Thilo has not admitted this term into his text of Servius, feeling that it proceeds from a later reviser. And Servius in his note to: *sternere nec iacta caecum dare cuspide volnus* (Aen. 10. 733), which is: *unum sensum per duos extulit*, though he does not use the term *endiadis*, seems to extend the figure to verbs as well as nouns. A rational account of the nature and development of hendiadys, as the opposite of *δύο δι’ ἐνός*, which it seems to be, will extend the figure to verbs as well as nouns, and will find in the varieties of it given by the grammarians merely its crowning developments.

The most obvious use of two for one in the poets is in repetitions for poetic emphasis; such as: *et magis magis in dies et horas* (Catull. 38. 3), *Rhaebe, diu, res si qua diu mortalibus ulla est, viximus* (Aen. 10. 861), *dulce ridentem Lalagen amabo, dulce loquentem* (Od. 1. 22. 23), *inde domum, si forte pedem, si forte tulisset, me refero* (Aen. 2. 756), *eheu fugaces, Postume, Postume, labuntur anni* (Od. 2. 14. 1), *ibimus, ibimus, utcumque praecedes* (2. 17. 10), *heu fuge crudeles terras, fuge litus avarum* (Aen. 3. 44), *iam parce sepulto, parce pias scelerare manus* (3. 41-2). There is no syntactical irregularity here involved; but when we compare Horace’s: *geminus Pollux* with Catullus’s: *gemelle Castor et gemelle Castoris*, we feel that it is emphasis that lies at the basis of this figure. The same seems true of the poet’s use of *non sine* for *cum* (Catull. 13. 4), of *non secus* for *velut* (Od. 2. 3. 2), of *post deinde* (Ter. And. 483) *mox deinde* (Tib. 1. 5. 73), *verum hercle vero* (Pl. Curc. 375). We approach the figure in: *a prima . . . origine* (Aen. 1. 753), *littoris oram* (3. 396), *dictus sacer* (6. 138) for *consecratus*, *caeli sidera* (8. 141) for *caelum*, *spiramenta animae* (9. 580) for

pulmones, dives avis (10. 201) for generosa, pacis ramos (11. 332) for olivas, pedibus uncis (3. 233) for unguis, nescios fari (Od. 4. 6. 18) for infantes, prominentes oras (Ann. 2. 24. 3) for promuntoria, biugis equis (Mart. 1. 12. 8) for bigis.

We have already noticed the emphatic force of the neuter plural in phrases like: *prima virorum* (Lucr. 1. 86), *summa ducum Atrides* (Ov. Am. 1. 9. 37). We may further note: *angusta viarum* (Aen. 2. 332), *opaca locorum* (2. 725), *summa navium* (Tac. Hist. 3. 47. 4), *scriptorum quaeque* (Sat. 2. 3. 2), *multos Danaum* (Aen. 2. 398), *multos illustrium Romanorum* (Ann. 3. 6. 1), *prominentia montium* (Ann. 2. 16. 2), *silvarum ac montium profunda* (Agric. 25. 1). But we find a noun substituted for the adjective in: *minae murorum* (Aen. 4. 88) for: *muri minantes*, *rotarum lapsus* (2. 236) for: *rotas labentes*, *blanditiae rosae* (Prop. 4. 6. 72) for: *rosae blandae*, *hostes Medorum* (3. 9. 25) for: *hostiles Medos*, *summa . . . opum vi* (Aen. 12. 552) for: *summis viribus*, *odora canum vis* (4. 132) for: *canes multi et sagaces*.

Very old is the use of *corpora* we see in: *delecta virum . . . corpora* (Aen. 2. 18) for *delecti viri*, *corpora natorum* (6. 22), *corpora . . . magnanimum heroum* (6. 306), *multa virum . . . corpora* (10. 662); for we read in Ennius: *ter quattuor corpora sancta avium* (Ann. 90, M.). On the analogy of this we have: *formae magnorum luporum* (Aen. 7. 18), *forma tricorporis umbrae* (6. 289), *regum colla minacium* (Od. 2. 12. 12), *variarum monstra ferarum* (Aen. 6. 285), *summa . . . fastigia rerum* (1. 342), *ignoti nova forma viri* (3. 591), *venerabile donum fatalis virgae* (6. 409), *impendentium montium altitudines immensitatesque camporum* (Cic. N. D. 2. 98. 39). Easy is the transition from *multos illustrium virorum* to *multos et illustres viros*; but when we try to convert *formae luporum magnorum* in like fashion we have at once a hendiadys in: *formae et lupi magni*. The same is the case when we turn *monstra variarum ferarum*.

Parallel to the two pairs of words connected by *que* in Cic. N. D. 2. 98 quoted above we have like pairs connected by *et* and designating a single object in: *ingens argentum Dodonaeosque lebetas* (Aen. 3. 466), *fortuna omnipotens et ineluctabile fatum* (8. 334), *arma artis opisque tuae* (Aen. 8. 377), *secutus Ledaeam Hermionem Lacedaemoniosque hymenaeos* (3. 328), *caestus ipsius et Herculis arma* (5. 410), *Danaum insidias suspectaque dona* (2. 36), *nec dulces natos Veneris nec praemia noris* (4. 33), *stridor ferri tractaeque catenae* (6. 558), *tumor omnis et irae concessere deum* (8. 40), *aureus arcus et arma Dianae* (11. 652). You will notice that of the ten examples cited, examples of true hendiadys, the last five consist each of two pairs, one of which is a noun with its adjective, the other a noun with a dependent genitive, and that the remaining four were made up of unions of one or other of these forms. We showed how out of the noun with its adjective was evolved the noun with its dependent genitive; and how out of the second could easily be developed a common form of hendiadys.

But we have not a like balancing of two and two in the following: where the second term gives a fuller description of the object than the first: *et pondus et ipsa vinclorum immensa volumina* (Aen. 5. 407), *at specus et Caci detecta apparuit ingens regia* (8. 241), *pellem horrentisque leonis exuvias* (9. 306), *infelix avis et Cecropiae domus aeternum opprobrium* (Od. 4. 12. 6). We have the opposite in: *ut prima novercae monstra manu geminosque premens eliserit angues* (Aen. 8. 289). In: *voces vagitus et ingens infantumque animae flentes* (6. 426) we have a hendiadys coupled with a union that is a combination of the adjectival and genitive unions that made up the unbalanced unions also that we have just quoted. We can feel throughout the development of this figure the influence of these unions on the figure we derived from the second of them.

Easier to understand and probably older are the unions that express two elements which unite to constitute the object represented. We have: *farre pio et saliente mica* (Od. 3. 23. 20) for the *mola salsa*, *rore levi et ramo felicis olivae* (Aen. 6. 230) for the *lustratio*, *pacem aeternam pactosque Hymenaeos exercemus* (4. 99), *arbutis texunt virgis et vimine querno* (11. 65). Most common are pairs corresponding to our 'purple and gold', as in: *mores sibi emit auro et purpura* (Pl. Most. 286), *auro ductores longe effulgent ostroque decori* (Aen. 5. 132), *ostroque insignis et auro* (4. 134), *purpurei cristis . . . auroque corusci* (9. 163), *vestes auroque ostroque rigentes* (11. 72), *ductores auro volitant ostroque superbi* (12. 126), *regali conspectus in auro nuper et ostro* (A. P. 228).

That this form of hendiadys is the more primitive is confirmed by the number of simple pairs I have met with in it, as in: *in saxis ac speluncis* (Lucr. 1. 348), *thalami taedaeque* (Aen. 4. 18), *velatum auro vittisque iuvenum* (5. 366), *Paridis direxti tela manusque* (6. 57), *voltum lacrimis et ora rigabat* (9. 251), *licet arma mihi mortemque minetur* (11. 348), *castra Aeneas aciemque movebat* (11. 446), *lances donaque saepe dedit* (Mart. Ep. Lib. 29. 6). In the following we have a single term followed by a pair: *cinerem et sopitos suscitavit ignes* (Aen. 5. 743), *gemitus iraeque leonum* (7. 15) where *irae* seems a metonymy for *fremitus*, *tergo stratisque . . . velleribus* (7. 94), *crates et molle feretrum* (11. 64), *currum*

rotasque volucres instabant (8. 433), Argos Agamemnoniasque Mycenae (6. 838) for totam Graeciam. More extended than the two balanced pairs, and leaning to the second are: amissis remis atque ordine debilis uno (5. 271), calidos latices et athena undantia flammis (6. 218), angit inhaerens elisos oculos et siccum sanguine guttur (8. 261); while leaning to the first we have: armentalis equae mammis et lacte ferino (11. 571), conum insignis galeae cristasque comantes (3. 468). We have four balanced by three in: matrisque . . . tremenda Carmentis nymphae monita et deus auctor Apollo (8. 335-6). That the nexus through the genitive is a later development in such unions than the adjectival union, is indicated by the marked preponderance of the latter in this class of hendiadys.

Of the type represented by *molem et montes* I have noted the following examples consisting like it of a single pair: *vocamus in partem praedamque Iovem* (Aen. 3. 223), *en dextra fidesque* (4. 597), *hic membris et mole valens* (5. 431), *quae forma viros fortunave mersit* (6. 615), *haud vincolo nec legibus aequam* (7. 203), *cenae sine aulaeis et ostro* (Od. 3. 29. 15), *spiritus et vita redit bonis* (4. 8. 14), *saecula posterique possint* (Mart. 10. 20. 16). Of a single term followed by one doubled by an adjectival or genitive adjunct we have: *floribus et dulci . . . complectitur umbra* (Aen. 1. 694), *telis et luce coruscus athena* (2. 470), *ferro accisam crebrisque bipennibus* (2. 627), *arboribus clausa circum atque horrentibus umbris* (3. 230), *miratus . . . adventum sociasque rates* (5. 36), *fama . . . et clari nomen Acestae* (5. 106), *nodos et vincula linea rupit* (5. 510), *clausae tenebris et carcere caeco* (6. 734), *fronde super galeam et felici comptus oliva* (7. 751), *truncis et duro robore nata* (8. 315), *tolerare colo vitam tenuique Minerva* (8. 409), *socios inhumataque corpora terrae mandemus* (11. 22), *in pastus armenta tendit equarum* (11. 494), *libro et silvestri subere clausam* (11. 554), *invadunt Martem clipeis atque aere sonoro* (12. 712), *ne metuas fastus limenque superbum* (Mart. 1. 70. 13). Of a term thus doubled followed by a single term we have: *barbarico postes auro spoliisque superbi* (Aen. 2. 504), *ire ad conspectum cari genitoris et ora* (6. 108), *repertorem medicinae talis et artis* (7. 772), *saevo gelu duramus et undis* (9. 604), *peregrina ferrugine clarus et ostro* (11. 772), *ut Dirae stridorem agnovit et alas* (12. 869), *liberas fruges et Cererem ferunt* (Od. 3. 24. 13). Of two terms each thus doubled we have: *obscuros colles humilemque videmus Italiam* (Aen. 3. 522), *securos latices et longa oblivio potant* (6. 715), *litoreas agitabat aves turbamque sonantem* (12. 248), *impios Titanas inmanemque turbam sustulerit* (Od. 3. 4. 42).

Of the type in: *pateris et auro* I have noted the following: *pallam signis auroque rigentem* (Aen. 1. 648), *lacrimis et mente morata* (4. 649), *radiisque ardentem lucis et auro* (7. 142), *Aeneae sedem et secreta petebat* (8. 463), *odiis et crimine . . . infensus* (11. 122), *da . . . fortunam atque viam* (10. 422), *pugnae nodumque moramque* (10. 428), *primus . . . fidei et constantiae dies* (Ann. 1. 58. 1), *ira et dissimulatio* (Ann. 2. 57. 4), *auxilium adventumque dei* (Aen. 8. 201), *primi sub limina solis et ortus* (6. 255), *squamis serpentum auroque polibant* (8. 436), *duplici squama lorica fidelis et auro* (9. 707), *loricam consortam hamis auroque tralicem* (3. 467). When we turn from the two elements constituting the object, as in: *ostro insignis et auro* to one set in this form, as in: *signis auroque rigentem*, or from: *effulgens in auro nuper et ostro* to: *radiis ardens lucis et auro*, we have at once this form of hendiadys springing from the representation of one element shaped after the analogy of the two. Probably then hendiadys is the extension by analogy to a single constituent element, of a syntax that is natural and proper to two constituent elements. Further extension by analogy has no doubt obscured it totally in most examples.

When we turn to verbs, we notice in poetry the use of many pairs for single verbs. Most common here is the union of *dare* with a noun or adjective, as in: *dicta dedit* (Aen. 2. 790), *cursum dedit* (10. 870), *fugam dant* (12. 367), *dedit quietem* (8. 30), *partu dabit* (1. 274), *dat inermum* (10. 425), *placata dant* (3. 70), *vasta dabo* (9. 323). So with *dicere* in: *dicere carmen* (Hor. C. S. 8), *nomine dicunt* (Aen. 6. 441), *cognomine dixit* (3. 335), and with others in: *edidit ore* (7. 194), *fecere profanos* (12. 779), *tulit gressum* (6. 677), *rotam volvere* (6. 748), *loco statuit* (12. 506), phrases which at once suggest the single verb for which they stand. Less obvious is: *servitio premet* (1. 285) for *comprimet*, *manus dedisset* (11. 568) for *se dedidisset*, *vomere exercent* (11. 318) for *arant*, *vestigia figit* (6. 159) for *constitit*, *gelidus coit* (3. 30) for *congelat*, *aequa solo ponam* (12. 569) for *solo aequabo*. More difficult is: *volvens arcana movebo* (1. 262) for *obscura aperiam*. We have a fourfold union: *finem dedit ore loquendi* (6. 76) for *dixerat*.

The usual way of shortening two verbs to one in poetry is by giving one of them the form of a participle, as in: *discite . . . moniti* (Aen. 6. 620), *turbata arripe castra* (9. 13), *patribus dat iura vocatis* (5. 758), *exceptum inmerserat* (6. 174), *pressoque obmutuit ore* (6. 155), *emissa manu contorsit spicula* (11. 676). In the last example we have a poetical inversion of: *contorta manu emisit spicula*; we have a like inversion in the order of the verbs in: *progressi subeunt luco fluviumque relinquunt* (8. 125) for: *fluvio relicto progressi luco subeunt*. So in: *vix pauca furenti subicio et raris turbatus vocibus hisco* (3. 314) for: *vix raris et turbatis vocibus hiscens furenti pauca subicio*, and in: *aulai medio libabant*

pocula Bacchi impositis auro dapibus paterasque tenebant (3. 354-5) for: pateras tenentes . . . libabant; in: sentiat et tandem experiatur Turnum in armis (7. 434) for: expertus Turnum in armis sentiat (quantum possit); in: di cuius iurare timent et fallere numen (6. 324) for: iuratum fallere numen; in: cui datus haerebam custos cursusque regebam (6. 350) for: haerens regebam; in: quod saepe malae legere novercae miscueruntque herbas (Geo. 3. 282) for: cum quo lecto miscuerunt herbas; in: quales Threiciae cum flumina Thermodontis pulsant et pictis bellantur Amazones armis (Aen. 11. 659-60) for: pulsant bellantes; and in: quasque Aniena sacras Tiburs per flumina sortes portarit sicco perlueritque sinu (Tib. 2. 5. 69-70) for: lautas (i.e. puras) perportarit. In: sequitur sic deinde Latinus suspiciens caelum, tenditque ad sidera dextram (Aen. 12. 195-6) the union sequitur—suspiciens—tenditque seems for sequitur—suspiciens—tendensque.

Besides these uses of two verbs for a verb and a participle, to which we might add: ad templum Palladis ibant . . . peplumque ferebant (1. 480), we have verbs for participles in adverbial relations, as in: numina magna vocat meritosque indicit honores (3. 264) for: numinibus vocatis indicit; in: litore athena locant alii flammisque ministrant (1. 213) for: athenis in litore localis flammisque ministrant; in: bellum ingens geret Italia populosque feroces contundet (1. 263) for: bello ingente cum Italis gesto . . . contundet; in: hic ego tuas sortes . . . ponam lectosque sacrabo viros (6. 73) for: sortes ponam sacratis viris lectis. Verbs are also used for participles in the object relation in: accipite ergo animis atque haec mea figite dicta (3. 250) for: dicta accepta in animis figite; in: effigies Pisonis traxerant in Gemonias ac divellebant (Ann. 3. 14. 6) for: effigies tractas in Gemonias divellebant. In: abdiderat sese atque aris invisae sedebat (Aen. 2. 574) for: abdita in aede atque aris invisae sedebat, invisae has a double force, and aris may be taken either as instrumental or dative. In: nec veterum meminisse laetorve malorum (11. 280) laetorve seems for laetus.

More difficult to convert is the hendiadys in: atque idem fugientem haud est dignatus Oroden sternere nec iacta caecum dare cuspide vulnus (10. 732-3), where Servius tells us that by sternere and caecum vulnus dare Virgil conveys a single idea. So with: verso tenuis cum cardine ventus impulit et teneras turbavit ianua frondes (3. 448-9), where we might change the syntax to: tenui impulsae vento per ianuam apertam frondes tenerae turbatae sunt; and in the previous example perhaps sternere hasta clam coniecta may give the prose construction. But in: spirat adhuc amor, vivuntque commissi calores Aeoliae fidibus puellae (Od. 4. 9. 10-12), while the two verbs express one idea, I have no thought of reducing them to one expression. I have ventured to give these few examples of hendiadys of the verb in the hope that I may call attention to this use of the figure, not because I think I am giving it adequate treatment.

## XXXII

### THE ELLIPSIS WITH QUE

IN poetry an adjective belonging to each of a pair of substantives is often expressed only with the second, when to it there is subjoined the enclitic que which connects the substantives, and indicates that the adjective to which it is subjoined must be understood with the first as well. Troes trepidique Latini (Aen. 12. 730) is for: Troes trepidi trepidique Latini; the same is true of: Rutuli veteresque Sicani (7. 795), Mnestheus acerque Serestus (9. 171), Catillusque acerque Coras (7. 672), Chii veterisque Falerni (Sat. 2. 3. 115). So with common names: gemitu miseroque tumultu (Aen. 2. 486), ludo fatigatumque somno (Od. 3. 4. 11), per titulos memoresque fastos (4. 14. 4), tigres comitesque silvas (3. 11. 13), moribus hic meliorque fama (3. 1. 12), and with verbs in: fervet immensusque ruit (4. 2. 7), metues doctusque cavebis (Sat. 2. 7. 68). Slightly more involved seems this figure in the following: at Messapus erit felixque Tolumnius (Aen. 11. 429), adiectis Britannis imperio gravibusque Persis (Od. 3. 5. 4), illa notocitius volucrique sagitta ad terram fugit (Aen. 5. 242), adsis o, placidusque iuves (4. 578), excutitur pronusque magister volvitur in caput (1. 115). In all of these the word to be supplied with noun or verb seems the same in form as that to which que is subjoined.

But often the word to be supplied is in a form changed to agree with the preceding noun, as in: moenia surgentemque arcem (Aen. 1. 366), pueri innuptaeque puellae (2. 238), insidias suspectaque dona (2. 36), clipeos mentitaque tela (2. 422), Spartam patriasque Mycenae (2. 577) crines incanaeque menta (6. 809), fidem mutatosque deos (Od. 1. 5. 6), pro curia inversique mores (3. 5. 7), hortos egregiasque domos (Sat. 2. 3. 24). Slightly more involved are: Lycios fidumque vehebat Oronten (Aen. 1. 113), limen erat caecaeque fores (2. 453), scopulos avolsaque viscera montis

(3. 575), craterasque simul pulcrosque tapetas (9. 358), iaculo celerem levibusque sagittis (9. 178), iaculo incedit melior levibusque sagittis (5. 68). Considerably more involved seem: regna Neoptolemi referam versosque penates Idomeni? (11. 264), pila manu saevosque gerunt in bella dolones (7. 664), succedam castris Tyrrhenaque regna capessam (8. 507), inmisitque fugam Teucris atrumque timorem (9. 719), totque maris vastaeque exhausta pericula terrae (10. 57), disce, puer, virtutem ex me verumque laborem (12. 435), spargite me in fluctus vastoque inmergite ponto (3. 605), sanguine cernis adhuc sparsoque infecta cerebro (5. 413). You will tell me that I am heaping up examples of this simple figure beyond all need; my answer is that in all eight of the more involved examples just cited Mackail has failed to translate it. Still more involved is it in: frigus quo duramque famem propellere possit (Sat. 1. 2. 6), culpantur frustra calami, inmeritusque laborat iratis natus paries dis atque poetis (2. 3. 7), in both of which Lonsdale and Lee's translation misses the figure; Bryce sees it in the first, but misses it in the second. It is not common in the best prose; I cite from Livy: quos (clamores) nemora etiam repercussaeque valles augebant (21. 33. 6).

We shall realize better the need of giving careful attention to this ellipsis when we examine the example of it in:

duri magno sed amore dolores

Pollute, notumque furens quid femina possit

Triste per augurium Teucrorum pectora ducunt (Aen. 5. 5-7).

Mackail translates: 'But the bitter pain of a great love trampled, and the knowledge of what a woman can do in madness, draw the Teucrians' hearts to gloomy guesses'. He misses the figure; as does Servius, who paraphrases: nam duri dolores magno animo polluto, id est laeso, et notus feminarum furor ducebat Troianos per triste augurium, scilicet ut crederent se interemisse Didonem. Forbiger's note: notum substantive est accipiendum, is repeated by Conington, Ladewig, Papillon, Page, and Sidgwick; but Sidgwick deserves credit for perceiving that this does not give perfect sense. He adds: 'The expression is tolerably clear, though not quite accurate; the grief is Dido's grief, and it is the *thought* of this that makes the Trojans anxious'. It is unfortunate that he should blame this lack of clearness and accuracy on Virgil's Latin, when it is his own lack of skill to translate Virgil's Latin that is at fault; he has missed the force of *que* in notumque, that should lead him to supply *noti* with *dolores* in the preceding clause. Virgil's expression is quite clear and accurate, and is much more adequate than what Sidgwick suggests; it is not the *thought*, but the *knowledge* of Dido's grief that makes the Trojans anxious. We should no more think of translating notumque here as if it were merely notum and *que* 'and' than we should translate undique as if it were unde and *que* 'and'.

That this figure holds for mixtusque, though our English does not call for the repetition, is plain from: Teucri mixtique Sicani (Aen. 5. 293), Teucri mixtique Latini (11. 134), laetitia mixtoque metu (11. 807). But in: avolsaque saxis saxa vides mixtoque undantem pulvere fumum (2. 609) and: aestuat ingens uno in corde pudor mixtoque insania luctu (10. 871) it seems best to resolve: mixtoque insania luctu into: et insania mixta mixto luctu, and: mixtoque undantem, etc., into: et undantem fumum mixtum mixto pulvere.

The figure is extended to three in: Mnesthea Sergestumque vocat fortemque Serestum (4. 288), Talon Tanaimque neci fortemque Cethegum . . . mittit (12. 513). It is used with pronouns in: Demetri teque Tigelli (Sat. 1. 10. 90), sapiens vitatu quidque petitu sit melius causas reddet (1. 4. 115), nexantem nodis seque in sua membra plicantem (Aen. 5. 279) where it shows that nexantem cited by Priscian and Eutyches is correct, and not nixantem, the reading of many good manuscripts, and adopted by Ribbeck. We have it with adverbs in: licuit semperque licebit (A. P. 58), sedet aeternumque sedebit (Aen. 6. 617), forte sacer Cybelae Chloereus olimque sacerdos (11. 768), fama dediti benigneque excepti Segestis (Ann. 1. 59. 1), hic aliud maius miseris multoque tremendum obicitur magis (Aen. 2. 199). But: defleo equidem filium meum semperque deflebo (Ann. 3. 12. 8) is not an example owing to the presence of equidem in the first clause balancing semper. We have it with a numeral in: Troiam nec fata vetabant . . . stare decemque alios Priamum superesse per annos (Aen. 8. 399), and with nouns alone or with appositives, adjectives, or genitives, as in: sed variat faciemque novat (Ov. Met. 15. 255), nox fabulaeque manes (Od. 1. 4. 16), suspirans imoque trahens a pectore vocem (Aen. 1. 371), tristitiam vitaeque labores (Od. 1. 7. 18).

We have it with the verb in: sic potenti iustitiae placitumque Parcis (Od. 2. 17. 16), recedentis trilingui ore pedes tetigitque crura (2. 19. 32), insanum te omnes pueri clamentque puellae (Sat. 2. 3. 130), fractas utinam tua tela sagittas si licet extinctas aspiciamque faces (Tib. 2. 6. 16). We have it twice in: at hic si plastra ducenta concurrantque foro tria funera, magna sonabit cornua quod vincatque tubas (Sat. 1. 6. 42-4). The figure is extended from two to three in: quid refert morbo an furtis pereamque rapinis? (Sat. 2. 3. 157), in cicere atque faba bona tu perdasque lupinis (2. 3. 182), and in: fervidus tecum puer et solutis Gratiae zonis properentque Nymphis (Od. 1. 30. 6). The examples I have noted, where

the word to be understood is either formally or substantially the same as that expressed, give a fair idea of its ordinary range.

It is easy to see that *ve*, so often confused with *que*, often takes its place in this figure. We have: *aut super Pindo gelidove in Haemo* (Od. 1. 12. 6), *ne noster honos infractave cedat fama loco* (Aen. 7. 332), *non Seres infidive Persae* (Od. 4. 15. 23), *lateris (miseri) miseri capitisve* (Sat. 2. 3. 29), *non me Lucrina iuverint conchyliis magisve rhombus aut scari* (Epod. 2. 50), *illa tamen se non habitu mutatave loco* (Sat. 2. 7. 64), *uter aedilis fueritve vestrum praetor* (2. 3. 180), *quis udo deproperare apio coronas curatave myrto?* (Od. 2. 7. 25), *non Pyladen ferro violare aususve sororem Electram* (Sat. 2. 3. 139), *qui . . . si illud idem in rapidum flumen iaceretve cloacam* (2. 3. 242). It is natural to expect that *vel* will be used like *ve*; and we read: *partem vel tolleret omnes* (Ep. 1. 6. 43), *quem virum aut heroa lyra (dulci) vel acri tibia?* (Od. 1. 12. 1), *vel Baccho Thebas vel Apolline Delphos insignes* (1. 7. 3).

*Que* is the oldest Latin copulative, and as it is the most usual in poetry, it is natural to find it the conjunction most common in this poetic figure. But it would be strange if *et* did not follow its analogy here. We find *et* subjoined like *que* to the word to be supplied in the first phrase in: *(quos) doctos ego quos et amicos prudens praetereo* (Sat. 1. 10. 87), *(vivunt) campestris melius Scythae . . . vivunt et rigidi Getae* (Od. 3. 24. 9-11). But *et* is usually placed just before the word to be thus supplied. We have it with adjectives in: *mittimur Elysium et pauci laeta arva tenemus* (Aen. 6. 744), *ille te mecum locus et beatae postulant arces* (Od. 2. 6. 21), *Typhoeus et validus Mimas* (3. 4. 53), *divitum mensis et amica templis* (3. 11. 6), *laudem et optatum . . . decus* (4. 14. 39), *Brontesque Steropesque et nudus membra Pyracmon* (Aen. 8. 425), *messes et bona vina date* (Tib. 1. 1. 24), *ut opus et alii proelium inciperent* (Ann. 1. 63. 7), and with an adverb in: *eam rem volutavi et diu disputavi* (Pl. Most. 87). We have it with a noun in: *otium et oppidi laudat rura sui* (Od. 1. 1. 16), and with verbs in: *et tunicae manicas et habent redimicula mitras* (Aen. 9. 616), *horrendum et dictum mirabile* (3. 26), *purus et insons . . . si et vivo carus amicis* (Sat. 1. 6. 70), *at bene si quis et vivat puris manibus* (1. 4. 68), *audire et videor pios errare per lucos* (Od. 3. 4. 7), *Plotius et Varius, Maecenas Vergiliusque, Valgius et probet haec Octavius* (Sat. 1. 10. 82). But we have examples of *et* not placed either immediately before or immediately after the word to be supplied, as in: *iactes et genus et nomen inutile* (Od. 1. 14. 13), *et corde et genibus tremit* (1. 23. 8), *Delius et Patareus Apollo* (Od. 3. 4. 64); but when we change *et corde et tremit genibus* to *et corde et genibus tremit*, we seem to pass from poetry to prose.

Of other conjunctions I have noted the following examples: *sive in: sive deae seu sint dirae* (Aen. 3. 262), *sive flamma sive mari libet Hadriano* (Od. 1. 16. 4), *tollere seu ponere volt freta* (1. 3. 16), *vacui sive quid urimur* (1. 6. 19), *ficta seu vera promeret* (Ann. 1. 6. 6), *Matutine pater seu Iane libentius audis* (Sat. 2. 6. 20), *turdus sive aliud privum dabitur tibi* (2. 5. 11). We have *aut in: et peccare nefas aut pretium est mori* (Od. 3. 24. 24), *quae nemora aut quos agor in specus* (3. 25. 2); and *atque in: iam satis terris nivis atque dirae grandinis misit Pater* (1. 2. 1), *parce, frugaliter atque viverem uti contentus eo quod mi ipse parasset* (Sat. 1. 4. 107). Other examples are: *nec cupressi nec veteres agitantur orni* (Od. 1. 9. 12), *furor ne caecus an rapit vis acrior* (Epod. 7. 13), *incertus scamnum faceretne Priapum* (Sat. 1. 8. 2), *quae (ludit) velut latis equa trima campis ludit exultim* (Od. 3. 11. 9). We have seen that *cum* was a conjunction before it was a preposition; and we have: *cur pendet tacita fistula cum lyra?* (Od. 3. 19. 20) and: *induit albos cum vitta crines* (Aen. 7. 418), to which Servius notes: *id est etiam vittas albas*.

The repetition of the same word or of closely related forms at the beginning of consecutive clauses joins them as if by conjunctions; and it was probably through such repetition that conjunctions were first developed. Examples of our figure dependent on such repetitions we have in: *nunc hos nunc accipit illos* (Aen. 6. 315), *nunc hos nunc illos aditus omnemque pererrat arte locum* (5. 441), *hic illius arma, hic currus fuit* (1. 16), *hunc equis, illum superare pugnis nobilem* (Od. 1. 12. 26), *huic mater quamvis atque huic pater adsit* (Buc. 4. 56), *quem mihi, quem tibi finem di dederint* (Od. 1. 11. 1), *pariterque (nunc) sinistros, nunc dextros solvere sinus* (Aen. 5. 831), *quae me fuga, quemve reducit?* (10. 670), *quantus equis, quantus adest viris sudor* (Od. 1. 15. 9), *genua amplexus, genibusque volutans haerebat* (Aen. 3. 607), *Nymphae, Laurentes Nymphae* (8. 71).

It seems probable that: *Troes trepidique Latini* is short for: *Troes trepidi trepidique Latini*; for I read in the poets: *indignanti similem similemque minanti* (Aen. 8. 649), *quam Turno regi aut regi adparere Latino* (8. 17), *caedebant pariter pariterque ruebant victores victique* (10. 756), *salve aeternum aeternumque vale* (11. 97), *graves nimium nimiumque severi* (Mart. 8. 3. 17). But it may be for: *trepidi Troes trepidique Latini*, for I also find: *fortemque Gyan fortemque Cloanthum* (Aen. 1. 222), *nigris oculis nigroque crine decorum* (Od. 1. 32. 11), *inter tot curas totque labores*

(Ep. 2. 2. 66), despiciam dices despiciamque famem (Tib. 1. 1. 78). We have a third form of this fourfold union in: Teucro duce et auspice Teucro (Od. 1. 7. 27), omne caelum et mare omne (Ann. 2. 23. 3). Virgil joins the second of these with the elliptical form in: inde alios ineunt cursus aliosque recursus adversi spatiis, alternosque orbibus orbes impediunt (Aen. 5. 583-4).

The two terms of this fourfold union thus reduced to one by the ellipsis may be different. Variations in inflexion we have already noticed, such as we see in: qui dapibus mensas onerent et pocula (mensis im)ponant (Aen. 1. 706) or: vis rapuit rapietque gentes (Od. 2. 13. 20). We have different words approximating in sense in: gracili sic tamque pusillo (Sat. 1. 5. 69), hoc spatium tantumque morae fuit illo (Aen. 10. 400), non Liber aeque, non acuta sic geminant Corybantes aera (Od. 1. 16. 7-8), ab omni corpore seiunctum secretumque esse ab inani (Lucr. 1. 430), dirae facies inimicae . . . numina (Aen. 2. 622), mitis ut in morem stagni placidaeque paludis (8. 88), scalae improviso subitusque apparuit ignis (12. 576). We may note the following parallel ellipses: iamque dies (unus) alterque dies processit (3. 356), (valde) salso multoque fluenti arbusto (Sat. 1. 7. 28), neque pugno (inerti) neque segni pede victus (Od. 3. 12. 9), Caecubum (vinum) et prelo domitam Caleno tu bibes uvam (1. 20. 9), eripite o socii (remos omnes), pariterque insurgite remis (Aen. 3. 560), instruimus mensas (et aras) arisque reponimus ignem (3. 231), diripiunt dapes (manibus foedis) contactuque omnia foedant inmundo (3. 227), et si fata deum (non inimica fuissent), si mens non laeva fuisset (2. 54). The figure passes into zeugma in: fundi Germanos acie et iustis locis (Ann. 2. 5. 3) for: acie iusta et aequis locis.

But the two terms thus reduced to one may primarily be pairs of correlated and even opposed ideas. We have such fully expressed in: ut ridentibus adrident, ita flentibus adsunt humani voltus (A. P. 101), concidunt venti fugiuntque nubes (Od. 1. 12. 30), informi limo glaucaeque exponit in ulva (Aen. 6. 416). We have the following ellipses that seem parallel: lustramurque (sacris) Iovi votisque incendimus aras (Aen. 3. 279), fere spatio extremo (confecto) fessique sub ipsam finem adventabant (5. 327), his magnum Alciden contra stetit, his ego suetus (contendere) (5. 414), sed iaculis (eminus emissis) tutisque clamoribus instant (10. 713), neque nix . . . cana cadens violat (umquam), semper innubilis aether integit (Lucr. 3. 21), discite iustitiam (colere) moniti et non temnere divos (Aen. 6. 620), o et praesidium (firmum) et dulce decus meum (Od. 1. 1. 2), tentabundus (pedibus) manibusque retinens virgulta (Liv. 21. 36. 1), ut credatur novissimum et sine terris (contra sitis) mare (Ann. 2. 24. 1).

We have them opposed in: hinc omne principium (defer), huc refer (omnem) exitum (Od. 3. 6. 6), nec curat Orion leones (feros) aut timidos agitare lyncas (2. 13. 39), vel quo discrimine ripas hae linquunt (repulsae) illae (acceptae) remis vada livida verrunt? (Aen. 6. 320), centum errant annos (exclusi) volitantque haec littora circum: tum demum admissi stagna exoptata revisunt (6. 329-30). In 6. 320 the fourfold figure has been reduced to two.

As a rule the position of the conjunction shows that it is the second of the pair of terms that is expressed, as we see in: gemitu miseroque tumultu or: Typhoeus aut validus Mimas. We saw that, while Cicero uses Castor for Castor et Pollux, Horace and Virgil use Pollux. So the poets in this figure tend to take the second of the two like terms; and when in a phrase like: abietibus patriis et (patriis) montibus aequos (Aen. 9. 674) the first is taken, the figure assumes the form usual in prose. Such examples of this figure, a form so obvious and common as not to merit the name of figure, we note in: claram Rhodon aut Mytilenen (Od. 1. 7. 1), et profestis lucibus et sacris (4. 15. 25), neglectum genus et nepotes (1. 2. 35), patiens pulveris atque solis (1. 8. 4), superis deorum gratus et imis (1. 10. 20), ignes per medios fluviosque (Sat. 2. 3. 57), argenti positi intus et auri (2. 3. 142), neque his fuga nota neque illis (Aen. 10. 757), incenditque animum dictis atque aggerat iras (4. 197).

This tendency in poetry often inverts prose order, giving a second place to the word that gets its name from its prior position in ordinary speech, the preposition or πρόθεσις; as in: nihil astra praeter vidit (Od. 3. 27. 31) or: spemque metumque inter dubii (Aen. 1. 218), or even removing it to a second clause, as in: chlamyde et pictis conspectus in armis (8. 588) or: quae nemora aut quos agor in specus? (Od. 3. 25. 2). Probably to this is also due the inversion of the usual order of names shown in poetry or later prose, as in: Maxime Lolli (Ep. 1. 2. 1), Musa . . . Antonius (1. 15. 3), Postumi Agrippae (Ann. 1. 6. 1), Gallus Asinius and Messala Valerius (1. 8. 4 and 5). We note it in commands, as in: sperne puer neque tu choreas (Od. 1. 9. 16), and in appeals, as in: adsis o placidusque iuves (Aen. 4. 578), and: quare agite o tectis, iuvenes, succedite nostris (1. 627).

Often the logical order of action is thus inverted, giving the figure called Hysteron Proteron, as in: discere et audire (Ep. 1. 1. 48), condo et compono quae mox depromere possim (1. 1. 12), where the order of importance seems to prevail over that of time. So when Quintilian uses the order: Aristarchus atque Aristophanes (10. 1. 54) it is probably not from

ignorance of chronology, as I have heard suggested, but from this poetic tendency which affects later prose more and more. It leads to such extended inversions as we have in:

Vidimus, o cives, Diomedem Argivae castra,  
Atque iter emensi casus superavimus omnes (Aen. 11. 243-4),

or:

Postera Phoebea lustrabat lampade terras  
Umentemque Aurora polo dimoverat umbram (4. 6-7).

So in: signoque repente corripunt spatia audito limenque relinquunt (5. 316), aut tu mihi terram inice, namque poles, portusque require Velinos (6. 366), coniunx arma omnia tectis emovet, et fidum capiti subduxerat ensem (6. 524), nunc pateras libate Iovi precibusque vocate Anchisen genitorem et vina reponite mensis (7. 134), sus, quam pius Aeneas tibi . . . mactat sacra ferens et cum grege sistit ad aram (8. 84-5). The inversion is threefold in: castigatque auditque dolos subigitque fateri (6. 567).

Probably it is this same tendency that leads in poetry to the frequent removal of words from a principal to a subsequent relative clause, as in:

multa . . . fieri . . . tuentur  
Quorum operum causas nulla ratione videre  
Possunt (Lucr. 1. 152-4),

and: alii quorum Comoedia Prisca virorumst (Sat. 1. 4. 2) and: malarum quas amor curas habet . . . obliviscitur (Epod. 2. 37).

### XXXIII

#### SYNCHYSIS OR DISTRIBUTION

PROF. CLEMENT SMITH (Odes & Epodes of Horace, p. LXXI, 120) tells how close the connexion is between the distribution peculiar to poetic diction and the ellipsis with *que*; but he has not seen that both are based on the fourfold union of terms to which we traced that ellipsis. Take the last example he cites: quo beatus volnere, qua pereat sagitta (Od. 1. 27. 11); this question falls into two parts, and the phrase: beatus pereat, belonging to both, is distributed between them. When we restore it to both we have the two fourfold unions by the synchysis of which we get the Horatian form, quo beatus pereat volnere; qua beatus pereat sagitta. So in: nunc tempus equos, nunc poscere currus (Aen. 9. 12) the phrase distributed is: tempus poscere, and when we restore this to each we have the threefold unions restored each to fourfold form. So with: ense pedes nudo, puraque interrta parma (11. 711) pedes interrta is here the distributed phrase, and in: nec Fortunati spernit, nec balnea Fausti (Mart. 2. 14. 11) spernit balnea is distributed. So in: nil intentatum Selius, nil linquit inausum (2. 14. 1) Selius linquit is distributed, and in: pascat et Hybla meas, pascat Hymettus apes (7. 88. 7) meas apes. But it is not always so regular; in: discite iustitiam moniti, et non temnere divos (Aen. 6. 620) it is involved with the ellipsis with *que*, here for *et*, giving: discite iustitiam colere moniti, et non temnere divos, where we must supply discite moniti with the second part. In: proles indiscreta suis, gratusque parentibus error (10. 392), though the distribution of suis parentibus is simple, it is distributed to balanced pairs, proles indiscreta and gratus error.

But in reckoning the terms for my fourfold unions I have not taken into account *et* and *que*. Words for Aristotle fell into two classes, λόγοι and λέξεις. Λόγοι are those which retain their full meaning and their accent; λέξεις those which, like ἔστιν or τίς, have lost their primary meaning and accent, and into this class fall prepositions and conjunctions as a rule, many pronouns and the copula ἔστιν. Further in counting terms, if ferocior is a single term, so will be magis fidus; if annum, so centum annos; if minantur, so metum intendunt, or spem offerunt. So in: Anxuris ense sinistram, et totum clipei ferro deiecerat orbem (Aen. 10. 546) the words distributed are Anxuris deiecerat, but balanced with sinistram is: totum clipei orbem. In: quid memorem infandas caedes, quid facta tyranni effera? (8. 483) memorem tyranni are distributed, but infandas caedes and facta effera are balanced as single terms. And in: horror ubique animos, simul ipsa silentia terrent (2. 755) the distribution of animos terrent is involved with the use of simul for simul . . . simul. The puzzle in: te ante quam me amare rebar, ei rei firmasti fidem (Ter. Hec. 581) was rightly solved by Ursinus, though not according to our form; te me amare—quam rem—ante—rebar is the first fourfold union; the second is ei rei—(te me amare)—(nunc)



—firmasti fidem, where we have the form we noticed in: discite iustitiam, etc., and supply two to the second from the first, one of which, nunc, is an equivalent of ante.

But in: has equidem memorare tibi atque ostendere coram iampridem, hanc prolem cupio enumerare meorum (Aen. 6. 716-17) we have evidently a triple union of such fourfold figures: has—memorare—tibi—iampridem cupio | has—ostendere—coram te—iampridem cupio | hanc prolem meorum—enumerare—coram te—iampridem cupio. So in: nam barbaris, quanto quis audacia promptus, tanto magis fidus rebusque motis potior habetur (Ann. 1. 57. 1) we have three fourfold unions: barbaris—quanto—magis promptus audacia—quis habetur | barbaris—tanto—magis fidus rebus motis—quis habetur | barbaris—tanto—potior rebus motis—quis habetur.

As if to convince us that such threefold unions arise out of fourfold ones, the Latin poets give us many examples of a fourfold union, to which is appended a threefold one thus arising. Some examples are: nox tibi longa venit, nec reditura dies (Prop. 2. 15. 24), dum nos fata sinunt, (dum) oculos satiemus amore (v. 23), nunc me fluctus habent, versantque in litore venti (Aen. 6. 362), his magnum Alciden contra stetit, his ego suetus (contendere) (5. 414), quem gravis ictu seminecem liquit, saxo lacerumque viator (5. 275), e quibus unus amet quavis adspergere cunctos praeter eum qui praebet aquam; post hunc quoque potus (Sat. 1. 4. 87-8). In: non ego avarum cum veto te fieri vappam iubeo ac nebulonem (Sat. 1. 1. 104) Horace has arranged his terms with such skill that it is hard to decide whether te fieri is to be constructed with veto or with iubeo; it is a fine example of the figure ἀπὸ κοινοῦ. In the following examples we have the opposite order: si patriae volumus, si nobis vivere cari (Ep. 1. 3. 29), tum pueri nautis, pueris convicia nautae ingerere (Sat. 1. 5. 11). In: non, ita me divi, vera gemunt, iuverint (Catull. 66. 18) we have a threefold and a fourfold union, but involved in curious fashion. In: o quantum est auri pereat, potiusque smaragdi (Tib. 1. 1. 51) this union is involved with the que ellipsis; and we restore: o quantum est auri pereat potius, potiusque pereat quantum est smaragdi.

In: peccatum fateor, cum te sic tempore laevo interpellarim (Sat. 2. 4. 4) we have a twofold union followed by a fourfold; but: peccatum fateor is short for: a me peccatum esse tum fateor. We have the same sequence in: hoc unum (sibi peperit), iusso non moritura die (Prop. 4. 6. 64), di melius (rem decrevere); quantus mulier foret una triumphus (v. 65), sed bene Messalam (rem agere), sua quisque ad pocula dicat (Tib. 2. 1. 31), talibus Ilioneus (dixit simul), cuncti simul ore fremebant (Aen. 1. 559). We have the fourfold union doubled in: hoc primum; nec si miserum fortuna Sinonem finxit, vanum etiam mendacemque improba finget (2. 79-80); and in: at pater ut gnati, sic nos debemus amici si quod sit vitium non fastidire (Sat. 1. 3. 43). We have the opposite order in: hic nuptarum insanit amoribus, hic puerorum (1. 4. 27); forte epos acer ut nemo Varius ducit (1. 10. 44); quibus haec, sunt qualiacumque, adridere velim (1. 10. 88), where sunt qualiacumque is for: sint haec qualiacumque sunt; nunc hiemem inter se luxu, quam longa, fovere (Aen. 4. 193), where quam longa is for: tam longam quam longa est. This order is frequent in prose, as in: quam plurimis, modo dignis, se utilem praebeat (Off. 1. 92. 26), perventum inde ad frequentem cultoribus alium, ut inter montanos, populum (Liv. 21. 34. 1). We have the twofold union doubled in: quid mi igitur suades? ut vivam Maenius? aut sic ut Nomentanus? (Sat. 1. 1. 101), and two enclosing a fourfold one in: huc tandem concede; haec ara (simul) tuebitur omnes, aut moriere simul (Aen. 2. 523).

We have a twofold union shortened from four standing alone in: sic placitum (res esse futuras) (Aen. 1. 283) and: Aeneas haec de Danaïis victoribus arma (Apollini voveo) (3. 288). We have it shortened to one in: dissimulant (se velle dextras iungere) (1. 516), non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis tempus eget, non, si ipse meus nunc adforet Hector (2. 521-2), where non is for: non Hectore defensore egeret tempus; and so in: concurritur (Sat. 1. 1. 7) and tabescat (v. 111). In: sum deus; est nostri sanguinis ista fides (Prop. 4. 6. 60) sum deus seems short for: sum nunc—deus factus—qui homo—olim fuerim. While we have twofold unions, the shortening of which from fourfold ones is not obvious, as in: quid faciam, si furtum fecerit? (Sat. 1. 3. 94), or: fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium et ingens gloria Teucrorum (Aen. 2. 325), or: noris nos; docti sumus (Sat. 1. 9. 7), they are comparatively rare.

Of the books of the Aeneid six begin with a sentence filling from five to seven verses; six with a shorter and less complex sentence of from one verse to two verses and a half. Let us look at the structure of these more simple beginnings.

The second Aeneid begins: conticuere omnes; intentique (omnes) ora tenebant. We have a union of two here, followed by one of three shortened from four. Book IV begins:

At regina gravi iamdudum saucia cura  
Volnus alit venis et caeco carpitur igni;

where we have a fourfold union: regina saucia gravi cura—iamdudum—volnus alit—venis; and a twofold: carpitur—caeco igni, with which regina and iamdudum are to be supplied. Book VI begins:

Sic fatur lacrimans classique inmittit habenas,  
Et tandem Euboicis Cumarum adlabitur oris.

It seems a sentence of threefold structure, each of whose parts is a union of three terms, the last being: tandem—adlabitur—Euboicis Cumarum oris. But we must remember that to each must be supplied the subject Aeneas. The seventh Aeneid begins:

Tu quoque litoribus nostris, Aeneia nutrix,  
Aeternam moriens famam Caieta dedisti.

It consists of a sentence of fourfold structure: tu quoque—litoribus nostris—aeternam famam—moriens dedisti, and a description of the subject shortened from four to three: Caieta—Aeneia—olim—nutrix. The ninth begins:

Atque ea diversa penitus dum parte geruntur,  
Irim de caelo misit Saturnia Iuno  
Audacem ad Turnum;

—a sentence of twofold structure, each part being fourfold. We may analyse: atque dum—ea—geruntur—diversa penitus parte || Saturnia Iuno—Irim—audacem ad Turnum—de caelo misit. The eleventh Aeneid begins: Oceanum interea surgens Aurora reliquit; to be divided: interea—Aurora—surgens reliquit—Oceanum. We have in these six initial sentences five fourfold unions, four shortened from four to three, and one twofold. We can see that the unions of two and four terms play a great part in poetic phrasing.

This becomes still more striking when we turn to the lyrics of Horace. I take a stanza marked by the absence of λέξεις:

Parcius iunctas quatiant fenestras  
Ictibus crebris iuvenes protervi,  
Nec tibi somnos adimunt, amatque  
Ianua limen (Od. 1. 25. 1-4).

You notice how the first and second verses are of four words each, constituting four pairs, arranged alternately in the first verse, but in order of pairing in the second, and making up a sentence of fourfold structure; iuvenes protervi—ictibus crebris—iunctas fenestras—parcius quatiant. The second is threefold for fourfold: (iuvenes)—tibi—somnos—neque adimunt, and the third is threefold for twofold: ianua—amat—limen; for amat limen is poetic for claudi solet.

The second stanza is still more clearly fourfold in structure, if less strikingly fourfold in the arrangement of words:

Quae prius multum facilis movebat  
Cardines; audis minus et minus iam:  
Me tuo longas pereunte noctes,  
Lydia, dormis?

It consists of three unions of fourfold structure: quae—multum facilis—prius—multum movebat cardines || audis—minus—et minus—iam || tu Lydia—dormis—longas noctes—me tuo pereunte.

Let us turn to the next ode, where we meet the Alcaic strophe:

Musis amicus tristitiam et metus  
Tradam protervis in mare Creticum  
Portare ventis, quis sub Arcto  
Rex gelidae metuatur orae,  
Quid Tiridaten terreat, unice  
Securus. (Od. 1. 26. 1-6).

If we leave the λέξεις out of account, we have four words in each verse. The whole sentence may be regarded as threefold in structure, consisting of a principal clause, and two questions each dependent on unice securus. Each part is threefold and may be analysed: Musis amicus—protervis ventis—tristitiam et metus—tradam portare (= portanda) in mare Creticum || unice securus—quis rex gelidae orae—metuatur—sub Arcto || unice securus—quid—Tiridaten—terreat.

Turn now to the first two verses of the Odes:

Maecenas atavis edite regibus

O et praesidium et duke decus meum.

We notice (1) that: O Maecenas is distributed between the first and second verses, (2) that from dulce we must imply firmum with praesidium, (3) that meum is evidently poetic for mihi. So we have: O Maecenas—atavis—edite—regibus || O Maecenas—et praesidium firmum—et dulce decus—mihi.

Let us now turn to the first two verses of Propertius:

Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis

Contactum nullis ante cupidinibus.

We notice at once that the pentameter is of four words; when we join Cynthia prima, suis ocellis, miserum me, the fourfold structure of the hexameter is clear. When we join nullis cupidinibus, the structure of the pentameter is threefold, but it must be attached to me, restoring its fourfold character. Let us turn to the first distich of Tibullus's third elegy:

Ibitis Aegaeas sine me, Messala, per undas;

O utinam memores ipse cohorsque mei.

The structure is twofold; and we may analyse:

O Messala—ibitis—sine me—per undas Aegaeas,

Utinam—o ipse cohorsque—memores sitis—mei.

Though we are not dealing specially with prose diction, we may here analyse the structure of the first three sentences of the *Bellum Gallicum*: Gallia—est divisa—omnis—in partes tres || quarum—unam—incolunt—Belgae || (quarum)—aliam—(incolunt)—Aquitani || (quarum)—tertiam—(incolunt—ei) || qui—ipsorum lingua—Celtae—(appellantur) || (qui)—nostra (lingua)—Galli—appellantur. || Hi omnes—lingua—institutis—legibus—inter se—differunt. || Gallos—ab Aquitanis—Garumna flumen—(dividit) || (Gallos)—a Belgis—Matrona et Sequana—dividit. I have set est with divisa, where it belongs, but Caesar set it between Gallia and omnis, marking off omnis as an independent term. We see in the second sentence three fourfold unions; for with lingua—institutis—legibus severally, we must supply the three remaining terms hi omnes—inter se—differunt. The three sentences are made up of eleven unions, all of them fourfold.

We notice how fourfold unions are repeated: in the opening verses of the sixth *Aeneid* we have a good example of four threefold unions, followed by one fourfold, and another threefold:

Sic fatur lacrimans || classique inmittit habenas ||

Et tandem Euboicis Cumarum adlabitur oris. ||

Obvertunt pelago proras; || tum dente tenaci

Ancora fundabat naves || et litora curvae

Praetexunt puppes.

But Aeneas is to be supplied with the first three, Aeneadae with the fourth, and tum with the sixth, making them all fourfold. We have in:

Te Dacus asper, || te profugi Scythae ||

Urbesque gentesque || et Latium ferox

Regumque matres barbarorum || et

Purpurei metuunt tyranni ||

Iniurioso ne pede proruas

Stantem columnam || neu populus frequens

Ad arma cessantes || ad arma

Concitet || imperiumque frangat (Od. 1. 35. 9-16),

a like series of unions really fourfold, but apparently twofold and threefold; and in:

Cum rapies in ius, malis ridentem alienis,

Fiet aper, modo avis, modo saxum, et cum volet arbor (Sat. 2. 3. 73-4),

we seem to have a series of three unions apparently threefold with three pairs to balance them.

We noticed how the ellipsis with que arose from unions like: nigris oculis nigroque crine, or: caedebant pariter pariterque ruebant. We find the distribution of pairs occurring in the former order in: parcius iunctas quatiant fenestras. We have this alternate distribution in:

Non ego Myrmidonum sedes Dolopumve superbas  
 Aspiciam, aut Graiis servitum matribus ibo (Aen. 2. 785-6),  
 Me famulo famulamque Heleno tramisit habendam (3. 329),  
 Ex utraque pari malarum parte profusa est (Lucr. 1. 88),

where *parte* must be taken twice as: *ex utraque parte malarum pari parte* (= *modo*), a case of *zeugma*. In: *non, ita me divi, vera gemunt, iuverint* (Catull. 66. 18) we have this alternation applied to a threefold and a fourfold union, as though they were each twofold.

We have the second form in: *integer vitae scelerisque purus* (Od. 1. 22. 1), *latis equa trima campis* (3. 11. 9), and a shorter form of this arrangement in: *meam canto Lalagen* (1. 22. 10), *curis vagor expeditis* (v. 11), *silva lupus in Sabina* (v. 9). This form is favoured by Catullus in his *Berenice's Lock*, where we read: *omnia qui || magni dispexit lumina mundi* (v. 1) in the fourfold, and: *dulcis amor || gyro devocet aereo* (v. 6) in the threefold form; and so in: *ut cedant || certis sidera temporibus* (v. 4), *qui vix sero || alto mergitur Oceano* (v. 68), and: *levia protendens brachia || pollicitast* (v. 10). We have these threefold unions paired in: *qua rex tempestate || novo auctus hymenaeo* (v. 11) and: *quis ego pro factis || caelesti reddita coetu* (v. 37).

## XXXIV

### PRIMUS QUISQUE—IAMDUDUM—NEQUIDQUAM

IN both the ellipsis with *que* and the usual forms of distribution we have examples of the expression of a union really fourfold by three terms; so that we can readily understand the full meaning of: *fortes creantur fortibus et bonis* (Od. 4. 4. 29). When the pair of words, one of which is omitted, are the same, as in: *arma (ferte), viri, ferte arma* (Aen. 2. 668), or: *nate fuge (fuge) nate* (2. 733), we feel that the omission is easy and natural. Easy too are most of the ellipses where the word is simply varied in inflexion, as in: *Gratia (nuda) nudis iuncta sororibus* (Od. 3. 19. 17), *ubi acris invidia (viget) atque viget ubi crimina* (Sat. 1. 3. 61), *adeo maxima quaeque (maxime) ambigua sunt* (Ann. 3. 19. 3). Sometimes there is doubt as to which was the omitted word; Servius's note to: *(credas) monies concurrere montibus altos* (Aen. 8. 692), *alii altis legunt, unum tamen est*, makes this clear. When we have the opposite pleonasm, as in: *res si qua diu mortalibus ulla est* (10. 861), where *ulla* is pleonastic, we pass it over without perceiving it. Indeed in: *sive reges (divites) sive inopes erimus coloni* (Od. 2. 14. 12), where the word omitted is the opposite of that expressed, we are apt to overlook the omission.

Easy is the ellipsis of *eis* in: *atqui licet esse beatis* (Sat. 1. 1. 19), but when we come to: *dederim quibus esse poetas* (1. 4. 39), many editors write *poetis*, not perceiving the ellipsis; for the fourfold expression is: *quibus dederim eos esse poetas*, giving a meaning quite different from that they assume. So natural is the ellipsis in: *his me consolor (me) victurum suavius* (Sat. 1. 6. 130) that, when we have the full expression in: *ut tandem agitando se se movere* (Liv. 21. 58. 10), we take *se se* as equivalent to *se*. The Romans seem to have fallen into the same mistake; for from such constructions seems to have arisen the use of *sese* for *se* in Latin. This was the easier, as in conversation and poetry *se* is often omitted with the verb, as in: *accingunt omnes operi* (Aen. 2. 235), and the enclitic *se* attaches itself quite naturally to the preceding word, becoming thus the second syllable of the new word *sese*. We have a good example of the opposite, the use of *se* for *se se* in: *iureiurando obstrinxit se non excessurum* (Tac. Ann. 1. 14. 6).

We do not feel the ellipsis in: *mixtae (mixtis) pueris puellae* (Od. 4. 11. 10), as the same ellipsis is usual in English, e.g. in 'good mixed with bad'. We have the same feeling about: *procella velum (adversum) adversa ferit* (Aen. 1. 103), *adversi rupto seu quondam turbine venti (cum adversis) confligunt* (2. 416), *genibus (adversis) adversae obluctor harenae* (3. 38), *qui se ignotum (ignotis) venientibus ultro . . . obtulerat* (2. 59). And generally, when it is the first of the pair that is omitted, we are less apt to notice the ellipsis, as in: *materies quia rebus (certis) reddita certa est* (Lucr. 1. 203), *per (tot) varios casus, per tot discrimina rerum* (Aen. 1. 204), *cernes urbem (promissam) et promissa Lavini moenia* (1. 258), *scaenis decora alta (futura) futuris* (1. 429), *trabes . . . devolvunt (alii), alii strictis mucronibus imas obsedere fores* (2. 449), *date (lymphas), volnera lymphis abluam* (4. 683), *amicus dulcis . . . cum (meis) mea compenset vitiis bona* (Sat. 1. 3. 70), *lanea et effigies erat (altera), altera cerea* (1. 8. 30), *cum Velabro (omni) omne macellum* (2. 3. 229).

Perhaps it is for the same reason that we are slow to see the ellipsis at the beginning of a poem, as in: (commotum) motum ex Metello consule civicum (Od. 2. 1. 1), or of a phrase in: mandata (data) Clementi centurioni quae perferret (Ann. 1. 26. 1). Tacitus writes: datis mandatis (3. 8. 1), and probably in filling the ellipsis Horace would have read: (commotum) motum. The ellipsis is easy to supply in: causasque (causis) innecte morandi (Aen. 4. 51), as causas comes first; and so in: curvam (curvis) compagibus alvum (2. 51). More involved is it in: si . . . perituraeque addere Troiae teque tuosque (perituros) iuvat (2. 661), huic ego volgus errori (errorem) similem cunctum insanire docebo (Sat. 2. 3. 63); and there is a slight variation of sense in: tum litore funem (laxatum) deripere excussosque iubet laxare rudentes (Aen. 3. 267). This variation becomes more marked in: magni quo pueri magnis e centurionibus orti (Sat. 1. 6. 73), and for: ductus Neptuno sorte sacerdos (Aen. 2. 201) the full expression would be: factus Neptuno sorte ducta sacerdos. So for: cui fata parent (2. 121) the full expression is: cui oracula mortem parent, and in fata we have an amphibole, whereby it serves as both subject and object to parent.

Ut is at times omitted in the predicate, giving greater vividness to the comparison, says Prof. Clement Smith, by completely identifying the subject with it, as in: totidem plagis consumimus hostem, lento (ut) Samnites . . . duello (Ep. 2. 2. 97). The omission is at times due to the reduction of four terms to three, as in: quid mi igitur suades? ut vivam (ut) Maenius? aut sic ut Nomentanus? (Sat. 1. 1. 101). We have the first ut omitted in: illuc unde abii redeo, (ut) nemo ut avarus se probet (1. 1. 107). The fact that in each case the ut expressed has developed a marked difference of meaning from that omitted, is parallel to what we noted above. Probably in our first example the omission of ut is due to totidem in the preceding clause. It is easier in: (ita) dives ut metiretur nummos; ita sordidus ut se non umquam servo melius vestiret (1. 1. 95) because of the second expression being in full. Nor is there difficulty in: furit ac velut ursus . . . recitator acerbus . . . occidit legendo . . . plena (velut) cruoris hirudo (A. P. 476), simplicior quis (est) et est (talibus) qualem me saepe libenter obtulerim tibi (Sat. 1. 3. 63), Antoni (sic amicus) non ut magis alter amicus (erat) (1. 5. 33). But much more difficulty has been offered by: frater erat Romae consulti rhetor (et amore adeo fraterno) ut alter alterius sermone meros audiret honores (Ep. 2. 2. 87-8).

We have this ellipsis with primus in: cum prorepserunt primis (prima) animalia terris (Sat. 1. 3. 99), qua prima fortuna saluus monstrat (primum) iter (Aen. 2. 387), helping us to understand it in: nam primum quemque necessest (primum) occupet ille locum (Lucr. 1. 389), cum acre fluit frigus, non primam quamque solemus particulam venti (primum) sentire et frigoris eius (id. 4. 260-1), where Munro has wrongly written privam, an emendation of Gifanius. So too in: ut noscas . . . primum iactum fulgoris quemque (primum) perire (5. 291), primum quicquid fulgoris (primum) disperit (5. 284), primum quicquid aquai (primum) tollitur (5. 264), primum quicquid flammaram (primum) perdere semper (5. 304).

The construction was examined with great care by Madvig in his note to: nec enim absolvi beata vita sapientis, neque ad exitum perducere poterit, si prima quaeque bene ab eo consulta atque facta, ipsius oblivione (prima) obruentur (Cic. Fin. 2. 105. 32); and yet he failed to perceive its origin, which is plain from some of the examples he cites. For he gives us: ut et prima quaeque pars, ut exposita est in partitione, sic ordine transigatur (Inv. 1. 33. 23), where ordine is plainly short for primo ordine. Near the end of this same section we have in: quemadmodum igitur hic et ad primam quamque partem primum accessit, et omnibus absolutis finem dicendi fecit, the construction in full, as we should expect to find it in Cicero's careful prose. But he has it usually in the shortened form, as in: primum quidque explicemus (Fam. 12. 1. 1). Other examples are: ut primus quisque acervos (primos) demittatur per series ad vasa olearia (Varro R. R. 1. 55. 5), opus quod prima quaeque (primum) perficiendo minui videbatur (Liv. 31. 1. 5), primas quasque aquas (primum) explicat (Sen. N. Q. 6. 17. 2), prima quaeque ut (primum) absolveris, mittito (Plin. Ep. 8. 4. 6), Africus vero prima quaeque congesta pulsu illisa maris (primum) subruit (Curt. 4. 2. 8).

As Madvig clearly saw, it has nothing to do with the similar phrase in: ut exercitui diem primam quamque diceret ad conveniendum (Liv. 42. 48. 4) 'the earliest day possible', a development from: primo quoque die ad senatum referant (Cic. Phil. 8. 33. 11), short for: quocumque die primo possint, etc. The phrase: proximum quodque, as Madvig saw, is parallel to primum quodque and must be solved in the same way. We have examples of it in: ne proxima quaeque (primum) amoliendo maioribus gravioribusque aditum ad se facerent (Liv. 33. 12. 11), quid agam si proxima quaeque (prima) relinquunt (Ov. Trist. 5. 2. 39). Again in: igitur antiquissimae cuique (epistulae) primum respondebo (Att. 9. 9. 1) Cicero gives us the full form usually shortened in this construction.

The varied use of tenses with iamdudum, iamdiu, iampridem, iam olim, has given some trouble. Iamdudum, the most common in classical authors, is usually joined with the present, as in: iamdudum et frustra cerno te tendere contra (Aen.

5. 27), where we translate the present by a perfect, 'I have long perceived'. But I read in Tibullus: iamdudum Syrio madefactus tempora nardo debueram sertis implicuisse comas (3. 6. 63-4). Iam-dudum 'now for some time' consists of iam, which usually takes a present, and dudum taking a perfect (or imperfect), as in: egomet dudum Beroen . . . reliqui aegram (Aen. 5. 650) or: quem dudum non ulla iniecta movebant tela (2. 726). It would be natural to expect for: iamdudum video (Sat. 1. 9. 15) the fourfold union: iam video—dudum vidi. This seems to have been ordered: iam dudum video vidi, and then reduced from four to three; of the two verbs video was retained as the stronger and more vivid.

In the English 'I have long seen' it is the perfect that is retained; for that we feel to be the stronger form. In Latin, too, when one of a pair is retained it is oftener the second, as in: te maximus Actor (ante gessit), te Turni nunc dextra gerit (Aen. 12. 96-7). So we might expect to find the perfect (or imperfect) joined with iamdudum as well as the present. And when we turn to archaic Latin we find the perfect quite frequently, as in: iamdudum, si des, porrexi manum (Pl. Pseud. 1148), iamdudum audiui (Merc. 953), iamdudum factumst quom abiisti domo (Trin. 1010), quia non iamdudum ante lucem ad aedem Veneris venimus (Poen. 318), iamdudum, mulier, tibi non imprudens advorsabar (Men. 419), Py. An abiit iam a milite? Ch. Iamdudum, aetatem (Ter. Eun. 734), Ct. Ain patrem hinc abiisse rus? Sy. Iamdudum. Ct. Die sodes. Sy. Apud villamst (Ad. 517), audiui, Archylis, iamdudum: Lesbiam adduci iubes (And. 228), to which Donatus's note is: utrum iamdudum audiui an iamdudum iubes incerta distinctio. He does not know whether to join iamdudum with audiui or with iubes, a difficulty which does not trouble our editors, who here, strange to say, prefer to join it with audiui. Probably in the last two examples we have an amphibole in the use of iamdudum, which can be joined with either perfect or present; as we seem to have in: visa iamdudum prosilit altis diva toris (Val. Fl. 6. 456).

When the continued act is transferred from the present to the past, we have the present with iamdudum or iampridem passing to the imperfect, as in: erat ei de ratiuncula iampridem apud me relicuom pauxillum nummorum (Ter. Phorm. 37), iamdudum flebam (Ov. Met. 3. 656). The perfect with iamdudum would naturally pass to the pluperfect; and this seems the explanation of debueram in Tib. 3. 6. 64. We have it transferred to the future in: in medios belli non ire furores iamdudum moriture paras? (Luc. 2. 524), iamdudum aetherias eadem reditura sub auras (Stat. Theb. 6. 857). We find it with the imperative in: iamdudum sumite poenas (Aen. 2. 103), where Servius explains it as for quam primum. To understand the syntax here, we must return to the fourfold form: iam poenas sumite; dudum poenas sumpsissetis,—to be rearranged: iamdudum poenas sumite sumpsissetis, and then reduced to three. We have the fourth and not the third term in: ut ego hue iamdudum simitu exissem vobiscum foras (Pl. Stich. 743). In the sense of quam primum it is transferred to the present subjunctive in: candida iamdudum cingantur colla lacertis (Ov. Ars 2. 457); and to the infinitive in: ingenti iamdudum de grege duci iussit (ib. 1. 317). We have iampridem with the imperative in: tollite iampridem victricia tollite signa (Luc. 1. 347), a construction clearly parallel to that just noticed, and pointing to the primary use of duci.

But we often find this reduction from four to three brought about by the omission, not of a second form of the same word, but of a word correlated in meaning or use to that expressed. So in: (eo) parto quod avebas (Sat. 1. 1. 94), nam displosa sonat quantum vesica (tantum) pepedi diffissa nate ficus (1. 8. 46), toga quae defendere frigus, (sit tam) quamvis crassa, queat (1. 3. 15). Both of course are often expressed, as in: nil satis est, inquit, quia tanti quantum habeas sis (1. 1. 62). Very usual in Tacitus is such an ellipsis with comparatives and superlatives, as in: quem haud fratris interitu (magis) trucem quam remoto aemulo aequiorem sibi (futurum) sperabat (Ann. 3. 8. 1), optimus quisque reipublicae cura (maxime) maerebat (3. 44. 2). We have it with numerals in: satis una superque vidimus exscidia et captae (semel) superavimus urbi (Aen. 2. 643).

We find it with words not thus related in the following examples, where I bracket the word omitted, and italicize the word suggesting it to the reader: facti de *nomine* Byrsam (appellatam) (Aen. 1. 367), lyra (dulci) vel *acri* tibia (Od. 1. 12. 1), tu (supremus) *secundo* Caesare regnes (1. 12. 51), ob Italiam (negatam) terrarum *clauditur* orbis (Aen. 1. 233), *fortia facta* patrum, series longissima rerum (gestarum) (1. 641), et breviter (narratum) Troiae supremum *audire* laborem (2. 11), artificumque manus *inter se* (certantium) operumque laborem miratur (1. 455), cognatos nullo natura labore (tuo) quos *tibi* dat (Sat. 1. 1. 88), tu semper urges *flebilibus modis* (lugere) Mysten ademptum (Od. 2. 9. 9), tum vero manifesta fides (mala), Danaumque patescunt *insidiae* (Aen. 2. 309), non haec, o Palla, *dederas promissa* parenti (precanti) cautius ut saevo velles te credere Marti (11. 153-4).

In several of these we have two or more words to suggest the word to be supplied, but in each they are joined and present a single idea. That is not the case in the following, where two separate words in the phrase or sentence join in

suggesting to the reader the word to be supplied: *tendoque supinas ad caelum cum voce* (sublata) manus (Aen. 3. 177), *vocat* (ad mortem) *lux ultima* victos (2. 668), *fundamenta* quatit *totamque* a sedibus (imis) urbem eruit (2. 611), *omnis spes* Danaum et coepti *fiducia* belli (bene gerendi) (2. 162), *mihi parvus lulus sit comes*, et *longe* (secuta) servet vestigia coniunx (2. 711), *ingens a vertice* pontus (deruens) in puppim *ferit* (1. 114), quae vos a stirpe parentum (olim amotos) *prima* tulit tellus, *eadem* vos ubere laeto *accipiet reduces* (3. 94-6), non me tibi Troia *externum* tulit, aut *cruor hic* (alienus sanguis hoc) de stipite *manat* (3. 43), at regina dolos *praesensit* motusque excepit *prima futuros* omnia (etiam) tuta timens (4. 296-8), where etiam is Servius's suggestion.

In return we have two ellipses suggested by a single word expressed in: fortunae (malae) *miseras* auximus (prava) arte vias (Prop. 3. 7. 32), longa (dictu) est iniuria, longae *ambages*; sed summa sequar (narrando) vestigia rerum (Aen. 1. 341), cithara crinitus Iopas (tectis) *personat* aurata (quae carmina) docuit quem maximus Atlas (1. 741).

In each of the following examples we have two ellipses, each suggested by a distinct word in the context: *nos*, tua *progenies* caeli quibus adnuis arcem (nostram futuram) (Aen. 1. 250), *adparent rari nantes* in gurgite vasto, (obscura videntur) arma virum tabulaeque et Troia gaza per undas (1. 118-19), illi me *comitem* . . . pauper *in arma* pater primis (et belli et pucritiae) huc misit ab annis (2. 87), arduus (exstans) *armatos* mediis in moenibus astans fundit equus, *victorque* Sinon incendia (caedibus) miscet (2. 328-9), *sanguine* quaerendi reditus, animaque *litandum Argolica* . . . obstipuerunt animi . . . cui fata parent (Argivo), quem poscat Apollo (inmolandum) (2. 118-21), non *haec* tibi litora (petere) suasit Delius, aut (hic) Cretae iussit *considerare* Apollo (3. 161-2), quem *sese ore ferens*, quam *forti pectore* et armis (validis instructus) (4. 11), et nos tela (certa), pater, *ferrumque haud debile* dextra (gerimus et) spargimus (12. 50), hac (aequa) lege (concessa) in trutina *ponetur eadem* (Sat. 1. 3. 72), ut *tuto* ab *atris* corpore viperis dormire et (atris) ursis . . . non sine dis (tuentibus) animosus infans (Od. 3. 4. 17-20), where *ater* varies in sense, being felt in the ellipsis in its proper meaning as the colour of bears, but figurative in the context of the poison of the vipers. In: donec ornus . . . supremum *congemu*t traxitque (secum) iugis *avolsa* ruinam (aliarum arborum) (Aen. 2. 631) the last ellipsis is that suggested by Servius, and it seems justified by the *secum* evidently implied in *traxit*, as well as by the *ornus avolsa*, which is the subject of the sentence.

In: *quid tantum* Oceano properent se tingere soles *hiberni*, vel quae (= unde tanta) tardis mora noctibus (hibernis) obstet (Aen. 1. 745-6) we have a twofold ellipsis arising from three words italicized in the context; and the same seems true of: Iuppiter omnipotens, *precibus* si *flecteris* ullis, adspice nos (vultu laeto); hoc tantum (precor) (2. 689-90). In: dum pecori lupus (inimicus pascua turbaret) et *nautis infestus* Orion *turbaret* hibernum mare (Epod. 15. 7-8) Horace has so nicely balanced his threefold ellipsis with the three terms suggesting it that it is not hard to trace. In: quanto rectius hoc, quam tristi laedere versu Pantolabum (Sat. 2. 1. 21) the last four words clearly suggest: alto laudare versu Caesarem as the phrase for which hoc stands; and in: saltat Milonius, ut *semel* icto *accessit fervor* capiti, numerusque (additur) lucernis (iam incertis) (2. 1. 24-5) we have a threefold ellipsis suggested by the three words italicized. In: hoc (iure = modo) etenim sunt omnes iure (= in iudicio) molesti, quo (iure = modo) fortes (molesti sunt), quibus adversum bellum incidit (Sat. 1. 7. 10-11), where the last phrase seems equivalent to the prose: in bello, we have a curious alternation of meaning in iure. With hoc and quo it takes a sense closely allied to that seen in: quo iure quaque iniuria praecipitem me in pistrinum dabit (Ter. And. 214) 'rightly or wrongly he will send me post-haste to the mill', while with molesti it seems to stand for in iudicio; cf. in ius ambula (Phorm. 936); and to be opposed to: in bello, here amplified by Horace as we have indicated.

Tacitus in his prose is a close and skilful imitator of Virgilian diction; but though his brevity disposes him to the use of ellipses, he has not used this figure so much as he has some closely allied with it. I cite here some examples of his ellipses: (se) moriturum potius quam (id commissurum ut) fidem exueret clamitans (Ann. 1. 35. 5), etiam (erant) quorum diversa (essent) oppida, (qui) tamen obvii (facti) et victimas (mactantes) atque aras dis manibus statuentes, lacrimis et conclamationibus dolorem testabantur (3. 2. 3), nam secutae leges, etsi aliquando in maleficos ex delicto (commisso), saepius tamen dissensione ordinum et (cupidine) apiscendi inlicitos honores aut (patria) pellendi claros viros aliaque ob prava latae sunt (3. 27. 2). In: raro ea tempestate et e vetere memoria facinore decimum quemque ignominiosae cohortis sorte ductos (= sorte ducta electos) fusti necat (3. 21. 1) we may paraphrase raro . . . facinore thus: exemplo eo tempore raro et vetere ex memoria prave adhibito. In: eam condicionem esse imperandi ut non aliter ratio constet quam si uni reddatur (1. 6. 6) the latter half, ut . . . reddatur, is a union of question and answer skilfully involved to hide the real structure. We may arrange the whole sentence in threefold form: imperandi condicionem esse eam: ut imperio Romano constet ratio? Non aliter quam si uni (i.e. principi) reddatur (ratio). The reader is likely to be led astray at first by the

apparent union of *ut* with *imperandi*.

Of a pair of objects, qualities, or relations, opposed to each other, one may be omitted which the other naturally suggests, and often so naturally that we are but obscurely, if at all, conscious of the omission. We have the fourfold groups of such objects without any omission in: *ego quid sit ater Hadriae novi sinus, aut quid albus peccet Iapyx* (Od. 3. 27. 19) and: *undique ex insidiis barbari a fronte a tergo coorti, comminus eminus (eos) petunt* (Liv. 21. 34. 6). But we read: *omnem oram . . . partim renovandis (veteribus) societatibus, partim novis instituendis Romanae dicionis fecit* (21. 60. 3), where the *veteribus* is so plainly implied in *novis* and *renovandis* that we hardly notice its omission. The following are also simple examples: *quaerenti talibus ille (respondit) suspirans* (Aen. 1. 370), *patrios foedasti (fili) funere voltus* (2. 539), *superstes restarem ut (filio) genitor* (11. 160), *at non Evandrum potis est vis ulla tenere (domi), sed venit in medios* (11. 148), *hinc spargere voces in vulgum ambiguas, et quaerere (doli) conscius arma* (2. 99), *nec iam amplius armis (eas adgredi), sed votis precibusque iubent exposcere pacem* (3. 260).

Though this figure is not common in Augustan prose, I have noted a fine example of it in Cicero's oration for Milo: *quam ob rem illa arma, centuriones, cohortes non periculum nobis, sed praesidium denuntiant* (3. 1). We should have expected: *non periculum nobis denuntiant, sed praesidium promittunt*; but Cicero in the bitter irony that marks his account of Pompey's measures to protect the court in this trial, measures that so overawed him as to cause the failure of the oration he then delivered, has chosen in the oration he wrote later to transfer *denuntiant* to *praesidium*, giving us a marked oxymoron and a variety of *zeugma* that reached its highest development in Tacitus's prose. I have noted from Tacitus: *Seio Tuberoni legato tradit equitem campumque . . . quod arduum sibi (sumpsit), cetera legatis permisit* (Ann. 2. 20. 2), which Furneaux calls a *zeugma*; and: *solum veneni crimen visus est diluisse, quod ne accusatores quidem satis firmabant, in convivio Germanici, cum super eum Piso discumberet, infectos (huius) manibus eius (= illius) cibos arguentes* (3. 14. 2), where *eius* seems to fill the place both of *huius*, i.e. Pisonis, and *illius*, i.e. Germanici, and to be a difficult *zeugma*.

We may note this threefold example in Propertius:

*Non tulit haec Paetus, stridorem audire procellae  
Et duro teneras laedere fune manus,  
Sed (gaudebat) Chio thalamo (dormire) et Oricia terebintho  
(recumbere quietum) et fultum pluma versicolore caput* (3. 7. 47-50).

We have the following in Martial:

*Hoc ego maluerim quam si mea carmina cantent  
Qui Nilum ex ipso protinus ore (ad ultimos fontes) bibunt* (7. 88. 6);

and in the epigram addressed to the Emperor Nerva:

*Et te (imperatorem) privato cum Caesare Magnus (privatus) amabit* (11. 5. 11).

We have the following two interesting examples in Lucretius:

*Et quae res nobis vigilantibus obvia mentes  
Terrificet morbo adfectis, somnoque sepultis (quamvis sanis)* (1. 132-3).

and:

*haud igitur quidquam procedere posset,  
Principium quoniam (pro)cedendi (cedendo) nulla daret res* (1. 338-9),

'since nothing could give a beginning of advance by its retreat', a solution that has occurred to no one, though an examination of the reason for omitting the preposition in composition will make it seem probable.

We have found few problems of any difficulty connected with this variety of ellipsis in Virgil; but one, which I will now state, raises the question how far that is due to Virgil, how far to emendations of his text by later grammarians. Hyginus in Gellius (10. 16. 14) quotes Aen. 6. 840 thus:

*Ultus avos Troiae, templa †intemerata Minervae.*

The obelisk was set before *intemerata* by Martin Hertz, my old teacher, who thus indicated that he did not understand the reading, but that it was that of the best manuscripts of Gellius. The courage and veracity that moved him to this are both admirable in themselves and of the highest value as an example to students of Latin. When we turn from the text of Gellius to that of the Aeneid, the problem is no longer so simple. All Virgil manuscripts give the reading adopted by



Ribbeck: ultos avos Troiae, templa et temerata Minervae; and this is the reading of Servius, who explains temerata: per stuprum Cassandreae.

And yet we have reason to pause; Gellius's citation of the verse is the oldest authority we have on the reading. The question is, which of the two readings proceeded from Virgil, which was the emendation of some grammarian. It cannot be a question of the careless error of some scribe; Gellius prized a correct text too highly for that. The more clearly we show that all students of letters among the ancients knew of Ajax's violation of Minerva's fane, the less likely becomes the change from Virgil's temerata to the intemerata of some unblessed grammarian. It is far more likely that some grammarian in early days determined to relieve Virgil's text from the apparent inconsistency involved in: intemerata, and emended it to: et temerata. When we turn to the figure with which we are now busied, we see at once that: templa intemerata Minervae will be the natural reduction to three of the fourfold: templa temerata intemeratae Minervae; for we have noticed that in determining the resultant of a pair like temerata intemeratae the second term is apt to have the greater influence. But you will ask, What could: templa intemerata Minervae mean to Virgil's reader in his day? It seems quite evident to me that the reader of Virgil in Virgil's day understood the common reduction of the threefold from the fourfold union, and would mentally substitute the latter for the former here. I have further shown how often we supply with an adjective the participle futurus, giving us here templa Minervae intemerata futura. What would be the effect of the vengeance we have here described, but to ensure that Minerva's shrine would be inviolate for the future? Of such varied interest are the ideas called up in the mind of the reader by the reading intemerata, that compared with it temerata, the text of Servius and the manuscripts, seems plain and prosaic.

As we saw in: temerata intemeratae, at times from a union of two words, one of which is syntactically dependent on the other, the governing word is omitted and the dependent retained and put in the case, or in the mood and tense of the word omitted. We have a good example in: Teucrum arma quiescant et Rutuli (Aen. 12. 79), where Rutuli is for arma Rutulorum, and where variety of expression seems to be the aim rather than brevity, which seems the poet's object in most examples of this change. So in: stupet Albius aere (Sat. 1. 4. 28) for: aeris splendore, lituo tubae permixtus sonitus (Od. 1. 1. 23), non laudis amor, nec gloria cessit (Aen. 5. 394), ille ducem haud timidis vadentem passibus aequat (6. 263).

For an adverb joined with a participle we have an adjective substituted, that represents the adverb transferred to the syntactical function of the omitted participle, in: equidem per litora certos dimittam (1. 576) for: certo eos inventuros; si quando adsideret, atrox ac dissentire manifestus (Ann. 2. 57. 4) for: manifeste visus; an falsa haec in maius volgaverint (3. 12. 6) for: falso credita. In: crateres auro solidi (Aen. 2. 765) for: auro solido facti, we have the ablative of specification developed through hypallage from the ablative of material; as in: ductus Neptuno sorte sacerdos (2. 201) for: factus . . . sorte ducta sacerdos, hypallage lies at the root of the change. In: degenerem Neoptolemum (2. 549) we have an adjective formed from the phrase: de genere (= de decore generis) declinatem in much the same way that the verbs are formed that we notice next.

In: Gabinium tres adhuc factiones postulant (Cic. ad Q. Fr. 3. 1. 15. 5) and: Ancharius . . . Cordum proconsule Cretae postulaverat repetundis (Ann. 3. 38. 1) the use of: postulare Gabinium for: Gabinio diem postulare is a natural shortening arising from the long and familiar use of diem postulare 'to impeach'; such phrases tend to expression by a single term, and they would in such case shift the object of their action from the dative to the accusative. But in: vox hominem sonat (Aen. 1. 328) for sono indicat, we have a verb formed from a noun dependent on the verb omitted, and giving the meaning primarily given by this noun joined with the verb now omitted.

In: ut ridentibus adrident, ita flentibus adsunt (flentes) humani voltus (A. P. 101) adrident seems short for adsunt ridentes—a union of a present participle with the verb to form the new verb. In: quibus haec . . . adridere velim, doliturus si placeant spe detenus nostra (Sat. 1. 10. 89) adridere seems to be for adridentes adire (= adire ut adrideant); and spe nostra is the old and usual expression for quam speramus, being the opposite of this construction, perhaps induced by such resolutions as: dicta dabas (Aen. 10. 600) and: discrimina dabat (10. 382). It is a present participle too that is involved in: tamquam parum ambitiose filium ducis gregali habitu circumferat (Ann. 1. 69. 5) for: circumferens obtendat militibus; but the past participle in: in flammam iugulant pecudes (Aen. 11. 199) for: iugulatas iniciunt, and in: ille autem impavidus partes cunctatur in omnes (10. 714) for: cunctatus (or cunctans) ruere meditatur.

But it is the gerundive in: cum corpora . . . prensa . . . frangeret ad saxum (3. 625) for: pelleret frangenda, and the gerund in: in magicis sacra piare focis (Prop. 1. 1. 20) for: sacra facere piando, and in: atram prorumpit ad aethera nubem (Aen.

3. 572) for: mittit prorumpendo. This seems the construction involved in: correctus Bestius (Hor. Ep. 1. 15. 37) for: corrigendo factus Bestius ‘become a Bestius in his censures’; for in Persius too: Bestius urget doctores Graios (6. 37) Bestius seems a censor whose severity outdoes the Stoics.

There has been doubt about the spelling and meaning of *nequidquam* ‘in vain’, which seems in its primary sense to be ‘not a whit’, ‘nothing whatever’. It is still used in its primary sense in: *secernere autem a corpore animum nequidquam est aliud quam emori discere* (Cic. Tusc. 1. 75. 31). Cicero in deriving *nequitia*, which is from *nequam* (*utilis*) ‘not useful to any extent’, says: *nequitia ab eo, quod nequidquam est in tali homine; ex quo idem nihili dicitur* (3. 18. 8), and it is useless to try to give any other force to *nequidquam* here but that plainly indicated by its composition (*ne—quidquam*). But when we turn to its use by the poets, we feel that we are at once involved in ambiguity. Are we to render Horace’s: *an male sarta gratia nequidquam coit et rescinditur?* (Ep. 1. 3. 32) ‘or does the friendship ill-patched-up utterly fail to join and pull apart again’, or ‘join in vain’? Porphyrio favours the former rendering; his note is: *nequidquam pro non*, and I feel that this sense is better. But he refers us to: *et nunc nequidquam fallis dea* (Aen. 12. 634), to which Servius’s note is: *nequicquam fallis pro non fallis*. I must translate ‘and now thy godhead escapes me not a whit’, i.e. I am fully aware that thou art a goddess. But Mackail, following the usual sense of *nequidquam* translates ‘and now thy godhead conceals itself in vain’, and the passage will bear that meaning too. But the other sense seems to have been that obvious to the Roman reader.

In: *quia non firmus rectum defendis, et haeres nequidquam caeno cupiens evellere plantam* (Sat. 2. 7. 27), shall we translate *nequidquam cupiens* ‘vainly wishing’ or ‘striving in vain’ as Lonsdale and Bryce do? No doubt our inconstant friend would like to have that generally believed, but the real trouble is expressed by the primary meaning of *nequidquam*: he is not in reality bent on doing anything of the kind; *si firmus esset* the result would be very different. We have here a purposed ambiguity on Horace’s part, giving a fine effect to his verse, which, when you reject the origin I suggest for *nequidquam* in consonance with the testimony of the ancients, you lose entirely. Let us turn to:

Sic fatus senior, telumque imbelles sine ictu  
Coniecit, rauco quod protinus aere repulsum,  
Et summo clipei nequidquam umbone pendit (Aen. 2. 544-6).

Again Servius explains *nequidquam* as *non*, and refers to Persius (2. 51). He adds that some wish to give *summo . . . pendit* the sense, that the shaft repelled from the boss did not even stick to the surface of the shield, so as to hang there. Others thought the phrase a vain repetition in that case; but Servius does not agree with this and thinks that to: *aere repulsum* Virgil might well add: *nec de clipeo pendit*. The idea of the weapon hanging in vain from the boss seems to have occurred to none of them; how could it hang suspended from the surface of the boss (*summo umbone*)? The weak weapon strikes full on the boss, which sings hoarse from the blow, and is repelled; nor does it hang from the burnished brass; if it had struck the hide of which the rest of the shield was made it might have hung thus suspended, but even this poor satisfaction was denied Priam. There seems little doubt that Servius is right in explaining *nequidquam* here as *non*.

But how does *nequidquam* get its common meaning of ‘in vain’? Let us turn to: *nequidquam deus abscidit prudens Oceano dissociabili terras* (Od. 1. 3. 21), where there can be no question that *nequidquam* means, not *non*, but *frustra*. We noticed that in Prop. 1. 1. 20 *piare* was used for *facere piando*; here *abscidit* is for *effecit abscindendo*, ‘the god has effected nothing whatever by sundering the lands from the Ocean’. Let us turn to: *ne istuc nequidquam dixeris in me tam indignum dictum* (Pl. Asin. 698); here *dixeris* is for *effeceris dicendo*. And so in: *qui ipse sibi prodesse non quit sapiens, nequidquam sapit* (Enn. F. 282, M.) for *nequidquam efficit sapiendo*. In: *hodie sero ac nequidquam voles* (Ter. Heaut. 344) *sero* is for: *sero et re infecta voles*. Different is the solution in: *neque illum flava Ceres alto nequidquam special Olympo* (Geo. 1. 96), where with *nequidquam* (*ad*)*spectat* we must supply *ad futura* (= *profutura*). So in: *cernimus adstantes nequidquam (ad)futuros lumine torvo Aetnaeos fratres* (Aen. 3. 678). In: *Rufe mihi frustra ac nequidquam credite amico* (Catull. 77. 1) the *magno cum pretio* of the next verse points to an ellipsis of *proficienti* with *nequidquam*. And in: *donec deceptus et exspes nequidquam fundo suspiret nummus in imo* (Pers. 2. 51), where Servius tells us that *nequidquam* is for *non*, the *nequidquam* expressed is probably for *non*, but the sentence is elliptical and we must supply *nequidquam* with *suspirando* in its later meaning of ‘in vain’, giving us: *donec deceptus et exspes (nequidquam suspirando) nequidquam fundo suspiret nummus in imo* ‘till baffled and hopeless from sighing in vain the penny at the bottom of his chest ceases from its sighing’; where we have a good example of the expression of four terms by two.

THE ambiguity of which we have such a fine example in Persius's use of *nequidquam* is often associated in Latin poetry with the amphibole, and is sometimes evolved from that figure. Murray defines the amphibole as an ambiguity, but in the Roman grammarians the term has a very special application, as the use of a single word in two different relations in the same clause or sentence. We read in Horace: *male verum examinat omnis corruptus iudex* (Sat. 2. 2. 8), of which Acron tells us: *male ἀμφίβολον*: aut *male verum*, i.e. non *verum*, . . . aut *male examinat*, i.e. non potest de sapientiae bono nequitia iudicare. It seems to me that here, as in several cases, it might be made threefold, and extended to *corruptus* as well, giving us: 'the depraved verdict of the badly warped juror strays far from the truth'. Acron refers us to: *cum sic unanimam adloquitur male sana sororem* (Aen. 4. 8), where Servius tells us that *male* may be for minus or for perniciose. In this verse we may take *male sana* as minus *sana*, and *male adloquitur* as perniciose *adloquitur*, and translate: 'when the queen far from sane with consequences disastrous to herself addresses her loving sister'.

That this figure is primarily a special form of the reduction of a fourfold union to three terms seems plain from: *cedamus Phoebō et moniti meliora sequamur* (Aen. 3. 188) 'let us yield to Apollo, and follow the better way he counsels' (Mackail); we have here clearly a shortening from: *moniti meliora meliora sequamur*, as Servius clearly sees. So in: *volans alte raptum cum fulva draconem fert aquila* (11. 751) for: *alte volans alte raptum*, etc., and in: *lustrabat studio recolens* (6. 681). In this figure the word, though in its various relations it may change its case, gender, or number, retains exactly the same form; when the figure passes to verbs, we call it, not amphibole, but *zeugma*.

As I began by citing examples of this figure with the adverb, I add a few more: *solve senescentem mature sanus equum* (Ep. 1. 1. 8) 'be wise in time and loose betimes, &c.', *rite repertum carpe manu* (Aen. 6. 145). In:

*Has equidem memorare tibi atque ostendere coram  
Iampridem, hanc prolem cupio enumerare meorum* (6. 716-7),

the position of *iampridem* between the clauses to which it is related is parallel to that of *alte* in: *alte volans raptum*. In: *bis patet in praeceptis tantum tenditque sub umbras* (6. 578) *bis tantum* is so distributed between the two clauses to which it is to be related, that its terms constitute the first words of each, and of each colon of the verse. In: *torquet agens circum* (1. 117) *circum* is not yet a preposition; but in: *laurus erat tecti medio in penetralibus altis* (7. 59) the preposition *in* is to be taken with *medio* as well as with *penetralibus*. In: *emicat, adrectisque fremit cervicibus alte luxurians* (11. 496) the connexion between the first and last words of the verse is so usual with Virgil and Horace, that we must join *emicat* with *alte*, giving it a threefold relation here, with *emicat*, *fremit*, and *luxurians*.

For pronouns I note: *Annam cara mini nutrix huc siste sororem* (4. 634), where *mihi* is to be joined with *huc siste* as well as with *cara*. In: *haec ubi nos praecepta iubent deponere dona* (6. 632) *haec*, the first word in the verse, must be joined in its usual sense with *dona* the last, but in the sense of 'our' with *praecepta* the last word of the first colon. In: *o genetrix, quo fata vocas, aut quid petis istis* (9. 94), to which Servius notes: *istis* utrum *precibus* an *navibus*?, we must join *istis* (= *istis precibus*) as an ablative with *vocas*, and as a dative (= *istis navibus*) with *petis*. In:

*Quid struat his coeptis, quem, si Fortuna sequatur,  
Eventum pugnae cupiat, manifestius ipsi  
Quam Turno regi, aut regi apparere Latino* (8. 15-17),

we have one of Virgil's hidden meanings. It is obvious and natural to refer *ipsi* to Aeneas. It may seem too obvious on reflexion; but, as Sidgwick points out, it may be a skilful irony for: *nos minime novimus* 'he knows, we don't'. But Servius's note is: *quem finem suae velit esse victoriae, ipsum melius nosse, qui iam antiquus est hostis*. This reference of *ipsi* to Diomedes, and not to Aeneas, will seem preferable, when we consider how Rome subjected Magna Graecia, and remember the historical purpose of Virgil in the Aeneid.

In: *quia non sentis quod clamas rectius esse* (Sat. 2. 7. 25) *rectius esse* goes with *sentis* as well as with *clamas*; and in: *casus . . . insontis amici* (Aen. 5. 350) *casus* has the double meaning of 'case' and 'fall', and in either sense *insontis* seems to belong to it as well as to *amici*. In: *fecerat et viridi fetam Mavortis in antro procubuisse lupam* (8. 630), as Servius notes, *Mavortis*, the first word of the second colon, is to be joined with its last word *lupam* as well as with: *in antro*. In: *rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet* (8. 730) the connexion of *rerum* with both *ignarus* and *imagine* is very plain; Aeneas does not yet know the achievements of Rome, but he is delighted with their portrayal on his shield. In: *illam*

Terra parens, ira irritata deorum, extremam, etc. (Aen. 4. 178-9) deorum is dependent on extremam as well as on ira, as is clear from the arrangement which puts illam at the beginning and deorum at the end of the verse in juxtaposition with extremam. Servius, moreover, sees an amphibole in the relation of deorum to ira; for this genitive may be subjective or objective, signifying either the wrath of the Gods at the Giants, Earth's offspring, or the wrath of Earth at the Gods for destroying them.

In: Herculeis sopitas ignibus aras excitat (8. 542) Servius notes the hypallage in: Herculeis ignibus for Herculeas aras; this hypallage seems due to the double use of ignibus, as an ablative of means with excitat, and as an ablative of respect with sopitas; in the last connexion the transference of Herculeas would be easy. In: bellis hoc victor abibat omnibus (10. 859) bellis is to be joined with victor as an ablative of manner, and with abibat as the proper ablative. In: exceptus tergo consueta locavit membra (10. 867) we have a triple amphibole in: tergo, which is in threefold relation with consueta, exceptus, and membra locavit; in the first it is a dative proper, but in the other two it seems the Virgilian dative for: in tergum. In: celsam oppugnat qui molibus urbem (5. 439) Servius sees the amphibole: aut celsam molibus, aut quae molibus oppugnatur, is his note. As: celsam molibus is a poetic variety for: celsis molibus, we should rather take as the alternative: aut quae celsis molibus oppugnatur. We have a threefold amphibole in:

Namque tibi reduces socios classemque relatam  
Nuntio et in tutum versis Aquilonibus actam (1. 390-1),

where: in tutum must be understood with reduces and relatam. In: petit ante alios pulcerrimus omnes Turnus (7. 55) ante alios omnes must be joined with both petit and pulcerrimus. So in: dum pluit in terris, ut possint sole reducto (in terris) exercere diem (10. 807) 'put in a busy day on their farms'; and in: obferebatque familiam (in tormenta) reus et ministros (Germanici) in tormenta flagitabat (Ann. 3. 14. 3).

In:

rex ipse Latinus  
Ni dare coniugium et dicto parere fatetur,  
Sentiat et tandem Turnum experiatur in armis (Aen. 7. 432-4),

we have an amphibole in: in armis, which must be joined with (expertus) sentiat as well as with experiatur, and a curious ambiguity in: dicto parere. At first sight dicto seems to be Turnus's command, but the oxymoron implied in making the king obey leads us to prefer as Virgil's hidden meaning the older sense of parere 'to be on hand'; for parere is the neuter of parare and related to it as is placere to placare. In that case dicto is Latinus's promise to Turnus, and: dicto parere is equivalent to: promisso stare.

In: corripiunt (spiris ingentibus) spirisque ligant ingentibus (2. 217) and: quid aeternis (consiliis) minorem consiliis (aeternis) animum fatigas? (Od. 2. 11. 11) we have amphiboles consisting each of a noun with its adjective in synchysis. To: quam (vallem) densis frondibus atrum urget utrimque latus (Aen. 11. 523) Servius's note is: utrum densis frondibus urget, an densis frondibus atrum? We have the amphibole distributed in: crescit occulto velut arbor aevo fama Marcelli (Od. 1. 12. 45), the full form being: crescit occulto (aevo) velut arbor (occulto) aevo fama Marcelli; and in: tutela vel ipsis certior arcebat muris (Sil. 12. 64), short for: tutela vel ipsis (muris) certior arcebat (ipsis) muris (Hannibalem). So in: utrumque sacro digna silentio mirantur umbrae dicere (Od. 2. 13. 29), short for: utrumque sacro (silentio) digna silentio (sacro) mirantur, etc., and: accipe si vis, accipiam tabulas (Sat. 1. 4. 14), short for: accipe si vis (tabulas), accipiam (si vis) tabulas; where the first si vis is our 'please', but the second is 'if you will'.

In: navis quae . . . debes Virgilium finibus Atticis reddas incolumem (Od. 1. 3. 6) the position of Virgilium finibus Atticis indicates its connexion with both debes and reddas. Very difficult is:

Quodque vehunt prorae Centaurica saxa minantes,  
Tigna cava et pictos experiere metus (Prop. 4. 6. 49-50).

Virgil described it as follows:

Tanta mole viri turritis puppibus instant (Aen. 8. 693),

to which Servius's note is: nam Agrippa primus hoc genus turrium invenit, ut de tabulatis subito erigerentur, simul ac ventum esset in proelium, turres hostibus improvisae, in navigando essent occultae. We shall write Virgil's verse in full thus: viri tanta mole (Centaurica) turritis puppibus (minantes tanta mole saxorum) instant, and Propertius's: quodque vehunt prorae (inmanes species Centaurorum) Centaurica saxa minantes, etc. It is characteristic of Virgil's style to give

us the unexpected in designating such shapes as *viri*, and not *Centauri*.

To:

Aenean credam quid enim fallacibus auris  
Et caeli totiens deceptus fraude sereni? (5. 850-1),

Sidgwick's note is: 'fallacibus auris must be dative after credam, and not ablative with deceptus; otherwise credam has no dative, and quid enim is awkwardly lost in the sentence. That being so, what is et?' The text is not certain; Servius read *caelo*, with some of the best codices, and Ribbeck has adopted this reading. If we follow him we shall have no difficulty with *et*, which joins the datives *auris* and *caelo*. But *caeli* agrees well with *sereni*, the beginning with the end of the verse; if we read *caelo*, *sereni* will be short for *sereni caeli*. Acron read *caeli* (ad Od. 1. 5. 6), and Servius adds: *alii legunt 'deceptus fraude caeli sereni'*. It seems the more difficult reading, and is supported by most of the manuscripts. The difficulty is that stated by Sidgwick: how can *auris* be both dative with *credam* and ablative with *deceptus*?

We have already seen how in Aen. 9. 94 *istis* seems as well for *istis precibus* with *vocas*, an ablative, and *istis navibus* with *petis*, a dative. In: *certum voto pete finem* (Ep. 1. 2. 56) 'in your prayer seek a definite limit for your petitions', i.e. 'pray to the gods for the contented mind', we have a similar amphibole. So in: *auxilio laetos dimittam* (Aen. 8. 171) 'you rejoicing in my aid I will send away to the Etruscans, who are to be your allies', *auxilio* must be joined with *laetos* in the ablative, and with *dimittam* in the dative. Parallel to this is: *poscor Olympo* (8. 533), to which Servius's note is: *aut de Olympo poscor, aut certe in Olympum poscor*. To: *neque finitimo Mezentius umquam huic capiti insultans tot ferro saeva dedisset funera* (8. 569-71) Servius's note is: *aut in finitimo, aut finitimo capiti*. In: *extulit os sacrum caelo tenebrasque resolvit* (8. 591) Sidgwick prefers to take *caelo* as the ablative with *extulit* as 'making more natural sense', but its position in the verse plainly shows that it is to be joined with both *extulit* and *resolvit*, being with *resolvit* the dative of advantage, and with *extulit* the Virgilian dative for: *in caelum*. In: *his informatum manibus iam parte polita fulmen erat* (8. 426) Servius explains *manibus* as: *in manibus*; Sidgwick translates 'shaped by these hands', making it depend on *informatum*, where it is probably a dative. The order of the words favours Sidgwick, but it is quite clear that the thunderbolt is still in Vulcan's 'hands', and has been only partly polished by them. In:

quo se multis cum milibus heros

Consessu medium tulit exstructoque resedit (5. 289-90),

Servius arranges thus: *quo se Aeneas medium tulit cum multis milibus et exstructo consessu resedit*. But the position of *consessu* shows that it must be constructed with (in)tulit as well as with resedit, being an ablative with resedit and a dative with intulit. The phrase: *quo consessu* seems parallel in syntax to: *unde domo* (Ep. 1. 7. 53), and to: *huc viciniam* (Ter. And. 70), where, however, the best manuscript has: *huic viciniae*. In: *paulatim adnabam terrae iam tuta tenebam* (Aen. 6. 358) *terrae* seems dative with *adnabam*, but genitive with *tuta*.

In: *ne turbata volent rapidis ludibria ventis* (6. 75) we have *rapidis ventis* in a threefold relation, to *turbata* as an ablative of cause, to *volent* as an instrumental ablative of the way along which, and to *ludibria* as a dative. So in: *da, non indebita posco, regna meis fatis Latio considerare Teucros* (6. 66-7) *meis fatis* is a dative with *da* and *indebita*, and an ablative with *considerare* for: *ex meis fatis*. The pregnancy of meaning involved in such constructions is plainly part of the poet's aim, and in *sermo* little attention is paid to grammatical categories like the dative and ablative; indeed it may be questioned whether the term: *ablativus* had come into use in Virgil's day, though the tradition is that it was devised by Caesar. But the important thing in relation to amphibole is evidently identity of form; and the dative and ablative are identical in form always in the plural, and very often in the singular.

Not that this confusion in grammatical categories is confined to these two cases. We have a like confusion between the feminine singular and the neuter plural in: *non adversata petenti adnuat* (4. 127), where we may take *adversata* as the neuter plural, the object of *adnuat*, and as the feminine singular in agreement with *Venus*, its subject. This is exactly parallel to the amphibole which Servius notices in: *classica iamque sonat* (7. 637); his note is: *bene posuit amphiboliam; nam classicum dicimus et tubam ipsam et sonum*. He clearly means that here too *classica* is both subject and object; and we must translate: 'the trumpets sound the war-notes'. When we remember the relation of the feminine singular to the neuter plural, how at this very time in popular speech most neuter plurals were becoming feminine singulars, a process we see in: *interea servitia repudiabat, cuius initio ad eum magnae copiae concurrebant* (Sall. Cat. 56. 5), we shall not be surprised to find in Virgil's verse unequivocal signs of this tendency.

A note of Servius to: sic te ut posita crudelis abessem? (Aen. 4. 681) expresses doubt whether crudelis refers to Anna or Dido, i.e. whether it is nominative or vocative. To: nomine Dido saepe vocaturum (4. 383) his note is: Dido potest et vocativus esse et accusativus. In: ille ictum venientem a vertice velox praevidit (5. 444) he sees that velox may agree with ille, or may be the accusative of cognate notion with venientem, giving the sense of velociter. In: sed magnum metuens se post cratera tegebat (9. 346) it seems well to take magnum with cratera as well as with metuens. Virgil's Latin is still a living language, and not intended merely as a mental gymnastic virginibus puerisque; and the Roman grammarians recognize in him this tendency to ambiguity which our scholars are at such pains to ignore. In: meritumque malis advertite numen (4. 611) our scholars take malis as neuter; Servius's note to meritum is: quod mali merentur, clearly indicating an amphibole in: malis. To: Acrisioe Danae fundasse colonis (7. 410) Servius's note is that Acrisioe here is the patronymic of Danae, and not to be joined with colonis; the position of these words at the beginning and end of the verse is clear proof to me that his negative is wrong, just as the juxtaposition of Acrisioe and Danae prove him right in his positive assertion.

In: ille agmine longo . . . serpens (5. 90-1) with ille we may supply anguis from v. 84; but it is far more consonant with Virgil's style to take serpens both as substantive and as verb. In: se . . . aufert, linquens multa metu cunctantem et multa parantem dicere. Suscipiunt famulae collapsaque membra . . . referunt (4. 389-92), to which Servius's note reads: multi pro 'relinquens Aeneam', alii pro 'deficiens' accipi volunt more antiquo, sicut 'delinquere' pro 'deficere', it is plain that from linquens we must supply linquentis with suscipiunt membra; the linquens expressed is for relinquens, but the linquentis to be supplied is for delinquentis 'fainting'. To: adsit laetitia Bacchus dator (1. 734) Servius notes: bene autem addidit dator laetitia, quia est et dator furoris. But the obvious construction of laetitia is not that of genitive with dator, but of dative with adsit. To: quantum summae curtabit quisque dierum? (Sat. 2. 3. 124) Acron notes: de summa curtabit, from which it is clear that summae is an amphibole, being for the genitive dependent on quantum, and the dative dependent on curtabit; quantum summae curtabit is short for: quantum summae summae decurtabit. But in: stridor ferri tractaeque catenae (Aen. 6. 558), where Servius notes that catenae may be a genitive singular or a nominative plural, there is probably no shortening, and the amphibole is in the ambiguity. In: et pater ipse suo superum iam signat honore (6. 780) Servius makes superum the accusative singular with signat; in reality it has a threefold relation, being also the genitive plural with pater and with honore, as their position at the beginning and end of the verse clearly indicates. So in: arserit Euhadne flammis iniecta mariti (Mart. 4. 75. 5) flammis is to be joined with arserit as well as with iniecta mariti.

But the variety in meaning marking the amphibole may depend, not on a confusion of inflexions, or even of parts of speech. In: his informatum manibus iam parte polita fulmen erat (8. 426) one of the meanings of manus was that we have in: nos aera, manus, navalia demus (11. 329), a sense exactly paralleled in English. Such uses involve a lack of propriety of meaning, that is a distinctive mark of Latin poetry as opposed to Latin prose. In: quare age et armari pubem portisque moveri laetus in arma para (7. 429-30) Servius notes that laetus cannot be properly used here of Turnus, who has just been deprived of his promised bride; it is, he thinks, for alacer; for: alacer quamvis tristis, perhaps we might better phrase it. In a fourfold union not reduced to an amphibole we have a like ambiguity in: quam pro me (i.e. pro vita mea) curam geris, hanc precor, optime, pro me (i.e. pro mea fama) deponas (12. 48-9).

In:

ea vox audita laborum

Prima tulit finem, primamque loquentis ab ore

Eripuit pater ac stupefactus numine pressit (7. 117-19),

at first sight we seem to have a repetition of prima and primam in a slightly altered sense; 'not till then' and 'at the first' Sidgwick proposes. But a glance at v. 116 shows that: mensas consumimus, the vox in question, was the last, not the first, that fell from the lips of Julius; but that his father was the first to catch it up and stay him from further speech; so that we should have: ultimamque loquentis ab ore eripuit pater primus, and primam here is an amphibole for ultimam primus. To go back to: patulis nec parcere quadris (v. 115), the bread bitten into is described as orbis in v. 114, but is here called quadra to elaborate the jest in: mensas consumimus; for quadra 'the square' is a word used for a table as well as for a loaf, as we see in: ut bona summa putes aliena vivere quadra (Juv. 5. 2). The prayer Aeneas offers for the consummation of the omen is followed by this sign from highest Jove:

Hic pater omnipotens ter caelo clarus ab alto

Intonuit, radiisque ardentem lucis et auro

Ipse manu quatiens ostendit ab aethere nubem (vv. 141-3).

Here *clarus* is both of the sound of the thunder-peal and of the bright glow of the cloud from which the lightning flashes. So in: *ne populum extrema totiens exoret harena* (Ep. 1. 1. 6) most scholars translate *extrema harena* ‘from the arena’s edge’, but Lucian Müller calls attention to the fact that it was customary to ask for the *missio* at the close of the performance. Evidently we have an *amphibole* in *extrema*, which Müller does not suspect however. So in: *dicta tibi est lex* (Ep. 2. 2. 18), where some translate ‘you were told the conditions of sale’, some ‘you have your law’, we have an *amphibole* in *lex*.

So too in: *quam sedem somnia volgo vana tenere ferunt* (Aen. 6. 283) Servius’s note is: *volgo* temere, passim, catervatim; aut *volgo* ferunt. *Volgo* he connects with *tenere* in the sense of ‘in swarms’, and with *ferunt* in the sense: ‘the common report is’. In: *nec dis nec viribus aequis* (5. 809), while the meaning of *viribus aequis* is plain, Servius explains: *nec dis aequis* as: *dis iniquis*, i.e. *adversis*. So in: *quin et supremo cum lumine vita reliquit* (6. 735), which Mackail translates: ‘when the last ray of life has gone’, we may recall the use of *lumine* in: *vix lumine quarto* (6. 356), and translate: ‘when on their last day life has departed with its latest ray’. In: *nec dextrae erranti deus afuit* (7. 498) ‘a present deity suffered not his hand to stray’ (Mackail), while we connect *neque* with *erranti* as well as with *afuit*—a very obvious *amphibole*—we should also regard: *dextrae erranti* as short for: *dextrae iuvenis errantis*, and recall: *ille . . . errabat silvis* (v. 491); when we must translate: ‘nor did the fury, on hand for mischief, allow the shaft of the roving youth to miss its mark’. To: *saevit medio in certamine Mavors caelatus ferro* (8. 701) Servius’s note is: *caelatus ferro*, aut in armis locatus, aut de ferro sculptus; either ‘clad in mail’ or ‘chased in steel’. In: *supposta furto Pasiphae* (6. 24) Servius explains *supposta furto* as: *furtim inclusa in vaccam ligneam*, where *furto* is for *dolo*; but he also explains *furto* as for *adulterio*, comparing: *Martis dolos et dulcia furta* (Geo. 4. 346), when *furto* is no longer an ablative of manner but a dative of goal with *supposta*. In:

A quo post Itali fluvium cognomine Thybrim

Diximus; amisit verum vetus Albula nomen (Aen. 8. 331-2),

we are at first inclined to take *cognomine* in the general sense it has in: *clari cognominis Albam* (8. 48), but we presently find that the *cognomen* *Thybris* is opposed to the *verum nomen* *Albula*. *Cognomen* really means nickname (= eke name), and we get its force here best if we supply this: *quo cognomine adsumpto amisit verum nomen*. In:

Talibus Aeneadae donis dictisque Latini

Sublimes in equis redeunt (7. 284-5),

it is clear that *sublimes* is to be joined with: *donis dictisque* ‘gifts and promises’ as well as with: *in equis*, and is really short for *elati et sublimes*. So in:

At pius Aeneas ingenti mole sepulcrum

Imponit, suaque arma viro remumque tubamque (6. 232-3),

*imponit* is short for: *imponit, ubi insculpsit*; and we have passed to *zeugma*.

In: *si quis bella tibi terra pugnata marique dicat* (Ep. 1. 16. 25) *tibi* has been removed from *dicat* and given a place next to *bella pugnata marique* to afford a shadow of excuse for the mistake Horace assumes the hearer might make in imagining that he, and not Augustus, is the hero referred to in *tibi*. In: *quattuor a stabulis praestanti corpore tauros avertit* (Aen. 8. 208) in *avertit* at first the reader will see only the usual meaning of ‘drives off’, the meaning Catullus transfers in sport from the ram to the fleece in: *auratam optantes Colchis avertere pellem* (64. 5); but as he reads on: *atque hos . . . cauda in speluncam tractos versisque viarum indicibus raptos* (vv. 210-11), he sees that by this use of *avertit* Virgil was paving the way to present his reader with this picture of Cacus dragging the cattle by their tails into his den. In: *alte consternunt terram concusso stipite frondes* (4. 443) the manuscripts have *altae*, but both Macrobius and Servius read *alte*, and Servius explains it as: *iugiter, diu; aut ex alto cadentes*. We may adopt the reading of the scholiast, while we remember how often *ae* and *e* are confused in manuscripts, and take care never to read *altae* as if it were written *altai*, a thing Virgil was plainly never guilty of. Evidently there is an *amphibole* in *alte*, which we shall understand if we restore: *altae consternunt terram concusso stipite alte concussae frondes* ‘thick strew the ground the leaves shaken from on high from the shaken trunk’. More difficult is:

Ergo iter inceptum celerant rumore secundo.

Labitur uncta vadis abies (8. 90-1).

In the last phrase we have an *amphibole* in *uncta*, which when connected with *abies* has the meaning of *picta*, but when

joined with *labitur*, that of *celeriter*. But the real difficulty is in the reading: *Rumone secundo*, which Servius does not adopt in his text because of its difficulty, though he attempts to explain it. Many of our modern scholars explain: *rumore secundo*, as though it were like: *clamore secundo* (10. 266) but we can readily see how far from probable this is, when we consider that they are rowing up an unknown river through a land swarming with hostile Latins. Some understand it as for: *cursu secundo*, *rumore* being the subdued murmur of the current round the keel; but I have no parallel to this use. Servius does not venture even so far as this; he explains *rumore secundo* as *bona fama*, since they avoided depredations on the banks. Did they really?—we seem to recall a story of a *sus alba cum fetu*, told just before this. We have the reading: *Rumone secundo* not merely in Servius, but in the *Codex Meliceus* and the *Romanus*, where the *n* has been corrected to *r* by a later hand. *Rumon*, the oldest name of the Tiber, Virgil gives us nowhere else; and from his usual practice it seems likely that he would find a place in his poem for this name. But the course of the boat is not down the Tiber, *flumine secundo*, but up the Tiber, *flumine adverso*. This objection is obviated by the meaning of *celerant*, which is here, for *celerare videntur*, an ambiguity. Servius meets the objection thus: *descendentis celeritate prope conscendit*; and he cites Statius about the *discus*: *ille citus sublime petit, similisque cadenti crescit in adversum* (*Theb.* 6. 682-3) ‘swift it makes for the sky, and with all the speed of a falling object it progresses in the opposite direction’. He means that such is the speed of the Tiber’s downward sweep, that the rowers feel, as they breast the current, that they are speeding rapidly on—a play on appearance opposed to reality quite in Virgil’s style. We may compare the arrow which: *celeres incognita transilit umbras* (*Aen.* 12. 859); it is not the shades that are swift, but the shaft that bounds unperceived across them.

We have this amphibole extended to threefold use in: *hic gravis Entellum dictis castigat Acestes* (5. 387), where when joined with *Acestes gravis* means ‘stately’, with *dictis* ‘lofty’ or ‘dignified’, and with *castigat* ‘severe’. So in:

*I nunc, ingratis offer te, inrise, periclis;  
Tyrrenas i sterne acies, tege pace Latinos* (7. 425-6),

*ingratis* with *offer te* is ‘against thy inclination’, with *periclis* ‘that bring thee no thanks’, and with *tege pace* ‘without gratitude from them’.

## XXXVI

### ZEUGMA

THE ascendancy of Virgil among the ancients and in the Middle Ages seems to have been due, not merely to his poetical genius, but to his supremacy in the learning of his day. He was not merely a great epic poet; he was universally believed to be a master in grammar, oratory, philosophy, theology, mythology, history, astronomy, magic, to such a degree that in the Middle Ages he was held to be the Master Magician. Throughout the Renaissance and the consequent advance of learning and literature in modern Europe he continued to hold a supreme place: Dante, Petrarch, Bossuet, Addison, Burke were among his devoted students; and it was only with the revival of classical studies in Germany in the nineteenth century that his claim to supremacy even among Latin poets began to be questioned. The obvious cause of this revolt, I read in Professor Sellar’s *Virgil* (p. 74), ‘is the great advance made in Greek scholarship during the present century’. Perhaps, if this had been associated with a like advance in Latin scholarship, Virgil’s reputation might have fared better. Of course we do not expect to trace in his poems the discoveries of Newton, or Dalton, or Tyndall; though the way in which Lucretius’s great poem has been illustrated by some of these is striking enough. But we do expect to find him abreast with the science which an average man of his day or ours can acquire by the exercise of his senses unaided by further instruments of precision, and by an average intellect. Now Virgil, I have been told, believed and recorded in his great epic that the moon rises in the west at the beginning of the month. For we read:

*quam Troïus heros,  
Ut primum iuxta stetit, agnovitque per umbram  
Obscuram, qualem primo qui surgere mense  
Aut videt aut vidisse putat per nubila lunam,  
Demisit lacrimas* (*Aen.* 6. 451-5).

There you have it:

*primo qui surgere mense*



## Aut videt aut vidisse putat per nubila lunam

But why: *aut videt aut vidisse putat surgere*? The expression seems to indicate two classes of observers; and we seem to have here an example of the threefold union, which we have so often been able to trace back to an older fourfold one. Does *surgere* mean the same with *videt* as with *vidisse putat*? Let us turn back to the nearest use of that verb; in: *per spes surgentis Iuli* (v. 364) surely the idea is not: *ex solio surgentis*, but rather: *in adulescentiam crescentis*. And what is there so novel or unheard of in associating *crescens* with *luna*? Why then not take *surgere* in its sense of *crescere* with *videt*? and in its usual sense with *vidisse putat*? He who casts a momentary and careless glance westward on the evening the new moon appears, and again a couple of evenings later, thinks he sees the new moon rising in the west; she is now much higher than when he saw her *primo mense*. But with him who really sees the case is different; and we have plainly a case here, where we can restore the old fourfold union: *aut videt lunam crescere, aut vidisse putat lunam surgere*. *Surgere* is the second of the pair, the term usually retained in the shortened form; and Virgil likes to surprise his reader. But in this threefold union, resulting from the expression of *crescere* and *surgere* by *surgere*, we have a fine example of the figure we call *zeugma*, an example which helps us to understand its development.

The examination of a second example, which has not been recognized as *zeugma*, and does not quite agree with the definition of the figure usually given, may be of interest, especially as it seems to solve a puzzling passage in the *Annals*. We read: *tum consultatum de honoribus, ex quis maxime insignes visi, ut porta triumphali duceretur funus, Gallus Asinius; ut legum latarum tituli, victarum ab eo gentium vocabula anteferrentur, L. Arruntius censuere* (1. 8. 4). Scholars have feared to trust the manuscripts here; Nipperdey wanted to omit *visi*, and Bezenberger to supply *qui* after *quis*, not seeing that both *quis* and *visi* naturally refer back to *honores*, and not forward to *Asinius* and *Arruntius*. After *visi* Tacitus gives the two decrees that he thought most important about Augustus's funereal honours in a form that seems but slightly varied from that in which they would appear in the *Acta Senatus*. There they would probably be recorded: *ut porta triumphali funus ducatur: Q. Asinius Gallus censuit. Ut legum latarum ab imperatore tituli, gentium victarum nomina anteferantur: L. Arruntius censuit*. Tacitus has made some verbal changes and alterations more suo, but his main change in syntax was to bring the two censuits together and make of them a single *censuerunt*. He had already composed a sentence closely parallel in a most important part of his work: *initium mihi operis Servius Galba iterum Titus Vinius consules erunt* (Hist. 1. 1. 1). Of course this is far from Cicero's style; but nothing in the *Annals* is in Cicero's style. It is clear that in the use of *censuere* here we have a second, and in some respects a simpler, form of *zeugma*, a form depending on variation, not in the word itself, but in its inflexions.

Let us begin with this form. *Zeugma* (τὸ ζεύγμα) is primarily the same as the Latin *iugum* 'the yoke'; and Liddell and Scott define it for grammar as the figure of speech wherein two subjects are used jointly with the same predicate, which strictly belongs only to one of them. The last clause does not fit some of the most striking *zeugmas*, as e.g. that I have just given; and we shall see that the structure of the figure is often threefold: i.e. three subjects are joined with a common predicate, which, while fitting all three in a measure, does not fit any one exactly. Ruddiman (II. p. 362 ff. cur. Stallbaum) deals with *zeugma* at some length, and defines it: *cum adiectivum vel verbum diversis nominibus substantivis adiunctum cum propiore expresse convenit, alteri, sed mutatis accidentibus, intelligendum*. To the: *cum propiore* he notes many exceptions, without finding a reason for them, and he is content to confine *zeugma* to this simplest and least interesting form of it, where the change is merely of the *accidentia* or inflexions.

He gives us examples of *zeugma* for gender in: *et genus et virtus nisi cum re vilior alga est* (Sat. 2. 5. 8), *eis otium, divitiae, optandae aliis, oneri miseriaeque fuere* (Sall. Cat. 10. 2); for number in: *hic illius arma, hic currus fuit* (Aen. 1. 16), *mediocres poetas nemo novit, bonos pauci* (Tac. Or. 10. 1); for person in: *paene ille timore, ego risu corruui* (Cic. Q. Fr. 2. 9 (8). 2), *cum hoc tempore nihilo magis ego, quam vos, subsidio Domitio ire possim* (Att. 8. 12a. 3). But we have it also for tense in: *hos tibi dant calamos . . . Ascraeo quos ante seni* (Buc. 6. 70), for mood in: *nisi facient, quae illos aequomst* (Ter. Ad. 454). It is not unusual in cases of nouns used as adjuncts of the predicate, as in: *conveniunt . . . flumina . . . nescia gratentur (parenti) consolenturne parentem* (Ov. Met. 1. 578), *imitari (bonos) quam invidere bonis malebant* (Sall. Cat. 51. 38), *cum ego unaquaque de re dicam, et (unamquamque rem) diluam* (Cic. Cluent. 6. 2), *quem neque pudet quidquam nec metuit quemquam* (Ter. Ad. 84).

The old grammarians classified *zeugma* according to its position as (1) *Protozeugma*, as in: *tutatur favor Euryalum lacrimaeque decorae* (Aen. 5. 343); (2) *Mesozeugma*, as in: *caper tibi salvus et haedi* (Buc. 7. 9); (3) *Hypozeugma*, as in: *quamvis ille niger, quamvis tu candidus esses* (Buc. 2. 16). Of these the *Mesozeugma* is the most interesting form; for in: *caper tibi salvus et haedi*, we trace at once the fourfold form in its most common order, though there is no difficulty in

reaching: tutatur favor Euryalum, tutanturque lacrimae decorae, or: quamvis ille niger esset, quamvis tu candidus esses.

While in most cases the zeugma is in agreement with the nearest subject, as we read in his definition of it, Ruddiman sees that in some examples this is not so. In these examples if, following the order of the subjects, we supply the missing predicate, we shall see that in the exceptions it is the second term of the pair that is omitted, while in the regular forms it is the first. This agrees with the treatment by Horace and Virgil of Castor et Pollux and like pairs; and we have seen that in pairs of common names, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs it is usually the second that is expressed and the first that is omitted. So to take Ruddiman's examples of the exceptions: sic imperium adeptus populum Romanum, vel dicam humanum genus, voti compotem (compos) fecit (Suet. Cal. 13. 1), cum natura loci, tum dolo, ipsi atque signa militaria obscurati (obscurata) (Sall. Jug. 49. 5), ego populusque Romanus populis Priscorum Latinorum bellum indico (indicat) facio (facit)que (Liv. 1. 32. 13). But regular are: quis igitur illum consulem nisi latrones (putat) putant? (Cic. Phil. 4. 9. 4), nil hic nisi carmina (deest) desunt (Buc. 8. 67), sin opportunior fugae collis quam campi (fuerat) fuerant (Sall. Jug. 50. 6), talem nisi tu nulla (pareres) pareret filium (Ten Heaut. 1022). The number of exceptions is no doubt increased by the tendency in Latin to make the subject of the active verb a living sentient person; and so to prefer the first person to the second, as in: ego et rex meus, or: melius ego istud quam vos fecissem.

But in many cases we have a marked zeugma in the meaning of the verb when joined with its different objects, though the verb can be used with either of them in varying senses, nor is there any need of supplying another verb. To begin with a striking example: donec ira et dies permansit (Ann. 1. 68. 6) 'while their anger was still hot and the daylight lasted'; or: angit inhaerens elisos oculos et siccum sanguine guttur (Aen. 8. 260) 'holding him fast he squeezes his throat till it is drained of blood, and makes his eyes start out with his strangling grip'. So in: Pergama cum peteret inconcessosque hymenaeos (1. 651); while the meaning of petere varies widely in its union with Pergama and hymenaeos, its use with each is natural and usual. So in: ubi . . . finem portusque tenebunt Ausonios (9. 98), non opibus mentes hominum curaeque levantur (Tib. 3. 3. 21), pariterque anima et rotis expulit (Ov. Met. 2. 312), aedificiorum et hominum strages (Ann. 1. 76. 1), cibos et hortamina pugnantibus gestant (Germ. 7. 4), misceri cuncta tenebris et armis (Hist. 4. 29. 2). In: deus ipse faces animumque ministrat (Aen. 5. 640), where Ribbeck reads animam with the Codex Romanus, animum, the more spirited reading and that of the rest of the manuscripts, seems justified by Horace's: vinum, quod verba ministret (Ep. 1. 15. 20). Sidgwick sees a violent zeugma in: hi Fescenninas acies . . . hi Soractis habent arces (Aen. 7. 695-6) 'these form the lines . . . these hold the battlements'. But if Virgil uses acies in its primary meaning—its root is that of acer, and it meant 'edge' or 'topmost ridge'—there is not here even the simplest form of zeugma, and Virgil is laughing at his editors.

More highly figured seems the zeugma in: sola domum et tantas servabat filia sedes (7. 52) 'a daughter was the sole stay of the household and prop of so great a line'. In: hinc saevitiam centurionum et vacationes munerum redimi (Ann. 1. 17. 6) there is a marked opposition between buying what is pleasant and buying off cruelty. In: iam galeam Pallas et aegida currusque et rabiem parat (Od. 1. 15. 12) we have a fourfold zeugma: Pallas fits on her helmet, buckles on her shield, harnesses her chariot, and whets her wrath. But only in the last verb do we feel that the prose must be different, probably incendit. So in: iam parce sepulto, parce pias scelerare manus (Aen. 3. 41-2) we have a close approach to a formal zeugma: noli is the proper prose word for which parce in the second clause is in poetic use. Hendiadys seems involved in: fugam Dido sociosque parabat (1. 360) for: socios Dido parabat fugitura, in: castra . . . aciemque movebat (11. 446) for: ex castris suos in aciem ducebat, in: quo (vultu) caelum tempestatesque serenat (1. 255) for: caelum tempestatibus turbatum serenat. Servius tells us there is a hysteron proteron in: moresque viris et moenia ponet (1. 264), where I am led to believe from Propertius's use of: ponere iura (3. 9. 24) that ponere mores too was in use in colloquial Latin.

While in the examples just quoted there is a marked zeugma or yoke of meanings combined in a single verb, in most the verb is capable of expressing each of them with propriety, and we feel no need of calling up in our minds another verb to represent fully and exactly the idea intended. But in the examples that follow we do feel such a need, and the careful reader usually does supply a second verb. The simplest form of zeugma here seems that presented in: Irim demisit Olympo quae luctantem animam (solveret) nexosque resolveret artus (Aen. 4. 695); for in poetry the prefix is often omitted where it is needed, and at times is expressed where it is superfluous. We have further examples of this kind in: Iliacas igitur classes (sequar) atque ultima Teucrum iussa (ex)sequar? (4. 538), protinus et graves iras (condonabo) et invisum nepotem . . . Marti redonabo (Od. 3. 3. 33), dum terras (incolunt) hominumque (ex)colunt genus (Ep. 2. 1. 7), et consulti patres integrum id negotium ad imperatorem (referendum) distulerant (Ann. 3. 52. 3). I have already spoken of:

haud igitur quidquam procedere posset, principium quoniam (pro)cedendi (cedendo) nulla daret res (Lucr. 1. 338-9), where I will ask my reader to compare vv. 372, 378, 379, and especially v. 374, which may well be short for: quo possint cedentes (procedentibus) confluere undae. We have a parallel to Ep. 2. 1. 7 in: luce demum, postquam dux et miles (internoscebantur) et facta (cog)noscebantur (Ann. 1. 39. 8).

But in many cases different verbs must be supplied. In: virginis os (habens), habitumque gerens et virginis arma (Aen. 1. 315), while habere seems proper for the person and gerere for what is worn, yet such uses as: formam similem gerit (Lucr. 4. 50) or: umbrata gerunt civili tempora quercu (Aen. 6. 772) make me hesitate to affirm that a Roman would supply a second verb here. So in: quem sese ore ferens, quam forti pectore et armis (se gerens) (4. 11). We have a pair of verbs standing in the relation of cause and effect represented by that which expresses the cause in: crudeles aras (ostendit) traiectaque pectora ferro nudavit (1. 356); Sychaeus had trusted the sanctity of altars that should have been sacred, and so fell a ready victim to Pygmalion, is my reading of Servius's note: *crudeles*: epitheton hoc de causa est, nam arae piaae sunt. So too in: longa tibi exsilia (ferenda) et vastum maris aequor arandum (2. 780), inclusos utero Danaos (liberat) et pinea furtim laxat claustra Sinon (2. 259), vocemque volens (emittit) atque ora resolvit (3. 457), disce puer virtutem ex me . . . fortunam (pete) ex aliis (12. 435). It seems the effect in: quod litore currum (evertere) et iuvenem monstis pavidi effudere marinis (7. 780), his fretus non legatos (praemisi) neque prima per artem temptamenta tui pepigi (8. 144), Tyrrhenamque fidem (sollicitare) aut gentes agitare quietas (10. 71), instans operi regnisque futuris (providens) (1. 504).

We have a single verb representing a pair that denote concomitant elements in the course of an action in: sic memorans umeros (amplectebatur) dextrasque tenebat amborum (9. 250), Phrygios . . . duces (interfice) pictasque exure carinas (7. 431), caeruleae cui terga notae (variabant) maculosus et auro squamam incendebat fulgor (5. 88), neu magis irae vestrae (pareatis) quam famae consulatis (Sall. Cat. 51. 8), tunc Arminius . . . reciperatam libertatem trucidatas legiones (commemorabat), spolia adhuc et tela Romanis derepta in manibus multorum ostentabat (Ann. 2. 45. 4), ius naturae (commemorant), labores educandi adversus fraudem et artes et brevitatem adoptionis enumerant (Ann. 15. 19. 2). We have a double zeugma in: consistere iussis militibus Italiam ostentat subiectosque . . . campos, (docet) moeniaque eos tum transcendere non Italiae modo, sed etiam urbis Romanae (conscendere) (Liv. 21. 35. 8). We have a threefold zeugma in: illa tibi Italiae populos (enumerabit) venturaque bella (narrabit) et quo quemque modo fugiasque ferasque laborem expediet (Aen. 3. 458-9) and one far more involved in: quod scelus aut Lapithas tantum (committentes), aut (quo scelere commisso) Calydonia (tantas poenas) merentem? (7. 307).

In prayer or intercession to a lord or conqueror on earth or to a god in heaven a common posture is that represented in: et duplices tendens ad sidera palmas talia voce refert (1. 93). In silent prayer it is the eyes that are raised with the hands, and when the hands are bound we have:

Ad caelum tendens ardentia lumina frustra,  
Lumina, nam teneras arcebant vincula palmas (2. 405-6),

where tollens would be the proper verb with lumina, but tendens with palmas. So we have tendo for tollo et tendo in:

illi has ego voces  
Qua datur, hasque manus . . . a litore tendo (Val. Fl. 7. 269-70).

But more usual is the form we see in:

Et duplices cum voce manus ad sidera tendit (Aen. 10. 667),

and:

tendoque supinas  
Ad caelum cum voce manus (3. 176-7),

where cum voce is subordinated to manus, as we should expect when tendo alone is expressed. In: caelo palmas cum voce tetendit (2. 688) we have the same order we find in: manus ac supplices voces ad Tiberium tendens (Ann. 2. 29. 2), where the verb belongs to the more distant object; we have it with the nearer object in: liberti etiam ac servi patrono vel domino, cum voces, cum manus intentarent, ultro metuebantur (3. 36. 1). But we have the verb belonging to the more distant object in: nec patris Anchisae cineres manesve revelli (Aen. 4. 427) for: cineres revelli manesque laesi; quin potius pacem aeternam pactosque hymenaeos exercemus? (4. 100) for: pacem exercemus et hymenaeos inimus; dedit iura quis pace et principe uteremur (Ann. 3. 28. 3) for: quis usi pace et principe frueremur.

In: sperat infestis, metuit secundis alteram sortem bene praeparatum pectus (Od. 2. 10. 13-14) we have a fourfold union

expressed in full, of which we might have expected the related terms *infestis . . . secundis* to be expressed by the second term. In: *quod arduum sibi (sumpsit), cetera legatis permisit* (Ann. 2. 20. 2) we have a fourfold union thus reduced, giving a zeugma where the verb is used to express its opposite as well. We have similar zeugmas, where the verb expresses its opposite in part or in full, in: *seu pacem (agam) seu bella geram* (Aen. 9. 279), *nec iam amplius armis (rem gerere), sed votis precibusque iubent exposcere pacem* (3. 260-1), *saepe (festinabat) velut qui currebat fugiens hostem, persaepe (incedebat) velut qui Iunonis sacra ferret* (Sat. 1. 3. 10), *demigrant Helicone deae quatiuntque novena lampade sollemnem thalamis coeuntibus ignem et de Pieriis (spargunt) vocalem fontibus undam* (Slat. Silv. 1. 2. 4-6), *nam sicut (non licuit) durare in hanc beatissimi saeculi lucem . . . ita festinatae mortis grande solacium tulit* (Tac. Agric. 44. 5), *utque ad fallendum silentio (agebant), ita coepta caede, quo plus terroris adderent, cuncta clamoribus miscebant* (Hist. 5. 22. 3), *datum id non modo precibus Artabani, sed (additum) contumeliae Pisonis* (Ann. 2. 58. 3), *simul nobilitatem domus (laudibus extulit), etiam ipsius quoquo modo meriti gravem casum miseratus* (3. 17. 1), *Agrippina, quae filio dare imperium (ausa est), tolerare imperitantem nequibat* (12. 64. 6).

In many zeugmas we find a use of the special for the general, a use highly conducive to poetic vividness; with one of the subjects is joined a verb denoting a special form peculiar to it of the action in question, and this special form is understood with the subject or subjects to which it does not properly belong. We have examples of this in: *retia rara, plagae, lato venabula ferro, Massylique ruunt equites et odora canum vis* (Aen. 4. 131-2), where *ruunt*, used with *equites*, cannot be properly joined with *retia* or *venabula*, with which we must understand *cito efferuntur*. So in: *inceptoque (perseverat) et sedibus haeret in isdem* (2. 654), *nunc hos, nunc illos aditus (tentat) omnemque pererrat arte locum* (5. 441), *hic thalamum invasit natae velitosque (iniit) hymenaeos* (6. 623), *ut celsas videre rates (adire) atque inter opacum adlabi nemus* (8. 108), *non ut tela tamen (iaceret), non ut contenderet arcum* (12. 815), *haec Proteus, et se iactu dedit aequor in altum . . . at non Cyrene (filium reliquit)* (Geo. 4. 528-30), *coniurata tuas rumpere nuptias et (evertere) regnum Priami vetus* (Od. 1. 15. 7), *Esquilias quidem ab hoste prope captas (nemo defendit), et scandentem in aggerem Volscum hostem nemo submovit* (Liv. 3. 67. 11), *Thraecias urbes (visit), mox Propontidis angustias et os Ponticum intrat* (Ann. 2. 54. 2), *primo boves ipsos, mox agros (dedebant), postremo corpora coniugum aut liberorum servitio tradebant* (4. 72. 4), *grates dis (agens), atque ipsam recentis casus fortunam celebrans* (15. 34. 2).

The opposite of this use of the special for the general was to be expected; and we have some interesting examples of it. In:

qui numina Phoebi,  
Qui tripodas, Clarii laurus, qui sidera sentis  
Et volucrum linguas et praepetis omina pennae (Aen. 3. 359-61),

we have a fourfold zeugma, where the general term *sentis*, though not properly adapted to union with any one of its objects, is used to represent four verbs, which with Servius's aid I venture to express thus: *qui numina Phoebi suscipis, qui oracula Pythii nosti, qui astrologiae peritus es, et volucrum linguas et pennae praepetis omnibus calles augur*. In the following examples I have set in brackets the special verbs for which the general verb seems to be used: *quos lucos et aquae (subterfluunt) subeunt et aurae (perflant)* (Od. 3. 4. 8), *iura (dant) magistratusque (creant) legunt sanctumque senatum* (Aen. 1. 426), where Virgil has the verb usually selected by the beginner for his Latin prose, *sacra (fert) manu victosque deos, parvumque nepotem ipse (ducit) trahit* (2. 320), *scalae improviso (adportatae) subitusque (adlatus est) adparuit ignis* (12. 576), *ne tenues pluviae (diluunt) rapidive potentia solis (exurat) acrior, aut Boreae penetrabile frigus (congelet) adurat* (Geo. 1. 92-3). With this use of *adurat* for *congelet* we may compare: *quam . . . canis urebat Luna pruinis* (Val. Fl. 2. 287), and further note that etymologists seem to find a common root for the Latin *calidus* or *caldus*, and the German *kalt*, our cold.

This curious form of zeugma is that most favoured by Tacitus, who begins in: *ita qui olim boni aeque Cherusci (laudabantur), nunc inertes et stulti (culpantur) vocantur* (Germ. 36. 2) with an easy and simple example of it. I have noted the following in the first two books of the Annals: *qui iudicium (habuit) et poenas in hunc modum (sumpsit) exercuit* (1. 44. 3) following Virgil's: *laeva malorum exercet poenas* (6. 542), *quia Romanis Germanisque idem conducere (putabam), et pacem quam bellum (malebam) probabam* (1. 58. 2), *cunctos adloquio et cura sibi (conciliabat) et proelio (con)firmabat* (1. 71. 5), *sed Maroboduum regis nomen invisum apud populares (reddebat), Arminium pro libertate bellantem favor (sequebatur) habebat* (2. 44. 3).

Thus far we have been dealing with zeugma, as though it had to do only with the verb. But the present and past

participles of the verb are often used as adjectives, as in: *umentes oculos et pallida bracchia tendens* (Ov. Met. 14. 734), or: *arte laboratae vestes ostroque superbo (pictae)* (Aen. 1. 639), an example of zeugma with the past participle. We have further examples of this in: *pallam signis (variatam) auroque rigentem* (1. 648), *tumulum, viridi quem caespitem inanem (exstructum) et geminas, causam lacrimis (exstructas), sacraverat aras* (3. 304-5), *ipse Quirinali lituo (praeditus), parvaque sedebat succinctus trabea, laevaue ancile gerebat Picus* (7. 187-8), *quem pellis ahenis in plumam squamis (composita et) auro conserta tegebat* (11. 771). In: *videre rates . . . inter opacum adlabi nemus et tacitos (remiges) incumbere remis* (8. 108) from *rates adlabi* we must imply *remiges* (= *remigantes*) with *incumbere*.

We have already noticed how in poetry the noun is often substituted for the verb, and that in the prose of Tacitus this substitution is common. So in: *fidem atque pericula polliceantur* (Ann. 2. 40. 3) we should expect: *se fidos fore atque audaces polliceantur*. In: *mederetur fessis, neu mortem in isdem laboribus, sed finem tam exercitae militiae neque inopem requiem orabant* (1. 35. 2) *mortem, finem, requiem* are used as co-ordinate with *mederetur*. So in: *praeda famaue onusti* (12. 28. 1) and: *ordinem agminis disiecti per iram ac tenebras* (Hist. 3. 22. 2) we have examples of our first variety of zeugma not dependent on inflexion; and in: *Inachus Acrisiusque patres mediaeque Mycenae (patria)* (Aen. 7. 372) one dependent on likeness of meaning and derivation.

In: *diversis animorum motibus pavebant terrebantque* (Ann. 1. 25. 2), where for: *metuendo et minando* Tacitus substitutes a general term: *diversis animorum motibus*, we have a good example of our last class favoured by Tacitus. In:

*vides quae maxima credis*

*Esse mala, exiguum censum turpemque repulsam*

*Quanto devites animi capitisque labore* (Ep. 1. 1. 42-44),

for the general term *labore* we must substitute: *dolore et periculo* to restore the fourfold union, balancing them with: *exiguum censum turpemque repulsam*. Here *animi dolore* must be related to *exiguum censum*, and is fully described in vv. 45-6, while *capitis periculo* is the risk run to avoid a disgraceful defeat in an election (*turpem repulsam*), having nothing to do with loss of life in Horace's day, and referring merely to the loss of *caput* or civic status consequent on a conviction for bribery. *Dolore* and *periculo* both appear as readings for *labore* in the manuscripts of Acron, whose note: *vis etiam mori propter honorem*, seems to have misled some of our editors.

## XXXVII

### HYPALLAGE

To: *nube candentes umeros amictus augur Apollo* (Od. 1. 2. 31) Acron's note is: *nube candentes*. *Melius candenti nube, quam candentes umeros, amictus*. *Candidis nubibus velatus, scilicet qui videri possis; irati enim di nequeunt conspici*. Hauthal wishes, with the usual wisdom of the emendator, to change *irati* to *velati*; but it is easy to believe that when the gods, like Tennyson's Hera, grow angry, they withdraw from human view 'into the golden cloud'. Bentley thinks that Acron wishes to change Horace's text here from *candentes* to *candenti*, and pleads that the resulting hiatus makes this impossible. But from Acron's note it is perfectly plain that *candentes* was the reading he found in his manuscripts, as it is in the best we have. As regards the meaning, it is true that the gods wrap themselves in clouds to hide from mortal view, if we may believe the ancients. Homer represents this in: *νεφέλη εἰλυμένος ὄμους* (Il. 5. 186), and Virgil in: *Venus obscuro faciem circumdata nimbo* (Aen. 12. 416), But that, as the gods were hidden from mortals *obscuro nimbo*, so they could be revealed to them *candenti nube*,—the contradiction revolts Bentley, *Hoc tamen inepte incommodeque, ut nihil supra*. So he turns resolutely from the *candenti nube* of Acron to the *candentes umeros* of the Sungod, and seeks a parallel in other shining objects that the Roman poets present, the *candidos lacertos* of Tibullus's Pholoe, and the *candidos umeros* of Horace's Lydia. Shall we join in his refrain: *hoc tam apte quam nihil supra*?

For we may feel that Lydia's shoulder-polish was a little different from the radiance that made the shoulders of the favouring god visible to his worshippers. And it is to show us the source of this radiance that Acron draws our attention to the shining cloud, which as it enwraps a modern saint or angel, our worshippers to-day, strangely enough, term a *nimbus*. Acron feels that from *candentes umeros* we must imply *candenti* with *nube*; for from the shining cloud comes the light that reveals to mortals the beneficent deity, who when angered veils himself in the *nimbus* or storm-cloud. So the threefold: *nube candentes umeros* goes back to a fourfold: *nube candenti candentes umeros*; the epithet *candens* belongs

rather to the nubes, the source of the radiance, than to the umeri, which the radiance lights up. This seems the meaning of Acron's *melius*; *candenti* would be better in prose, and it is prose he is writing in his notes. The epithet *candens* is transferred by the poet from *nubes* to *umeri*; and by this reduction of a fourfold union to three we get the figure of the transferred epithet, the most usual form of hypallage.

Of the nature and origin of this transference Bentley has no idea, nor does he always recognize it when he meets it. In: *iam tibi lividos distinguet Auctumnus racemos purpureo variis colore* (Od. 2. 5. 10-12) he rejects the manuscript reading just given, as well as Lambinus's emendation to: *purpureus vario*, and gives us in *purpureo variis* the plain prose to which his nature directs him. Here the poet gives Auctumnus a purple complexion, because he changes the grapes to purple, just as with the poet *atra mors* passes to *pallida mors* because of the pallor of the dead. It is the fourfold union: *varius Auctumnus racemos varios*, with the omission of *varius* in its apter and more obvious application. And yet Bentley understood why Horace in: *inaequali tonsore* (Ep. 1. 1. 94) calls a barber 'uneven': *inaequalis est tonsor, qui tam prave capillum secat, ut una parte brevior sit, altera longior*.

But again in: *timet . . . miles sagittas et celerem fugam Parthi* (Od. 2. 13. 17) against all his manuscripts he wants to change *celerem* to *reducem*. The soldier has no dread of the swift flight of the Parthian; it is the feigned flight he dreads and the swift arrows with which, as he turns back, he transfixes the soldier. *Celerem* is the epithet transferred from *sagittas* to its concomitant *fugam*; and it is because the feigned flight of the Parthian is swift in these speeding shafts that the soldier dreads it. On the next page I find his note on: *pugnas et exactos tyrannos densum umeris bibit aure volgus* (2. 13. 31-2), where following, as he imagines, Acron's note: *bibit*, *avide audit*, he changes *umeris* to *avida*. *Densum volgus*, he says, is sufficient without further qualification, but we want an epithet with *aure*. So he writes *avida aure*, failing to see that, when Acron makes *bibit* equivalent to *avide audit*, he shows how Horace by his striking oxymoron: *bibit aure* really supplies this lack. When Ovid writes: *densum trabibus nemus* (Met. 14. 360) it is short for: *nemus densum densis trabibus*; and Horace writes here: *densum umeris volgus* for: *densum densis umeris volgus* 'a crowd packed with thronging shoulders'.

Let us begin with an example where the fourfold union has not been reduced to three. We read: *illum absens absentem auditque videtque* (Aen. 4. 83), where, though *absens* could be omitted and is usually omitted in prose, its expression adds greatly to the poetic force of the verse. The usual prose construction is that shunned in verse; and the omission of *absentem* would have made the line weaker still. But in: *pulverulenta fuga Rutuli dant terga per agros* (12. 463), where *fuga dant terga* is for: *conversi fugiunt*, of the repeated terms we have that retained which is the less obvious and goes with the word which gives the verse its distinctively poetic character. In: *procella velum (adversum) adversa ferit* (1. 103), *serpens . . . quem obliquum rota (obliqua) transiit* (5. 274), *mixtoque insania (mixta) luctu* (10. 871), *furens (media) mediisque in milibus ardet* (1. 491), of the several pairs the terms omitted are so clearly implied in those expressed that their omission would not be felt, were it not that the term omitted in each case is the more obvious, and that which would have found expression in prose. In: *saxum (spumans) spumantia contra litora* (5. 124) the very omission of *spumans* tends to call up in the mind of the reader the picture Stevenson gives us in the *Merry Men*; and the same seems true of the omissions in: *postes auro spoliisque superbi* (2. 504), or: *Troiae renascens alite lugubri fortuna tristi clade iterabitur* (Od. 3. 3. 62), or: *miramur, facilis ut (lyram) premat arte manus* (Prop. 2. 1. 10).

The old grammarians, starting from the most puzzling form of hypallage, defined it as: *mutua casuum permutatio*, as we have it in: *dare classibus Austros* (Aen. 3. 61) for: *dare classes Austris*, the obvious prose form. The form of hypallage of which we have just cited some examples they styled hypallage imperfecta; for hypallage perfecta they required that both cases should be exchanged with each other, as in: *et cum frigida mors anima seduxerit artus* (4. 385) for: *animam seduxerit artubus*.

Let us cite first a few simpler cases of such double hypallages; for double they seem to be. In:

*Ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbram* (6. 268),

Servius says we have a hypallage for: *sub obscura nocte soli ibant*. This seems to be the result of a union by distribution of two threefold clauses reduced from *ibant soli sub sola nocte*, and *ibant obscuri sub obscura nocte*, in each of which the more obvious term of the like pairs is omitted as sure to be suggested by the expression of the less obvious term. We have another example in: *vides ut alta stet nive candidum Soracte* (Od. 1. 9. 1) 'you see how Soracte stands white with high snow'. Of course it is Soracte that is high and the snow that is white. So Shakspeare tells of 'books in the running brooks, sermons in stones'. In: *perpetui numquam moritura volumina Sili* (Mart. 7. 63. 1) it is Silius who is to be read

from age to age, and his volumes which will never die; <sup>A</sup> and in: *si quis procurrat ad oras ultimus extremas* (Lucr. 1. 970) it is he who has run up to the outer edge, who is beyond it; and he does pass beyond it by hurling his spear. In: *aurea quam molli tergo vexit ovis* (Prop. 2. 26. 6) it is the sheep that is golden and the hide that is soft.

We have other examples in: *tacitae per amica silentia lunae* (Aen. 2. 255), where but for the hypallage *tacitae* would be superfluous, at *subitae horridico lapsu de montibus adsunt* (3. 225), *omnem cursum mihi prospera dixit religio* (3. 362), *madidaque fluens in veste* (5. 179), *seraque terrifici cecinerunt omina vates* (5. 524), *tepidaque recentem caede locum* (9. 455), *sic flammis aditura pias aeterna sacerdos* (Ov. Am. 3. 7. 21). I have spoken of: *auras suspiciens hausit caelum* (Aen. 10. 899) as a double metonymy; the older grammarians would have called it a perfect hypallage; but there is no visible exchange of cases discernible. I suspect that metonymy comes to pass much in the same way as hypallage, though I have not traced it fully.

We seem to have it transferred to verbs, where exchange of cases is out of the question, in: *vos . . . coetum . . . celebrate faventes* (1. 735) for: *vos coetui favete celebrantes*. In: *vix primos inopina quies laxaverat artus* (5. 857), while *primos* is transferred from *quies* to *artus*, *inopina* is transferred to *quies* not from *artus*, but from the suppressed *Palinuri*. So: *omnem cursum mihi prospera dixit religio* (3. 362) is for: *totum cursum prosperum futurum praedixerunt omina prospera omnia*, a combination impossible for poetry. But in: *rudentem contorsit laevas proram . . . ad undas* (3. 562), *postera . . . dies primo surgebat Eoo* (3. 588), *candenti perfecta nitens elephanto* (6. 895), *Idaeae sacro de vertice pinus* (10. 230) the double hypallage seems to have come from the regular interchange of epithets.

The easiest transference here seems that from a noun to its dependent genitive, or from a genitive to its governing noun. The two form a complex of meaning which facilitates the transfer, and inclines me to think that it was from this starting-point that the figure developed. In: *incredibilis rerum fama* (Aen. 3. 294) or: *innumerabilis annorum series* (Od. 3. 30. 4) the transference seems easy and natural; and in: *ruentis imperi rebus* (1. 2. 26) or: *miseri post fata Sychaei* (Aen. 4. 20) one sees the omission of a term rather than a transfer, which is of course the truth. Of the transference from the genitive we may note these examples: *vastum maris aequor* (2. 780), *imo barathri . . . gurgite* (3. 421), *Euboicis Cumarum . . . oris* (6. 2), *Tyrrhenus tubae . . . clangor* (8. 526), *arma dei . . . Volcania* (12. 739), *superbos Tarquini fasces* (Od. 1. 12. 34), *iratos . . . regum apices* (3. 21. 19), *Tyrrhena regum progenies* (3. 29. 1), *regum tumidas . . . minas* (4. 3. 8); and of transference to the genitive: *molem hanc inmanis equi* (Aen. 2. 150), *summi fastigia tecti* (2. 302), *templum . . . desertae Cereris* (2. 714), *iugis summae . . . Idae* (2. 801), *variarum monstra ferarum* (6. 285), *confusae stragis acervum* (6. 504), *Stygique per flumina fratris* (10. 113), *coetu variantis acervi* (Lucr. 1. 775).

We find also the epithet transferred from the subject to an adverbial clause, as in: *vertimus . . . certantibus aequora remis* (Aen. 3. 668), *haec . . . canit divino ex ore sacerdos* (3. 373), *primisque elabitur undis* (5. 151), *quadrupedante . . . sonitu quatit ungula campum* (8. 596). In: *mediaeque per Elidis urbem ibat ovans* (6. 588), *iuvat . . . mediosque fugam tenuisse per hostes* (3. 283), *tres . . . incertos caeca caligine soles erramus pelago* (3. 203) we feel the omission with the subject of *medius*, *incertus*, *caecus*, and feel the change in meaning of the last two when used with adverbial phrases. Martial's verse: *nulla magis toto ianua poste patet* (1. 70. 14) seems for: *nulla ianua magis patet totis cum postibus tota*.

In return we have many cases where the epithet has been transferred from the adverbial phrase to the subject, as: *quibus ibat in armis aureus* (Aen. 9. 269), *eludit gyro interior* (11. 695), *nocturnusque vocat clamore Cithaeron* (4. 303), *creber utraque manu pulsatur* (5. 460), *tot pullulat atra colubris* (7. 329), *imaque sedit inguine* (10. 785), *cui pineus ardor acervo pascitur* (11. 786), *manu trepidae iaciunt* (11. 893), *ubi plurima fuso sanguine terra madet* (12. 690), *hesternisque rubens deiecta est herba coronis* (Mart. 9. 61. 17). In: *purpureis ales oloribus comissabere* (Od. 4. 1. 10) *purpureis ales oloribus* is for *Venus purpureorum oloribus alis vecta*, where *alis vecta* has been shortened to *ales*, a striking extension of this transfer.

In like fashion in: *quod adest memento componere aequus* (Od. 3. 29. 33) *aequus* is transferred to the subject from the adverbial phrase *aequo animo*, which has disappeared as a result of the transfer. So in: *hunc primo levis hasta Themillae strinxerat* (Aen. 9. 576) *levis* is for a vanished *leviter*, and so in: *ubi prima fides pelago* (3. 69) and: *lacrimae volvuntur inanes* (4. 449).

In: *fessos opibus solatur amicis* (5. 41) we have in: *amicis* an epithet transferred from the object to an adverbial clause, and so in: *diversa per aequora vectos* (1. 376). We have the opposite in: *Herculeis sopitas ignibus aras excitat* (8. 542), and in: *tribus aut novem miscentur cyathis pocula commodis* (Od. 3. 19. 12) it is from the subject of a passive that the

epithet is thus transferred. In: *alitis in parvae subitam collecta figuram* (Aen. 12. 862) the *subitam* is transferred to the object from a vanished adverb *subito*, and in return in: *hanc primum ad litora classem conspexi venientem* (3. 651) *primum* is plainly for *primam*.

In such transfers we have many examples of the double or perfect hypallage, but they are of nouns, not adjectives. Perhaps the failure of the ancients to draw our distinction between nouns and adjectives here may have to do with this difficulty, but it does not solve it. We read: *(navem) rapidus vorat aequo re vortex* (1. 117), where we expect: *vorat aequor rapido vortice*. So: *(navis) excussa magistro* (6. 353) for: *nave excussus magister*. In: *celebramus litora ludis* (3. 280) the old meaning of *celebramus*, ‘we throng’, obviates the hypallage. But in: *sanieque aspersa natarent limina* (3. 625) for: *saniesque aspersa fluebat in liminibus*, and: *excisum Euboicae latus ingens rupis in antrum* (6. 42) for: *antrum incisum in latus rupis*, this exchange is the only account I have to give of the irregularity. In: *magno clamore morantur* (5. 207) for: *magna voce morati clamant*, the verb is involved in the interchange. In: *horrere videns iam colla colubris* (6. 419) we have a transference to the subject from the dative which points to the interchange of constructions with *dono* and *circumdo*. The transference is still to the subject in: *respiciunt totumque adlabi classibus aequor* (10. 269), but it is now from an ablative. It is to the object that the transference takes place from the ablative in: *spem fronte serenat* (4. 477) and: *Lavinia . . . visa . . . longis comprehendere crinibus ignem* (7. 73).

We have the epithet transferred from the subject to the object in: *caeca regens filo vestigia* (6. 30), *maestasque sacravimus aras* (5. 48), *laetum cuncti celebremus honorem* (5. 58), *rorantia vidimus astra* (3. 567), where the transference indicates that the foam rose so high as not merely to drench the sailors, but as to seem to drench the heavens. So too in: *corpora . . . ignibus aegra dedere* (2. 566), *fessum quotiens mutet latus* (3. 581), *frena ferox spumantia mandit* (4. 135), *tacitumque obsedit limen Amatae* (7. 343), *dum terga dabant palantia Teuceri* (12. 738), *per te immaturum mortis adimus iter* (Prop. 3. 7. 2), *medias fallit permixta sorores* (Stat. Silv. 1. 2. 10). In: *sese medium iniecit periturus in agmen* (Aen. 2. 408) *medium* may be joined either with *sese* or with *agmen*, giving a threefold transfer.

In return we find the epithet transferred from the object to the subject in: *tectusque tenet se* (Aen. 10. 802), *conversique oculos inter se atque ora tenebant* (11. 121), *dum sacra secundus haruspex nuntiet* (11. 739), *qua . . . (fortuna) ostendit se dextra* (2. 388), *verus mihi nuntius adfers (te)* (3. 310), *lumenque obscura vicissim luna premit* (4. 80), *tu secreta pyram . . . erige* (4. 494), *navis se tarda movebat* (5. 280), *sonitum dat stridula cornus* (12. 267). In: *miratur nemus insuetum fulgentia longe scuta . . . pictasque . . . carinas* (8. 92) we at once supply: *insueta spectacula*. In: *convolvit . . . terga arduus ad solem* (2. 475) we see that *arduus* is for: *ardua adtollens*; cf.: *sibila colla arduus adtollens* (5. 278). In: *ille dies . . . primusque malorum causa fuit* (4. 169) *primus* is transferred to the subject from *causa*, a predicate nominative, which is for an old accusative. In: *tectusque recusat* (2. 126), where *tectus* may be taken as for *caute*, it seems to stand for: *dum se tegit*.

Again from these two transferences, from the subject to the object and the reverse, we have a double or perfect hypallage, the strongest of all, by which the living subject is made the object, and the object, often lifeless, becomes the subject. In: *me . . . infelix habuit thalamus* (6. 521) this double hypallage seems less strange to us than it would to the Roman, to whom *habet* here is the older use for its frequentative *habitat*, as we see it in: *ille geminus qui Syracusis habet* (Pl. Men. 69). To: *cui plurimus ignem subiecit rubor* (Aen. 12. 66) Servius’s note is: hypallage pro ‘*cui ignis animi subiecit ruborem*’. We read: *quae te, genitor, sententia vertit?* (1. 237) and: *neque me sententia vertit* (1. 260). Servius recognizes the hypallage in both, and in the former he suggests that *quae* is for *cuius*; for Venus does not, he thinks, venture to assail Juno directly. Other examples are: *apes . . . exercet sub sole labor* (1. 431), *supremo cum lumine vita reliquit (quemquam)* (6. 735), *sin nostrum adnuerit nobis victoria Martem* (12. 187).

The relation of the dative with the accusative seems often close, and there is in both Latin and Greek a constant transition from the use of the dative with transitive verbs to that of the accusative, a transition which has led to the loss of the dative in modern Greek, and which in Latin leads Terence to the use of the accusative with *inmineo*, and classical writers to join either the accusative or the dative with *temperare* and *moderari*, culminating in Apuleius’s use of the accusative with *suadere* for the person persuaded. To the analogy promoted by this is perhaps due the transference of the epithet from the dative to the nominative we find in: *miserandaque venit arboribus satisque lues* (Aen. 3. 138) and: *mentis vacat hic tibi solus fortunaeque locus* (11. 179). With these must be placed such hypallages as: *ingens adgeritur tumulo tellus* (3. 63) and: *parietibus textum caecis iter* (5. 589). In: *omnibus idem animus . . . dare classibus Austros* (3. 61) Servius tells us we have a hypallage for: *dare classes Austris*; and in: *arma parate animis* (11. 18) he suggests



that we have a hypallage for: *armis parate animos*, where *armis* will be a metonymy for *bello* (*gerendo*). To: *ne tanta animis adsuescite bella* (6. 832) Servius's note is: *mire dictum: ab ipsis enim quasi consuetudinem facit populus Romanus bellorum civilium*. This may be the true account of this puzzling hypallage; the wars, the object primarily indirect to which they were accustoming themselves, became in time their habit itself, which would be a cognate accusative with *adsuefacere*, and as such were expressed as the direct object of *adsuescere* here, while the old direct object passed by analogy to the dative.

Closely similar to this is the course of transference with *dono* and *circumdo*. Plautus has: *modo qui hanc mihi donavit* (Poen. 469), but: *hoc donavisti dono tuom servom Stichum* (Stich. 656). Livy has: *eorum contioni satellites armatos circumdedit* (34. 27. 5), but Caesar: *Octavius quinque castris oppidum circumdedit* (B. C. 3. 9. 4), and Virgil: *arma . . . circumdat nequidquam umeris* (Aen. 2. 510), but: *canibus circumdare saltus* (Buc. 10. 57). With a compound of *do* we may assume that the dative is the older construction, and that presently the object surrounded is felt as an object of cognate notion and is transferred to the accusative; when the old accusative, following the analogy of: *donare aliquem aliqua re*, is in turn transferred to the ablative. For this seems the older construction with *dono*, a derivative of *donum* and a verb of later formation, which is later led by the analogy of *do* to take the construction: *donare alicui aliquam rem* as well. This double construction is extended to many other verbs in poetry; we note on the analogy of *circumdo* with the ablative: *plurima salute Parmenonem . . . impertit Gnatho* (Ter. Eun. 270), *me divom pater . . . fulminis adflavit ventis* (Aen. 2. 649), *fama est . . . Trinacriam caelum subtexere fumo* (3. 582), *duroque intendere brachia tergo* (5. 403), *paribus palmas amborum innexuit armis* (5. 425), *idem ter socios pura circumtulit unda* (6. 229), *spumantis equi (in)foderet calcaribus armos* (6. 881). The following are swayed by the analogy of *donare* with the dative: *vina bonus qui deinde cadis onerarat Aestes* (1. 195), *stipatque carinis ingens argentum* (3. 465), *inmeritam saevae natam mactare Dianae* (Ov. Met. 13. 185); and Horace has *donare* thus constructed in: *donarem . . . meis aera sodalibus* (Od. 4. 8. 2).

The uses of *induo* deserve separate mention; it is the opposite of *exuo*, and is compounded of *indu* (= into) and *ovo* 'I dress'; cf. *subucula* and *exuviae*. It seems to have been primarily constructed with three regimens, as in: (1) *sibi et torquem et cognomen induit* (Cic. Fin. 2. 73. 22); (2) *soccus quibus indutus esset* (De Orat. 3. 127. 32); (3) *tu te in laqueum induas* (Pl. Cas. 113). For in with the accusative Virgil has substituted the ablative in: *an sese mucrone ob tantum dedecus amens induat* (Aen. 10. 682), as have Livy in: *induissent se hastis* (44. 41. 9) and Caesar in: *quo qui intraverant se ipsi acutissimis vallis induebant* (B. G. 7. 73. 4).

The transfer of an epithet to a different object will usually lead to a change of meaning in the epithet itself. Often this change is so slight that we do not feel the need of a different epithet in the new connexion; as in: *placidam per membra quietem inrigat* (Aen. 1. 691). But with a change of element, though the word transferred may still seem adequate, the change of meaning is quite plain, as in *tremulo* in: *splendet tremulo sub lumine pontus* (7. 9), where the ripple of the water is transferred to the sunlight and the lustre of the sun to the depth of tawny Tiber; or in: *late ferreus hastis horret ager* (11. 601), where the iron of the spears is transferred to the field now bristling with them; or in: *pontus . . . scopulos . . . superiacit unda spumeus* (11. 626), where we feel that *spumeus* belongs rather to the wave or to the cliffs than to the deep, to which it is here transferred. In: *adversis rerum inmersabilis undis* (Ep. 1. 2. 22) *adversis* has, besides the force of 'fronting' with *undis*, the force of 'adverse' with *rerum*. So in: *positus . . . carbo in caespite vivo* (Od. 3. 8. 3) 'a live coal placed on the green turf'. In: *duris dolor ossibus ardet* (Aen. 9. 66) the change from cruel to hard involved in the transfer of *durus* from *dolor* to *ossibus* is very plain. So in: *male barbaras regum libidines ulta est* (Od. 4. 12. 7) the change involved in the transfer of *barbarus* from *reges* to *libidines* is clear.

Just as we transfer our speed in a railway carriage to the homes and trees that seem speeding past, so Virgil transfers the rush of a flying missile to the air through which it passes, as in: *sagitta . . . volucres diverberat auras* (Aen. 5. 503). We have a like transference, but from sound, in: *celeres defer mea dicta per auras* (4. 226), and from the messenger god in: *ferre iubet celeres mandata per auras* (4. 270). We have a complete conversion of this transfer to the moral sphere in: (malos) *ad impia Tartara mittit* (6. 543), where, however, Virgil, to avoid omitting the necessary malos, has substituted *impia* for it with *Tartara* with a fine enhancement of force from the personification. In: *tali Cyllenius ore locutus mortales visus medio sermone reliquit* (4. 277) *medio* is transferred from Mercury, who has not given his thought full expression, to his speech thus untimely interrupted, giving it the double meaning of 'incomplete', a force not inconsistent with *medius*—and 'ended', the opposite of *medius*. It recalls: *Rumone secundo* (8. 90) with the double meaning in: *secundo* of 'favouring their seeming speed', a meaning not inconsistent with *secundus*—and 'upstream', a meaning the opposite of *secundus*. There are more of such contradictions in Virgil, as we shall see. In: *vescitur Aeneas . . . perpetui*

tergo bovis (8. 183) the epithet perpetui properly belongs to tergo 'the unbroken chine'; but when transferred to bovis gets an entirely new meaning, as Servius tells us. The meat of the ox sacrificed to Hercules, when sold, brought such a price that with it the worshipper was able to buy a new ox, which he called perpetuus 'that continued to him by the gods'; in other words, he was able to eat his cake and have it.

But the change is, as a rule, more marked when the transference is from a living to a lifeless object, or the opposite, as in: apricis statio gratissima mergis (5. 128), where apricus is transferred from the sunny nesting-place to the gulls delighting in the sunshine. To turn to men, in: inutile ferrum cingitur (2. 511) the transition is from Priam disabled by old age to his sword, useless because of the old age of its wearer. And so in: ni frustra augurium vani docuere parentes (1. 392) and: continuo in montes sese avius abdidit altos (11. 810). In: agmine remorum celeri ventisque vocatis prona petit maria (5. 211-12) agmine has three meanings, and we may translate 'by the push of the speeding rowers', or 'by the swift sweep of the oars', or 'by the swift array of oarsmen'. In: prona maria we have also a transference from proni remiges, implied in agmine remorum, when it means the seas down which they swiftly glide; for when applied to the waters pronus has the idea of sloping down to the land; 'I sail into port' is: (in portum) deferor (Ep. 1. 1. 15); compare ἀναπλεῖν and καταπλεῖν. In: manesque vocabat Hectoreum ad tumulum (Aen. 3. 304) the epithet is properly Hectoreos with manes, and is transferred to tumulum only by prolepsis; the tumulus here is a cenotaph, and only when Andromache can by the blood of her victims attract to it the manes of Hector, will it become 'Hectoreum tumulum'.

Virgil's use of tacitus in such transference is interesting. In: quis te, magne Cato, tacitum . . . relinquit? (6. 841), though one may remember Cato's skill in oratory, and the record that, though he was prosecutor in more cases than any man of his day, he never lost a case, the obvious meaning is of course: nullis laudibus elatum. In: tacitumque obsedit limen Amatae (7. 343) Servius sees that the threshold is to be used as an ambush, from which Allecto may surprise the queen; and so tacitum is here for: ubi reginam occulte excipiat. In: quae sublegi tacitus tibi carmina nuper (Buc. 9. 21) tacitus seems for: nesciente te, words that Servius thinks should be supplied. In: totumque pererrat luminibus tacitis (Aen. 4. 364), Servius explains: *luminibus tacitis* pro ipsa tacita, which is far from satisfactory; no doubt her very sighs were eloquent. But Servius knew of others who had a better grasp of the meaning here, and recognized that tears constituted a language of the eyes; for they explained tacitis as for siccis. In: tacitis regnavit Amyclis (10. 564) the meaning is more involved. Both the Spartan Amyclae and the Italian town of that name, so called by its founders who came from Amyclae in Sparta with Castor and Pollux, both perished because of their silence; the Spartan Amyclae, because the townsmen, tired of false alarms, imposed silence on all announcements of the coming of a foe. But though silence was a marked characteristic of the Pythagorean discipline that prevailed in the Italian Amyclae, it was not this part of their creed that destroyed the townsmen, but their rule, founded on their belief in metempsychosis, that forbade them to destroy living creatures; so that they tolerated the serpents that bred in the neighbouring marshes, till they multiplied so as to destroy the town.

We have seen how: totumque pererrat luminibus tacitis is short for: totumque pererrat ipsa tacita luminibus siccis, where we have the epithet, proper in its primary connexion, taking the place of another that better fitted its new position. So we read: alto a sanguine divom (Aen. 5. 45) for: progenie clara altorum deorum, ipse deum manifesto in lumine vidi (4. 358) for: manifestum claro in lumine, primam qui legibus urbem fundabit (6. 810) for: legibus qui primus priscam urbem fundabit, frontem obscenis rugis arat (7. 417) for: frontem deformem obscenis rugis, udae vocis iter (7. 533) for: vocis liquidae udum iter, insani Martis amore (7. 550) for: Martis furentis insano amore, foedati . . . ora Galaesi (7. 575) for: ora lacerata foede interfecti Galaesi, quos illi bello profugos egere superbo (8. 118) for: illi superbi profugos egere iniusto bello (Serv.), caede viri tanta (10. 426) for: caede tam atroci viri tam magni, extremam . . . sinu perfundit harenam (11. 626) for: sinu extremo proximam harenam perfundit, formidolosis dum latent silvis ferae (Epod. 5. 55) for: dum latent in silvis tenebricosis formidolosae ferae, molem propinquam nubibus arduis (Od. 3. 29. 10) for: molem arduam et propinquam altis nubibus, iracunda Iovem ponere fulmina (1. 3. 40) for: Iovem iracundum perfervida fulmina deponere, regina dementes ruinas parabat (1. 37. 7) for: regina demens praecipites ruinas parabat.

Easier and more simple transferences for different words are: delecta . . . corpora . . . includunt caeco lateri (Aen. 2. 19) for: includunt occulta obscure lateri, creber ad aures visus adesse (multorum) pedum sonitus (2. 731), vocemque (resonantem) inclusa volutant litora (5. 149), armatum peditem gravis adtulit (gravida) alvo (6. 516), utque pedum primis infans (incerta) vestigia plantis institerat (11. 573), obliti ignoto camporum in pulvere (neglectum) relinquunt (11. 866), nemus (umbrosum) uvidique Tiburis ripas (Od. 4. 2. 30), de te splendida Minos (iudex illustris) fecerit arbitria (4. 7. 21), prensare manu (leni) lentissima bracchia (Sat. 1. 9. 64), aliae spem gentis adultos educunt fetus (Geo. 4. 163)

for: educendo educant; Servius explains: educendo faciunt adultos.

Very difficult once seemed to me such constructions as: bacchatamque iugis Naxum (Aen. 3. 125), Neritus ardua saxis (3. 271), Averna sonantia silvis (3. 442); I expected what I find in prose, the ablative of description, as in: Naxum insulam iugis bacchatis, Neritus insula arduis saxis. But it will be clear, from the examples which we have just reviewed, that Virgil has here transferred the epithet, e.g. ardua, from the descriptive ablative to the object described, giving him a new form of description with which he can vary the descriptive ablative, a form which, involving as it does the poetic transference of the epithet, he favours as against the prose idiom of the ablative of description. We have here the epithet in agreement with the object described completed by an ablative of specification, as we see it in: Arcentis filius . . . insignis facie (9. 583), totidemque pares aetate ministri (1. 705), socios . . . praestantes virtute (8. 548), progeniem virtute . . . egregiam (7. 258), pictas abiete puppes (5. 663), urbes litore diductas (3. 419). When we compare: forma pulcerrima Dido (1. 496) or: ipse acerrimus armis (12. 226), where the ablatives may be classed as the old ablatives of specification, with: praedurum viribus Orsen (10. 748) or: egregium forma iuvenem (12. 275), we see how closely the new Virgilian ablatives of specification resemble the old.

But in Aen. 12. 275: egregium forma iuvenem et fulgentibus armis is the full verse, where we find this new substitute for the ablative of description placed beside an example of that ablative to vary the diction. We have the same union in: turbidus hic caeno vastaue voragine gurgis (6. 296) with which compare 9. 105, Euryalus forma insignis viridique iuventa (5. 295), (hastam) rudem nodis et cortice crudo (9. 743), (telum) solidum nodis et robore cocto (11. 553), mille . . . densos acie et horrentibus hastis (10. 178), dona . . . auro gravia sectoque elephanto (3. 464), to take a few examples I have noted. We have the order reversed in: cervus . . . forma praestanti et cornibus ingens (7. 483) and: pari ferocia et velut aucti numero (Ann. 2. 25. 5). Tacitus gives us the opposite of this construction in: Augustum fessa aetate (Ann. 1. 46. 3) for: Augustum fessum (= confectum) aetate. In prose the ablative of specification is often joined with the preposition a or ab, as in: nisi qui a philosophia, a iure civili, ab historia fuisset instructor (Cic. Brut. 161. 43). So in this Virgilian form we find at times a or ab, as in: recens a volnere (Aen. 6. 450), a stirpe coniunctus (8. 130), Alpheae ab origine Pisae (10. 179).

But of like origin and meaning with the ablative of description (qualitatis) is the genitive of description, an idiom peculiar to Latin. Though it is frequent in Horace, e.g.: parvula . . . magni formica laboris (Sat. 1. 1. 33), Virgil seems to shun this idiom. I have noted only six examples of it in the Aeneid: alter ab Arcadio Tegeaeae sanguine gentis (5. 299), Dardanius divinae stirpis Acestes (5. 711), atri velleris agnam (6. 249), Assaraci quem sanguinis (6. 778), Ascanius clari condet cognominis Albam (8. 48), nodum informis leti (12. 603). To: geminos inmani pondere caestus (5. 401) Servius's note is: *inmani pondere* pro 'inmanis ponderis' more suo, ut 'hamis auroque trilicem' (3. 467). We have here proof positive that Servius saw the close relation between the ablative of description and the Virgilian ablative of specification, of which: hamis auroque trilicem is an example. The note tells us too, what we have abundant proof of in other scholia of Servius and Acron, that in their day the genitive of description was the usual idiom, and the ablative of description had become archaic. Probably it was becoming archaic even in Virgil's day, and this was his reason for preferring it. But it would be strange if it were always the ablative, and never the genitive, that we found in the transferred form—always turbidus caeno, and never turbidus caeni. Naturally Virgil offers no such example of the genitive, for he shuns the genitive of description. But I find in Tacitus: reductus in hiberna miles laetus animi (Ann. 2. 26. 1), and: principem longa experientia eundemque severitatis et munificentiae summum (1. 46. 2), and in Lucretius: longa diei infinita aetas (1. 557).

In: hamis auroque trilicem we have an expansion of our idiom, due apparently to hendiadys. But the most usual form of expansion is due to the addition of an adjective to the ablative of specification, giving it again the form of the ablative of description, from which it was derived; as in: per orbem aere cavum triplici (Aen. 10. 784), asperque inmani corpore Thybris (8. 330), caligine turbidus atra pulvis (11. 876). To see the effect of this addition we may compare: Cacum . . . timentem turbatumque oculis (8. 223) with: spelunca alta vastoque inmanis hiatu (6. 237), purpurei cristis iuvenes auroque corusci (9. 163) with: turbidus imber aqua densisque nigerrimus Austris (5. 696), and: pietate insignis et armis (6. 403) with: sororem . . . pedibus celerem et pernicipibus alis (4. 180), aureus et foliis et lento vimine ramus (6. 137) with: terribili impexum saeta cum dentibus albis (7. 667).

Opposed to this tendency to expansion are the contractions we have in: prata recentia rivis (6. 674) for: prata virentia recentibus rivis, turris . . . opportuna loco (9. 531) for: turris opportune loco sita, Messapus . . . altus equo (12. 295) for:

Messapus alto equo vectus. Further examples are: laetantes agmine cynos (1. 393) for: cynos laetanti agmine volantes, aurea bullis cingula (9. 359) for: cingula aureis bullis ornata, galeam . . . cristis . . . decoram (9. 365) for: galeam cristis decoris aptam, saeva sonoribus arma (9. 651) for: saevo sonitu sonantia arma, urbs Etrusca solo (10. 180) for: urbs Etrusco solo sita.

But in: furiis accensas pectore matres (7. 392) we have an ablative of cause joined with this ablative of respect. To: atro . . . membra fluentia tabo (3. 626) Servius's note is: *fluentia tabo* pro *fluenti tabo*. Evidently Virgil's phrase is for: membra atra fluenti tabo, and is got by a double transference of atra from membra to tabo and of fluenti from tabo to membra. But fluenti tabo is an ablative not of description, but of cause. Here then we have an extension of this transference; it arises not merely from ablatives of description, its usual source, but also from ablatives of cause.

Far more usual is the transference from ablatives of manner and means, as in: animis opibusque parati (2. 799), nos . . . effusi lacrimis (orabamus) (2. 651), sola fuga nautas comitabor ovantes (4. 543), proximus ingreditur donis (5. 543), furtivum partu . . . edidit (7. 660), ibat iam mollior undis (8. 726), praeceps saltu sese . . . in fluvium dedit (9. 815), animo spem turbidus hausit inanem (10. 648), equis aversi ad moenia tendunt (11. 871), saltuque superbus emicat in currum (12. 326), nec numero inferior pugnae nec honore recedes (12. 630). We have this transference from ablatives of material in: crateres auro solidi (2. 765) and: argento clari delphines (8. 673).

In: Gallica ora (Od. 1. 8. 6) we have clearly a shortened form for: equorum Gallicorum ora, where the epithet has been transferred to ora from its dependent genitive, giving us: (equorum) Gallica ora. We have parallel shortenings in: sacer paries (1. 5. 14) for: sacrae aedis paries, in: mediae fraudes (3. 27. 27) for: medii ponti fraudes, in: crudeles terras . . . litus avarum (Aen. 3. 44) for: terras crudelis regis . . . litus avari regis. More difficult is: cavae aedes (2. 487), which Servius explains as: camerata tecta. Probably we may resolve it into: aedes cameris cavis constructae, and: tela Typhoia (1. 665) into: tela velut ea in Typhonem coniecta. Domum ambiguum (1. 661) seems for: domum feminae mutabilis, as: pallida Mors (Od. 1. 4, 13) is for: Mors quae corpora pallida reddit, and: inaequali tonsore (Ep. 1. 1. 94) for: tonsore qui capillos inaequaliter secat. But: commissa piacula (Aen. 6. 569) for: scelera pianda, and: in aperta pericula (9. 663) 'into the perilous breach' seem to be based on double or perfect hypallages such as we have repeatedly examined in this chapter.

*A* In: *perpetui numquam moritura volumina Sili* (Mart. 7. 63. 1) it is *Silius* who is to be read from age to age, and his *volumes which will never die*;

Text printed as shown; hand-written correction reads "it is his books which are to be read ... and he who will never die". This is probably what the author meant.

## XXXVIII

### OMISSION OF THE PREFIX

No student of Latin poetry can have failed to notice the frequent omission of the prefix in composition with Latin verbs, as we see it in: tum Thetidi pater ipse iugandum Pelea sensit (Catull. 64. 21), where it is plain that iugandum is for coniugandum, and this leads the reader to the conclusion that sensit is for consensit, where the omission decidedly affects the sense. So in: denique saepe hominem paulatim cernimus ire (Lucr. 3. 526), where: vitalem deperdere sensum in the next verse shows the reader that ire is for perire, 'pass' for 'pass away'. The figure is met at times in English poetry. We see it in Hamlet's: 'This bodes some strange eruption to our state', in Gray's: 'Graved on the stone beneath yon aged thorn', in Marvell's:

'And does in the pomegranate close,  
Jewels more rich than Ormus shews'

It is not characteristic of Latin classical prose; indeed Cicero seems to avoid it; the student will remember the way in which he piles prefix on prefix in: abiit, excessit, evasit, erupit (Cat. 2. 1. 1).

Often the meaning of the verb of itself suggests the prefix omitted, as in: modo me Thebis, modo ponit Athenis (Ep. 2. 1. 213) for deponit, or: frontis ad urbanae descendi praemia (1. 9. 11) for condescendi, or: quaeque aliae nationes usque

ad Albim colunt (Ann. 2. 41. 2) for incolunt. Indeed at times in later writers the form of the verb at once suggests the loss of the prefix, as in: quo cingi cludique terrarum orbem hinc fides (Tac. Germ. 45. 1), where cludi for claudi is evidently short for concludi. In: si numerus militum potius quam legionum putetur (Hist. 3. 2. 7) the use of putare in its old sense of 'to sum up' straightway suggests computare. But when in: orare Iovem qui ponit et aufert (Ep. 1. 18. 111) 'sets before and takes away', Lucian Müller tells us that ponit is for proponit, he fails to see the etymology of pono (= por-sino 'I set before'). Often the preposition omitted becomes clear from the context, as in: braccia candidae cervici iuvenis dabat (Od. 3. 9. 3) or circumdabat, acrem militiam paras (1. 29. 2) for comparas, concursu ad ianuam facto moliuntur fores (Ann. 1. 39. 4) for demoluntur. In: cessatum ducere somnum (Ep. 1. 2. 31) that ducere is for reducere is readily deduced from: cui pulcrum fuit in medios dormire dies (v. 30) 'whose ideal it was to sleep till midday'. In: multa inter sese vario sermone serebant (Aen. 6. 160) the vario suggests the missing prefix dis-, and in: pueris . . . beata creandis uxor (Ep. 1. 2. 44) the missing pro- will be suggested by uxor and pueris. In: infelix operis summa quia ponere totum nesciet (A. P. 34) that ponere is for componere is suggested by: si quid componere curem in the next verse; the importance of this for the figure we shall presently see. But in: pectus praeceptis format amicis (Ep. 2. 1. 128) the presence of invidiae in the next verse does not at first help me much, and I feel grateful to Acron for his explanation that format here is for 'informat' 'instructs'. Servius's note to: nec vim tela ferunt (Aen. 6. 400): non obferunt, tantum repellunt, is very welcome too. In: cui nomen Superiori, sub C. Silio legato; inferiorem A. Caecina curabat (Ann. 1. 31. 2) legato suggests that curabat is for procurabat. So in: it pectore summo . . . per collum circulus auri (Aen. 5. 558) it seems to be for circuit, and the prefix is implied in circulus.

The prefix omitted is usually what we call a preposition, but it is evidently not confined to this class. It is quite plain that the ancient grammarians called any words prepositions that were put in composition with verbs. Potis or pote, which is compounded with est in potest, is one of the particles with which we have to do. In utputa and utpote we have ut apparently entering into such composition; and accordingly we read in Donatus (p. 389, K.): sunt etiam dictiones, quas incertum est utrum coniunctiones an praepositiones, an adverbia nominemus ut *cum* et *ut*. So we read eat for veneat in Claudian's verses:

Tot Galatae, tot Pontus eat, tot Lydia nummis,  
Si Lyciam tenuisse velis, tot milia ponas (In Eutrop. 1. 203-4).

We have the prefix omitted from nouns as well as verbs. Virgil has theatri for amphitheatri in: ad tumulum cuneosque theatri (Aen. 5. 664); when he first speaks of it, he uses for amphitheatrum the periphrasis: theatri circus (5. 288). For Acroceraunia he uses Ceraunia (3. 506), as does Propertius too (1. 8. 19), very much as to-day we have Salonika for Thessalonica. So Adryasin (Prop. 1. 20. 12) seems a similarly shortened form for Hamadryasin (v. 32). In: cras vel atra nube polum Pater occupato vel sole puro (Od. 3. 29. 44) Pater seems for Diespiter, and in return: Assyria . . . nardo (2. 11. 16) seems a lengthened form for Syria nardo.

For we have also the opposite of this omission in poetry. It is quite plain that in: ubi non Hymetto mella decedunt (2. 6. 15) decedunt is lengthened for cedunt; and so in: prospere decedentibus rebus (Suet. Iul. 24. 3). In: seu cum se Martia curru Penthesilea refert (Aen. 11. 661) Servius explains that refert is for fert or infert, and to: nec plura adludens (7. 117) Servius suggests: vacat ad et ludentem significat. So in: tuaque exspectata parenti vicit iter durum pietas? (6. 687) he explains that exspectata is for probata, as is spectata in: rebus (gestis) spectata iuventus (8. 151), which implies that ex in: exspectata pietas is superfluous. But it seems to me that: tua exspectata pietas is for: spectata pietas tui exspectati.

But the omission of the verb may be taken as the opposite of the omission of the prefix; does that ever occur? We read: neque erat Lydia post Chloen (Od. 3. 9. 6), where post seems short for postposita. When the verb is dropped and the preposition only remains, the dative must pass to an accusative, and this, no doubt, is why it is so rare with prepositions. But this difficulty is not felt with potis or pote. So we have: quam potis (est fieri) (Pl. Mil. 781), hoc facias, sive id non pote sive pote (Catull. 76. 16), nil pote supra (Ter. Ad. 264), quid pote simplicius? (Mart. 9. 15. 2). If potis or pote can be used for potest, what of the more usual ellipsis? Is not est used for potest? It would be strange if it were not. We read:

Ut caput in magnis ubi non est tangere signis  
Ponitur hic imos ante corona pedes (Prop. 2. 10. 21-2),

'as when in tall statues one cannot touch the head, the wreath is laid here before the feet'. And so in: si quid usquam iustitia est (Aen. 1. 604), est quadam prodire tenus, si non datur ultra (Ep. 1. 1. 32), neque est te fallere quidquam (Geo. 4. 447), a use corresponding exactly to pote in the examples cited. Like pote in Pl. Mil. 781 it is often for potest fieri, as

in: nil erit ut distet (Lucr. 1. 620), non est ut copia maior ab Iove donari possit tibi (Ep. 1. 12. 2), where it is nearly equivalent to licet. When for the subjunctive with ut there is substituted the infinitive, as in: nec non et Tityon . . . cernere erat (Aen. 6. 596) it becomes equivalent to licet. The Greek use of ἔστι in: ἔστι μὲν εὐδεν, ἔστι δὲ τερπομένοισιν ἀκούειν (Od. 15. 392) is parallel, but does not account for the Latin idiom. Interesting here is Propertius's use of potest for licet in: pauper, at in terra, nil ubi flere potest (3. 7. 46), evidently for: ubi sine lacrimis vitam agere licet. Compare: non sic futurumst: non potest (Ter. Phorm. 303), or: dic exeunti, potes non reverti: dic redeunti, potes non exire (Sen. Ep. 49. 9), or: possum scire ego istuc ex te quid negoti est? (Pl. Cas. 654). The use of can for may, usually so sternly censured by pedagogues with us, was usual in colloquial Latin.

In: ubi non Hymetto mella decedunt (Od. 2. 6. 15) the addition of de leaves the meaning of cedunt unchanged; just as its omission in: socii cesserunt aequore iusso (Aen. 10. 444) leaves the verb with the same meaning it has in: e pastu decedens agmine magno (Geo. 1. 381); and in prose we see the like in: inde cessero: in Africam transcendes (Liv. 21. 44. 7) and: de provincia decessit (Cic. Verr. 2. 2. 48. 20). We find pellere for depellere in: patrio . . . pellere regno (Aen. 3. 249), Europa atque Asia pulsus (1. 385), and in prose in: uti omnes ex Galliae finibus pellerentur (B. G. 1. 31. 11) and: ut possessores pellantur suis sedibus (Off. 2. 78. 22). Virgil has: praeceps se . . . ad undas misit (Aen. 4. 254), but: demissa . . . nubibus Iris (10. 73). Virgil has always vastare, but Livy has: ad devastandos fines discessere (4. 59. 2) as well as: omnia ferro ignique vastata (7. 30. 15). Following the analogy thus established, we are not surprised to find: agros Remorum depopulati (B. G. 2. 7. 3) and: qui cum agros maximos et feracissimos per se ipsum, . . . depopularetur (Verr. 2. 3. 84. 36), but: eorum agros populaturum (B. G. 5. 56 fin.) and: noctu populabatur agros (Off. 1. 33. 10). From depopulari 'to strip a land of its people' by the omission of the prefix we get the form populari, just as from cohortari 'to encourage the cohorts' we get hortari. Populari and hortari look like the older and simpler forms, but the reverse is the case. With depopulari as regards formation we may compare expectorare and degenerare; degener is later and is first formed in Virgil. So in later Latin we get verbs like adripere, the French arriver, and abocularé, the French aveugler. Woelfflin mistook the secondary populari for the primary form, of which he thought depopulari a derivative, and explained it as from populus 'the army', and as meaning 'to traverse the country with an army'. But we have little evidence that to the Roman populus ever meant an army, though in the days of Prussian lordship the idea seemed natural enough to Woelfflin.

But perfectly parallel to the use of populari for depopulari is the use of textit for detexit in Virgil without change of meaning, asserted by Servius for Aen. 10. 424-5:

dum textit Imaona Halaesus  
Arcadio infelix telo dat pectus inermum.

All the moderns translate: 'while Halaesus covered (i.e. guarded) Imaon with his shield, the unfortunate man left his breast bare to the shaft of the Arcadian chief'. Dum here takes the perfect of tego, and is joined with dat, the present of dedit, a construction exactly opposite to that prevailing for dum in prose and poetry; for dedit is not lasting but momentary. Virgil might use this exact opposite as a surprise to his readers, but it occurs nowhere else; and it is far more likely that he used textit for detexit after the analogy of populatur. Servius's note is: *dum textit*, dum spoliatur; nam tempus praesens est, non praeteritum ab eo quod est tego. Sic Plautus: ego hunc hominem hodie texam pallio. Winter (Fr. Pl. v. 294) places the quotation among the fragments of unknown Plautine plays; but it is hardly conceivable that Servius's citation is not genuine. Thilo and Hagen refer me to: illic homo hodie hoc denuo volt pallium detexere (Amph. 294) 'yon man wants to purloin this cloak anew to-day', giving me detexere the form parallel with depopulari. If I follow Servius, I return at once to the usual syntax with dum: while Halaesus is stripping Imaon of his arms, he exposes for a moment his own breast. In the context I find Halaesus engaged in a course of ruthless slaughter; there is no hint that he was likely to turn from it and expose his life to guard a fellow-warrior.

Textit has here a meaning opposite to its usual sense, just as: Rumone secundo (Aen. 8. 90) meant 'up the Tiber'. But we have an example of the same verb once expressed giving us two opposite senses in:

Tum virgam capit: hac animas ille evocat Orco  
Pallentes, alias sub Tartara tristia mittit,  
Dat somnos adimitque, et lumina morte resignat (Aen. 4. 242-4).

The difficulty is in the meaning of resignat, which may mean either to duly seal, cf. recipere, or to unseal, cf. recludere. Mr. Jas. Henry tells me: 'Virgil could hardly have chosen a more clear, proper, and forcible word to express the unclosing (unsealing) of the eyes of the sleeper, the metaphorically dead, than resignare'. I turn to Servius and read:

*resignat*, claudit. I cannot but admire the assurance of Mr. Henry, when he tells me that he cannot entertain Servius's interpretation for a moment. Who was Servius? and what qualifications had he for interpreting Virgil? But: *lumina morte resignat* explains: *adimit somnos*; does it not also explain: *dat somnos*? Was Mercury more usually engaged in restoring the dead to life than in conducting the shades to Hades? In the last verse the second colon corresponds to the double idea in the first, and in *resignat* the prefix has two meanings related to: *evocat animas* and to: *alias sub Tartara mittit*. *Morte* is for either: in *morte* or: *ex morte*, and the meaning is: 'he bestows slumbers and takes them away, and closes men's eyes in death, and opens them to life'; opening and closing eyes in sleep constitute a pair.

Of course this is a very strong and interesting example of zeugma. Let us look at other examples of zeugma to which this ellipsis gives rise. In: *quos dura premit custodia matrum* (Ep. 1. 1. 22) *premit* from the mother's standpoint seems for *comprimit*, from the boy's for *opprimit*. In: *quo res sponsore et quo causae teste tenentur* (1. 16. 43) *tenentur* fits with *res*, but is for *obtinentur* with *causae*. In: *Iliacas igitur classes atque ultima Teucrum iussa sequar* (Aen. 4. 538) *sequar* fits with *classes* but is for *exsequar* with *iussa*. In: *hinc omne principium, huc refer exitum* (Od. 3. 6. 6) with *hinc* we must imply *defer*, used for *deduce*, from the *refer* expressed with *huc*. In: *regna Neoptolemi referam versosque penates Idomenei* (Aen. 11. 264) *versosque* seems short for: *eversa eversosque*, though the form *versosque* implies also his flight to Italy; for to go into exile is: *vertere solum*. In: *te (latum) circum omnes alias irata puellas differet* (Prop. 1. 4. 21), where *te* is for: *tuum nomen*, *latum* is to be implied from *differet*.

In: *vim duram et vincula capto tende* (Geo. 4. 400) *tende* with *vim* seems for *contende*, and with *vincula* for *intende*. In: *luce demum postquam dux et miles et facta noscebantur* (Ann. 1. 39. 8) *noscebantur* with *dux et miles* is for *internoscebantur*, and with *facta* for *cognoscebantur*, and in:

Romulus et Liber pater et cum Castore Pollux,  
Post ingentia facta deorum in templa recepti,  
Dum terras hominumque colunt genus, aspera bella  
Componunt, agios adsignant, oppida condunt,  
Ploravere (Ep. 2. 1. 5-9),

when we think of the comparison of these demigods with Augustus, who is still on earth, it seems right to take *colunt* with *terras* for *incolunt*, and with *hominum genus* for *excolunt*, translating: 'while they dwelt on earth and refined the race of men'.

In: *discedam, explebo numerum, reddarque tenebris* (Aen. 6. 545) our modern scholars follow Heyne's view that *exple* means 'to fill up'. They translate: *explebo numerum* 'I will fill up the number', i.e. 'I will go back to the rest of the shades'. But Servius's view is the opposite of this: *explebo* est *minuam*: nam ait Ennius: *navibus explebant sese terrasque replebant* (Ann. 561, M.) . . . *sensus ergo est*: *minuam vestrum numerum et reddar tenebris* 'I shall withdraw from your number and be restored to the dark'. He adds that others take *explebo* here wrongly for *complebo*, as do our modern scholars. There is a third view, of which Servius knows: *finiam tempus statutum purgationi et in corpus recurram* (= *reddar tenebris*), for we have: *clausae tenebris et carcere caeco* (6. 734) of life in the body on earth. Servius prefers to take *explebo* as *minuam*, as that signifies Deiphobus's compliance with the Sibyl's wish for his departure. This would no doubt be the meaning Virgil would first wish to convey to his reader.

If so, we find in *explebo* the prefix *ex* conveying to the Roman reader the two opposite ideas conveyed by *complebo* and *deplebo* and to us by 'fill up' and 'empty', ideas which constitute a pair. The meaning found in Ennius's *explebant* is also found in: *exple animum eis teque hoc crimine expedi* (Ter. Hec. 755, cf. vv. 785 and 787 and And. 188), to which Donatus's note is: *explere inanire*, which brings *exple* into line with *expedi*. So Nonius (I. 471, M.): *explere minuire*. In Pliny N. H. 11. 19 the codices Vaticanus and Parisinus give: *sunt et operis morbi, cum favos explent*; and Hardouin seems right in preferring this to the non *explent* of the other MSS. as presenting a more difficult reading, and one certain to be changed by later scribes. In: *haec tu cum istis tuis auctoribus excogitasti, ut vetera vectigalia venderetis, et expleretis nova* (Leg. Agr. 2. 98. 36) Ennius's sense of *explere* fits so well that the only escape from it is to emend to *expilaretis*. In:

Fleque meos casus: est quaedam flere voluptas;  
Expletur lacrimis egeriturque dolor (Ov. Trist. 4. 3. 37-8),

*expletur* is best taken in this sense: 'pain is relieved and removed by tears'. In: *oblivioso levius Massico ciboria exple* (Od. 2. 7. 22) 'fill up the tankards and drain them', Horace must have been delighted with the double meaning *explere*

supplies; it is the rarer meaning of 'empty' that best suits with the *nec parce* of v. 20, and with *funde* (v. 22). The determination of our editors to give one meaning and one only to each word in Horace and Virgil is, I must assume, a feeling for the intellectual limitations of the primary classes in our schools.

Regarding the three interpretations of *explebo* presented by Servius, while I agree with him in accepting *minuam* as that to be taken by the average reader, and that for the reason he suggests—its agreement with the context—I feel that Virgil intended that the thoughtful reader should accept the third, which assumes a familiarity with vv. 723-751. In the verse: *discedam, explebo numerum, reddarque tenebris*, we have three cola, which should offer three distinct meanings. If we take *explebo* as *deplebo*, the archaic use, we have a repetition of *discedam*. If we take it as *complebo numerum*, we have a repetition of it in: *reddar tenebris*. True, it is rather more closely connected with *discedam* in the scansion of the verse, and that is the rarer meaning. But probably *explebo numerum reddarque tenebris* is a poetical inversion for *reddar tenebris et explebo numerum*: 'I will return to the shades and fulfil my purification for another life on earth'; and Virgil hopes that after perusing vv. 723-751 his thoughtful reader will see this, and restore to the verse its due order in thought. The threefold use seems parallel to that of *superum* (v. 780).

How does the verb *expleo* come to have the meaning properly given by *compleo* or *repleo*? for *replebant* in Ennius's verse cited above has the meaning of *complebant*. Of the two uses of *expleo*, that equivalent to *depleo* 'I empty' seems the older and more genuine, when we compare *ex* here with that in: *exeo, expendo, emitto, expugno, eripio*. In: *navibus explebant sese terrasque replebant* (Enn. Ann. 561, M.) we have the union: *explere et replere* 'to empty and fill again', which imply *compleo* 'to fill completely', a meaning usually conveyed by the second verb *replere*, but also later by the first verb *explere*. So the meaning 'to fill up' for *explere* seems the result of synecdoche. *Replere* too is primarily and properly 'to fill again', as we see in: *veteremque exire cruorem passa, replet sucis* (Ov. Met. 7. 287). The simple verb *pleo* is not in use in historical Latin, except in its old passive participle, *plenus*: but Festus says *plentur* is used by the antiqui. Probably it entered into such unions as *pleo et repleo, pleo et compleo, pleo et expleo*, where the resultant idea was usually expressed by the second verb of the pair; hence its loss.

We read in Plautus: *mihi magis par est via decedere et concedere* (Amph. 990), and so *concedere* is used for *decedere* by metonymy, as in: *concedi optumumst, Hegio* (Capt. 557) 'Hegio, we'd better be off', *concedite atque abscedite omnes, de via decedite* (Amph. 984), *concede hinc a foribus paulum istorsum sodes* (Ter. Phorm. 741), *ut opinor, ab eorum oculis aliquo concederes* (Cic. Cat. 1. 17. 7), *superis concessit ab oris* (Aen. 2. 91), where Servius's note is: *concessit pro decessit*, and: *ut Agrippa vita concessit* (Ann. 1. 3. 3). *Decedo* is used for *concedo* in: *minitarier populo ni decedat mihi* (Pl. Amph. 987), *qui nuper fecit servo currenti in via decesse populum* (Ter. Heaut. 32), *sanctis coepit decedere divis* (Catull. 64. 268), *vivere si recte nescis decede peritis* (Ep. 2. 2. 213).

How and whence this omission took its beginning seems clear. I read in Lucretius: *sed tamen, ut potero, summam, adtingere, tangam* (3. 261) evidently for: *adtingere, adtingam*. We know how readily Lucretius separates the prefix from the verb, as we see in: *seiungi seque gregari* (1. 452) or: *inter enim iectast vitai pausa* (3. 860). So he probably still feels: *ad tingere, ad tingam* as a fourfold union, which is reduced to three in: *ad tingere tangam*, where *tangam* is for *ad tingam*, just as in: *fortes creantur fortibus et bonis*, *fortes* is for *fortes et boni*. So in: *sonitu distare (dis)sonanti* (1. 826), *ipse in se (con)trahere et partes conducere in unum* (1. 397), *deceptaque non capiatur* (1. 941), *quo possint (con)cedentes confluere undae* (1. 374), *omnia enim stolidi magis admirantur (ad)amantque* (1. 641) cf. *quem Dion admiratus est atque adamavit* (Nep. Dion 2. 3), *cum redeunt fetusque (re)ferunt variosque lepores* (Lucr. 3. 1006), *(con)cedant arma togae, concedat laurea laudi* (Cic. Carm. Fr. 10), *his commota fugam Dido sociosque (com)parabat* (Aen. 1. 360), *osculaue impressis (in)nixa dedi gradibus* (Prop. 1. 16. 42), *vita (con)cedat uti conviva satur* (Sat. 1. 1. 119). Virgil shuns such unions as *attingere tangam*, and Ennius in the fragments shows few traces of the omission of the prefix. On the contrary, when two words are associated with like ending, at times he omits this ending, as in: *altisonum cael, endo suam do, laetificum gau* (Ann. 554-6, M.), *exutus regno ut famul oplumus esset* (Ann. 337, M.), a habit perhaps due to Oscan influence, and followed by Lucretius in: *proinde ac famul infimus esset* (3. 1035).

We read in Ennius: *quos ubi rex epulo spexit de cotibus celsis* (Ann. 437, M.), but in Virgil: *cum Iuppiter aethere summo despiciens* (1. 224). Parallel seem: *Irim de caelo misit . . . Iuno* (9. 2) but: *quis te . . . detulit in terras?* (9. 19), *munera de prono saepe (de)voluta sinu* (Prop. 1. 3. 26), *(in)missis in me certatis habenis* (3. 1. 13). We have already noted: *infelix operis summa quia (com)ponere totum nesciet*. *Hunc ego me, si quid componere curem* (A. P. 34-5) and: *pectus praeceptis (in)format amicis, asperitatis et invidiae corrector* (Ep. 2. 1. 128-9). So in: *nihil illi (in)tendere contra, sed*



celerare fugam in silvas (Aen. 9. 377-8), cetera consimili fingit ratione (com)putatque (Lucr. 1. 842), nam communibus inter se radicibus (co)haerent ex ineunte aevo coniuncta (5. 554-5). From ad in: raptas ad litora (a)vertere praedas (Aen. 1. 528) we infer the opposite a for vertere; compare: avertere pellem (Catull. 64. 5). From iugandum in Catull. 64. 21 we inferred con for sensit; so in: Thesea (de)cedentem celeri cum classe (in)tuetur (64. 53) from de implied in cedentem we infer the opposite in for tuetur, and in: summo me mittere saxo (Prop. 2. 26. 19) from de implied in: summo saxo we infer de for mittere.

## XXXIX

### ANTALLAGE

YOU will remember how in Geo. 3. 89 we found Virgil naming four persons by the names of two, as also in Buc. 6. 74 and 78-9. There we had to do with proper names, and from the examples Servius had collected, we could see that when two pairs were united in a fourfold figure, Virgil named them by the names of one of each pair, using the first and last of the four. It is comparatively easy to trace this for proper names; is the figure valid for common names as well? From some examples I have been able to collect I hope to show that it is, and that readers better versed in the Latin classics than I will be able to add to these examples.

I read: accedes siccus ad unctum (Hor. Ep. 1. 17. 12), where in their translation editors agree in following the scholia. Acron's note is: *Siccus*. Pauper tenuis. *Unctum*. Locupletem; Porphyrio's: siccus ad opulentum. So they agree in translating: 'you, a poor man, will resort to the rich man', a maxim of prime importance for the parasite's craft; for Scaeva, who is addressed here, is a budding parasite. But Wickham adds: 'It is doubtful whether unctum is neut. as in A. P. 422, "as a hungry man to a savoury dinner", or masc., the epithet being transferred from the fare to the person who partakes of it. Siccus is most easily explained by Sat. 2. 2. 14.' There we read:

Cum labor extuderit fastidia, siccus, inanis  
Sperne cibum vilem.

Kiessling quotes further: sicci mane die, dicimus uvidi (Od. 4. 5. 39), where siccus is evidently opposed to uvidus; from these he constructs a fourfold union: siccus et inanis ad uvidum et unctum. He explains unctum as: unguentis delibutum, wrongly, it seems to me; for unctus must be opposed to inanis just as uvidus is to siccus.

The parasite is a man who measures wealth, not by abundance of silver and gold, but by abundance of meat and drink; to him the poor man is not pauper, but siccus et inanis, with nothing to drink and nothing to eat; the rich man is not opulentus or locuples, but uvidus et unctus, the man who has drunk so much that the wine oozes out of him, and has fed on meats till he is greasy with their fat. We have here two pairs, of which the first and third, and the second and fourth are opposites; the figure expresses only one of each pair, here the first and fourth; so I have ventured to name the figure antallage, or exchange of opposites.

To: opinor omnibus et lippis notum et tonsoribus esse (Sat. 1. 7. 3) Prof. E. P. Morris's note is: 'lippis, tonsoribus: the shops of apothecaries and barbers were lounging places and centres of gossip. The obvious words would have been: et medicis et tonsoribus, but inflammation of the eyes was a frequent subject of ridicule, and Horace substitutes the name of this one class of patients for the commoner phrase.' No doubt the poet does shun the obvious and common phrase, and when he can, he substitutes for it the exquisite phrase got in the way I have described. For another look at the verse will convince you that here in: lippis et tonsoribus we have an antallage for: lippis et medicis, tondendis et tonsoribus.

It would be vain to expect many examples of this figure so perfectly balanced as those I have tried to elicit, but I may cite a few others I have observed, more or less perfected. Wickham has seen that a similar balance of epithets is implied in: quo pinus ingens albaque populus umbram hospitalem consociare amant ramis (Od. 2. 3. 9-10), where it seems natural to expand the subjects to: pinus ingens nigraque et tenuis albaque populus; giving us the antallage of: ingens albaque for: ingens nigraque, tenuis albaque. So in: gelidos (et puros) inficiet tibi (calido et) rubro sanguine rivos lascivi suboles gregis (Od. 3. 13. 6). So in: est modus in rebus (Sat. 1. 1. 106) we seem to have an antallage for: est modus certus omnibus in rebus. In: urbis opus (Aen. 5. 119) we best explain the phrase by expanding it to: opus tantum quantum urbis; so: una muro (6. 783) to: una urbs uno muro. In: nobilis et fama . . . memoratus in oris (7. 564) the union nobilis et memoratus seems short for: nobilis et notus, memorabilis et memoratus. In the curious phrase: munia ducis . . .

induit (Ann. 1. 69. 2) it seems natural to expand it to: *munia exsecuta personam ducis induit*; and in: *vario rumore* (3. 14. 7), which Church and Brodribb translate ‘as it was variously rumoured’, we have a shortened form for: *rumore divulgato alio et alio* ‘a report being spread abroad to this quarter and to that’. In: *qualem meruit, Pallanta remitto* (Aen. 10. 492) *qualem meruit* seems for: *qualem remitti pater meruit*.

But the balance of meaning in this figure was soon lost to some extent. In: *gratatur reduces* (Aen. 5. 40) the use of the accusative with *gratatur* puzzles the good student. Servius explains *reduces* as for *salvos*, citing: *ut reduces illi ludunt* (1. 397), where *reduces* is plainly for *salvi redeuntes*. The meaning is, not ‘he congratulates them as they return’, which would be: *eis gratatur reducibus*, but ‘he congratulates them on their safe return’, which whether we expand it as: *gratatur eis quod sint reduces* (Forbiger), or: *gratatur eis eos esse reduces*, gives us a good example of our figure. So in: *prosit nostris in montibus ortas* (9. 92), which is evidently to be expanded to: *prosit eis (navibus) eas esse nostris in montibus ortas*. We have a better example in the oxymoron: *siccabat lymphis* (10. 834), which we may express as: *lymphis lavando sanguinem siccabat*. In: *nec veni, nisi fata locum sedemque dedissent* (11. 112) the curious: *nec veni* seems short for: *nec venissem qui veni*. To: *verum ubi nulla datur dextra adfectare potestas* (3. 670) Servius’s note is: *dextram adfectare*, *dextram intendere*, *scilicet sic, ut posset navem tenere*. Nam si *dextra legeris*, ut sit ‘*dextra contingere*’, *adfectare* ‘*contingere*’ caret exemplo. But the example he cites for: *dextram adfectare: ad dominas qui adfectant viam* (Ter. Heaut. 301), shows that we must expand this expression; and following our figure we have: *dextra extenta navem adfectare*, where we may mark the necessary change in the case of *dextram*. A like change is not needed in: *mercede colonum* (Sat. 2. 2. 115) for: *mercede agros habentem colonum*. Nor in: *statimque flagitavit* (Ann. 1. 37. 1) for: *statimque legata solverentur flagitavit*.

When we compare: *signa movet* (Geo. 3. 236) of the charging bull, with: *vellere signa* (Aen. 11. 19) and with: *castra ex eo loco movent* (B. G. 1. 15. 1) it seems short for: *signa vellit et castra movet*. The curious expression *cuius modo in: cuius modo rei nomen reperiri poterat, hoc satis esse ad cogendas pecunias videbatur* (B. C. 3. 32. 2) seems short for: *cuiuscumque tantum modo* ‘of whatsoever charge merely a name could be devised’, for the context makes it clear that *rei* stands for *criminis*, a use not strange when we think of its relation to *reus*. In: *vindicta postquam meus a praetore recessi* (Pers. 5. 88) *vindicta meus* is evidently short for: *vindicta praetoris factus meus*. *Nuper me in litore vidi* (Buc. 2. 25) is short for: *nuper me in litore stans in aqua vidi*.

In:

Cor iubet hoc Enni, postquam destertuit esse  
Maeonides, quintus pavone ex Pythagoreo (Pers. 6. 10-11),

the jest in *quintus* has presented difficulties. Ennius’s words are: *memini me fieri pavum* (Ann. 15), if we may trust Vahlen. The scholiast’s note is: *ideo ‘quintus’ dicit, propter eam opinionem quae dicit animam Pythagorae in pavonem translata. De pavone vero ad Euphorbum, de Euphorbo ad Homerum, de Homero autem ad Ennium*. The apparently twofold expression in v. 11 is really fourfold union: *Pythagoras—pavo—Euphorbus—Homerus*. Of course *Euphorbus* should be given first place, and from the corrected order: *Euphorbus—Pythagoras—pavo—Homerus*, we understand Ennius’s verse, where *Homer* is the speaker, and *Tertullian’s* reference: *pavum se meminit Homerus Ennio somniantes; sed poetis nec vigilantibus credam* (De An. 33). I like to think that the scholium is from *Cornutus*, who, though he went wrong about *Euphorbus*, still could catch the fourfold figure. It was evidently lost by the time of *Donatus*, not to speak of *Servius* or *Acron*.

Just as in: *pavone ex Pythagoreo* we have a use of one for two, *pavo* and *Pythagoras*, so in: *dum veteres avias tibi de pulmone revello* (Pers. 5. 92) ‘while I relieve you by plucking your old grandmothers from your lungs’, *veteres avias* is for: *veteres veterum aviarum fabulas*. When we compare: *luant peccata* (Aen. 10. 32) with: *mei peccati luo poenas* (Cic. Att. 3. 9. 1), we see that it is short for: *luant meritas poenas peccatorum*, where after the ellipsis *peccatorum* as the object of *luant* passes from the genitive to the accusative, just as in Aen. 3. 670 we noticed *dextram* pass from the ablative to the accusative. So in: *condensae . . . sedebant* (2. 517) we have a shortening for: *condense ordine stipatae sedebant*, and in: *illum ardens infesto volnere Pyrrhus insequitur* (2. 529) *infesto volnere* seems short for: *infesto telo minanti volnus*, giving us a metonymy as the shortening of a fourfold union, just as in: *Scyllam Nisi* (Buc. 6. 74). In: *sumpsisse merentis laudabor poenas* (Aen. 2. 585) *Heyne* and *Wagner* rightly maintain that *merentis* is the accusative, not the genitive, and compare: *sceleratas sumere poenas* (2. 576). Just as in: *sceleratas sumere poenas* we have a shortening for: *feminae sceleratae sumere poenas*, so here: *sumpsisse merentes poenas* is short for: *feminae male merentis meritas poenas sumpsisse*. So in: *ille etiam seras in versum distulit ulmos* (Geo. 4. 144) *distulit* seems for *dis-*

tributas trans-tulit.

In the puzzle cited from Laevius by Gellius (19. 7. 10): item ‘curis intolerantibus’ pro ‘intolerandis’ it is better to think of intolerans here as used for intolerabilis, not intoleranda. For in:

quod si fecissem paulo saepius

Didicisset ferre et non esse intolerabilis (Afran. Com. 254-5, R.),

Nonius (179. 5, M.) says that intolerabilis means ‘quae tolerare non possit’. If intolerabilis can be used in this active sense usually expressed by intolerans, we may well expect to find intolerans in return used in the sense usual to intolerabilis, which happens to be that of intolerandus. But: curis intolerantibus ‘with sorrows beyond bearing’ seems short for: curis neque tolerabilibus tolerantibus ‘sorrows not to be endured even by the patient’, where the omitted words are expressed by in- in composition.

Turning to verbs, to: vina coronant (Aen. 1. 724) Servius tells us: *vina* pro poculis posuit, et est tropus synecdoche, ut Cererem dicimus pro frumento . . . *Coronant* autem est aut implent usque ad marginem, aut quia antiqui coronabant pocula et sic libabant; unde est: magnum cratera corona induit implevitque mero (3. 525). In both passages Virgil has in mind Homer’s: κρητῆρας ἐπεστέψαντο ποτοῖο (Il. 1. 470), and in this passage the filling up of the cups is plainly the main idea, an idea we reach when we regard: vina coronant as short for: vino pocula implendo coronant, where in the shortened form vino has assumed the inflexion of the omitted pocula. To: nunc hiemem inter se luxu quam longa fovere (Aen. 4. 193) Servius’s note is: veteres fovere pro diu incolere et inhabitare dixerunt, ut ipse alibi: fovit humum (Geo. 3. 420). But fovere hiemem is here plainly for: hiemem amores fovendo peragere; just as: castra fovere (Aen. 9. 57) is for: in castris manere se fovendo. Here in the shortened clause the gerundive coalesces with the following verb to form a verb which has the stem of the gerundive and the inflexion of the verb. So in: sed nullo ture litabis (Pers. 5. 120), where litabis is for litando impetrabis, and in: nec linguae, quantum sitiāt canis Apula, tantae (1. 60), where sitiāt is for sitiendo extrudat. So: causas exsudet (Sat. 1. 10. 28) is for: causas summo studio exsudando agat. To: annos demoror (Aen. 2. 648) Servius’s note: quasi festinantes diu vivendo detineo, gives the impression the phrase makes on his mind, but is hardly an explanation of it. We understand: impudens Orcum moror (Od. 3. 27. 50), and with its aid we may construct: annos mortem morando dego as the old fourfold expression.

In Cicero’s: liberatur Milo non eo consilio profectus esse (Mil. 47. 18) liberatur Milo seems short for: Milo vobis liberandus videtur, where liberandus is for absolvendus. Tacitus’s phrase: praeverti ad Armenios (Ann. 2. 55. 6) seems short for: ad Armenios ceteris rebus omissis sese vertere. So in: prouunt fossas (Ann. 1. 68. 2) we have a short form for: prouunt terram ad explendas fossas, and in: ruperat vittas (1. 57. 2) for: vittas abiciendo sacerdotium (= servitium) ruperat. In nullius suorum necem duravit (1. 6. 3) seems short for: in nullius suorum necem perpetrandam se duravit. Difficult is: reparavit oras in: nec latentes classe cita reparavit oras (Od. 1. 37. 24). Acron explains: non collegit denuo exercitum ex intimis regni partibus sibi faventibus; and Porphyrio: nec fugit in latentes, i.e. intimas Aegypti regiones, ut vires inde repararet. From both it is clear that this was no question of new conquests; the orae in question were already part of her domains. We may reconstruct: nec—latentes oras—opibus reparandis—repetivit.

Easiest and most usual is this figure in such phrases as: confessa deam (Aen. 2. 591) for: confessa se esse deam, artem vitae professus (Cic. Tusc. 2. 12. 4) for: artem vitae se docere professus. In: grammaticum professus, or: rhetoricen profitens we have this accusative regarded as belonging to profiteri, which has assumed the sense of docere, the omitted verb. So too in: si quis . . . simulet . . . Catonem (Ep. 1. 19. 13) for: si quis Catonem se esse simulet, or: illa chorū (se ducere) simulans (Aen. 6. 517), or: simulavit anum (Ov. Met. 3. 275), or: dissimulata deam (Fast. 6. 507). So in: dedidit iam pace (se praestare) ducem (Luc. 1. 131). In: votum pro reditu simulant (Aen. 2. 17) votum is passing through the infinitive passive into a noun; and already in: simulare mortem verbis (Ter. Heaut. 636) we have mortem used for: te filiam interfecturam. We have a like ellipsis in: impune putans (Aen. 12. 728) for: impune id fore putans, si tibi (ea se daturus) quae posco promittunt (9. 194), comitem exitii (se fore) promittebat (Ann. 3. 15. 2), modo non montes auri (illi fore) pollicens (Ter. Phorm. 68), leading to the use of a noun instead of an infinitive after verbs of promising. And so with verbs of refusing; we have this figure in: victum (se laturam) seges aegra negabat (Aen. 3. 142), illi membra (se adfore) negant (Slat. Theb. 2. 669). So too in: scribit (se daturum) nummos (Pl. Asin. 440), and probably in the much discussed: scribe decem (data esse) a Nerio (Sat. 2. 3. 69). The figure seems to have had very much to do with the later substitution of nouns for verbs. That the ellipsis was quite forgotten seems clear from: ferrum . . . nega (Mart. 1. 42. 6) and: mortem non posse negari (v. 3).

We have good examples of our figure in: *decies sestertium*, for *decies centena milia sestertium*, in *centies* and *milies sestertium* and the like, where it seems to have become purely formal. What of the form: *decem sestertia*? Probably the primary fourfold figure was: *decem milia nummum sestertium* (= *nummorum sestertium*). I find threefold unions intermediate between this and the twofold form in: *sexagena milia nummum* (Varro R. R. 3. 6. 1), *dena milia sestertia* (3. 16. 11), *dena . . . sestertia nummum* (Hor. Ep. 2. 2. 33). The order *nummus sestertius* seems to be favoured by some manuscripts, and since *nummus* was the substantive and *sestertius* the adjective, that is the order we should find common, though our editors rather favour *sestertius nummus*. But the fact that *sestertius* is the term of the pair more usually preserved also points to its occupying the second place. Probably then we should write as full form for *decem sestertia*: *decem milia nummum sestertium*.

We read:

Choerilus incultis qui vertibus et male natis

Rettulit acceptos regale nomisma Philippos (Ep. 2. 1. 233-4),

where both Acron and Porphyrio explain that Choerilus received for his verses in praise of Alexander, rough and uncouth though they were, a sovereign a verse: *pro singulis versibus singulos Philippos accepit*. Evidently the fourfold union that lies behind: *versibus . . . Philippos* is: *versibus singulis singulos Philippos*. We read in Livy: *frumentum Maelianum assibus in modios aestimatum plebi divisit* (4. 16. 2), where again we must expand to: *assibus singulis singulos in modios*. Again: *consules . . . in iugera asses vectigal . . . imposituros* (31. 13. 7) for: *in iugera singula singulos asses*. So Pliny tells us of the funeral of Scipio: *asses ergo contulit populus ac funus elocavit* (N. H. 21. 10. 7), for: *asses singulos ergo contulerunt singuli plebei*, where the irregularity in *populus* finds its parallel in Persius's verse: *o miser inque dies ultra miser* (3. 15) for: *inque dies singulos usque miserior*. The figure itself is hardly sufficient to account for the ellipsis here, disguising the meaning as it does to many students. But in speaking of distributives we noticed the constant omission of *semel*, and the frequent omission of *singuli* in: *in dies* and: *in horas*, and especially the almost constant omission of *singuli* when associated with another distribution, as in: *si inermes (singuli) cum binis vestimentis velitis ab Sagunto exire* (Liv. 21. 13. 7) or in: *bina boum . . . Acestes dat numero capita in naves (singulas)* (Aen. 5. 62). When *singuli* is joined with *singuli* as in the examples cited above, it is only logical that both should be omitted, and no doubt the Roman could supply the omission. We read:

Quinquagesima liba septimamque

Vestris addimus hanc locis acerram (Mart. 10. 24. 4-5),

where the poet is offering to the gods cakes and incense on his fifty-seventh birthday. If we assume that the poet *metri gratia* has slightly changed the order in which the words naturally occurred to him, we may derive his condensation here, 'curious and very artificial' Mr. Stephenson calls it, from: *liba quinquagesima septima et quinquagesimam septimam acerram*. It follows exactly the lines of the antallage in: *confessa deam or pollicens donum*, which he would no doubt consider perfectly natural and very commonplace.

We read:

'Da spatium vitae, multos da, Iuppiter, annos'

Hoc recto voltu, solum hoc et pallidus optas (Juv. 10. 188-9).

Most scholars translate the second verse: 'This is thy prayer in good health, this in illness is thine only prayer'. *Pallidus* perhaps refers to illness, thinks Mr. Hardy, but *recto voltu* cannot mean 'in good health'. Why cannot? is it not for 'erecto voltu' and opposed to *pallidus*? is not its opposite *deiecto voltu*? and is not that used of Marcellus in Aen. 6. 862? and Virgil tells us of him: *ostendent terris hunc tantum fata* (v. 869). But let us try our figure here: *hoc floridus et erecto voltu, hoc solum pallidus et deiecto voltu optas*. But here we have not the first and last of four terms, but the middle terms, the second and third, expressed. This is the opposite of the usual form; and we usually find the opposite of any irregularity usual in syntax. So we have: *cuncta equidem tibi, rex, fuerit quodcumque, fatebor vera* (Aen. 2, 77), where: *fuerit quodcumque* is short for: *illud fuerit quodcumque fuerit*, our English 'hap whate'er'. So: *ceu plena leo per ovilia turbans . . . manditque trahitque* (9. 340) is short for: *alia mandit, trahitque alia*. This form is more common in prose, as we see it in: *quodque facere non turpe est, modo occulte, id dicere obscaenum est* (Off. 1. 127. 35), where: *modo occulte* is short for: *dum modo occulte fiat*, and in: *quam plurimis, modo dignis, se utilem praebeat* (1. 92. 26), where: *modo dignis* is shortened and changed by attraction from: *dum modo digni sint*.

When two clauses primarily fourfold in expression are set side by side, it seems natural to shorten the second by

omitting in it the words that were already expressed in the first. The second clause thus abbreviated at times takes the usual form, as in: *si male rem gerere insani est, contra bene sani* (Sat. 2. 3. 74), where: *bene sani* is short for: *bene rem gerere est sani*. But far more frequently we have the first two words or terms of the second clause preserved, leaving the rest to be supplied from the first clause, whether from likeness or the opposite, as in: *hic nuptarum insanit amoribus, hic puerorum* (Sat. 1. 4. 27). This pattern is so usual that it passes to independent clauses, as: *quanti holus (venum eat)* (Sat. 1. 6. 112). So in: *hoc unum (sibi peperit)* (Prop. 4. 6. 64), *di melius (rem decreverunt)* (v. 65), *ante diem (fatis constitutam)* (Aen. 4. 697), *peracta messis (et ablatae fruges)* (Mart. 11. 18. 23). The adverb *saltem* is thus derived by Nigidius (Gell. 12. 14. 3): ‘*saltem*’ ex eo dictum, quod esset ‘*si aliter*’, idque ipsum dici solitum per defectionem, nam plenam esse sententiam: ‘*si aliter non potest*’. Professor Minton Warren (Am. Phil. Assoc. 32. 118) thinks that *saltem* has been formed from *si aliter* after the analogy of its opposite item, but he thinks *si* here for *sin*, and pays no attention to Nigidius’s fourfold union: *si aliter non potest*. Nigidius is a contemporary of Cicero and Caesar and seems to have been aware of the shortening from four to two. According to Nigidius, if Gellius’s reference is right (he had not himself been able to find the statement in his commentaries), *si aliter* was used for *si aliter non potest*, and had been shortened to *saltem*. Of this shortening we shall speak in a moment. (See also Appendix B.)

We should expect to find the opposite of this figure too—to find the first two terms of the fourfold union omitted. And this we have in:

donec deceptus et exspes

Nequidquam fundo suspiret nummus in imo (Pers. 2. 50-1),

where the full form is: (nequidquam suspirando) nequidquam suspiret. So in:

effluis amens,

Contemnere; sonat vitium percussa, maligne

Respondet viridi non cocta fidelia limo (Pers. 3. 20-22),

*effluis amens* is plainly for (vas vitiatum) *effluis amens*. So the natural restoration seems: (mercede promissa) *opus debentibus* (Ep. 1. 1. 21). What is *sesquipes* in:

nugaris, cum tibi, calve,

Pinguis aqualiculus protenso sesquipede extet (Pers. 1. 56-7)?

Turn back with me to Plautus:

Inde ibis porro in latomias lapidarias.

Ibi quom alii octonos lapides effodiunt, nisi

Cotidiano sesqueopus confeceris,

Sescentoplagi nomen indetur tibi (Capt. 723-6),

‘unless you do every day a day’s work and a half, you will get the name of “countless cuffs”’. Here the manuscripts have *sesqueopus*, showing that the *qui* in *sesquipes* is the older form of the conjunction *que*. And *se(m)sque opus*? What else can it be than: (opus totum) *semisque opus*?—a fine example of this form of antallage. *Sestertius* is not for *semisque tertius*, as Walde supposes, but for: (duo sestertii) *semis tertius*, an old phrase in which the conjunction was not yet expressed.

Two conceivable forms of omission remain for the fourfold union: we may have the alternate omission of the first and third terms, or of the second and fourth. No doubt there are many examples of these; I have noted the following in Persius and Sulpicia. The first and third are omitted in: *pacem longis frenavit habenis* (Sulp. 28) short for: (bellum) *pacem (futurum) longis frenavit habenis*; the second and fourth in: *cui verba? quid istas succinis ambages?* (Pers. 3. 19), where we naturally expand: *cui verba?* to: *cui (ista) verba (succinis)?* In:

Dic mihi, Calliope, quidnam pater ille deorum

Cogitat? An terras et patria saecula mutat? (Sulp. 12-13),

‘is he for returning to earth and to the realms of Saturn?’, while it seems natural to expand to: *an (caelo) terras et (regnis suis) patria saecula mutat?*, Sulpicia may have in mind: *Lucretilem mutat Lycaeum Faunus* (Od. 1. 17. 1). We read: *bisque die numerant ambo pecus, alter et haedos* (Buc. 3. 34), which Page translates: ‘and twice a day they count both of them the flock, one of them the kids also’. Servius’s note is: *bis die n. a. pecus*, et cum vadit ad pascua et cum inde revertitur. *alter et haedos*, male quidem privignum accipiunt: ‘alter’ enim de duobus dicimus, non de tribus. Unde ‘alter’ de noverca intellegamus, nee nos moveat, quod ‘alter’ dixit de femina: nam et in subauditione ponuntur ea quae non

possumus dicere, et scimus, quia quotiens haec duo genera iunguntur, femininum non praeponderat. Evidently some, puzzled by the apparent use of *alter* for *noverca*, introduced a *privignus*, a son of the *noverca*, who, after the father and stepmother had counted the whole flock, counted the kids anew. But this second computation, whether by a *privignus* or by the *noverca*, seems superfluous. Servius felt a *subauditio* here, a union of the *pater* with the *noverca* in the counting, expressed in: *quotiens duo genera iunguntur*. He does not give us the ellipsis; perhaps to determine its exact form we shall do well to turn to: *ut opus (alii) et alii proelium inciperent* (Tac. Ann. 1. 63. 7), a use of three for four. Following this we have here: *bisque die numerant ambo pecus, (capellas) alter et (altera) haedos*, where the four are represented by two, the second and fourth. Thus we have the counting morning and evening reasonably distributed between man and wife. Virgil evidently felt that the gender of *alter*, which could not be for *noverca*, would make his meaning clear to the reader who was accustomed to his figure of *antallage*.

But *saltem* and *sestertius* have been reduced from pairs to single words. We remember how *enim vero* seemed short for *enim vero tu dixisti*, and how it appears either as *enim* or *vero*. This union of the resultant terms in one seems most usual when they are either the first and second, or the third and fourth of the fourfold union. But in: *dissimulant et nube cava speculantur amicti* (Aen. 1. 516) *dissimulant* is a result of this second union, and is short for: *simulant se prorumpere nolle*, balancing the fourfold union in the second colon. *Quotannis* is short for: *tot annis quot sunt*, and is the union of its second and third terms: *annis quot*, reversed by the natural tendency to give the first place to the interrogative. Curious is its form in: *non trabe, sed tergo prolapsus et ingluvie albus* (Sulp. 36), which from: *cum fracta te in trabe pictum ex umero portes* (Pers. 1. 89) is evidently for: *non trabe (fracta et fame pallidus) sed tergo*, etc. In: *me muttire nefas? nec clam? nec cum scrobe? nusquam?* (Pers. 1. 119) we have a fourfold union passing to a threefold, double, and single. In:

*Non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis*

*Tempus eget, non, si ipse meus nunc adforet Hector* (Aen. 2. 521-2),

we have a form of this abbreviation corresponding to the copious use of ‘yes’ and ‘no’ in our modern forms of speech. And just as *non* is short for: *ne unum* and *oui* for *hoc illud*, so Skeat makes *yes* for: *gea sy* (= *sic esto*), and Kluge for *ge swa* (= *sic vero*).

Further examples are: *fallas veneno* (1. 688) for: *fallax perdas occulto veneno*, where *occulto veneno* balances *occultum ignem*; *celerans iter* (1. 656) for: *celeriter facere cupiens iter*, and: *vita (privatum armis) . . . spoliavit* (6. 168), vide Serv. *ad utrumque locum*; *regis Romani (creati secundi)*, *primam qui (primus)* (6. 810); *ineptus pastillos Rufillus olet*, *Gargonius (incultus olet) hircum* (Sat. 1. 4. 92); *caballum adripit* (Ep. 1. 7. 89) for: *caballum raptim instratum conscendit*; *victor violens* (1. 10. 37) for: *violento certamine discedens victor*; *excantare puellas* (Prop. 3. 3. 49) for: *puellas foras elicere cantando*; *sidere (orto sidere) aequinoctii* (Ann. 1. 70. 2), where the first *sidere* is for ‘storm’ (cf. Aen. 11. 260; 12. 451), and the other for ‘season’ (cf. 4. 309; Geo. 1. 1). In Aen. 2. 244 Servius explains *inmemores* as *improvidi*, though it may well refer to: *sonitum . . . dedere* (v. 243). In v. 248 *miseri* is plainly for: *laetantes quamvis miseri*; and we may assume here an example of *antallage*: *inmemores (et improvidi . . . laetantes quamvis) miseri*.

## XL

### NISI AND DONEC

Is the word or the clause the unit of speech? There is much to favour the clause, e.g. the failure to separate words in older inscriptions. Thus far in examining the fourfold union we have been occupied mainly with words, though in many cases the words primarily in question expanded into clauses. When we compare Proverbs 16. 18 with the everyday form of the proverb, we have a striking example of this, and when we come to the irregular constructions with *nisi* and *ni*, it is not words, but clauses, with which we have to deal. Most of these are found in Virgil and Tacitus, and it is only there that I have tried to examine every case; but the result tends to assure me of the correctness of the following view.

*Nisi* is a pair, made up of *ni* ‘not’ and *si* ‘if’. *Ni* is the old form of *ne*, and is still in use in phrases like: *ni mirum* ‘no wonder’, *quid ni* ‘why not’, *quid ego ni fleam?* (Pl. Mil. 1311). Of the pair *nisi* the second term *si* is often omitted, giving us *ni* with the meaning of *nisi*. *Si* is the locative of the pronoun *sos* (= *is*) still in use in Ennius in some of its case forms, as in: *constitit inde loci propter sos dia dearum* (Ann. 23, M.), *virgines iam sibi quisque domi Romanus habet sas* (102, M.). *Sos* seems the cognate of the Greek *ó* and the Sanskrit *sa*, but does not use the root *to-* to form its oblique

cases in Latin. In related clauses *si* forms a pair with *sic*, as in: *sic ignovisse putato me tibi si cenas hodie mecum* (Ep. 1. 7. 70) ‘*in this case* consider that I have pardoned you, *in case* you dine with me to-day’. *Sic* is simply *si* with the addition of the deictic suffix *so* plain in: *hisce*.

The use of *nisi* or *ni* calls for little further comment where the sequence of moods or tenses shows little or no irregularity, as in: *possum multa tibi veterum praecepta referre, ni refugis* (Geo. 1. 177), *ni dare coniugium . . . fatetur, sentiat* (Aen. 7. 433), *nisi . . . adsiduis herbam insectabere rastris . . . heu magnum alterius frustra spectabis acervum* (Geo. 1. 155-8), *natum exhortarer, ni mixtus matre Sabella hinc partem patriae traheret* (Aen. 8. 510), *nec Boi detrectassent pugnam, ni fama Insubres victos adlata animos fregisset* (Liv. 32. 31. 2). Nor does the variation of the related past and present in: *nisi me . . . ante . . . monuisset ab ilice cornix, nec tuus hic Moeris nec viveret ipse Menalcas* (Buc. 9. 14-16) present much difficulty; nor the present and perfect in: *ni mea cura resistat, iam flammae tulerint, inimicus et hauserit ensis* (Aen. 2. 600). The union of the present subjunctive and the imperfect in: *ni iam sub fine laborum vela traham et terris festinem advertere proram, forsitan et . . . canerem* (Geo. 4. 116-19) is a union of the earlier and later way of expressing the present unreal. So with the oblique in: *caelo nam Iuppiter Irim demisit germanae haud mollia iussa ferentem, ni Turnus cedat* (Aen. 9. 803-5), where: *ferentem iussa* is a present in agreement with the present perfect *demisit*. But such a syntax as: *nec veni, nisi fata locum sedemque dedissent* (11. 112) is a different matter; nor, when we consider the meaning, are matters improved at all, if we convert it to: *nec veniebam*, etc., the more usual form. If we could at once convert it to: *nec venissem*, the case would be different.

What am I to do with: *quin ipsae inter se legiones octava et quintadecima ferrum parabant, dum centurionem cognomento Sirpicum illa morti deposcit, quintadecimani tuentur, ni miles nonanus preces et adversum aspernantes minas interiecisset* (Ann. 1. 23. 6) ‘*may the eighth and fifteenth legions were for drawing sword on each other, while the former demands for death the centurion Rushlight by nickname, the men of the fifteenth protect him, had not the soldiery of the ninth interposed entreaties, and threats in the face of those who despised their entreaties*’? We had already noticed in the examples cited above several of threefold structure; this appears to be of threefold structure, but the moment we try to understand its meaning, we find that we have to supply another clause: *et re vera ferrum parassent* ‘they would indeed have drawn sword’, which at once gives us an example of fourfold union or antallage. Is such a union really involved? are there any examples of this syntax where such a fourfold union is expressed in full?

There are not many; but I seem to be able to produce two such examples, both slightly altered in structure, but plainly fourfold. We read:

Nec vero haec urbis custodia vana fuisset,  
Nec fuerat, ni Scylla novo correpta furore . . .  
O nimium cupidis Minoa inhiasset ocellis (Ciris 129-32).

Here we have the fourfold union: *nec fuerat,—nec . . . fuisset,—ni Scylla . . . correpta (esset,—et) . . . inhiasset ocellis*. *Correpta* has been reduced to a participle, but the primary syntax is easily restored; and, what is most important, the apodosis of the condition introduced by *ni*, is here expressed, showing me that I had good ground for supplying it in the previous example. This is the case too in: *is crimina maiestatis et cupidinem imperi obiectabat, praebuissetque aures Caesar, nisi Agrippinae minis magis quam precibus mutatus esset, ut accusatori aqua atque igni interdiceret* (Ann. 12. 42 fin.), where we have the verbs of the four terms in: *obiectabat—praebuisset—mutatus esset—interdiceret*. The last clause: *ut interdiceret* is an adaptation for variety of: *et interdixisset*. But it is the first term that is omitted in: *quin (omnia perlegebant et) protinus omnia perlegerent oculis, ni iam praemissus Achates adforet, atque una (adforet) . . . sacerdos* (Aen. 6. 33-5), where *quin* usually takes the indicative or imperative. So in: *continuoque (inibant et) ineant pugnas et proelia tentent, ni roseus fessos iam gurgite Phoebus Hiberno tingat equos noctemque die labente reducat* (11. 912-14), where the fourfold figure is expanded to sixfold, and the pres. subj. is used for the impf. for the present unreal. So in: *(capiebant) et fors aequatis cepissent (aequata) praemia rostris, ni palmas ponto tendens utrasque Cloanthus fudissetque preces divosque in vota vocasset* (5. 232-4). But in the great majority of examples it is the first subjunctive that is omitted. The expression in some examples of the term usually omitted gives ground for supplying it; but the expression in almost all examples of the terms omitted in these three examples makes the ground for supplying them much stronger, though they do not seem so indispensable for the expression of the full meaning.

We have the form of this figure inverted in: *ac ni propere neque corpus ullum reperiri, et servos adhibitibus cruciatibus abnuere caedem, neque illi fuisse umquam fratrem pernotuisset, haud multum ab exitio legati aberant (= non multum aberat quin legati perirent)* (Ann. 1. 23. 3), where the *nisi* clause is threefold in structure: *ni . . . reperiri . . . abnuere*

caedem . . . neque illi fuisse . . . pernotuisset, and the principal clause is simple, giving us the fourfold structure involved in a twofold one. We have a like arrangement in: *accedebant muliebres offensiones novercalibus Liviae in Agrippinam stimulis, atque ipsa Agrippina paulo commotior (atque ideo fortasse culpanda), nisi quod castitate et mariti amore quamvis indomitum animum in bonum vertebat* (1. 33. 6), where, however, it is the *nisi* clause that is simple, and the principal clause that is threefold, with one term obviously to be supplied. The inversion in *Ann.* 1. 23. 3 is plain too in: *non illa (prior fuisset), Hesperidum ni munere capta fuisset, quae volucrum cursu vicerat Hippomenen* (*Virg. Catal.* 9. 25-6). We have the fourfold form reduced to a twofold in: *mox bellum in Angrivarios Stertinio mandat, ni deditionem properavissent* (*Ann.* 2. 22. 3) short for: *mox bellum Stertinio mandat, qui Angrivarios subigeret (quos sane subegisset) ni deditionem properavissent*. In: *opposuerunt abeunti arma, (arma) minitantes, ni regrederetur* (1. 35. 4) it seems best to confine the *ni* construction to the oblique after *minitantes*, making it simple, and changing (*arma*) to: *se illum adgressuros*.

For the missing first term I supplied the imperfect even in *Aen.* 11. 912-14, as that is the tense commonly found in the first term of this figure. But it begins with the present perfect in: *nec veni*, etc. (11. 112) and in: *primam merui qui laude coronam (et tenuissem), ni me, quae Salium, fortuna inimica tulisset* (5. 355-6). In: *prope in proelium exarsere, ni Valens . . . admonuisset* (*Hist.* 1. 64. 4) *exarsere* is converted by *prope* to a virtual imperfect. In: *ferrum a latere diripuit elatumque deferebat in pectus, ni . . . adtinuissent* (*Ann.* 1. 35. 5) and: *prorupere concepta pridem odia, et summum supplicium decernebatur, ni professus indicium foret* (6. 3. 5) the perfect is followed by an imperfect in the second term. So in: *pons sublicius iter paene hostibus dedit (quod vero dedisset), ni unus vir fuisset (qui erat) Horatius Cocles* (*Liv.* 2. 10. 2). We have a present in the first place in: *at perfidus ensis frangitur in medioque ardentem deserit ictu (et ilico pereat), ni fuga subsidio subeat* (*Aen.* 12. 732-3), in *Ann.* 2. 22. 3 cited above, and in: *Orpheus . . . ni fata resistant, suscitatur, et rapta graviter pro coniuge saevit* (*Geo.* 4. 455-6), where the four clauses are: *Orpheus . . . saevit, ac poenas suscitatur, et ni fata resistant, poenas sumat*. In: *inclusam Danaen, etc. (Od. 3. 16 init.)* the four terms seem: *turris aeneae . . . (muniebant) et muniissent, ni Iuppiter et Venus scivissent fore tutum iter et risissent*. For *muniebant et muniissent* the poet has substituted *munierant*, giving it the mood of *muniebant* and the tense of *muniissent*. In: *te, boves olim nisi reddidisses . . . puerum (poena se adfecturum) minaci voce dum terret* (*Od.* 1. 10. 9-11) the *terret* with *dum* stands for an imperfect.

We have the pluperfect in: *contremuerantque patres . . . ni Celsus . . . tum inter indices, Appium et Calvisium discrimini emisisset* (*Ann.* 6. 9. 6), where *contremuerant* is the plupf. of the inceptive *contremisco*, and equivalent to an ordinary imperfect. But in: *praeclare viceramus (et hostem spoliavisse), nisi spoliatum, inermum, fugientem recepisset Antonium* (*Cic. Fam.* 12. 10. 3), and *Virg. Catal.* 9. 25 cited above, the pluperfect probably follows the analogy of uses like: *nec fuerat* (*Ciris* 130), where *fuerat* is often equivalent to *erat*. In: *effigiesque Pisonis traxerant in Gemonias ac divellebant, ni iussu principis protectae repositaeque forent* (*Ann.* 3. 14. 6) the first part is a hendiadys for: *effigies tractas . . . divellebant*.

We have the fourfold figure expanded to five in: *effigies traxerant . . . ac divellebant . . . (quas certe divolsissent) . . . ni . . . protectae . . . repositaeque forent* (3. 14. 6) and: *ferrum . . . diripuit . . . elatumque deferebat in pectus . . . (quo certe se confixisset) . . . ni proximi prensam dextram . . . vi adtinuissent* (1. 35. 5), and to sixfold in: *continuoque (inibant . . . et) ineant pugnas . . . et proelia tentent . . . ni Phoebus . . . tingat equos . . . et die labente . . . noctem reducat* (*Aen.* 11. 912-14) and: *feralem annum ferebant . . . et consilium . . . absentiae (ferebant) . . . fortuita ad culpam trahentes . . . (quae in principe vituperassent) . . . ni Caesar obviam isset . . . tribuendo (et tribuisset)* (*Ann.* 4. 64. 1). But the prevailing tendency is to contract into one the two terms expressed in either the first or second part, as in: *prolapsi . . . (non) cohibebantur (atque pugnam iniissent), ni Stertinus adcurrere . . . adtinuisset* (2. 10. 2) or: *recuperare Armeniam aebat (quod certe suscepisset), ni a Vibio . . . bellum minitante cohibitus foret* (11. 10. 1).

The disagreement of tenses in: *namque tibi reduces socios classemque relatam nuntio, et in tutum versis Aquilonibus actam, ni frustra augurium vani docuere parentes* (*Aen.* 1. 390-92) seems a result of shortening from the fourfold figure: *reduces socios (nuntio) . . . et classem . . . actam nuntio . . . (quae vera nuntiavi) . . . ni augurium vani docuere parentes*.

Much perplexity has been occasioned by the omission of the negative in: *igitur Metellus ubi videt . . . bellum renovari, quod nisi ex illius lubidine geri posset . . . statuit . . . bellum gerendum* (*Sall. Jug.* 54. 5), where *non* is felt to be needed with *geri posset*, and is usually supplied without comment. But in: *circumducto exercitu procul navibus suis castrisque, ubi spem nisi in virtute haberent* (*Liv.* 34. 16. 1) Hertz writes *non* before *nisi* in brackets, evidently feeling doubt as to its



right to the place; for Sallust and Livy may have written nisi for non nisi, especially in view of the verses of Commodianus. For Commodianus writes:

Cedet dolor omnis a corpore, cedet et volnus

Nec erit anxietas ulla, nisi gaudia semper (Apol. Carm. 794-5),

‘all pain will pass from the body, pass will every wound, nor will there be any sorrow, but delights alway’. Nisi, here used as our ‘but’, must be short for: nil erit nisi. And again the shortening of our fourfold figure to three solves the difficulty, for we have:

Quod . . . non . . . nisi ex illius lubidine . . . geri posset,

Ubi . . . spem (nullam) . . . nisi in virtute . . . haberent,

(Nil erit) . . . nisi . . . gaudia . . . semper (erunt).

Interesting to me in this connexion is the use of donec with the subjunctive, where donec is purely temporal in meaning. We find for donec the older form donicum in the fragments of Livius Andronicus and in Plautus and Cato, as in: ibi manens sedeto donicum videbis me (Liv. Andr. Od. 19. 9), donicum solutum erit (Cato R. R. 146. 2), ego me amitti, donicum ille huc redierit, non postulo (Pl. Capt. 339). It seems for do-ne-cum, where ne is the interrogative particle, cum is ‘when’, and do- is the phonetic equivalent of our ‘to’, as it seems to be in quando and gerundos. Following Grimm’s Law do is the German zu, the English to, just as lacrima (= lacrima) is the German Zähre, our tear. Donicum, later donec (cf. nihilum and nihil), is primarily ‘till when?’ and later ‘until’, and in archaic and classical Latin it is constructed with the indicative except in oblique. But in: temporibus Augusti dicendis non defuere decora ingenia, donec gliscente adulatione deterrentur (Ann. 1. 1. 4) ‘splendid geniuses were not wanting to tell the story of Augustus’s days, till they were frightened away by the rise of flattery’, it is constructed with the subjunctive for no visible reason.

This use of the subjunctive with donec first appears to my knowledge in Livy, where we read of the elephants: nihil sane trepidabant, donec continenti velut ponte agerentur, primus erat pavor, cum soluta ab ceteris rate in altum raperentur; ibi urgentes inter se cedentibus extremis ab aqua trepidationis aliquantum edebant, donec quietem ipse timor circumspicientibus aquam fecisset (21. 28. 10-11). The first donec is used in the sense of dum, ‘they showed no fear whatever so long as they were driven as it were along a bridge without a break’; but in the second part, ibi . . . fecisset, ‘then, while those on the outer edge backed away from the water against the others, the brutes occasioned a good deal of alarm, till very fear had imposed quiet upon them as they looked around at the water’. Donec in the first clause takes the imperfect subjunctive, in the second the pluperfect; and it is in this rare use that we feel its connexion with nisi. For here it seemed to me easy to substitute nisi for donec; from the clauses with this substitution I could frame the fourfold union: trepidationis aliquantum edebant (et fortasse nonnulli in flumen se extrusissent), nisi aquam circumspexissent et timore ipso quievissent. For this substitution at once accounted for the new subjunctive with donec, and by that substitution this was at once gained, that from a syntax which we feel to be awkward and disjointed all feeling of ellipsis at once disappeared, and the only trouble left was for the grammarian who had to account for the subjunctive—a worry that has remained almost inaudible in my experience. Livy may have used the construction again; for in: progredi . . . non poterat, donec a consule lictores missi essent, qui summoto iter ad praetorium facerent (45. 7. 4) ‘no advance was possible, till the consul had sent his lictors to clear the way to his tent’, missi essent is the reading of Kreyssig for mis ssent of the MSS.

While Livy uses nisi and donec with both the imperfect and the pluperfect subjunctive, Tacitus uses donec always with the imperfect subjunctive, when it takes that mood, and nisi as a rule with the pluperfect. In consequence donec in Tacitus does not suggest by its meaning its use for nisi. But where Tacitus uses nisi with the imperfect, as in: nondum tamen summa moliri Agrippina audebat, ni praetoriarum cohortium cura exsolverentur Lusius Geta et Rufius Crispinus (Ann. 12. 42 init.), ni seems to be nearer in meaning to ‘until’ than to ‘unless’. The same is true of many uses of ni with the pluperfect, as in: trudebantur in paludem gnaram vincentibus, iniquam nesciis, ni Caesar productas legiones instruxisset (Ann. 1. 63. 3), quibus additis praepollebat, ni Inguimerus cum manu clientium ad Maroboduum perfugisset (2. 45. 2); see also 2. 10. 2; 3. 28. 6; 4. 30. 4; 6. 36. 1; 12. 39. 1. Of course there is no question in my mind of a direct substitution of donec for nisi by Livy; such changes arise in popular usage. From such an example of the fourfold union as we have in: inter se legiones . . . ferrum parabant, dum centurionem . . . hi tuentur, (et ferrum parassent) ni miles nonanus preces . . . interiecisset (1. 23. 6), where the first two terms are connected by dum, the second two by ni, when we think of Livy’s use of donec for dum in this connexion, it is conceivable that ni in the second was replaced by donec, which expressed the meaning so much more smoothly. So true is this that we feel that the moment donec had once been

substituted for *ni* here the innovation was certain to find acceptance and to prevail, as it has with the imperfect subjunctive. Sed, *si quid novisti rectius his, candidus imperti*. (See also Appendix C.)

## XLI

### FIRST AND LAST

WE read in Virgil: *non ignara mali miseris succurrere disco* (Aen. 1. 630). *Nobilissimus versus*, writes Heyne, *gravissima sententia*; if a youth, when once he has caught the meaning of this verse, is not thrilled with pleasure, Heyne's advice is to drive him at once from the perusal of the poets. He adds: *turbas Burm. post Servium facit. Sensus: ipsa οὐκ ἀπειρόκακος, ipsa tot adversa experta, animum habeo primum ad succurrendum aliis, qui et ipsi fortuna adversa iactantur. disco, teneo, novi*. So every one else has translated the verse in modern times, except perhaps the unfortunate Burmann, who was misled by Servius. How unfortunate it would be to disturb such harmony, or after Heyne's prelude to question the correctness of his translation! And yet: *aliud est disco, novi omnino aliud*. Every teacher and every student knows that 'I am a learner' is not the same as 'I know'; and Forbiger and other modern scholars who follow Heyne's translation do not quote his: *disco, novi*.

Servius tuibas faciebat. You will think so, when first you read his note to this verse. Quare 'non disco'? he begins, *quia non sum ignara; bis enim intellegimus non, ut supra diximus*. He is referring to the end of his long note on Scyllam Nisi (Buc. 6. 74), where he suggests supplying from aut Scyllam a second aut with *quam fama secuta est* (which may be right), and adds: *ut est illud in primo (630), non ignara, etc*. You are to supply from aut Scyllam a second aut with *quam*, just as from non ignara you supply a second non with disco, but while the first and last words of a verse are usually in close connexion, I can trace no such connexion between Scyllam and quam. The connexion I do see forbids the supplying of aut; but not so the connexion of non ignara with disco. Servius does not found his suggestion on any feeling for or consciousness of such a connexion. And yet Servius, for all his ignorance of Latin poetry, to use a Scotch idiom, might have expected some slight attention from our modern scholars; no editor of Virgil since Heyne, except Conington, refers to his note.

They do not copy Heyne's: *disco, novi*. 'Disco', says Conington, 'seems to be used instead of didici, as more modest', and he adds that Servius seems to have found some difficulty in the tense, as he wishes to take non twice. What a pity Servius could not learn from our modest moderns! Disco is modest for didici; I suppose *vivunt* is modest for *vixerunt*. Here you will protest, who remember how after Lentulus and Cethegus were strangled in the Tullianum, Cicero announced their fate in the Forum with the one word: *vixerunt*. He did not mean 'they are alive'; he meant the opposite; and in like fashion disco is not modest for didici; it is the opposite. Servius is right when he tells us that here it is for: non disco; and we must translate 'not untaught of ill I am no learner in succouring the wretched'. And you will notice that he does not enlarge on the matter, but expects that all his hearers and readers will accept his interpretation at once, though he seems unable to develop the reason for supplying non a second time. Servius does not know all about Virgil's Latin; Nigidius, and Cornutus, and even Hyginus seem to know more, but it is not well for modern scholars to despise him. In questions of idiom how weak is the wisdom of the wise!

What is the principle underlying Servius's explanation of our verse?—a verse which, despite its apparent simplicity, both Heyne and Conington fail to translate. While I fail to find any principle to justify his supplying aut with *famam*, which from its position at the end of his long note looks like a *pis aller*, that is not true of his: non disco. It fits the sense, which disco does not. Let us turn to one of Horace's simplest verses:

Virtus est vitium fugere, et sapientia prima  
Stultitia caruisse (Ep. 1. 1. 41-2.),

'virtue is to avoid vice, and the beginning of wisdom to get clean rid of folly'. The second half seems right, but the first? What an empty and negative definition of virtue! Porphyrio has no note, but Acron: *iste ordo vivendi, ut inprimis vitia fugiamus, deinde per sapientiam stultitia careamus*. It does not help us far; we find more help in Quintilian's: *prima virtus est vitio carere* (8. 3. 41). And so Kiessling supplies prima with virtus in Horace's verse, and we have, 'the beginning of virtue is the avoidance of vice, and the beginning of wisdom perfect freedom from folly'. Wickham's note is: 'We are probably, as is usual with Horace, to understand prima from its second substantive'. Is supplying prima in

this way so usual with Horace? Why does not Wickham give us a few examples, that we may understand the meaning of his note?

We have all noticed again and again the close connexion existing in many verses between the first and last words of the verse. For Aen. 1. 630 Servius tells us that from: non ignara at the beginning of the verse we must supply non with disco at the end; we have now found with Kiessling that from sapientia prima at the end of the verse we must supply prima with virtus at its beginning. In Virgil's verse we have: non ignara . . . non disco shortened to: non ignara . . . disco; in Horace's verse we have: virtus prima . . . sapientia prima shortened to virtus . . . sapientia prima. It is the shortening from four to three, the shortening which at times we call hypallage, at times zeugma, at times the amphibole. It is evidently found when a verse begins and ends with a pair of words connected in sense, and when one of one pair coincides with or is opposed to one of the other. Have we such verses? In: optabam primum montes primumque petebam (Aen. 2. 636) we have a verse beginning and ending with such pairs, where no shortening has taken place. This may be what Wickham meant, but I don't think so.

I have noted this shortening at the end of the following verses: moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque (antiquis) (Enn. Ann. 426, M.), ite domum pasti, si quis pudor, ite iuveni (Buc. 7. 44) cf. ib. 10. 77, occultum inspire ignem fallasque veneno (occulto) (Aen. 1. 688), imponit suaque arma viro remumque tubamque (insculpsit) (6. 233) and Servius's note, parva Philoctetae subnixa Petelia (parvo) muro (Aen. 3. 402) for Servius notes: condita iam pridem civitate murum tantum factum (esse), Acrisioneis Danae fundasse (Acrisioneis) colonis (7. 410), nondum subacta ferre iugum (nondum) valet cervice (Od. 2. 5. 1-2), infirmo capiti fluit utilis, utilis alvo (infirmo) (Ep. 1. 16. 14), iratus tibi quod vini somnique (tibi) benignus (Sat. 2. 3. 3), me modo laudabas et carmina nostra (modo) legebas (Prop. 2. 24. 21), ferte per extremas gentes et ferte per (extremas) undas (1. 1. 29), sic hodie veniet si qua negavit heri (se venturum) (2. 14. 20), haec (moenia) di condiderunt, haec di quoque moenia servant (3. 11. 65), nulla (reverentia) est poscendi, nulla est reverentia dandi (3. 13. 13), uvaque conspecta livorem ducit ab uva (conspecta) (Juv. 2. 81), where the scholium quotes the proverb: uva uvam videndo varia fit. In this verse the conspecta expressed goes with uva at the end, and the conspecta to be supplied goes with uva at the beginning of the verse. Far more numerous are the omissions at the beginning of the verse, as in: ardua (viai) dum metuunt, omittunt vera viai (Lucr. 1. 659), extorres (longe) idem patria longeque fugati (3. 48), hos (horrendos) Helenus scopulos, haec saxa horrenda canebat (Aen. 3. 559), ille (velocem) ictum venientem a vertice velox praevidit (5. 444), et si (non adversa) fata deum, si mens non laeva fuisset (2. 54), nigram (infelici) Hiemi pecudem, Zephyris felicibus albam (3. 120), dente (vel uno turpior) si nigro fieres, vel uno turpior ungui (Od. 2. 8. 3), nec tantum (servire) ingenio, quantum servire dolori (Prop. 1. 7. 7), non ulla verebor regna (contemnere) vel Alcinoi munera despicere (1. 14. 23-4), ultima (fides mea) talis erit quam mea prima fides (2. 20. 34), quae (fiat) tibi terra, velim, quae tibi fiat aqua (2. 16. 46), aut pudor (reticendus) ingenuus aut reticendus amor (2. 24. 4), noli (conferre) nobilibus, noli conferre beatis (2. 24. 49), non si (regna) Cambysae redeant et flumina Croesi (2. 26. 23), hoc (nunc) perdit miseras, hoc perdidit ante puellas (2. 28. 7), praeterea (metuis) domibus flammam, metuisque ruinas (2. 27. 9), materia (pari) constare putat paribusque elementis (Juv. 14. 17). The lines beginning and ending in pairs from which such ellipses proceed seemed to me so numerous that no reader of Virgil or Propertius can miss them.

Turn with me to a verse which seems not to have been translated by any one in modern times. We read:

Ibant octonis referentes idibus aera (Sat. 1. 6. 75),

if our editor chooses to give us the text explained by Acron and given by the best manuscripts. Nowadays it is becoming more and more the fashion to read with the worse manuscripts as do Keller-Holder:

Ibant octonos referentes idibus aeris.

Acron's scholium is: *ibant octonis referentes idibus aera*. Nummos pro mercedibus, octonos asses aeris, quia ante idus mercedes dabantur. *Idibus aera*. Per idus antea mercedes dabantur. It is from this scholium that the readings octonos and aeris have been derived by the poorer manuscripts, and yet Acron gives us octonis as the reading of his text and twice repeats aera. The secret is that just as in Aen. 1. 630 Servius read in the end of the verse non disco, though non was not written there, just as in 'good men and true' we see 'true men', so here Acron was explaining: ibant octonis referentes idibus octona aera. He takes the ellipsis as a matter of course, a matter needing no explanation for his readers. He begins by explaining: octona aera as: octonos asses aeris, the prose expression for it, just as Servius explains: socii cesserunt aequare iusso (Aen. 10. 444) by the prose form: socii cesserunt campo iussi. We can see how the poorer reading is derived; the justification of the reading which Acron explains comes to us only with the knowledge of this ellipsis which has eluded our editors. But we may also judge the readings by what they tell us; Keller's reading tells us that they

brought eight asses apiece on the ides, presumably of each month in the year; Acron's, that they brought eight asses apiece on the ides of eight months in each year. Any one who has passed a summer in the south of Italy will understand the necessity of setting aside as holidays the four summer months from June to September.

Verses in which the first and last words are the same, or are closely connected in sense or form or both, are numerous in the poets; but in poetry variety is constantly aimed at, and so such verses are not found in succession. We have the same word in: *unum illud tibi, nate dea, proque omnibus unum* (Aen. 3. 435) and: *ultra animos tollit dictis atque increpat ultra* (9. 126), thrice in: *Oceanitides ambae, ambae auro, pictis incinctae pellibus ambae* (Geo. 4. 341-2), and with change of inflexion in: *Daphnim ad astra feremus, amavit nos quoque Daphnis* (Buc. 5. 52), *vela facit tamen et plenis subit ostia velis* (Aen. 5. 281), *Tantalum atque Tantali* (Od. 2. 18. 37), *Romae Tibur amem ventosus, Tibure Romam* (Ep. 1. 8. 12), *sacra facit vates, sint ora faventia sacris* (Prop. 4. 6. 1), *Caesaris in nomen ducuntur carmina: Caesar* (4. 6. 13). We have a word halved in: *Argi nempe soles subire letum* (Mart. 1. 117. 9), and in: *Celso gaudere et bene rem gerere Albinovano* (Ep. 1. 8. 1) we have the cognomen and nomen of the same person, to which: *Magna Caecilio incohata Mater* (Catull. 35. 18) is parallel.

In the following the verse begins and ends with different names, proper or common, applied to the same person or thing: *Ilium, et ex imo verti Neptunia Troia* (Aen. 2. 625), *Italiam dixisse ducis de nomine gentem* (1. 533), *Panthus Othryades, arcis Phoebique sacerdos* (2. 319), *arboribus clausa circum et horrentibus umbris* (3. 230), *Ascanium surgentem et spes heredis Iuli* (4. 274), *Annam cara mihi nutrix huc siste sororem* (4. 634), *exsulibusne datur ducenda Lavinia Teucris?* (7. 359), *rectores iuvenum et rerum dedit esse magistros* (9. 173), *et Dauno possem incolumem servare parenti* (10. 616), *di maris Aegaei, quos sunt penes aequora, venti* (Prop. 3. 7. 57), *Vertumnus verso dicor ab amne deus* (4. 2. 10), *Acmen Septimius suos amores* (Catull. 45. 1), *Ennius et sapiens et fortis et alter Homerus* (Ep. 2. 1. 50), *sit Tityrus Orpheus, Orpheus in silvis, inter delphinas Arion* (Buc. 8. 56).

In the following the first and last words of the verse are opposed: *Atridas Priamumque et saevum ambobus Achillem* (Aen. 1. 458), *Hectore qui redit exuvias indutus Achilli* (2. 275), *Myrmidonumque dolos; fusi per moenia Teucris* (2. 252), *Hectoreum ad tumulum viridi quem caespitem inanem* (3. 304), *certa manent pueri et palmam movet ordine nemo* (5. 349), *ignaros, Rhoetum vigilantem et cuncta videntem* (9. 345), *extremi primorum, extremis usque priores* (Ep. 2. 2. 204), *o maior tandem parcas, insane, minori* (Sat. 2. 3. 326), *iratus tibi quod vini somnique benignus* (2. 3. 3), *sicci mane die dicimus uvidi* (Od. 4. 5. 39), *magna modis tenuare parvis* (3. 3. 72), *ducere et rivos celeres morari* (3. 11. 14), *Tyrrhenum omne tuis et mare Ponticum* (3. 24. 4), *Cecropiam solitam esse dapem dare Minotauro* (Catull. 64. 79), *Theseus infernis, superis testatur Achilles, hic Ixioniden, ille Menoetiaden* (Prop. 2. 1. 37-8), *Cimbrorumque minas et benefacta Mari* (2. 1. 24), *desit odoriferis ordo mihi lancibus, adsint* (2. 13. 23), *nox tibi longa venit, nec reditura dies* (2. 15. 24), *et terram rumor transilit et maria* (2. 18. 38), *ex oculis quae mox narret facundia praesens* (A. P. 184), *Lesbia quis ipsa notior est Helena* (Prop. 2. 34. 88), *sicca sed in prima aspergis vestigia lympa* (Auson. Id. 10. 47), *Oenotri coluere viri, nunc fama minores* (Aen. 1. 532).

The following are of persons closely connected by relation or occupation, or of words joined in construction or closely allied in meaning, and at times in sound and form. In: *Neptunus fratri par in amore Iovi* (Prop. 2. 26. 46) the union is indicated by the central word in the verse; they are *par nobile fratrum*. We have a pair of rustic minstrels in: *Damonis musam dicemus et Alphisiboei* (Buc. 8. 5), and a pair of great lyric poets in: *Callimachi manes et Coi sacra Philetae* (Prop. 3. 1. 1); a pair of lovers in: *Colchida sic hospes quondam decepit Iason* (2. 21. 11), and of unfortunates beloved of Jove in: *ut Semela est combustus, ut est deperditus Io* (2. 30. 29), where the gender seems interesting. And the connexion is not hard to trace in: *Tydidem sed enim scelerumque inventor Ulixes* (Aen. 2. 164), *Trinacria fines Italos mittere relictas* (3. 440), *Romulus Assaraci quem sanguinis Ilia Mater* (6. 778), *manque vasto fert uterque Neptunus* (Catull. 31. 3), *Phasidos ad fluctus et fines Aeetaeos* (4. 3), *aequoreae monstrum Nereides admirantes* (64. 15), *Cranonisque domos ac moenia Larissaea* (64. 36), *Maecenatis erunt vera tropaea fides* (Prop. 3. 9. 34), *Penelope melius, levius torquetis Arachne* (Juv. 2. 56). And so with: *frigora nec tantum cana concreta pruina* (Geo. 2. 376), *nox erat, et placidum carpebant fessa soporem* (Aen. 4. 522), *delphinum caudas utero commissas luporum* (3. 428), *desertosque videre locos litusque relictum* (2. 28), *fecunda vitis, nec sterilem seges* (Od. 3. 23. 6), *derecta plumbo et pumice omnia aequata* (Catull. 22. 8), *puberibus caulem foliis et flore comantem* (Aen. 12. 413), *saepius Andromache ferre incommitata solebat* (2. 456), *vivamus, mea Lesbia, atque amemus* (Catull. 5. 1), *attrivere utroque animam sub fasce dedere* (Geo. 4. 204), *dixit et in silvam pennas ablata refugit* (Aen. 3. 258), *praedicam et repetens iterumque iterumque monebo* (3. 436), *vixi, et quem dederat cursum Fortuna peregi* (4. 653), *luserat insignis facie multoque iacebat* (9. 336),

deest iam terra fugae; pelagus Troiamne petemus (10. 378), sensi ego, cum insidiis pallida vina bibi (Prop. 4. 7. 36). In: commendo sociis et curva valle recondo (Aen. 2. 748) we have in: commendo et recondo a hendiadys for: reconditos commendo. Tacitus, a close student of Virgil's style, imitates him at times in this arrangement also, as in: citatus ab imperatore nomen, ordinem, patriam, numerum stipendiorum, quae strenue in proeliis fecisset, et cui erant dona militaria, edebat (Ann. 1. 44. 7).

But the most usual relation between the first and last words of a verse is that of the adjective and the noun. We have: suspensi Eurypylum scitantes oracula Phoebi (Aen. 2. 114), apparent only, but real in: Delius aut Cretae iussit considerare Apollo (3. 162), tres adeo incertos caeca caligine soles (3. 203), obscenas pelagi ferro foedare volucres (3. 241), et patrio Harpyias insontes pellere regno (3. 249), sola novum dictuque nefas Harpyia Celaeno (3. 365), purpureo velare comas adopertus amictu (3. 405), speluncam Dido dux et Troianus eandem (4. 124), solaque culminibus ferali carmine bubo (4. 462), falcibus et messae ad lunam quaeruntur ahenis (4. 513), Troia Criniso conceptum flumine mater (5. 38), ereptumque dolo reddi sibi poscit honorem (5. 342), sordidus ex umeris nodo dependet amictus (6. 301), quos dulcis vitae exsortes et ab ubere raptos (6. 428), Daucia Laride Thymberque simillima proles (10. 391), votiva pateat veluti descripta tabella (Sat. 2. 1. 33), multi Lydia nominis, Romana vigui clarior Ilia (Od. 3. 9. 7-8), Thurini Calais filius Ornyti (v. 14), reiectaeque patet ianua Lydiae (v. 20), o nullis tutum credere blanditiis (Prop. 1. 15. 42), nam cui non ego sum fallaci praemia vati? quae mea non decies somnia versat anus (2. 4. 15-16), et volucres ramo submovet insidias (1. 20. 30), saxosamque forat sedula gutta viam (4. 5. 20).

In: frigidus Arcadibus coit in praecordia sanguis (Aen. 10. 452) frigidus is predicative, which explains its agreement with sanguis, for which the usual attribute is calidus. In: Tyrrhenusque tubae mugire per aethera clangor (8. 526) Tyrrhenus is transferred from tubae to clangor to heighten the agreement between first and last. But that is not the case with: Tisiphoneque sedens palla succincta cruenta (6. 555) and: Sidonio est invectus equo, quem Candida Dido (5. 571), where the agreement is in form and not in syntax. In: Emathiaque iterum maeffient caede Philippi (Ov. Met. 15. 824) contrary to usage thus far Emathia has been transferred from Philippi to caede. In: litora, dat signum specula Misenus ab alta (Aen. 3. 239), mortales, totidem nobis animaeque manusque (10. 376), quae tibi si veris animis est questa puella (Prop. 3. 6. 35) the agreement is of form only. In: ingenti gyro, sed sustinet aureus umbo (Aen. 10. 884), while the two words at the beginning, and the two at the end are connected, the agreement between gyro and umbo is in rhyme only. To: hoc tunc Ignipotens caelo descendit ab alto (8. 423) Servius's note is: hoc pro huc posuit secundum antiquum morem. Virgil seems to have given huc its antique form here to preserve an appearance of agreement with alto.

The reader will notice how in: primo ne medium, medio ne discrepet imum (A. P. 152) the positions of primo, medio, and imum correspond to the meanings of each. The opposite is true of principiis in: his Troiana vides funera principiis (Prop. 2. 6. 16). But he will find a like agreement in the following: et tuba commissos medio canit aggere ludos (Aen. 5. 113), demens qui Rutulum in medio non agmine regem (9. 728), obruis insano terque quaterque mari (Prop. 3. 7. 6), devolvunt; alii strictis mucronibus imas (Aen. 2. 449), undique ponderibus solidis confluet ad imum (Lucr. 1. 987), corporis officiumst quoniam premere omnia deorsum (1. 362). I have little doubt that in: conceptum summum aetatis pervadere finem (1. 555) finem, the correction in the margin of Flor. 30, is right, being the object of motion to with pervadere, like Romam ire in prose, and the opposite of conceptum. But variety is the poetic principle; and while Lucretius gives us: nam quodcumque suis mutatum finibus exit (1. 670), the next verse is: continuo hoc mors est illius quod fuit ante, where the position of ante is opposed to its meaning. So in: extremi primorum, extremis usque priores (Ep. 2. 2. 204) and: extremus formaque ante omnes pulcher Iulus (Aen. 5. 570), where the meaning of the line vindicates the first place for extremus, showing that in the case of Iulus the last is first.

Worth notice here is Lucretius's representation of mixture in: verum semina multimodis inmixta latere multarum rerum in rebus communia debent (1. 895-6), with which compare Virgil's involution of the game of Troy: inde alios ineunt cursus aliosque recursus adversi spatii, alternosque orbibus orbes impediunt (5. 583-4). The idea of inter is not difficult to represent by order of words, and we have it in: est inter Tanaim quiddam socerumque Viselli (Sat. 1. 1. 105), where of course quiddam is the word in question. Nor is the idea of separation, which Lucretius gives us in: discidio potis est seiungi seque gregari (1. 452), where potis est balances seque gregari, giving us two pictures of division. The idea of interfusion in interesse is brought out in the order of the last four words in: intersintque patris lacrimis, solatia luctus exigua ingentis (Aen. 11. 62), where not merely the words, but the verses are involved; for the last two belong to v. 63. The correspondence of first and last in a verse is well calculated to convey the idea of encircling, confining, or enclosing that we have in: taurino quantum possent circumdare tergo (1. 368), Lernaean turba caput circumstetit anguis

(8. 300), speluncam Dido dux et Troianus eandem (4. 124), totum ut te faciant, Fabulle, nasum (Catull. 13. 14). And to close our paragraph appropriately, you will notice how in: infelix saxis in procurentibus haesit (Aen. 5. 204) haesit 'she sticks fast' is followed at once by a full stop.

In: Boeotum in crasso iurares aere natum (Ep. 2. 1. 243) Kiessling and Wickham make Boeotum a genitive (= Βοιωτῶν) dependent on aere, a connexion that suits our English version. But its position connects it with natum, and Acron's note: Boeotum, id est, quemlibet ex Boeotia, shows that he took it for an accusative. We may ask whether Horace did not intend an ambiguity here, which, while it is awkward to turn into English, is just what both he and Virgil delighted in. In: fidens iuventus horrida bracchiis (Od. 3. 4. 50) shall we make fidens for confidens and translate: 'the presumptuous youth bristling with arms' (Briareus had a hundred arms), or shall we follow Acron and translate: 'the uncouth youth trusting in their strength of arm', making bracchiis a metonymy for viribus? Centimanus Gyas (v. 69) favours the first rendering. In: praecipites metus acer agit quocumque rudentes excutere (Aen. 3. 682) we need praecipites as the object of agit, which seems, moreover, the first word in the second colon, while its position connects it with rudentes. But if we so connect it, it will be as a transferred epithet, which will not affect our translation.

Very common is the occurrence of pairs of words at the beginning and end of the verse, of which pairs at times one term of either the initial or the final pair is not expressed, though it seems present in the consciousness of the reader. We have the opposite of this ellipsis in: inter Peliden festinat et inter Atriden (Ep. 1. 2. 12). We have a good example of such pairs in: unguibus ora soror foedans et pectora pugnis (4. 673), vinaque fundebat pateris animamque vocabat (5. 98), ipsa canat vocemque volens atque ora resolvat (3. 457), disce tuum, ne me incuses, Iuturna, dolorem (12. 146), desine meque tuis incendere teque querelis (4. 360), candida tam foedo brachia fusa viro (Prop. 2. 16. 24), frigidaque Eoo me dolet aura gelu (1. 16. 24), Ino etiam prima terris aetate vagata est (2. 28. 19), omnia post obitum fingit maiora vetustas (3. 1. 23), altera maternos exaequat turba Libones (4. 11. 31).

Participles are involved in: sole dies referente siccos (Od. 3. 29, 20), et scissa gaudens vadit Discordia palla (Aen. 8. 702). We have adjectives with dependent ablatives in: purpurei cristis iuvenes auroque corusci (9. 163). Most usual is the adjective in agreement with a noun, as in: adversi rupto ceu quondam turbine venti (2. 416), custodes lecti Phoenix et dirus Ulixes (2. 762), aerae quercus aut coniferae cyparissi (3. 680), litoreis ingens inventa sub ilicibus sus (3. 390), per medias urbes agitur populosque feroces (7. 384), inmanem veluti pecora inter inertia tigrim (9. 730), caesa manus iuvenum foede thalamique cruenti (10. 498), sola Sophocleo tua carmina digna cothurno (Buc. 8. 10), quo vafer ille pedes lavisset Sisyphus aere (Sat. 2. 3. 21), at roseo niveae residebant vertice vittae (Catull. 64. 309), unum opus est, operi non datur unus honos (Prop. 4. 2. 64), Assyrias Latio maculavit sanguine Carrhas, Parthica Romanos solverunt damna furores (Luc. 1. 105-6). It is involved with genitives in: infelix simulacrum atque ipsius umbra Creusae (Aen. 2. 772), infantumque animae flentes in limine primo (6. 427), aeternum telorum et virginitatis amorem (11. 583), Romula ne faciem laederet hasta Tati (Prop. 4. 4. 26).

We have lines beginning with a set of three words and ending with a similar set. In some examples these are isolated and parallel sets, as in: mens inmota manet, lacrimae volvuntur inanes (Aen. 4. 449), urbem praeclaram statui, mea moenia vidi (4. 655), summa petit scopuli, siccaque in rupe resedit (5. 180), prona petit maria et pelago decurrit aperto (5. 212), maius adorta nefas, maioremque orsa furorem (7. 386), regnave prima Remi aut animos Carthaginis altae (Prop. 2. 1. 23), huius ero vivus, mortuus huius ero (2. 15. 36), maxima praeda tibi, maxima cura mihi (2. 16. 2), nec cito desisto, nec temere incipio (2. 20. 36), meque deum clament, et mihi sacra ferant (3. 9. 46). In: heu terra ignota canibus data praeda Latinis (Aen. 9. 485) Bentley changed data to date as there was data in the verse before it, and Sidgwick follows this, but plainly data must agree with praeda. So far we had two sets of three occupying the verse; but some have an additional word or phrase dividing the sets, as in: tu vina Torquato move consule pressa meo (Epod. 13. 6), frenaque bina meus quae nunc habet aurea Pallas (Aen. 8. 168), urbe velit posita templis sibi ferre dicatis (5. 60).

We have ellipses arising from this arrangement in: culmina perque hominum volvuntur perque (culmina) deorum (4. 671), illum et labentem (risere) Teuceri et risere (illum) natantem (5. 181), tela manu miseri iactabant irrita (incerta) Teuceri (2. 459), oderunt hilarem tristes, (oderunt) tristemque iocosi (Ep. 1. 18. 89).

We have unions of four in the first and second cola of: me licet unda ferat, te modo terra tegat (Prop. 2. 26. 44), sive ea causa gravis, sive ea causa levis (2. 9. 36). Consequent ellipses are seen in: filius (aderat) huic Pallas, illi comes ibat Achates (Aen. 8. 466), illa subit (minans mediae urbi) mediaeque minans inlabitur urbi (2. 240), qui durare potest multa, et (multum) amare potest (Prop. 2. 26. 28). In: (seu) prora cubile mihi (erit), seu mihi (cubile) puppis erit (2. 26. 34) we

have two fivefold unions reduced by ellipses to threefold and fourfold.

We have been speaking of the extremes in a Latin verse; will the middle terms also correspond and be shortened at times, just as are the extremes? I find the correspondence plain in: *Iane pater clare clare cum dixit Apollo* (Ep. 1. 16. 59), *sin manibus vestris vestram ascendisset in urbem* (Aen. 2. 192), *primo ne medium, medio ne discrepet imum* (A. P. 152). In these examples of the corresponding words one comes immediately before the caesural pause, the other immediately after. If I followed Servius I should cite as an example: ‘*sed moriamur*’ ait; ‘*sic sic iuvat ire sub umbras*’ (Aen. 4. 660); his note is: *sic sic* quasi interrogatio et responsio. This would be right, if the caesural pause came between *sic sic*, but it precedes them; and we have the same pathetic repetition as in: *hortatur Mnestheus: nunc nunc insurgite remis* (5. 189), *post vento crescente magis magis increbescunt* (Calull. 64. 274).

But we rarely in comparison find the words the same or differing merely in inflexion. Often they agree only in sense, as in: *Centaurus nunc una ambae iunctisque feruntur* (Aen. 5. 157), *continuo auditae voces vagitus et ingens* (6. 426), *durum a stirpe genus natos ad flumina primum* (9. 603), *nodosi tabulas centum, mille adde catenas* (Sat. 2. 3. 70), *fastidire lacus et rivos ausus apertos* (Ep. 1. 3. 11), *sit qui dicta foras eliminet, ut coeat par* (1. 5. 25), *cum pateris sapiens emendatusque vocari* (1. 16. 30), *quem nisi mendosum et medicandum? vir bonus est quis?* (v. 40), *noctem peccatis et fraudibus obice nubem* (v. 62). We have the nomen and cognomen of the same person in: *scribere quod Cassi Parmensis opuscula vincat* (1. 4. 3), *utere Pompeio Grospho, et si quid petet ultro* (1. 12. 22), and names joined with epithets of the same person in: *Romulus et Liber pater et cum Castore Pollux* (2. 1. 5) and: *gratus Alexandra regi magno fuit ille* (2. 1. 232).

We have allied persons or things in: *dilecti tibi Vergilius Variusque poetae* (2. 1. 247), *incolumi Rhodos et Mytilene pulcra facit quod* (1. 11. 17), *debemur morti nos nostraque; sive receptus* (A. P. 63), *haud procul hinc Tarcho et Tyrrheni tuta tenebant* (Aen. 8. 603), *accepit trepidos ac Nisum dicere iussit* (9. 233), *stultorum regum et populorum continet aestus* (Ep. 1. 2. 8). We have opposites in: *fert et amat spatiis obstantia rumpere claustra* (1. 14. 9), *si quidquid vidit melius peiusve sua spe* (1. 6. 13), *vivere nec recte nec suaviter, haud quia grando* (1. 8. 4), *sed neque qui Capua Romam petit imbre lutoque* (1. 11. 11), *si laedit caupona, Ferentinum ire iubebo* (1. 17. 8), *dum tu declamas Romae, Praeneste relegi* (1. 2. 2), *excidit et Troum Rutulorumque agmina complet* (Aen. 9. 113).

We have words allied in syntax in: *puppibus et laeti nautae imposuere coronas* (4. 418), *hoc sibi pulcra suum ferri Proserpina munus* (6. 142), *infantumque animae flentes in limine primo* (6. 427), *plebs eris, at pueri ludentes ‘rex eris’ aiunt* (Ep. 1. 1. 59), *quod si me populus Romanus forte roget cur* (v. 70), *ut lippum pictae tabulae fomenta podagram* (1. 2. 52), *aestivam sermone benigno tendere noctem* (1. 5. 11), *Iuppiter; Augusti laudes agnoscere possis* (1. 16. 29). *Musa rogata refer comiti scribaeque Neronis* (1. 8. 2), *incipi. Qui recte vivendi prorogat horam* (1. 2. 41), *neve putes alium sapiente bonoque beatum* (1. 16. 20). We have balancing verbs allied or opposed in: *canities inculta iacet, stant lumina flammae* (Aen. 6. 300), *ut primum iuxta stetit agnovitque per umbras* (6. 452), *hos successus alit; possunt quia posse videntur* (5. 231), *te tractare voles, accedes siccus ad unctum* (Ep. 1. 17. 12). We have three words thus joined in: *quid Sophocles et Thespis et Aeschylus utile ferrent* (2. 1. 163), *tertius Argolica hac galea contentus abito* (Aen. 5. 314), and four in: *hic quos durus amor crudeli tabe peredit* (6. 442), *non est aptus equis Ithace locus ut neque planis* (Ep. 1. 7. 41). These varieties are closely parallel to those we noted for the extremes.

Here too we find at times one of the central terms omitted, which it is necessary to supply in translation. We read: *nexantem nodis seque in sua membra plicantem* (Aen. 5. 279) according to Priscian, Eutyches, and some of the best manuscripts. But most of the manuscripts have *nixantem*, a reading adopted by Ribbeck. Heyne prefers *nexantem*; but Forbiger changes this to *nixantem* for two reasons: because he has no other example of *nexare* for *nexare se*, and because of the tautology of *nexantem . . . plicantem*. After what we have already seen of Virgil’s practice with extremes, we may say that this tautology confirms the reading; and adopting the reading of Priscian and Eutyches we supply: *nexantem nodis (se) seque in sua membra plicantem*. In: *et pater ipse suo superum iam signat honore* (6. 780) Servius tells us that *superum* is the acc. sing., and that *pater* is for Mars. Sidgwick follows Servius here; but Heyne and Forbiger, having in mind the common use of *pater ipse* for *pater ipse deum*, make *superum* the gen. pl. No doubt the *superum* here expressed is the acc.; but we must understand: *et pater ipse suo (superum) superum (superum) iam signat honore*. In: *optat ephippia bos piger optat arare caballus* (Ep. 1. 14. 43) Bentley prefers to assign *piger* to *caballus*, as it would be a perpetuum epitheton with *bos*, and so add no force to the verse. The *piger* we have expressed certainly belongs to *caballus*, but the motive for the choice of both *bos* and *caballus* is *pigritia*; and so we must understand: *optat ephippia bos (piger), piger*

optat arare caballus. In: terra parum fuerat fatis adiecimus undas (Prop. 3. 7. 31) Lachmann joins fatis with fuerat, Butler with adiecimus; but it is best to supply: terra parum fuerat (fatis), fatis adiecimus undas, thus giving the pregnancy of meaning so dear to Augustan poets.

We may cite further examples of this ellipsis, to show how common it is in these poets: molibus incurrit (validis) validis cum viribus amnis (Lucr. 1. 287), ignibus impositum (calidis) calidis torrescere flammis (3. 890), qui mare, qui terras (omnes) omni dicione tenerent (Aen. 1. 236), fecisti et patrios (filii) foedasti funere voltus (2. 539), ambasas subigat (malis) malis absumere mensas (3. 257), litora litoribus contraria (contrarias) fluctibus undas (4. 628), tandem inter pateras (leves) et levia pocula serpens (5. 91), ordine ahena locant alii (alii) fusique per herbam (5. 102), visuri Aeneadas (pars), pars et certare parati (5. 108), Centauro invehitur magna (magna) Scyllaque Cloanthus (5. 122), inmiscentque manus manibus, (pugna) pugnamque lacesunt (5. 429), magna tropaea ferunt (eorum) quos dat tua dextera leto (11. 172), fervet avaritia (misera) miseroque cupidine pectus (Ep. 1. 1. 33), pertulit adversis (adversarum) rerum inmersabilis undis (1. 2. 22), 'durus', ait, 'Voltei nimis (nimis) adtentusque videris' (1. 7. 91), serpit humi tutus nimium, (nimium) timidusque procellae (A. P. 28), aut in avem Procne (vertatur), vertatur Cadmus in anguem (A. P. 187), fortiter et ferrum (saevum), saevos patiemur et ignes (Prop. 1. 1. 27), quippe ubi non liceat (vacuo) vacuos subducere ocellos (1. 9. 27) where Baehrens changes vacuos to vacuo, saepe imprudenti (improvisa) fortuna occurrit amanti (1. 20. 3), fanaque peccatis (plurimis) plurima causa tuis (2. 19. 10), ambos una fides (servabit), auferet una dies (2. 20. 18), Hannibalis spolia (victi) et victi monumenta Syphacis (3. 11. 59).

It is clear that as a result of this expression of two words by one in the middle of the verse, that word gains much in weight and force. In itself the middle of the verse is perhaps the most emphatic position in it; and this is especially true when the word placed there stands in close relation both with the words preceding it and those that follow, as in: sordidus ex umeris nodo dependet amictus (Aen. 6. 301). Often this place is chosen for the word conveying the keynote of the verse, as in: sponsi Penelopae, nebulones, Alcinoique (Ep. 1. 2. 28) or: perfide, deserto liquisti in litore, Theseu? (Catull. 64. 133). It is a usual position for the name in a verse naming a distinguished character, as in:

Contemptor divum Mezentius agminaque armat.

Filius huic iuxta Lausus, quo pulchrior alter (Aen. 7. 648-9).

In our remains of Naevius's Saturnians it is prominent, as in: fato Metelli Romae consules fiunt, and the answer: malum dabunt Metelli Naevio poetae, or in: novem Iovis concordēs filiae sorores (B. P. 1, M.), or:

Noctu Troiad exhibant capitibus opertis

Flentes ambae abeuntes lacrimis cum multis (B. P. 7-8, M.),

or:

Patrem suum supremum optimum adpellat

Summe deum regnator, quianam me genuisti? (17-18, M.),

or:

Elatiis manibus Priamus supplicat Achillem (Dub. I, p. 169, M.).

It is not prominent in the laboured verses of Ennius, but in Virgil we find it common in two main types. First it stands between two connected groups of words, as in:

Et patriam Epirum referat fortesque Mycenae (Geo. 3. 121),

Temporibus geminis canebat sparsa senectus (Aen. 5. 416),

Nam sese opposuit Salio per lubrica surgens (5. 335),

Transeat elapsus prior ambiguumve relinquat (5. 326),

Et clipeum efferri iussit Didymaonis artem (5. 359),

Nomen avi referens Priamus, tua cara, Polite (5. 564),

Vendidit hic auro patriam, dominumque potentem (6. 621),

Ardet inexcita Ausonia atque immobilis ante (7. 623),

Volcani domus et Volcania nomine tellus (8. 422),

Non tamen omnino Teucros delere paratis (9. 248).

In the second type, where the words that precede are coupled with those that follow, the first with the last, the second



with the fourth, and often in reversed order, we seem to have the highest achievement in arranging the hexameter, as in:

Aequaevumque ab humo miserans adtollit amicum (5. 452),  
Quis tibi tum, Dido, cernenti talia sensus (4. 408),  
Annuus exactis completur mensibus ordo (5. 46),  
Quattuor ex omni delectae classe carinae (5. 115),  
Cetera populea velatur fronde iuventa (5. 134),  
Et paribus palmas amborum innexuit armis (5. 425),  
Aut spoliis ego iam raptis laudabor opimis (10. 449).

We may cite the following examples of this central position from Propertius:

Et citius nigras Sol agitabit equos (2. 15. 32),  
Dic alias iterum naviget Illyrias (2. 16. 10),  
Aspice quid donis Eriphyla invenit amaris (v. 29),  
Mendaces ludunt flatus in amore secundi (2. 25. 27),  
Haec eadem Persei nobilis uxor erat (2. 28. 22),  
Si non unius, quaeso, miserere duorum (v. 41),  
Et tu materno tacta dolore Thetis (3. 7. 68),  
Neptunus fratri par in amore Iovi (2. 26. 46),  
Quid mihi coniugium Pauli, quid currus avorum (4. 11. 11).

We may also notice:

Thyiadas effusis euantes crinibus egit (Catull. 64. 391),  
Non facilis nobis, aequales, palma parata est (62. 11),  
Tyrrhenum omne tuis et mare Ponticum (Od. 3. 24. 4),  
Fortiaque adversis opponite pectora rebus (Sat. 2. 2. 136),  
Quis sibi res gestas Augusti scribere sumit? (Ep. 1. 3. 7),  
Ire tamen restat Numa quo devenit et Ancus (1. 6. 27),  
Alterutrum velox Victoria fronde coronet (1. 18. 64),

where, giving Victoria her fitting place as cope-stone, we may close our list.

But let us notice first the correspondence here in two couplets of Propertius, the second of which I have not yet seen rightly explained:

Si te forte meo (ad)ducet via proxima busto  
Esseda caelatis (ad)siste Britanna iugis (2. 1. 75-6),

and:

Multa prius vasto (e)labentur flumina ponto  
Annus et inversas (e)duxerit ante vices (1. 15. 29-30).

Of course it is opposed to the usual course of events that many rivers should flow out of the sea, and here it is parallel with the inverted course of the seasons. Cf. also *adeo* in Lucr. 5. 122-3 and *vitae* in vv. 179-80.

The hexameter and the pentameter are each divided by the caesural pause into two cola, equal in the pentameter, and with the division in the middle of either the third or the fourth foot of the hexameter. These have each a beginning and end, and when longer, often a centre. We have the first colon of the hexameter consisting at times of a single word, as: *Parthenopaeus* (Aen. 6. 480), *Androgeoneae* (Catull. 64. 77), *Amphitryoniades* (Prop. 4. 9. 1). The second colon seems usually too long for this; I have seen no example. The first begins and ends with the same word in: *nudus ara, sere nudus* (Geo. 1. 299), *nymphae Laurentes nymphae* (Aen. 8. 71), *Tuscus ego Tuscis* (Prop. 4. 2. 3); or with different names for the same person, as in: *idem me ille Conon* (Catull. 66. 7), *Iaside Palinure* (Aen. 5. 843), *Augustus Caesar* (6. 792), *Idomeneia ducem* (3. 122). Opposed are: *Atridas Priamumque* (1. 458), *Laurentum Troiumque* (12. 137), *Graecia Barbariae* (Ep. 1. 2. 7), *Cacus et Alcides* (Prop. 4. 9. 16), *et sumpta et posita* (2. 1. 36); allied are: *Ilusque*

Assaracusque (Aen. 6. 650), Ascanium Anchisenque patrem (2. 747), Pandarus et Bitias (9. 672), Eupolis atque Cratinus (Sat. 1. 4. 1). Connected in syntax are: talis prima Dares (5. 375), tempore non alio (Geo. 3. 245), hirsutumque supercilium (Buc. 8. 34), Orphei Calliopea (4. 57), Deiphobe Glauci (Aen. 6. 36), Pergameamque voco (3. 133), sparge, marite, nuces (Buc. 8. 30), miratur molem Aeneas (Aen. 1. 421). We have ellipses dependent on the arrangement in: quidve (ipse) petat quidve ipse ferat (10. 150), ensem (insignem) atque insignem galeam (5. 367), ut nemo (ducit) Varius ducit (Sat. 1. 10. 44), hic ego dux (bonus) milesque bonus (Tib. 1. 1. 75).

We have the second colon beginning and ending in the same word in: divum inclementia divum (Aen. 2. 602), fratrem ne desere frater (10. 600), Pallas te hoc vulnere Pallas (12. 948), non te facundia non te (Od. 4. 7. 23); and in different names of the same person in: Claudi virtute Neronis (Ep. 1. 12. 26), avunculus excitet Hector (Aen. 12. 440), Mnestheus certamine victor (5. 493), deus auctor Apollo (8. 336), Volcania nomine tellus (8. 422). We have them opposed in: sequar atris ignibus absens (4. 384), Italiam concurrere Teucris (10. 8), Troesque Latinique (10. 895), pede pes densusque viro vir (10. 361), Tiburtum ex agmine Tarchon (11. 757), terris agitare vel undis (12. 803), Troiamque aperiret Achivis (2. 60), Priamo narrabis Achillem (9. 742), Corynaeum sternit Asilas (9. 571), Thebis nutritus an Argis (A. P. 118); and allied in: Remo cum fratre Quirinus (Aen. 1. 292), hiems et aquosus Orion (4. 52), Teucris et Trinacria pubes (5. 450), Thesea Pirithoumque (6. 393), Poenos Gallumque rebellem (6. 858), Xanthum et Simoenta (10. 60), vaginaque eripit ensem (10. 896), ferrugine clarus et ostro (11. 772), Lydorum quidquid Etruscos (Sat. 1. 6. 1), Numa quo devenit et Ancus (Ep. 1. 6. 27), maternis atque paternis (1. 15. 26).

Connected in syntax are: Scaevae saevissima portas (Aen. 2. 612), candentem in litore taurum (5. 236), summo me mittere saxo (Prop. 2. 26. 19), Phrygias nunc ire per undas (2. 30. 19), Aetolis surgit ab Arpis (Aen. 10. 28), Rutulis cecidistis in agris (10. 390), pictis Arcades armis (12. 281), stellis Aurora fugatis (3. 521), velorum pandimus alas (3. 520), cingite tempora ramis (5. 71), simul ultima signant (5. 317), spatia et si plura supersint (5. 325). In: hoc illis curia templum (7. 174) hoc is not attracted by curia, as it would be in prose, owing to its close connexion with templum. I have noted the following ellipses dependent on the arrangement: Graii (Graio) cognomine dicunt (Aen. 1. 530), moniti (meliora) meliora sequamur (3. 188), manibus date lilia (multa) plenis (6. 883), pede pes (densus) densusque viro vir (10. 361), Mnestheus (fortis) et fortis Asilas (12. 127), multum similis (multum) metuenti (Sat. 2. 5. 92), monitus (multum) multumque monendus (Ep. 1. 3. 15), sanum (recte) recteque valentem (1. 16. 21), Messalam terra dum (sequitur) sequiturque mari (Tib. 1. 3. 56), verba (componere) et componere fraudes (Prop. 2. 9. 31).

When we come to relate the first to the second colon, in many cases we find the central word of the first very closely related to the central word of the second, as in: miles 'io' magna voce 'trumphe' canet (Tib. 2. 5. 118) or: testor, cara, deos, et te, germana, tuumque (Aen. 4. 492). We have different names or epithets for the same person in: mons Idaeus ubi et gentis cunabula nostrae (Aen. 3. 105), at non tardatus casu neque territus heros (5. 453), non Beroe vobis, non haec Rhoeteia, matres (5. 646), qua rex Clusinis advectus Osinius oris (10. 655), cui Tati dextris collocat ipse iugas (Prop. 4. 4. 38), attulit ipse viris optatum casus honorem (Aen. 5. 201), incola Cacus erat metuendo raptor ab antro (Prop. 4. 9. 9). We have allied names in: cui Pylumnus avus, cui diva Venilia mater (Aen. 10. 76), tum Thetidi pater ipse iugandum Pelea sensit (Catull. 64. 21), et quicumque sacer, qualis ubique lapis (Prop. 1. 4. 24), necdum ultra Tiberim belli sonus ultima praeda (4. 10. 25); and opposed in: et quot Troia tulit vetus et quot Achaia formas (2. 28. 53), vincit Roma fide Phoebe, dat femina poenas (4. 6. 57), sunt aliquid manes, letum non omnia finit (4. 7. 1), nox ruit, Aeneas; nos flendo ducimus horas (Aen. 6. 539), sic domilo saevum prostravit corpore Theseus (Catull. 64. 110).

We have words joined in syntax in: quis angusta malis cum moenia vexarentur (v. 80), ipse suum Theseus pro caris corpus Athenis (v. 81), quasque Aniena sacras Tiburs per flumina sortes (Tib. 2. 5. 69), caeruleo per summa levis volat aequora curru (Aen. 5. 819), gaude, Crasse, nigras si quid sapis inter harenas (Prop. 4. 6. 83), ergo avidus muros optatae molior urbis (Aen. 3. 132), quod mare conceptum spumantibus exspuit undis (Catull. 64. 155). I have noted the following ellipses dependent on this arrangement: pascite ut ante boves, pueri; submittite (ut ante) tauros (Buc. 1. 46), sola viri molles aditus et tempora (idonea) noras (Aen. 4. 423), Romulus Assaraci (sanguinis) quem (Assaraci) sanguinis Ilia mater (6. 778), tum pueri (convicia) nautis, pueris convicia nautae (Sat. 1. 5. 11), non tibi: iam (relinquet illa) somnos, non illa (tibi) relinquet ocellos (Prop. 1. 5. 11), seu pedibus (carpere) terras, seu pontum carpere remis (1. 6. 33), quid si non (tam) constans illa et tam casta fuisset? (2. 34. 11).

We find the first word of the first colon identical with or in close relation to the central word of the second in: proximus huic longo sed proximus intervallo (Aen. 5. 320), Caesaris haec virtus et gloria Caesaris haec est (Prop. 2. 16. 41),

cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Graii (2. 34. 65), Callisto Arcadios erraverat ursa per agros (2. 28. 23), qui testamentum tradet tibi cumque legendum (Sat. 2. 5. 51), Calve, tua venia, pace, Catulle, tua (Prop. 2. 25. 4). They are connected in syntax in: gratatur reduces et gaza laetus agresti (Aen. 5. 40), Antenor potuit mediis elapsus Achivis (1. 242), hoc iuvenem egregium praestanti munere donat (5. 361), pulcra sit in superis, si licet, una locis (Prop. 2. 28. 50), fortunata meo si qua escelebrata libello (3. 2. 17), Lydus Dulichio non distat Croesus ab Iro (3. 5. 17), et Tyros ostrinos praebet Cadmea colores (3. 13. 7), matrona incedit census induta nepotum (v. 11). We have ellipses arising from this arrangement in: sanguine (infecta) cernis adhuc, sparsoque infecta cerebro (Aen. 5. 413), vivere si recte nescis, decede (recte vivendi) peritis (Ep. 2. 2. 213), illa (devicta) petit Nilum cumba male nixa fugaci (Prop. 4. 6. 63).

We find the last word of the first colon identical or in close relation with the central word of the second in: ecce volat calcemque terit iam calce Diores (Aen. 5. 324), tuque o Eurytion vino Centaure peristi (Prop. 2. 33. 31), si quid vidisti, semper vidisse negato (2. 18. 3), emicat Euryalus, et munere victor amici (Aen. 5. 337), Callimachi manes et Coi sacra Philetiae (Prop. 3. 1. 1), tempora cum Calvo, docte Catulle, tuo (Ov. Am. 3. 9. 62); haec amat obscurum, volet haec sub luce videri (A. P. 363), idem si clamet furem (me esse), neget (me) esse pudicum (Ep. 1. 16. 36). They are connected in syntax in: prima patrum magnis Salii clamoribus implet (Aen. 5. 341), quem petit et summis adnexus viribus urget (5. 226), hic velut in nigro iactatis turbine ventis (Catull. 68. 63), Pierides, magni nunc erit oris opus (Prop. 2. 10. 12), quid si iam canis aetas mea curreret annis? (2. 18. 5), de te quodcumque ad surdas mihi dicitur aures (2. 20. 13), qualem purpureis agitatam fluctibus Hellen (2. 26. 5), cum me Castalia speculans ex arbore Phoebus (3. 3. 13), Musa, Palatini referemus Apollinis aedem (4. 6. 11), cur nardo flammae non oluere meae? (4. 7. 32), qua Velabra suo stagnabant flumine quaque (4. 9. 5), per ferrum tanti securus volneris exit (Luc. 1. 212). We have pairs of words in this relation in: nos quocumque loco, nos omni tempore tecum (Prop. 2. 21. 19). Cf. caelum and sidera (Lucr. 5. 115).

We have ellipses dependent on this arrangement in: non tamen Euryali (oblitus) non ille oblitus amorum (Aen. 5. 334), digna dabis? primam merui qui laude (prima) coronam (Aen. 5. 355), Massylique ruunt equites et (ruit) odora canum vis (4. 132), iam prece Pollucis, iam Castoris (prece) implorata (Catull. 68. 65), quidquid (veneni) habet Circe, quidquid (habet) Medea veneni (Tib. 2. 4. 55), hic ego Pelides (ferus), hic ferus Hector ego (Prop. 2. 22. 34), vivam si vivet (illa), si cadet illa cadam (2. 28. 42), ante tuosque pedes illa ipsa (caput) operta sedebit (2. 28. 45), alter remus (pellat) aquas, alter tibi radat harenas (3. 3. 23), fortunae miseras auximus arte (misera) vias (3. 7. 32), quo seges in campo (maturescit), quo viret uva iugo (2. 34. 78), et durum Zethum (lacrimis mollem) et lacrimis (argutum) Amphionia mollem experta est stabulis mater abacta suis (3. 15. 29-30), sic noctem (producam) patera, sic (patera pro) ducam carmina donec (4. 6. 85).

At times the central word of the first colon is in agreement with the first word of the second, as in: fit Beroe Tmarii coniunx longaeva Dorycli (Aen. 5. 620), hinc Gaetulae urbes, genus insuperabile bello (4. 40), cinge caput mitra, speciem furabor Iacchi (Prop. 4. 2. 31), haud equidem sine mente reor, sine numine divum (Aen. 5. 56), fabula nullius veneris, sine pondere et arte (A. P. 320), decisis humilem pennis, inopemque paterni (Ep. 2. 2. 50). They are connected in syntax in: naturae deus humanae, mortalis in unum (Ep. 2. 2. 188), indue me Cois, fiam non dura puella (Prop. 4. 2. 23), quem bis terve bonum cum risu miror. Et idem (A. P. 358) where bis terve is co-ordinate with cum risu and has an allied meaning, sola domo maeret vacua, stratisque relictis (Aen. 4. 82), tu modo posce deos veniam, sacrisque litatis (4. 50), syllaba longa brevi subiecta vocatur iambus (A. P. 251). In: viribus, ingenio, specie, virtute, loco, re (Ep. 2. 2. 203) viribus naturally connects with re, and specie with loco, leaving ingenio for virtute. We have examples of ellipses arising out of this arrangement in: non eadem est aetas, non (eadem) mens. Veianius armis (Ep. 1. 1. 4), aequae pauperibus prodest locupletibus (prodest) aequae (v. 25), o dulci iucunda viro, iucunda (dulci) parenti (Catull. 67. 1), lusisti satis, edisti satis, atque (satis) bibisti (Ep. 2. 2. 214).

The central word of the first colon may agree with the last word of the second, as in: hic labor ille domus, et inextricabilis error (Aen. 6. 27), tu recte vivis, si curas esse quod audis (Ep. 1. 16. 17), si qua venit sero, magna ruina venit (Prop. 2. 25. 28), pars calidos latices et athena undantia flammis (Aen. 6. 218), ausa Iovi nostro latrantem opponere Anubim (Prop. 3. 11. 41), tecta rapit silvas inventaque flumina monstrat (Aen. 6. 8), ille meum comitatus iter maria omnia mecum (6. 112), inter saxa virum spumosa inmerserat unda (6. 174), Aeneas matri Eumenidum magnaeque sorori (6. 250), fecit avem Circe, sparsitque coloribus alas (7. 191), stant belli causae, pugnatur comminus armis (7. 553), pacis amor deus est, pacem veneramur amantes (Prop. 3. 5. 1). They are joined in syntax in the following: huc se provecti deserto in litore condunt (Aen. 2. 24), inde toro pater Aeneas sic orsus ab alto (2. 2), Liber agens celso Nysae de vertice tigres (6. 805), Phoebe graves Troiae semper miserate labores (6. 56), vidit harenosis Tatium proludere

campis (Prop. 4. 4. 19), hic Tiburtina iacet aurea Cynthia terra (4. 7. 85), inmisitque Fugam Teucris atrumque Timorem (Aen. 9. 719).

We have pairs in this agreement in: multa tulit fecitque puer, sudavit et alsit (A. P. 413). The central word in question is related with both the first and the last word of the second colon in: cum tot sustineas et tanta negotia solus (Ep. 2. 1. 1) and: tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento (6. 851).

We have ellipses dependent on this arrangement in: reddat signa Remi, mox dabit ipse (signa) sua (Prop. 4. 6. 80), sive (volo sentire) meas lacrimas, sive videre tuas (3. 8. 24), dicere credit eos, ignave multa (dicere) fatetur (Ep. 2. 1. 67), dum septem donat sestertia, mutua (addit) septem (1. 7. 80), ille nihil (moratur), neque me quaerentem vana moratur (Aen. 2. 287), tela manu miseri iactabant irrita (incerta) Teucris (2. 459), Hectors (tractum) per campos ter maculasse rotas (Prop. 3. 1. 28), quas (non oraveris) gentes Italum aut quas non oraveris urbes (Aen. 6. 92), non haec Pleiades faciunt neque aquosus (facit) Orion (Prop. 2. 16. 51), una Clytaemnestrae (vehit) stuprum, simul altera Cressae portat mentitae lignea monstra bovis (4. 7. 57-8).

Far more usual is the agreement with or relation of the first word in the first colon to the first word in the second, as in: felix heu nimium felix si litora tantum (Aen. 4. 657), Cynthia forma potens, Cynthia verba levis (Prop. 2. 5. 28), taurum Neptuno, taurum tibi, pulcher Apollo (Aen. 3. 119), sed Troia obscura, Troia infelice sepultum (Catull. 68. 99), funera Cecropiae nec funera portarentur (64. 83), Pharsalum coeunt, Pharsalia tecta frequentant (v. 37), alba solo recubans, albi circum ubera nati (Aen. 8. 45), maius adorta nefas, maioremque orsa furorem (7. 386), septem ingens gyros, septena volumina traxit (5. 85), solus qui Paridem solitus contendere contra (5. 370), hinc movet Euphrates, illinc Germania bellum (Geo. 1. 509), contendat mecum ingenio, contendat et arte (Prop. 2. 24. 23), non haec Calliope, non haec mini cantat Apollo (2. 1. 3),

Sive illam Hesperii sive illam ostendet Eois.

Uret et Eois, uret et Hesperios (2. 3. 43-4).

They are connected in syntax in: caeruleae cui terga notae maculosus et auro (Aen. 5. 87), acrior ad pugnam redit ac vim suscitatur ira (5. 454), Tydides multa vastabat caede cruentus (1. 471), effodere loco signum quod regia Iuno (1. 443), instant ardentes Tyrii, pars ducere muros (1. 423)—but why multiply examples? You will find many on every page of Virgil. I have noted these ellipses dependent on this arrangement: consessu medium tulit (consessu) exstructoque resedit (5. 290), discite iustitiam moniti et (discite) non temnere divos (6. 620), non contacta levi, (non) velatum pectus amictu (Catull. 64. 64), non ingrata tamen (non) frustra munuscula divis (v. 103), extremo veniet mollior (extrema) hora die (Prop. 2. 28. 16).

Next in importance to the agreement of the first and last words of the verse seems the agreement of the last words of each colon. Not that we find them often ending in the same word, as in: hoc de me sat erit, si modo matris erit (Prop. 3. 7. 64) or: nil desperandum Teucro duce et auspice Teucro (Od. 1. 7. 27); or in words varying but slightly in form, as in: nomine Casmillae, mutata parte Camillam (Aen. 11. 543) or: sive illam Cois fulgentem incedere coccis (Prop. 2. 1. 5). But the use of different terms here for the same person or persons is frequent, as in: magnam Teiresias adspexit Pallada vates (Prop. 4. 9. 57), obvia, nescio quot pueri, mihi turba minuta (2. 29. 3), it comes et iuvenis quondam nunc femina Caeneus (Aen. 6. 448), where Caeneus is determined by iuvenis at the end of the first colon, and not by femina, or by the meaning of the verse. So in: cui domus (dulcis) et dulces latebroso in pumice nidi (5. 214) the use of nidi for pulli is explained when we connect it with dulces. We have here allied names, as in: quos neque Tydides nec Larissaeus Achilles (2. 197), consurgunt venti, atque in nubem cogitur aer (5. 20), non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo (Prop. 2. 1. 3); or opposed, as in: sternere nec Priami regnorum eversor Achilles (12. 545) or: parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus (A. P. 139); or parallel, as in: per tacitum Ganges, aut pingui flumine Nilus (Aen. 9. 31). But most usual is the connexion in syntax, as in: sceptrum Palatini, sedemque petit Evandri (9. 9), condunt se Teucris portas et moenia complent (9. 39), iste dolor, solisque licet capere arma Mycenis (9. 139), et quaecumque meos implicat unda pedes (Prop. 4. 11. 16), et sciat indociles currere nympha vias (1. 2. 12).

I have noted the following examples of ellipsis dependent on this connexion: sic ait. Illa gradum (anilem) studio celebrabat anili (Aen. 4. 641), prima tenet, plausuque (secundo) volat fremituque secundo (5. 338), haec ait; et socii (iussi) cesserunt aequore iusso (10. 444), o quantum est auri pereat (potius) potiusque smaragdi (quantumst pereat) (Tib. 1. 1. 51), quid maris extremes Arabas ditantis et Indos (extremos) (Ep. 1. 6. 6), hoc primus repetas opus, hoc postremus omittas (opus) (v. 48), pastillos Rufillus olet, Gargonius hircum (olet) (Sat. 1. 4. 92), quem damnosa Venus (nudat),

quem praeceps alea nudat (Ep. 1. 18. 21), carmine di superi placantur, carmine manes (placantur) (Ep. 2. 1. 138), sit modo libertas (loqui) quae velit ira loqui (Prop. 1. 1. 28), hoc mihi perpetuo ius est (amare) quod solus amator (2. 20. 35), pro quibus optatis (votis) sacro me carmine damno (2. 28. 43).

But agreement of words in syntax here often implies likeness of ending, resulting in rhyme, as in: vinaque fundebat pateris animamque vocabat (Aen. 5. 98), campus et apricis statio gratissima mergis (5. 128), respicit instantem tergo et propiora tenentem (5. 168), delegi comites; nunc illas promite vires (5. 191), et primum in scopulo luctantem deserit alto (5. 220), Chloreaque Sybarimque Daretaque Thersilochumque (12. 363), et maribus Cariis et decantata Camillis (Ep. 1. 1. 64), fecerit auspicium, eras ferramenta Teanum (1. 1. 86), uxor et incultae pacantur vomere silvae (1. 2. 45), fratrem maerentis, rapto de fratre dolentis (1. 14. 7), ut puerum saevo credas dictata magistro (1. 18. 14), ibitis Aegaeas sine me, Messala, per undas (Tib. 1. 3. 1), aut regum auratis circumdata colla catenis (Prop. 2. 1. 33), o utinam traiecta cava mea vocula rima (1. 16. 27), sit Galatea tuae non aliena viae (1. 8. 18), omniaque ingrato largibar munera somno (1. 3. 25), nec tuba sit fati vana querela mei (2. 13. 20), in te ego et aeratas rumpam, mea vita, catenas (2. 20. 11), de te quodcumque ad surdas mihi dicitur aures (2. 20. 13), dulcis ad hesternas fuerat mihi rixa lucernas (3. 8. 1).

Ribbeck reads: Troiaque nunc staret, Priamique arx alta maneres (Aen. 2. 56) against the testimony of the grammatici and the majority of the manuscripts, which, with most modern editors, have stares. But while Propertius is fond of the homoeoteleuton, there is much to show that Virgil avoided it, probably to avoid too great monotony of effect. This is even more the case with Ovid, the model for modern Latin verse, though in his verse we have effects like: dum moror, in summa fulsit mihi purpura prora (Her. 5. 65), but he is evidently inclined to confine it, as a rule, to the pentameter, as in: haerebat gremio turpis arnica tuo (v. 70) or: aequora legitimos destituantque tuos (v. 78). If too often indulged in, it tends to give a monotonous effect to their verse, an effect it was their special aim to avoid. At times Virgil shows it in successive verses, as in:

Adsit et evinctis attollat brachia palmis.  
Sic ait et geminum pugnae proponit honorem  
Victori velatum auro vittisque iuvenum (5. 364-6),

though in the last verse the rhyme appealed rather to the eye than to the ear.

In:

Inde aliud super atque aliud figitque volatque  
Ingenti gyro; sed sustinet aureus umbo (10. 883-4),

the effect is purposed to represent the circling onset of Mezentius; while in:

Rhaebe diu, res si qua diu mortalibus ulla est (10. 861),

it serves to emphasize diu. We have threefold rhyme at times, as in:

Alter Amazoniam pharetram plenamque sagittis (5. 311),  
Iamque neci Sthenelumque dedit Thamyrumque Pholumque (12. 341),

and in lines of threefold structure like:

Troia fidem, si vera feram, si magna rependam (2. 161).

I have noted a fourfold rhyme in:

Dimensi Rutulique viri Teucrique parabant (12. 117).

We have verses of threefold structure showing two well marked caesural pauses, as in Homer's verse:

πρόσθε λέων, ὄπιθεν δὲ δράκων, μέσση δὲ χίμαιρα (Il. 6. 181).

Examples are: Marsa manus, Paeligna cohors, Vestina virum vis (Enn. Ann. 532, M), sic virgo, dum intacta manet, dum cara suis est (Catull. 62. 45), 'at ramum hunc', aperit ramum, qui veste latebat (Aen. 6. 406), castigatque, auditque dolos, subigitque fateri (6. 567), hic erit, hic iurata manet, rumpantur iniqui (Prop. 1. 8. 27), di patrii, purgamus agros, purgamus agrestes (Tib. 2. 1. 17), quid faciam? roger anne rogem? quid deinde rogabo? (Ov. Met. 3. 465); and, with division into three cola of three words each: 'iam satis est!' dum aes exigitur, dum mula ligatur (Sat. 1. 5. 13). In Propertius's pentameters:

Haec spolia, haec reges, haec mihi currus erunt (2. 14. 24),

and:

Cur haec tam dives? quis dedit? unde dedit? (2. 32. 42),

the basis is fourfold, shortened to two in two cola of each. There is a marked regularity of arrangement in such verses, and this is reflected in the ellipses I have noted: quem mulcent aurae, firmat sol, educat imber (Catull. 62. 41), quantus Athos, aut quantus Eryx, aut ipse coruscis (Aen. 12. 701), scurror ipse mihi, populo tu. Rectius hoc et (Ep. 1. 17. 19), quae mare, quae terras, quae totum possidet orbem (Luc. 1. 110).

Older than the division into single verses seems the division into distichs. I notice in the Mahābhārata that the correspondence I have been describing appears in the first and last words of a distich rather than in a single verse. Of course in the elegy it is natural to think of the hexameter and pentameter as making up a unit. But it is of a couplet in hexameters that we have the most interesting account in this regard. According to Gellius (1. 21) almost all in his day read:

At sapor indicium faciet manifestus et ora  
Tristia tentantum sensu torquebit amaro (Geo. 2. 246-7).

Hyginus maintains there that amaror, not amaro, is what Virgil wrote. Favorinus, when the question was referred to him, mentioned Lucretius's use of: tangit amaror (4. 224). Macrobius confirms the reading amaror, and compares also: foedo sapore (Lucr. 2. 401). Servius accepts amaror, as does Ribbeck, finding it in some of his best manuscripts. When we balance: sapor indicium faciet at the beginning with: sensu torquebit amaror at the end, we may well feel that this is a strong argument for Hyginus's reading. The lack of an epithet with sensu may well have been made good for the Roman by supplying amaro from amaror at the end of the first colon thus: tristia tentantum (amaro) sensu torquebit amaror.

But what of Hyginus's argument: videtur absurde dici 'sapor sensu amaro torquet'? Not at all, if the words sapor and amaro are in successive clauses in poetry. Take:

Illis et silices et possunt cedere quercus  
Nedum tu par sis (resistere), spiritus iste levis (Prop. 1. 9. 31-2),

where for par we must imply from cedere its opposite, resistere. So in:

Altera (gaudebat) deiectos Parnasi vertice Gallos,  
Altera macrebat funera Tantalidos (2. 31. 13-14),

and from tulit in:

Non tulit hoc Paetus, stridorem audire procellae  
Et duro teneras laedere fune manus,

we must imply:

Sed (gaudebat) Chio thalamo aut Oricia terebintho  
Et fultum (esse) pluma versicolore caput (3. 7. 47-50),

and in another distich:

Crede mihi, nobis mitescet Scylla nec umquam  
(Frendescet) alternante vorans vasta Charybdis aqua (2. 26. 53-4).

For the ellipses we have noticed in the single verse seem to hold for the distich, as in:

Cynthia me docuit semper quae cuique petenda  
Quaeque (cuique) cavenda forent; non nihil egit amor (1. 10. 19-20).

We noticed the ellipses of ad and ex in Prop. 2. 1. 75-6 and 1. 15. 29-30; we have a parallel case in:

Non tamen ut vastos ausim (ad)tentare leones  
Aut celer agrestes comminus (ad)ire sues (2. 19. 21-2).

So in:

Pro quo dumosi monies (dantur) et (datur) frigida rupes  
Et datur inculto tramite dura quies (1. 18. 27-28),  
Haec ille (canit) et si quae miseri novistis amantes,  
(Illa canit) et matutinis obstrepit alitibus (1. 16. 45-6),  
Illis (dicitur) formosum iacuisse paludibus, illuc  
Diceris effusa tu, Venus, isse coma (2. 13. 55-6).

And in:

Parvaeque tam magnis admoram fontibus ora,  
Unde pater sitiens Ennius ante bibit  
Et cecinit Curios fratres et Horatia pila,  
(Cecini) regiaque Aemilia vecta tropaea rate (3. 3. 5-8),

the Itali had changed cecinit to cecini against the manuscripts, but the change is not necessary till v. 8, where we may imply it from cecinit, just as above I implied dicitur from diceris.

In:

Hunc Salius simul et Patron, quorum alter Acarnan  
Alter ab Arcadio Tegeaeae sanguine gentis (Aen. 5. 298-9),

we may ask which was the Acarnanian, which the Tegeate. Taking this as prose order, Salius was the Acarnanian and Patron the Tegeate; but if we connect the beginning with the end of the distich, Salius will be from Tegea, and Patron from Acarnania; and we learn (Dion. Hal. 1. 51) of a Patron from Acarnania who joined Aeneas near Buthrotum. We have a like connexion in:

At gravis ut fundo vix tandem redditus imo est  
Iam senior madidaque fluens in veste Menoetes (5. 178-9),  
Qualis ubi hibernam Lyciam Xanthique fluenta  
Deserit ac Delum maternam invisit Apollo (4. 143-4).

In:

Aggeribus socer Alpinis atque arce Monoeci  
Descendens, gener adversis instructus Eois (6. 830-1),

we have the opposing chiefs in the beginning and end of the distich.

Still more interesting is:

Gratatur reduces et gaza laetus agresti  
Excipit ac fessos opibus solatur amicis (5. 40-1),

where to the eyes, to gratatur with an accusative is opposed solatur with a dative. True, fessos, not amicis, is the real object of solatur; but that the position of words counted for much with the Roman hearer and reader is plain from Plautus's verses: haec eri immodestia coegit me, qui hoc noctis a portu meo ingratis excitavit. Nonne idem hoc luci me mittere potuit? (Amph. 163-5), where the opposition of hoc noctis and hoc luci seems to have been effective, though they are not parallel in syntax. Editors usually reject v. 165 for this reason, though Sisenna, an elder contemporary of Cicero, refers to it. We have alike apparent agreement in: cernimus adstantes nequidquam lumine torvo (Aen. 3. 677).

In:

Quam pius Aeneas, et quam magni Phryges et quam  
Tyrrhenique duces, (et quam) Tyrrhenum exercitus omnis (11. 171-2),

we have an example of fourfold structure passing into threefold. Usually the structure of the distich is threefold, as in: hanc aram luco statuit, quae maxima semper dicetur nobis, et erit quae maxima semper (8. 271-2), quam pro me curam geris, hanc precor, optime, pro me deponas, letumque (me) sinas pro laude pacisci (12. 48-9), radit iter laevum interior, subitoque priorem praeterit, et metis tenet aequora tuta relictis (5. 170-1). We have a distich of threefold structure, of which the first verse is likewise of threefold structure, in:

Me sinite atque auferte metus; ego foedera faxo  
Firma manu; Turnum debent haec iam mihi sacra (12. 316-17).

In:

Haec mandata prius constanti mente tenentem  
Thesae (liquere) ceu pulsae ventorum flamine nubes  
Aerium nivei monies liquere cacumen (Catull. 64. 238-40),

we have a union of three verses of twofold structure.

In:

Longe illi dea mater (ab)erit, quae nube fugacem

Feminea (sese) tegat, et vanis sese (fugacem) occulat umbris (Aen. 12. 52-3),

the verbs in the second and third cola are plainly subjunctives in oblique with sese (= me) dependent on precanti to be implied with illi.

The following are further examples of ellipsis determined by this structure in the distich: hic duo rite mero libans carchesia Baccho fundit humi, duo (carchesia) lacte novo (fundit humi), duo (carchesia) sanguine sacro (fundit humi) (5. 77-8), haec ubi dicta locum capiunt, signoque repente (audito) corripiunt spatia, (signo repente audito) limenque relinquunt (5. 315-16), salve sancte parens iterum, (iterum) salvete recepti nequidquam cineres, (salvete iterum) animaeque umbraeque paternae (5. 80-1), his dictis curae emotae (parumper, his dictis) pulsusque parumper corde dolor tristi, (his dictis parumper) gaudet cognomine terra (6. 382-3), sic Mnestheus (ultimus volat), sic ipsa fuga secatur ultima Pristis aequora, sic illam fert (ultimam) impetus ipse volantem (5. 218-19).

If this likeness of beginning and end holds good in a union of two or three verses, shall we not find it in longer passages? It seems to hold good for the introduction and closing of Virgil's longest narrative, that related by Aeneas in the Second and Third Aeneid. There we begin: conticuere omnes, intentique ora tenebant (2. 1) and close: conticuit tandem, factoque hic fine quievit (3. 718). For passages on such a scale of magnitude we may expect correspondence in verses rather than in single words. Again in the corpus receptum of his pastoral and didactic poems we find Virgil beginning: Tityre tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi (Buc. 1. 1) and ending: Tityre te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi (Geo. 4. 566).

To descend to a smaller scale, in the fine simile in Aen. 5. 213-17 we have a picture of the dove frightened from her nest in the cliffs, of the terrified beating of her wings in her first alarm, presently calmed into a smooth gliding along the quiet air, and summed up in the oxymoron: celeres neque commovet alas. We may recall the structure of Horace's Ode 2. 9, which seems to fall into three divisions of two stanzas each, divisions which begin: non semper—tu semper—flevere semper. Martial begins and closes Ep. 3. 63 with the words: Cotile, bellus homo.

There has been some doubt about the reading in the opening word of Ode 1. 32. Is it poscimus or poscitur? Our editions have usually: poscitur, the reading of Keller and Holder's Variorum text. Bentley read poscimus; and this is the reading that seems most in agreement with the modest and unassuming character of Horace. An analysis of Keller and Holder's authorities, so far as that is possible to me, seems to show that their oldest manuscripts give poscimus. They quote Acron and Porphyrio as giving poscitur, but Hauthal found almost all his manuscripts reading poscimus for both, the reading most in agreement with the sense of the scholia. Porphyrio's is: hac ode lyram adloquitur Horatius, ut adsit et canere perseveret; which is paralleled in Acron's: hac ode lyram adloquitur; ut adsit et canere non desistat; poscebatur enim dicta sua edere. When we relate this opening word of the ode to the close: mihi cumque salve rite vocanti, there is little doubt that vocanti refers back to poscimus.

To return to Burmann, whose recension of Heinsius was not accessible when I began this chapter, he contents himself with quoting Servius's scholium to Aen. 1. 630. Such a citation rightly made means much. To: sortiti remos passimque in litore sicco (3. 510) Heyne quotes the second part of Servius's scholium: per sortem divisi ad officia remigandi, adding: ut adeo pars in navi ad remos pernoctaret. Moved by this, Sidgwick makes them take their oars ashore, where they sleep, each presumably remum amplexus. But Conington and Page make them cast lots on landing for a speedy start at morn. Does Palinurus join in this? or Ilioneus? or grandaevus Aletes? The futility of this recalls the interpretations of Buc. 3. 34. Servius's note begins: quia remigium suppletum erat 'because they were through with their rowing'. Virgil has the prose sense of sortiti in Aen. 3. 634, but not in 3. 376, where Servius explains sortitur as sorte ordinat, nor in 2. 18. Just as non disco with non ignara, so here: in litore sicco gives us the sense of sortiti remos, which is for: opere functi remis, quod erant sortiti. Sortiri and fungi constitute a pair.

## XLII

### THE OXYMORON

THE oxymoron or acutifatum is a figure in which to a name there is joined an epithet or verb of a meaning quite opposed



to it, in such a way that in the incongruity, which is as a rule less apparent, a point of resemblance finds forcible expression. It seems to take its rise in a confusion in the use of nouns and verbs characteristic of the oldest Latin poetry. Perhaps there is no antithesis more common in Latin thought than that between land and sea; and yet we noticed that the word *aequor* is used both for the main and for the plain; for both have a point of likeness, the level surface. Catullus in: *sive quae septemgeminus colorat aequora Nilus* (11. 7-8) uses *aequora* in such a way that it may be doubted whether by *aequora* he means the waters of the Mediterranean or the black flats of Egypt; perhaps it is best to regard *aequora* here as an amphibole. We noticed how in: *Mincius infesta ducebat in aequora pinu* (Aen. 10. 206) in *aequora* at first seems to mean ‘to the sea’, but really means ‘to the battlefield’; and in: *sic toto Aeneas desaevit in aequore victor* (v. 569) we have the ambiguity cleared up. So Lucretius tells us of Sisyphus’s stone: *volvitur et plani raptim petit aequora campi* (3. 1002) ‘seeks the levels of the level plain’, and we read: *quae rigat aequora Sarnus* (Aen. 7. 738). In Aen. 10. 214 Virgil calls the waters of the Tiber down which they sail: *campos salis*, an oxymoron in which neither term is properly used; and in: *vastis tremit ictibus aerea puppis, subtrahiturque solum* (5. 199) *solum* is used for *aequor*. *Arva* is for *aequora* in: *arva nova Neptunia caede rubescunt* (8. 695).

For the idea expressed in: *campos salis aere secabant* (10. 214) we often have: *aequor arare*, a very common oxymoron, as in: *aequor arandum* (2. 780), *latum mutandis mercibus aequor aro* (Ov. Trist. 1. 2. 76), *quae lassarit arando aequora* (Am. 2. 10. 33). That *arator* and *aratrum* are not used of the sea by Latin poets must be due to the constant opposition of *arator* to *nauta* in verse and thought. But in: *litus arandum* (Aen. 4. 212), as in: *non profecturis litora bubus aras* (Ov. Her. 5. 116) and: *litus sterili versamus aratro* (Juv. 7. 49), we have in ‘ploughing the sea sands’ a phrase for ‘useless toil’. In: *nos castra movemus . . . et velorum pandimus alas* (Aen. 3. 519) and in: *sic acer equo turbata petivit castra* (5. 669) we have in the use of *castra* for *classem* the opposite of the old use of *classes* in: *Hortinae classes* (7. 716) ‘the cavalry from Horta’. In return we have: *laevam cuncta cohors remis ventisque petivit* (3. 563). The *Classes* of the *Comitia Centuriata* constitute the army, not the fleet; and the term *Classici* for members of the highest *Classis* was later transferred to authors or works of the first class. Still *classici milites* in Livy and *classici* in Tacitus are ‘the marines’. *Classicum* is the trumpet note that calls to war and is derived from *calare*, hardly cognate with our ‘call’, if Grimm’s Law has any validity. When we read of the Harpies: *magnis quatunt clangoribus alas* (3. 226) we feel that Virgil in substituting here *clangor* for *stridor*—cf. *clangorque tubarum* (2. 313) and: *stridorem . . . et alas* (12. 869)—is representing it as their *classicum* or war note.

But more marked and older is the use of *altum* for *pontus*. From the Columna Duilia we have: *in altod marid pugnandod*, probably adapted by Claudius from a tradition of the old inscription; for Livius Andronicus in his *Helena* wrote: *tu qui permensus ponti maria alta velivolam* (Macrob. Sat. 6. 5. 10). For ‘the sea’ Virgil uses ‘the deep’ in: *penitusque profundo vela dabit* (Aen. 12. 263) and ‘the high’ in: *in altum vela dabant* (1. 34). He has transferred *profundum* to *caelum* in: *maria ac terras caelumque profundum* (1. 58). The use of *altus* for *profundus* he has transferred to land in: *hic alta theatri fundamenta locant alii* (1. 427). When we compare: *tuta . . . terra* (3. 387) with: *aequora tuta* (1. 164) of the harbour, we feel that the oxymoron in: *omnia tuta timens* (4. 298), where Servius supplies *etiam*, may have to do with this transference.

We have another easy transference from the horse to the carriage and vice versa, a transference so easy that we use the same word for either mode of progress and no oxymoron results. We have noticed how *equi* is used for *currus* and *currus* for *equi*; so *vehi* is used both for riding and driving. While *sedere* is also thus used, as in: *ei carpento sedenti* (Liv. 1. 34. 8) or: *uno credis equo posse sedere duos?* (Mart. 5. 38. 4), this is not the most common meaning of *sedere*, and in consequence we are likely to think that we must supply *in* here, a notion strengthened by Cicero’s use in: *ut eum nemo umquam in equo sedentem videret* (Cic. Verr. 2. 5. 27. 10). Both *carpento* and *equo* seem primarily instrumentals in this construction, and: *equo sedeo* is probably older than: *in equo sedeo*. *Vehi* and *sedere* are used of sailing as well, as in: *ventis maria omnia vecti* (Aen. 1. 524), *navita puppe sedens* (Ov. Fast. 6. 471). But with *vehi* we enter a third element. We read: *apes . . . liquidum trans aethera vectae* (Aen. 7. 65), *dum caelum stellas, dum vehet amnis aquas* (Tib. 1. 4. 66); and we have the sea of air in: *quodcumque fluit de rebus id omne aeris in magnum fertur mare* (Lucr. 5. 275-6). But in: *dum non tractabile caelum* (Aen. 4. 53) we have ‘while the season does not permit sailing’.

From this exchange oxymora at once arise. We have *volare* transferred to the sea in: *caeruleo per summa levis volat aequora curru* (Aen. 5. 819), and: *insuetum per iter gelidas enavit ad Arctos* (6. 16). The analogy of *vehor* at once attracts *volo* to land, and we have: *medios volat ecce per hostes vectus equo spumante Saces* (12. 650-1), *litterae Capuam ad Pompeium volare dicebantur* (Cic. Alt. 2. 19. 3). With this we reach what is perhaps our most common

oxymoron, the use of 'fly' for 'flee'. We have: *nubesque volantes* (Lucr. 5. 253), but: *fugiant vasto aethere nimbi* (Aen. 5. 821); *longeque volante sagitta* (Ov. Trisi. 3. 10. 55), but: *spicula converso fugientia dirigit arcu* (Aen. 11. 654). Passing to the sea we have: *pelagoque volamus* (3. 124), but: *fugit illa per undas* (10. 247).

Hence we have *fugere* for *raptim fluere* in: *tenuis fugiens per gramina rivus* (Geo. 4. 19), *nunc (pontus) rapidus retro . . . fugit* (Aen. 11. 628), and *fluere* for *festinanter incedere* in: *illi convenere fluuntque ad regia plenis tecta viis* (11. 236). In: *Euphrates ibat iam mollior undis* (8. 726) *ibat* is for *fluebat*. Such transferences lead to a generalization of meaning in verbs primarily special in sense, such as we see in *petere* 'to make for' or 'seek', but primarily 'to pass quickly through the air', and so 'to fly' or 'to fall', the Greek *πέτομαι* and the Sanskrit *patāmi*. We have a return to the older meaning of *peto* in: *petierunt aethera pennis* (11. 272), *et hiems adpetebat* (Agric. 10. 6). So with *enare*; Silius tells us of Daedalus: *inter nubila . . . enavit, superosque novus conterruit ales* (12. 95), but in: *has observatis valles enavimus astris* (3. 662) we are traversing, not now the shifting winds, but the shifting sands of the desert.

Most interesting here is the history of *adnare*, as far as it can be traced. Virgil has it in its primary sense in: *paulatim adnabam terrae* (6. 358); but he uses it for *adnavigare* in: *huc pauci vestris adnavimus oris* (1. 538). Cicero has it in this meaning in: *inest illa magna commoditas . . . ut ad eam urbem, quam incolas, possit adnare* (Rep. 2. 9. 4). The *commoditas* is that the *urbs* is *maritima*, to which the approach is by sea, so that *admare* here will quickly be generalized to *adire*; for that is the mode of approach to such cities. Brachet tells me that in Papias it has taken on the meaning of 'to come by land' as well, and that from its later assimilated form *anare* (= *annare*) it passes to the French *aller*. Like *adnare* in this generalizing process is the Low Latin *arripare* (*ad-ripam*) 'to reach the bank', which became our 'arrive'.

Joined with *adnare* to form the French verb *aller* are *ire* and *vadere*. The relation of *vādere* to *vādum* has been obscured by the formation from *vādum* of *vādare* 'to cross by a ford'. Walde still accepts the derivation of *vadere* from *vadum*, and Ramshorn thinks its proper meaning is 'to make your way with difficulty through obstacles', as in: *cum agmine patriciorum iuvenum per turbam vadens* (Liv. 3. 49. 2), a meaning seen in *invadere* and *evadere*. If *vado* is really 'I cross by wading', in: *pedibus qui pontum per vada possent transire* (Lucr. 1. 200) from *per vada* we must imply *vadentes*, giving us a picturesque oxymoron: to giants such as Lucretius here describes the deeps of ocean would be mere shallows (*vada*).

But while: *vehi per aequora* is to pass along the surface of the water, *vehi per aera* is to pass through the air, and so: *enaret in aeris auras* (Lucr. 3. 591) seems soon to have led to the use of *nare* for *navigare* which we noticed in Aen. 1. 538. This seems to have been its use in: *alter nare cupit, alter pugnare paratust* (Enn. Ann. 238, M.); for Festus makes Cornificius use this verse to support his derivation of *nare* from *navis*. When Lucretius in describing the drunken man writes: *nant oculi* (3. 480), and Virgil in describing the pilot overcome with sleep calls his eyes *natantia lumina* (Aen. 5. 856), both words seem to give the result of the swaying of the ship, and so to imply the use of *no* and *nato* for *navigo*; it is the motion described in: *segetes aliae . . . natantes lenibus horrescunt flabris* (Geo. 3. 198). We have in return the use of *navigare* for *nare* in: *iam certe navigat* (Ov. Her. 19. 47) of Leander.

Allied to this union of sea and land in *aequor* is the union of wet and dry we find in: *volnera siccabat lymphis* (Aen. 10. 834), which seems shortened from: *volnera siccabat lymphis (lavando)*, where the ellipsis adds force to the expression. It seems based on a use like: *atros siccabat veste cruores (detergendo)* (4. 687), where there is no oxymoron; for it is natural to use *vestis ad tergendum*, but not so *aqua*. Very strong is the oxymoron in: *siccum sanguine guttur* (8. 261) 'his throat choked in blood', where I cannot follow Servius. On the fabled sands of Pactolus depend the oxymora in: *Pactolusque irrigat auro* (10. 142) and: *ut te . . . liquidus Fortunae rivus inauret* (Ep. 1. 12. 9). *Remigium alarum* (Aen. 6. 19) seems a natural result of the confusion between *mare* and *caelum* we have observed. Very delightful is the oxymoron in: *viros mediis exponit in undis* (10. 305) 'he lands the heroes in the waves', where: *in undis* is substituted for: *in terras*. The obvious oxymoron in: *lacu fluvius se condidit alto* (8. 66) is based on the older meaning of *lacus* we see in *lacunar* (cf. *λάκκος*, a pit).

In: *tua ne retardet aura maritos* (Od. 2. 8. 24) is *aura* to be taken in its natural sense of 'breeze'? or is it the gleam and lustre of Barine's beauty, a parallel to the: *auri aura* of Aen. 6. 204, 'the sheen of the gold'? or is it the odour that is so identified with the breezes in: *si tantum notas odor attulit auras* (Geo. 3. 251)? or is it all three, giving the verse a pregnancy of meaning so appropriate to the last verse of the ode. Acron thinks of a fourth meaning: *aurae* is here short for *levitas aurae*, a quality in her which might attract a like quality in them. But he thinks also of *unguentorum odor*; Porphyrio in his: *amoris aurae quae ad te eos fert*, seems to have Virgil's *odor* in mind. Acron refers us to: *nescius aurae*

fallacis (Od. 1. 5. 11), where we have a like amphibole. Pyrrha's beauty is at once the impelling breeze and the attracting gleam. Like λαμπρός, clarus appeals both to the eye, as in: clara . . . in luce refulsit (Aen. 1. 588), and to the ear, as in: clara dedit sonitum tuba (5. 139). The confusion between light and heat on the one hand, and sound loud or clear on the other, is frequent. We read: fremitusque ardescit equorum (11. 607) and: maestam incendunt clamoribus urbem (11. 147) Tacitus's oxymoron is even finer: incendebat haec fletu (Ann. 1. 23. 1), reminding us of the deacon's prayer: 'If a spark of grace be left, water that spark'.

But the figure in Ennius's: viri nunc gloria claret (Ann. 288, M.) may be an amphibole; it is not an oxymoron, and it is only when we substitute its opposite for the appropriate clara that in: quos fama obscura recondit (Aen. 5. 302) the oxymoron appears. The incongruity often arises from the confusion of one sense with another, such as is likely to arise for sight or hearing from such ambiguous terms as aura or clarus. So we have: creber ad aures visus adesse . . . sonitus (2. 731) where visus (est) is ambiguous, vidistis toto sonitus percurrere caelo (Prop. 2. 16. 49) from the union of lightning with thunder, and having really a fourfold basis, vidistis fulgora et audistis sonitus, ventos aequore fervido deproeliantes (Od. 1. 9. 10) where the roaring and foaming main is represented as heated in the conflict, visaeque canes ululare (Aen. 6. 257), oculis postquam saevi monimenta doloris . . . hausit (12. 946), suspiciens hausit caelum (10. 899) where oculis is omitted, vocemque his auribus hausi (4. 359), animo spem turbidus hausit inanem (10. 648), nimis meracam libertatem sitiens hauserit (Cic. Rep. 1. 43), though the proper use is: aquam ore hausit. In: caecique in nubibus ignes terrificant animos (Aen. 4. 209) the lightnings are clearly seen; it is their origin that is obscure, as Servius reminds us.

Turning to other bodily functions we may notice: pugnas . . . bibit aure volgus (Od. 2. 13. 32), superatne et vescitur aura? (Aen. 3. 339), vigilans stertis (Lucr. 3. 1048), vestigavit apes fumoque implevit amaro (= gravi) (Aen. 12. 588), volvitur ater odor tectis (v. 591) for gravis odor, alte vestiga oculis (6. 145) where the proper use would be that in: humi vestigia sequere naribus, pedibus celerem et pernicipibus alis (4. 180) where pernix seems connected with perna, ad caelum tendens ardentia lumina (2. 405). From: aiebam tacitus (Sat. 1. 9. 12), where tacitus is short for mecum tacitus, we have some interesting examples derived directly, like: respondes tacitis mutua carminibus (Prop. 1. 16. 26), cantas in aurem, iudicas, taces, clamas (Mart. 1. 89. 4), nunc ipsa vocat res (Aen. 9. 320) based on the opposition of facta to verba. Taceo is of man, sileo of nature; very effective is the transference in: cum tacet nox (Catull. 7. 7), and in: eo dicente deum domus alta silescit (Aen. 10. 101). In Hades, loca . . . tacentia late (6. 265), there is no vox but mere τρισμός.

But of like form with aiebam tacitus, we have: subterlabentis tacito rumore Mosellae (Auson. Id. 10. 22), praecipitate moras (Aen. 8. 443), maria exurere (9. 115), aegrescit medendo (12. 46), palluit audax (Od. 3. 27. 28), nunc et damna iuvant (Mart. 1. 12. 11), pater urget absens (Od. 3. 27. 57), sequar atris ignibus absens (Aen. 4. 384), luminis effossi fluidum lavit . . . cruorem (3. 663), iacet alms Orodes (10. 737), possunt cedere (Prop. 1. 9. 31), collectis omnibus una defuit (Aen. 2. 743), celeres neque commovet alas (5. 217), vivit sub pectore volnus (4. 67), rarescent claustra (3. 411), victores . . . cadunt Danaï (2. 368), veluti stet volucris dies (Od. 3. 28. 6), macrescit rebus opimis (Ep. 1. 2. 57), qui id flagitium formidine auderent (Ann. 1. 69. 1), ludit lacte mero mentes perculsa novellas (Lucr. 1. 261), principium quoniam (pro)cedendi (cedendo) nulla daret res (1. 339), quod fugiens semel hora vexit (Od. 3. 29. 48), si non tanta quies iret frigusque caloremque inter (Geo. 2. 344), arcanique patet penetrabile fluenti (Auson. Id. 10. 60). Very close to these are the antitheses in: mortalem vitam mors . . . immortalis ademit (Lucr. 3. 869), lumina luminibus quia nobis praepediuntur (3. 364), quos fida crearat una tot . . . coniunx (Aen. 12. 272), novo veterum deceptum errore locorum (3. 181). In: ruit in medios . . . in solo Volcente moratur (9. 438-9) Virgil uses to describe the same action two verbs diametrically opposed in meaning. Vivo saxo (1. 167) is the opposite of caeso saxo.

When we turn to epithets of like form we notice the following: telum imbelles (2. 544), atro lumine (7. 456), venerande puer (9. 276), vilis annona (Ep. 1. 12. 24), candente favilla (Aen. 3. 573), praesens exitium (12. 760), minae murorum (4. 88), lene tormentum (Od. 3. 21. 13), ferae pecudes (Lucr. 1. 14), dira quies (Ann. 1. 65. 2), spirantia exta (Aen. 4. 64), spirantia aera (6. 847), vivos de marmore voltus (v. 848), morsuque elusus inani (12. 755), oppidi . . . rura sui (Od. 1. 1. 17), heu vatum ignarae mentes (Aen. 4. 65), nigri cum lacte veneni (4. 514), satis spissum filum mulieris (Pl. Merc. 755), volvitur ille vomens calidum de pectore flumen frigidus (Aen. 9. 414), ardentem frigidus Aetnam insiluit (A. P. 465), periurum . . . in parentem splendide mendax (Od. 3. 11. 35), quae solet irato dicere pota ioco (Prop. 1. 16. 38), asper incolumi gravitate iocum tentavit (A. P. 222). In: lumenque obscura vicissim luna premit (Aen. 4. 80) obscura is by hypallage for obscurum and is predicative.

Such is the sportive use of *minari* of the boastful promise, as in: *multa et praeclara minantis* (Sat. 2. 3. 9), *multa et pulcra minantem* (Ep. 1. 8. 3), *qui magna cum minaris extricas nihil* (Phaedr. 4. 22. 4). The corresponding use of *promitto* is rare, as in: *ecastor qui subrepturum pallam promisit tibi* (Pl. Asin. 930), but we have: *at sperate deos memores fandi atque nefandi* (Aen. 1. 543). The zeugma we have in: *quam ob rem illa arma . . . non periculum nobis, sed praesidium denuntiant* (Cic. Mil. 3. 1) is parallel to that in: *vincere nec duro poteris convellere ferro* (Aen. 6. 148) for: *nec vincere duro ferro nec vi summa convellere poteris*, and in: *et nos tela, pater, ferrumque haud debile dextra spargimus* (12. 50) for: *tractare ferrum et tela spargere*. In: *urbem alii reserare iubent et pandere portas* (12. 584) ‘to unbar the city and open the gates’, the exchange of objects leads to an oxymoron in: *urbem reserare*.

The sentiment: *felix morte tua* (11. 159) is common to humanity, and finds like expression in: *pereas quin fortiter* (Sat. 2. 3. 42) and: *hominum manibus periisse iuvabit* (Aen. 3. 606). The same Stoic sentiment is at the basis of: *qui scis an prudens huc se proiecerit atque servari nolit?* (A. P. 462), where unless *prudens* is taken in its etymological force an oxymoron is apparent. In: *pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede*, etc. (Od. 1. 4. 13) a perception of the amphibole in: *aequo* obviates the assumption of any oxymoron. But only if we perceive the etymological sense shall we feel the oxymora in: *per linea terga* (Aen. 10. 784), *nullo se rore foveri* (Mart. 9. 18. 5), *divum nemo* (Aen. 9. 6), *meretrice nepos insanus amica filius* (Sat. 1. 4. 49), *paribus magistris* (Aen. 5. 562), *glacies futilis* (12. 740). But the perception of the primary meaning of *infantes* in: *seu rubra Canicula findet infantes statuas* (Sat. 2. 5. 40) obviates the oxymoron. So in: *bellum haec armenta minantur* (Aen. 3. 540) if we think of *armenta* as plough-horses we feel the oxymoron, while in: *bellum, o terra hospita, portas* (v. 539) we feel the oxymoron unless we connect *hospes* with *foris*, the cognate of *hostis*.

In: *fluctu spumabant caerulea cano* (8. 672) *caerulea* has been generalized from ‘sky-blue’ to ‘marine’, so that there is no real incongruity. In: *portisque moveri laetus in arma para* (7. 430) Servius rightly explains *laetus* as *alacer*. In: *tu sanguinis ultimus auctor* (7. 49) the *auctor* shows that *ultimus* is for *primus*; and in:

*Inde ubi prima quies medio iam noctis abactae  
Curriculo expulerat somnum* (Aen. 8. 407-8),

short for *ubi (primum) prima quies (finita) medio*, etc., the *medio* shows that the *prima quies*, which is all this *femina diligens* allows herself, is over, and sleep for her is ended. In: *germani minas* (Aen. 4. 44) the atrocity of such conduct from the brother to the sister may be inferred from the word *avunculus*. In: *non flebo in cineres arcem sedisse paternos Cadmi* (Prop. 3. 9. 37) the art which Propertius shows in making: *cineres paternos* mean ‘the ashes of her sons’ calls for notice; *paternos* is here for *patrios*, citizens of the *urbs patria*. But it is a case of *aprosdoketon* rather than an oxymoron. Nor do we feel an oxymoron in: *oscula suspensis instabant carpere palmis* (Prop. 1. 20. 27), nor in: *nos hic voramus litteras* (Cic. Att. 4. 11. 2). But it seems plain in: *carpe diem* (Od. 1. 11. 8), *carpe viam* (Aen. 6. 629), *viam vorabit* (Catull. 35. 7). How *carpere* is paired with *vorare* you may learn from any urchin who scales your orchard wall. Horace’s use of: *carpere iter* (Od. 2. 17. 12) gives vivid expression to his eagerness to rejoin his departed friend, no matter how drear the shades into which he will have to follow him.

## XLIII

### QUOD MINIME RERIS

VERY interesting is it after the lapse of nearly twenty centuries to read the welcome given to the first reports of Virgil’s great Epic by Propertius, second in genius to Virgil alone among poets then alive. In the last elegy of his second book, after censuring his friend Lynceus with contemptuous gravity for his attempt to seduce Cynthia from himself, he tells how he finds one thing to console him in this attempt. Lynceus has learned to know the power of Venus and Cupid, the gods that inspire lyric poets; now he will abandon his philosophic themes, his attempts at the Epic and the Tragedy; now he will join the lyric poets, attracted by the success of Propertius, who is king among the maids of Rome, though he had by inheritance no money to buy their favours.

Propertius is pleased at this accession to the number of lyric poets, especially as there has lately been a notable defection from their ranks; Virgil has lately turned to epic themes; and with mocking irony Propertius calls on all Roman, all Greek writers to stand aside; something or other greater than the *Iliad* is coming to birth. He had, it is true, but little success in lyric verse; his loves were cheap country wenches, who, though they could resist the charm of Tityrus’s

verses, yielded to his gift of a few apples; or else Alexis—but why more of him? No matter how weary he was when he sought relaxation on his oaten pipe, he found praise among his facile wood nymphs. Lately he had turned to imitate the old man of Ascrea in his rules for farming, and had produced a poem such as Cynthius himself entunes when he applies his finger joints to the lyre.

‘A great success!’ says Propertius; ‘but these lays of mine will not fail to please any reader whether skilled or unskilled in love; nor has the note of me, the tuneful swan, though it fail of epic power, proved inferior in inspiration to the untaught song of the goose’. And he proceeds to foretell the future fame of Leucadia sung by Varro of Atax, of Lesbia of higher fame than Helen through the verses of Catullus, of Quintilia mourned by the muse of Calvus, of Lycoris whose beauty dealt such wounds to Gallus dead but lately. And he feels little doubt that Fame, in giving him a place among lyric poets like these, will assign high rank among the maidens loved by poets to Cynthia, the theme of his verse. And here he closes; for whom among Virgil’s loves could he match with heroines like these? Was he to name Amaryllis, bought by the gift of half a score of apples? Had not Virgil himself felt that he had bequeathed to future ages the name of no woman that could vie with Lesbia or Cynthia, when he felt obliged to turn to the praise of ‘vineyard, hive, and horse, and herd’? To many a schoolboy of to-day the sweet laughter of Horace’s Lalage rings ‘rarer than the memory of all his golden pages’. But what schoolboy finds aught to remember in Virgil’s Amaryllis, or Phyllis, or Galatea?

But Virgil is the poet of surprises, and in the great Epic, which Propertius praised in bitter irony, he was to create for Roman literature its two great female figures, Dido and Camilla. It was natural for the poet, who described the founding of the city that dated her freedom from the death-blow of Lucretia, to lavish the best and choicest flowers of his genius on the pure and noble votary of Diana, with whose death at the hands of a traitor from her own mountains falls all hope of successful resistance to the invading Trojan. But who could have expected Virgil to raise to a still higher eminence the stately Tyrian princess, who gave shelter to Aeneas when shipwrecked on her coast and met with such vile guerdon for her generous welcome? Who could have hoped for her triumph over him in the Campi Lugentes, especially in a poem composed in honour of that Rome that showed so little pity for the last struggle of the Punic matrons to save their homes? And yet we still hear the ἔσσεται ἡμῶν of the generous Scipio as he gazed on the flames of Carthage; and our love for Virgil rises in glad surprise to higher levels, when we see him forget the imperial pride of Rome, and vindicate in the shades the wronged honour of the noblest queen pictured in ancient literature. If we apply Propertius’s test here, we have assuredly a poem much greater than either Iliad or Odyssey; how compare Nausicaa with the light grace and conquering heroism of Camilla? or the home-keeping faith of Penelope, or even the love for child and husband of the pure Andromache, with the generous love and despairing pride of Dido, which melted the heart even of Rome’s greatest eulogist, and melts the heart of every reader of to-day? I have given this triumph of Virgil’s genius the first place among the many surprises prepared for us with such cunning and skill in his great poem.

I have given it this place, though Virgil’s whole tale is a series of surprises. Sed quis ad Hesperiae venturos litora Teucros crederet? is Anchises’ comment on the enterprise. The poem was never finished, and much was left disjointed and but half told; and yet what a tale of Harpy and Cyclops, of plague and storm, of love and hate, of tragic loss and comic disappointment, of the wild flight of Turnus and the fierce charge of Camilla! and that from the bard of a time when the thought of:

*Pilaque feminea turpiter apta manu*

called forth detestation in every Roman heart. Virgil is no ordinary Roman with his limited views on humanity or womanhood; he may teach a lesson of justice and tolerance to the Englishman of to-day. *Via prima salutis, quod minime reris, Graia pandetur ab urbe.*

The plan of his work has its surprises. The first half of his poem is not an Iliad but an Odyssey, setting its sail into the unknown West, and ending in the underworld where Aeneas views the heroes to come of that city which was to rule the globe and to find its founder among his descendants. But the storm and dark of this Odyssey is lit up by a lesser Iliad, where he tells of the defeat which was to issue in such victory, of the flames of Troy from which issued that bright meteor that marked for him the course of empire, and in his escape from which he was to give an example of that pietas, with which Virgil hoped to infect the Romans, now lords of the world. For out of Roman victory was to spring Roman peace: *aspice venturo laetentur ut omnia saeclo!*, nor was the hope utterly vain; under the shelter of the pax Romana spread the teaching of the Christ which still inspires us with the hope of a coming age of gold when will vanish all *priscae vestigia fraudis*. In the second part, his Iliad, the less finished part of his work, what noble praise of Italy and Italian peoples, as they muster to expel the invader! How fine the picture as Aeneas is rowed up the Tiber to the site of

Rome to be! and how Father Tiber welcomes the chief who opens the door to his course of empire! Hic mihi magna domus celsis caput urbibus exit (8. 65). It is eminently Virgilian to use exit for init at the close of this verse, especially as it leads the reader for a time to a different and superficial meaning.

Full of interest in this connexion is Servius's note to: at regina (Aen. 4. 1): Apollonius Argonautica scripsit, et in tertio inducit amantem Medeam: inde totus hic liber translatus est. This judgement all our scholars have followed, most of them, one suspects, without reading Apollonius. For how far Dido excels Medea in generous womanliness! How far in the depth of her despair! But Servius continues: sane totus in consiliis et subtilitatibus est (hic liber).

No doubt I shall be told, as I have been, that I am attributing to Virgil subtle meanings of which he never dreamed, that our business as his interpreters is to take the plain sense of his words, and account for that. But Servius could see that in many cases there was no such sense; that the only sensible course is to credit Virgil with subtleties, and to try even at our distance to interpret them. And while Servius has not to the full the larger literary sense that should have checked him when he represented Virgil as the imitator of Apollonius, he has caught some of these subtleties, and under his guidance we can make a start on the way we must take. He continues: licet stulte quidam dicant hunc (librum) tertio non esse coniunctum—in illo enim navigium, in hoc amores exsequitur (Aeneas)—non videntes optimam coniunctionem. 'Non videntes' is what ails most of us; what is the course of our own sailors when they come into port?

But after so long a voyage I have but little space left for so great a theme, and must now turn to the unexpected in the use of words. Not that the oxymoron is not a special form of that very thing, in seeming at least. For when I seem to present sky-blue as white, as in: fluctu spumabant caerula cano (Aen. 8. 672), I am surely awaking surprise in the reader. But the surprise here rests on the incongruity we feel in the terms juxtaposed: caerula cano; and we name this by similar Greek juxtaposition oxymoron. But in:

Adveniet iustum pugnae, ne arcessite, tempus,  
Cum fera Carthago Romanis arcibus olim  
Exitium magnum et Alpes inmittet apertas (Aen. 10. 11-13),

where we have Carthage pictured as a Titan assailing the Dea Roma and hurling upon her vast destruction and opened Alps! If he had written: Alpes fractas, or Alpes fissas we might have gone on with our picture of the mountains that the Aloidae were piling up to scale Olympus; but—Alpes apertas? The poet is using the door as a metonymy for the nations that passed in through it. And it is tempting to turn and deal with a few of such second meanings that I have traced; sed nos inmensum—.

Let us begin with a very simple example: terraeque urbesque recedunt (3. 72), to which Servius notes: physicam rem dixit; ita enim navigantibus videtur, quasi ab his terra discedat. Virgil, who belongs to an age that still had the sense of wonder, is thrilled by this simple appearance, as is a boy to-day. We have one almost as simple in: hinc quoque quingentos in se Mezentius armat (10. 204), where again Servius: odio sui in arma compellit. In: non Libyae, non ante Tyro (4. 36), to which Servius notes: aut in Tyro, ac si diceret Tyri, aut certe id est de Tyro, Virgil gives us a curious grammatical surprise, where he constructs the name of a country as though it were a town, and vice versa. When Servius omits Libyae, he shows his failure to perceive Virgil's aim. Woelfflin has shown how Aegyptus and Epirus, names of countries that do not end in -ia like Gallia and Italia, but in -us like Amathus and Corinthus, are often constructed like names of towns. So Virgil constructs Libyae on the analogy of Romae, and in return Tyro is used for Tyri just as Plautus uses Epheso for Ephesi.

Easy is the use of paludem for aquam in: multam accepit rimosa (cymba) paludem (6. 414). Not very difficult is: postquam omnis res mea Ianum ad medium fracta est aliena negotia curo (Sat. 2. 3. 19). It has always been recognized as an excellent reason for attending to other people's business that you are not fit to attend to your own; and Damasippus's estate had made shipwreck, not in mid sea but in mid Forum. In: hostemque per auras facta nube premunt (Aen. 12. 254) the substitution of nube for agmine in case of seagulls is easy and natural. Not quite so easy is the substitution of cornua for arma in: irasci in cornua tentat (12. 104); for there arma (futura) was for: pugnas futuras. Easy is the synecdoche in: auratam optantes Colchis avertere pellem (Catull. 64. 5), where avertere is substituted for auferre, as though the golden fleece were still on the back of the living ram. Not so easy is that in: per remos alii (Aen. 10. 290); Heyne thinks of them as landing by the pole leap, using the oars as poles; 'others slide down the oars to the beach', says Conington. Sidgwick has paused to take a second thought, and thinks it better to leave, as did Virgil, 'by the aid of oars'. Servius makes it synecdoche: *per remos*, id est scaphis; et deest descendunt; which seems to me more in accord with Virgil's habit.

In: si qua fidem tanto est operi latura vetustas (10. 792) Virgil seems to assume the paradox never assumed since, shall we say? that it is not the marvel of recent times or of our own day that finds most ready belief with men, but that of ancient days when all was so much more marvellous. But perhaps Servius has caught his second thought, when in: tamen credat vetustas ex scelerato homine pium filium fuisse procreatum, he evidently takes vetustas as a metonymy for posteritas longinqua. Very neat is the metonymy dependent on both form and meaning in: conducto navigio aequae nauseat ac locuples quem ducit priva triremis (Ep. 1. 1. 93), where nauseat is used by way of surprise for navigat. Like it is: olli ingens barba reluxit, nidoremque ambusta dedit (Aen. 12. 301), where reluxit leads us to expect nitorem 'a gleam', not 'a smell'. From these we may explain the curious: di te, Damasippe, deaeque verum ob consilium donent tonsore (Sat. 2. 3. 17) as being the unexpected for donent thensauro, or rather tensoro, as was probably the common pronunciation. Horace may have hoped to direct us to this solution when he wrote tonsores in the verse before that containing nauseat, and tonsore in the following one.

Life and death are of supreme importance to the Roman as to us, and there as a rule it is the unexpected that happens. We read: vitamque volunt pro laude pacisci (Aen. 5. 230), where there is no fatal result, but: letumque sinas pro laude pacisci (12. 49), where the result is the death of Turnus. So we have: detur inoffenso vitae tibi tangere metam (Ov. Trist. 1. 9. 1) and: metasque dati pervenit ad aevi (Aen. 10. 472), but: hic tibi mortis erant metae (12. 546) of the death of Aeolus. In: tenues sine corpore vitas (6. 292) we have a curious periphrasis for umbrae, which becomes intelligible when we turn to: vitae . . . volantum (6. 728) 'the vital principles of birds'; but we may feel some surprise when we find for umbrae: defunctaque corpora vita (6. 306), where corpora is used in the general sense of 'persons'. We have vivus for mortuus, or rather for the pair mortuus vivus, in: succedet fama, vivusque per ora feretur (12. 235), recalling the words of Ennius's epitaph: volito vivus per ora virum. In: umeris inimicum insigne gerebat (12. 944) the balteus he wore had belonged to his opponent Pallas, but it was also at this moment to prove fatal to Turnus himself. I read in my Oxford text: ripamve iniussus adibis (6. 375); Servius knows the reading, but prefers: ripamve iniussus abibis, ut si dicas, de Campania abeo in Tusciam. Ribbeck finds that the manuscripts keep changing d to b and b to d, and, cast on his own resources, decides against Servius invita Minerva. For we have seen Palinurus approach the bank; what he is not allowed to do is to take Charon's boat from the bank.

Dolon asks as his reward (pretium) for going to spy out the Greek camp, the horses of Achilles: illum Tydides alio . . . adfecit pretio, nec equis adspirat Achillis (12. 352). Here pretio is for damno mortis. But we have damnare used in an opposite sense in:

Quem damnet labor et quo vergat pondere letum (12. 727), where Servius, and with him Nonius and Agroecius, explain damnet as liberet, so that we should translate 'which is to conquer in the struggle, which to perish'. This reading of the verse in its twofold issue well fits the twofold figure of the scales, and involves an unexpected use of damnare, and the figure of τὸ ἀπροσδόκητον, of which Virgil is evidently fond. Heyne says of Servius: parum luculenter mentem declarat, and with Forbiger he explains: damnet leto. The rest follow; though Sidgwick admits that 'we naturally expect that, when two questions are given here, they will contain the two alternatives, "which is to lose, which to win". Instead of this they both mean, "which is to lose" expressed variously'. In any case then we have the unexpected; but let us try to understand Servius. He refers us to:

Ut Baccho Cererique, tibi sic vota quotannis  
Agricolae facient; damnabis tu quoque votis (Buc. 5. 79-80),

'as to Bacchus and to Ceres, so to thee the farmers will yearly offer vows; thou too wilt (bestow blessings and) exact vows (therefor)', also to: taurum constituam ante aras, voti reus (Aen. 5. 237), where voti reus is equivalent to voti damnatus. In Livy we read: cuius damnatus voti cum victor Romam revertisset (7. 28. 4) 'and when he had returned to Rome victorious and so bound to pay this vow'. Macrobius tells us: damnatus (est votis) qui promissa vota iam solvit (Sat. 3. 2. 6). So: quem damnet labor here is plainly Virgilian for: utrum victorem et voti damnatum certamen praestiterit. If only Heyne could have understood Servius!

Very noble is the Sibyl's injunction to Aeneas:

Tu ne cede malis, sed contra audentior ito  
Quam tua te fortuna sinet (Aen. 6. 95-6).

The clause quam . . . sinet has in view the scanty resources of Aeneas and perhaps his death now not far off. Heyne has changed quam to qua to preserve the sense, for 'a man cannot meet his fate more boldly than his fate allows'; you see that

to Heyne fate was an objective reality, while to Virgil it was rather subjective and man might be master of it to some extent. Forbiger refuses to follow him here; *qua* is a mere conjecture of Paulus Manutius, and has no authority; all the manuscripts and all the grammatici give *quam*; but Ribbeck restores *qua*, relying apparently on a single codex, and that of Seneca, not of Virgil. Conington and Sidgwick restore *quam*, the latter noting with his usual regret Virgil's artificiality. Very noble is Servius's explanation: *esto audentior quam tua te fortuna permittit. Et bene adversa fortunae docet virtute aut vitari aut inminui aut patienter sustineri. In: tristesque ex aethere Dirae* (8. 701) the *ex aethere* is unexpected, but has given little trouble. We have here the representation of Actium on the shield of Aeneas, and how else the Furies could be represented as conducting the fight but from above, it is hard to see.

Striking is the use of *cunctatur* for *ruit* in: *ille autem impavidus partes cunctatur in omnes* (10. 714). We had already noticed the use of *ruit* and *moratur* in 9. 438-9 to describe the determined onset of Nisus, who disregards all else, but is bent on depriving Vocens of his life. *Moratur* is for *perseverat* here, and the result is described in the antithesis: *morians animam abstulit hosti* (9. 443). But here Mezentius sees so many hated foes before him, that he is attracted in all directions. He cannot rush in all directions; and so he hesitates or delays in all directions; only when the gauds of Acron, *purpureum pennis et pactae coniugis ostro*, attract him at length: *ruit in densos . . . hostes* (10. 729). Interesting and very difficult is: *cunctantem* (6. 211). In the next verse the scene shifts to the burial of Misenus, and the offerings of black bullocks to the gods of the underworld. In the story of the Golden Bough, which Virgil has adapted to his hero's descent, he who plucks the bough passes at once with it to the shrine of Diana Nemorensis, where he meets and slays 'the priest who slew the slayer'; and then no doubt installs himself as priest with *piacula* to Diana for the death of her last priest. Though Aeneas does no such killing, yet Virgil remembered that the plucking of the Golden Bough was always accompanied by a death and *piacula*; hence the death of Misenus at this point. The hesitation of the bough is not through any reluctance to accompany Aeneas to the shades; the Sibyl had reassured him on that point; but he has first to bury Misenus, and it is on account of this *officium funestum* that the bough is made to hesitate. Still more interesting is *cunctantem* in: *reginam thalamo cunctantem ad limina primi Poenorum exspectant* (4. 133). In: *ad limina* here we have an amphibole, and it must be taken as for *ante limina* with *exspectant*, and for *post limina* with *cunctantem*. Servius is wrong here, and is followed by all modern editors. It is hardly *sui ornandi gratia* that Virgil makes her delay to cross the threshold on a wedding-journey that was to lead to no valid nuptials but to self-slaughter. While this journey is decked out with elaborate ornament by Virgil, we feel at once that it can hardly be of good omen for the bride to set out to her nuptials arrayed as Diana.

In:

*Dis equidem auspicibus reor et Iunone secunda  
Hunc cursum Iliacas vento tenuisse carinas* (4. 45-6),

the important words are *reor* and *vento* in the centre of each verse. Anna, the speaker, is right in her opinion about Juno, but wrong about the rest of the gods. To *vento* Servius's note is: *mire, cum alio iter haberent, huc delati sunt; et ideo addidit 'vento'*. Mackail translates *vento* 'before the wind', and no editor thinks it worth a note. To understand it here, we must bear in mind the pair: *forte non consulto*, and treat *vento* as one for two, as short for: *vento non consulto*. They did not come of set purpose, but were driven by a storm. In: *quos Africa terra triumphis dives alit* (4. 37) and: *Teucrum comitantibus armis Punica se quantis attollet gloria rebus!* (v. 49) the phrases *triumphis dives* and *Punica gloria* seem strange in a Roman epic. But they are Anna's words, and are quite in place on the lips of a woman of Carthage. While the ancient treaty subsisted between Rome and Carthage, Punic glory did flourish; and it was through the defeat of Carthage that the lordship of the world passed to Rome. '*Quidam dicunt Afros numquam triumphasse*' is part of Servius's note; but we have all read Horace's story of Regulus's counsel to the Senate. We have here again a striking instance of Virgil's sense of justice and fair play in representing a beaten foe.

But, I shall be asked, does Virgil always show this sense of justice? Is he really a 'good sport'? Is he not rather inclined to condone Nisus's foul play in the foot-race at Panormus, and Euryalus's acceptance of a prize he had not won? True, Nisus wrongs Salius, and Euryalus carries off the prize, but a foot-race follows soon after in which both lose their lives; and it is only when Nisus has fallen pierced through and through on the lifeless corpse of Euryalus that Virgil declares of them: *Fortunati ambo*. Servius wonders at this apostrophe to two youths that had just perished miserably; only then by their death had they vindicated their piety and atoned for their too successful foul play. The careful reader of the poem who thinks it worth his while to compare different episodes in it, will see that Virgil understood fair sport and punished most severely any breach of it, though I cannot congratulate his modern editors on having emphasized the lesson—indeed



I fear they have not even noticed it.

To my mind the story of the midnight sortie in the ninth Aeneid throws so much light on that of the foot-race in the fifth, and presents so many points of purposed correspondence with it, that it is plain that Virgil intended their conduct in the foot-race to be connected with their fate in the sortie. Servius notes the verbal coincidence in: *primus abit . . . Nisus* (5. 318) and: *Nisus abit* (9. 386). As they near the goal, Nisus far in the lead, Salius next, *longo sed proximus intervallo*, Euryalus third, *spatio post relicto*, Nisus infelix slips in the blood of the victims and falls prone in the foul dung and mire. But not forgetful of the youth he loves he raises himself so as to trip up Salius and give the victory to Euryalus, who as he comes in first is greeted: *plausu . . . fremituque secundo* (5. 338).

Servius remarks that *fremitu* needs the adjective *secundo* to make it agree with *plausu*: *quia est et irascentium*. That there is a minority that protests and favours Salius seems clear from the way Dioreas, who will lose his prize as third if Salius has the first place restored to him, does his best *magna voce* to support Euryalus, whose beauty and tears move the spectators. And I think that in: *secundo* here we have a *zeugma*: *plausu secundo* is the favour of the majority, *fremitu secundo* is the protest of a minority reduced to a second place by the favor Euryali, a phrase which has its significance. *Plausu fremituque secundo* is really for: *plausu secundo fremituque adverso*. The state of mind in Nisus that led to his tripping up Salius is best accounted for by his first speech in the ninth:

*dine hunc ardorem mentibus addunt,  
Euryale, an sua cuique deus fit dira cupido?* (9. 184-5).

Certainly it was *dira cupido* that prompted him to this vile trick in the foot-race. Aeneas recognizes the undeserved misfortune of Salius—*insontis amici*, he styles him, and gifts him with a lion's hide, adorned with claws of gold. When Nisus rises from the bloody mire, and reminds his hearers that he would have won but for ill-luck, Aeneas appeases him with the gift of a shield, a gift which has its significance. A man so heedless of the rights of others has need of protection from their resentment, though he needs still more to be on his guard against his own unhappy whims.

In the ninth Aeneid Virgil introduces Nisus as a rough hunter from Ida with no settled faith in the gods and with a fierce lust for carnage. As he leaves the band of Trojan chiefs to sally forth into Turnus's camp, Mnesteus bestows on him: *pellem horrentisque leonis exuvias* (9. 306). When he reaches the camp of the Latins he falls upon them: *impastus ceu . . . leo* (v. 339). When he promises to bear a message to Aeneas, Iulus promises him: *campi quod rex habet ipse Latinus* (v. 274), and it is in the *stabula alta* (388), then held by Latinus, that both are slain. It is a chief of the ill-omened name of Aletes, 'the wanderer', that gifts Nisus with his helm as he sets out, and as he turns back to find his friend: *dumis . . . silentibus errat* (v. 393). As he starts on the sortie, Ascanius promises him, besides two silver cups captured at Arisba, a town taken by Achilles, an ancient mixer, the gift of Sidonian Dido; and we are reminded of Dido's words: *sequar atris ignibus absens* (4. 384). As he turns to find his friend whom in his lack of foresight he had deserted, he strays at first, but directed by the shouts of pursuers, when he comes in view of the foe he prays Luna the huntress goddess to direct his shafts and help him to distract the foe by making havoc of them. The goddess, who already by her rays had betrayed Euryalus, grants his prayer, but merely to ensure the destruction of both.

Thus far our clues have no direct reference to the foot-race in the fifth, but this changes when we turn to Euryalus. He is a boy of about seventeen, born about the time that the Greeks landed in the Troad, and only now beginning to take his part in deeds of arms. He is the fairest of the Aeneadae, and the description of his beauty as he darts into the first place in the foot-race (5. 343-4) finds a more elaborate parallel in Virgil's comparison of him with Hyacinthus as he falls pierced by the sword of Volcens (9. 433-7). For guidance he trusts mainly to his friend, though at last he is betrayed by greed for spoil and disobeys him. Without hesitation he accepts the horse with its phalerae, the first prize he had not fairly won. In the slaughter of the Latins he slays many nameless men, whom Virgil surprises us by naming in the following verse, showing that by *sine nomine* here he means *sine laude*. When warned to flee he loads himself with the phalerae and belt of Rhamnes, whom not he, but Nisus, had slain, and the rich helm of Messapus, which he had picked up and dons for his flight. It is this stolen ornament which flashing in the moonlight betrays him. The correspondence of the rare term *phalerae* seems purposed by the poet.

Nisus in the foot-race had helped Euryalus to a victory not fairly won; now in this race for life Euryalus hampered by his stolen gauds fails to keep up with his friend, who loses his life in a vain attempt to rescue him. Nisus in the foot-race: *non oblitus amorum* (5. 334) by foul play wins the first place for Euryalus; but now: *iam . . . imprudens evaserat hostes* (9. 386), where Servius explains: *imprudens remanentis Euryali*, his conduct is the reverse of that in the fifth, conduct

fitting the reversed conditions, where he is betrayed to death by the folly of his favourite. Confused by dread, Nisus chooses rather to confuse the foe by slaughter than propitiate them by his surrender; when at last he sees all their rage turned on his friend, too late he offers his life to save him. His appeal: *mea fraus omnis* (v. 428) bears a double meaning to us who, following Virgil's hints, connect this loss: *phalerae Rhamnetis* with the winning of the *phalerae* in the fifth. To Nisus's mind *fraus* is the harm he has wrought the Latins in his midnight sortie; to ours they point back to his foul play with Salius as well. And the bloody scene of his exploits here (vv. 453-6) calls to mind the mire and blood in which he slipped and fell (5. 333). Only when he rests at last in peaceful death on the corpse of his friend does Virgil, appeased by their fate, and attracted by their *pietas*, the virtue he was bent on inspiring in the Romans of his day, promise them ever-during fame while the greater successor of Aeneas, the *Pater Romanus*, holds sway hard by the unshifting shrine of *Terminus*. Clearly we have here an example of Virgil's tragic irony, so fully depicted in *Nettleship's Suggestions*, pp. 31 ff.

Fortunati ambo! Hardly so fortunate seem to me our modern scholars, when I turn to deal with a verse of the episode which contains the most striking verbal example of the unexpected in the *Aeneid*. We read:

*hasta volans noctis diverberat umbras,  
Et venit adversi in tergum Sulmonis, ibique  
Frangitur ac fisso transit praecordia ligno* (9. 411-13);

rather I should say, virtually all the manuscripts give us this reading, which is supported by the citations of Acron (ad Sat. 2. 1. 14), of Nonius, and of Servius, and the repeated explanations of Servius (ad 9. 412 et 10. 718), of which I need cite only the second here: *tergo scuto*, ut: *et venit adversi in tergum Sulmonis*. Curious is the effect on Heyne of this harmony of authority: *conturbat interdum animum, si videas totam antiquitatem absurdam opinionem pervicaciter tenere, et recentiores eidem inhaerere*. On the contrary such a harmony of authority, even for a reading which you do not at the moment understand, should have the effect not of disturbing your mind, but rather of calming it (*animum serenandi*). You may not understand it, but you may rest assured that the reading is secure, and those will come after who will understand it, if your love of truth prevails so far as to let them have the reading. But no modern printed text of Virgil now in my possession has the reading *adversi*, though that is the only reading that has any authority.

What does Heyne suggest *conturbato animo*, as he owns he is? Forbiger quotes him thus, and fairly I think: *is cuius tergum petitur, averso sit corpore necesse est, non adverso*; and he follows Heyne in the correction of *adversi* to *aversi*, coming thus to the view to which the casual Roman reader would no doubt come when he first read the verse. Ribbeck prefers *abversi*, being anxious to preserve the symmetry of the manuscripts. Conington says that the manuscripts on *adversi* are not of much more authority than on a matter of orthography! And what of the explanations of Servius's scholia? Sidgwick does not waste words on so slight a matter: '*aversi* is clearly right'. Page feels that a modern might condescend to give a reason for the change—a very small one; and he calls our attention to *circumspiciunt*; the Latins had their backs to Nisus. They were in a circle about Euryalus, and most of them were not facing Nisus; but according to all ancient authority *Sulmo* was.

But Heinsius wants to take *tergum* as *loricam coriaceam*; *quod nemini persuadebit*, adds Heyne. *Mihi certe minime*; for I don't place Heinsius on a level with Servius in explaining the Latin language. We moderns, with our limited knowledge both of ancient language and life, are very foolish when we disregard the testimony as to the meaning of word or phrase given by the Romans themselves. And so I shall follow Servius in his repeated explanations: *tergum*. *scutum*. I read: *at clipeum, tot ferri terga, tot aeris* (10. 482), where you may note the catachreses, *per linea terga* (10. 784), *more equestris proelii sumptis tergis et redditis*, a fragment from Sallust's *Histories* quoted by Servius to *Aen.* 11. 619. In the first we have the *clipeus*, consisting of *terga* or layers of iron and brass, in the second *terga* is used for *clipeus*, in the third the collective singular *tergum* is used for *parma*, i.e. it has become a general term for the shield. In *Aen.* 9. 412 et 10. 718 *tergum* and *tergo* are used, according to Servius, for *scutum* and *scuto*. 'But', says Conington, 'though *tergum* might perhaps stand for a shield, *tergum Sulmonis* could hardly mean the shield of *Sulmo*.' Perhaps I do not follow Conington's reasoning; but it makes little difference whether it is *Sulmo's* shield or not, if he is behind it, and a spear shivered in its passage through the shield pierces *Sulmo's* breast.

Of course, in a case like this, the mischief is not confined to a single passage. Virgil again used *tergum* for 'a shield' in:

*Ille autem impavidus paries cunctatur in omnes,  
Dentibus infrendens et tergo decutit hastas* (10. 717-18).

Heyne without scruple removes these lines three verses back, giving them to the *aper*, though: *partes cunctatur in omnes* 'is in doubt whom to attack' is surely of Mezentius. Virgil has been comparing Mezentius to a wild boar, hence his picture of Mezentius's rage in: *dentibus infrendens*. Conington and Page both feel that these verses are in their proper place in the manuscripts, though they do not seem to see how this decision reflects on their judgement about Aen. 9. 412. If *tergo* is 'with the shield' here, why is not *tergum* 'the shield' there? Sidgwick transposes the verses, and thinks Mezentius's act—*tergo decutit hastas*—would be 'grotesque to a degree'; but that is because he takes *tergum* as Mezentius's back, and not his shield. But to turn to the general question, all this foolish interference with the manuscript readings is grotesque to a degree, and brings little credit to our modern scholars. The text of both Virgil and Horace has been conserved with the greatest care by the ancients; it is much better than that of any other books we have, and there is absolutely no place for emendation here, but only for a choice between readings. Emendation seems to have its place in dealing with Lucretius and Propertius, to whom we have no scholia, since their poems were evidently less valued by the ancients; but even there it has been carried to absurd lengths. As a rule the reading preserved in the manuscripts should be given its place, unless it presents a form that is plainly not Latin. And in determining this we must take account of the evidence of inscriptions as well as of manuscripts. For example, inscriptions give us for -a stems datives ending in -a; and it is only reasonable to expect to find in Latin this form, as in: *solita* for *solitae*, just as we find both *populo* and *populoi*, *manu* and *manui*. And we plainly have this form in: *mandet humo solita* (Aen. 9. 214), the reading of all good manuscripts, just as we have it in: *telaque feminea turpiter apta manu* (Prop. 4. 6. 22), where all manuscripts have *feminea* and the best give *apta*, not *acta*. So also in: *Tantalea poterit tradere poma manu* (2. 1. 66), where all manuscripts give *Tantalea*, and Butler thinks it a bold ablative of place, and: *non Ida et cupido quondam discordia Phoebos* (1. 2. 17), where the best manuscripts all have *Ida*, though editors follow a correction to *Idae* in the codex Neapolitanus, a correction that you might have expected.

For the tendency amongst scholars is to assume that the endeavour after uniformity of expression that prevails in prose is characteristic of poetry also; that the meaning given to a word by a poet in any passage will be that given it by him when he uses it elsewhere. This goes so far that we hear of a definite Lucretian or Horatian use of a word. But variety and novelty, not uniformity, Horace tells us, is what a poet should aim at who aspires to distinction in diction:

In verbis etiam tenuis cautusque serendis  
Dixeris egregie notum si callida verbum  
Reddiderit iunctura novum (A. P. 46-8).

We have an easy example of what he means in: *memini quae plagosum mihi parvo Orbilius dictare* (Ep. 2. 1. 70), where *plagosus*, which till then had meant 'receiving many strokes', now by its union with the schoolmaster Orbilius takes on at once the opposite sense of 'dispensing many strokes'. So in: *et mihi res, non me rebus subiungere conor* (Ep. 1. 1. 19) he represents as the *dominus rerum* the Epicurean, not the Stoic, sage, ironically vaunted as *rex denique regum* (v. 107). In: *stellae sponte sua iussaene vagentur et errent* (Ep. 1. 12. 17) it is the Epicurean, not the Stoic, theory of the heavens, wherein we find presented the reign of Law. In:

Quid qui pervenit, fecitne viriliter? Atqui  
Hic est aut nusquam quod quaerimus (Ep. 1. 17. 38-9),

in a masterpiece of irony he presents the parasite's art, when practised with success, as a good example of *virtus*, the *summum bonum* of the Stoic. In: *prima dicte mihi, summa dicende Camena* (Ep. 1. 1. 1) *summa* balanced against *prima* is given the force of *ultima*, a meaning usually expressed by *suprema*, as in: *morie suprema* (Ep. 2. 2. 173). Can Horace by a *callida iunctura* give *supremus* the meaning of 'midmost' instead of 'last'? This he has done in: *supremo te sole domi, Torquate, manebo* (Ep. 1. 5. 3), though editors of our day obstinately refuse to believe it, and because of the usual force of *supremus* elsewhere insist on translating *supremo sole* here as 'sunset'.

The *notum verbum* here is *supremo sole*, *notum* in its old and usual sense of 'sunset', but here invested with a new sense through its union with *Torquatus*, a very intimate friend of Horace, whom he may venture to entreat to set aside business for a day and enter on a convivium with him, not at sunset, as is usual and seemly, but at high noon. *Sol* is often used in poetry for *dies*, and so *supremo sole* 'when the sun is at its highest' is used here as a *verbum novum* for *medio die*. Of this novel phrase we have a right to expect an explanation from Acron and Porphyrio; Acron's note is: *cum est altissimus medio die*, and Porphyrio's: *supremo; summo, id est, hora sexta*. But as *supremus* is usually for *ultimus*, and sunset is the usual hour for the *cena*, editors assume it is so here, and disregard the scholia. If this is not Horace's meaning it is sure to work mischief in their treatment of the Epistle. Ribbeck thinks vv. 12-20 an interpolation with no direct connexion

with the rest of the letter. Kiessling feels that if we omit these verses the value of the letter is gone, though he regards them as a bit of conventional moralizing on Horace's part; and they must be so, if *supremo sole* means 'at sunset'; but if it means 'at high noon', then his entreaty to Torquatus to disregard hopes of wealth and fame are closely connected with the loss of a day in the courts, which the acceptance of his invitation will involve. But the matter seems settled by the closing words of the Epistle: *rebus omissis atria servantem postico falle clientem* (vv. 30-1) 'let business go, and by a back door cheat the client who has been (since early morn) waiting for you in the entrance hall'. Such are the perils awaiting the scholar who forgets that the poets of the *aurea latinitas* are *tenues cautique in verbis serendis*, and insists on taking the obvious and hackneyed meaning of a word regardless of warnings from the scholiasts. When Horace talks to his horse, it is not with his own mouth, but with his horse's mouth; for *equi frenato est auris in ore* (Ep. 1. 15. 13).

## XLIV

### ALIA QUAEDAM

#### I

ACCORDING to the great majority of manuscripts the Address of Horace's Epistle 1. 13 is: *ad Vinnium Asellam*; some few manuscripts give *Asellum*, a few *Asellium*, but only the inferior codices that Keller and Holder do not think worth citing by name have *Asinam*. And yet most editions of to-day that print an Address give: *ad Vinnium Asinam*. Their reasons for this seem to me best put in Lucian Müller's introduction to the Epistle: 'The person to whom this letter is addressed must have been named Vinnius Asina; for one can understand vv. 8-9 only of a cognomen handed down on the father's side. The Anonym (he means Acron), it is true, names him Vinnius Asellus, adding that his father's name was Asina. The titles of the manuscripts give *Asellam*, *Asellum*, *Asellium*, also *Asinam*. Yet one cannot at all understand why Horace, when the ancients show such an obvious aversion to changing a proper name, should have thus obscured the name *Asella* or *Asellus*, which he could have so readily fitted into his verse.'

Horace's verses in question are:

*Abicito (sarcinam) potius quam quo perferre iuberis  
Clitellas ferus impingas, Asinaeque paternum  
Cognomen vertas in risum et fabula fias* (Ep. 1. 13. 7-9).

Acron gives us as introduction: *hac epistula adloquitur Vinnium, qui alio nomine Asellus vocabatur a patre, qui Asina dictus est abusive. Per quem Vinnium Asellum solitus erat Horatius carminum suorum libellos Augusto dirigere, . . . (C.) Vinnius Fronto, ad quem haec epistula scripta est, patrem habuit cognomine Asinam. Adludit ergo nomini eius, et quasi convenire hanc adpellationem nominis eius ingenio volt videri. v. 6. Sarcina chartae. Sarcina figuram Vinnium paterni cognominis facit Asinae. Porphyrio gives us: Ut proficiscentem docui t. s. d. Haec scribit ad Vinnium Asellam quibus docet Horatius, quemadmodum Augusto velit exhiberi libellos suos. 8. 9. Asinaeque paternum cognomen. Ostendit non aliquo vitio hoc cognomen Vinnio contigisse, sed gentile. Further in a scholium of the Codex Parisinus 8213 (saeculi XIII) he is called Grunnius Fronto. Probably the Grunnius is merely a badly copied G. Vinnius. Such is the testimony handed down from the ancients about Vinnius, besides that from the manuscripts, which decidedly favour the name Asella.*

We notice how the scholia persist in giving the name *Asina* to the father and *Asella* or *Asellus* to the son. Porphyrio explicitly tells us that the son's name was *Asella*, and Acron calls him *Asellus*; while he adds that the father was called *Asina*, and again: *habuit cognomen Asinam*. Now the cognomen of the father was not always handed down to the son. To take another and a similar plebeian name from the Italian hills, C. Asinius Pollio's son was named C. Asinius Gallus, and he had a son called Asinius Celer, and another called Asinius Gallus. So that we can understand that a father can have the name Vinnius Asina, and the son the name Vinnius Asella, though the moment we put it thus, the feeling of a possible jest comes in. But there is no force in Lucian Müller's 'must'.

Though Porphyrio tells us that the name was *gentile*, and not given from any defect, Acron expressly tells us that the father was so called *abusive*, and twice he hints at a reason for calling the son *Asellus*, in: *convenire . . . ingenio*, and in: *sarcina figuram . . . Asinae*. Further he tells us that *Asellus's* name was C. Vinnius Fronto; and this is repeated in the

Parisian scholium. What does he mean by *abusive*? Quintilian tells us that words are used *abusive* in what he calls *translationes*—what we often call poetic tropes. In the Horatian verses: acer et Marsi peditis cruentum voltus in hostem (Od. 1. 2. 39-40) both Acron and Porphyrio read Mauri for Marsi. Acron's note is: Maurum abusive posuit pro quocumque hoste; Porphyrio's: *Mauri*; pro cuiuslibet accipe bellicosae gentis; speciem pro genere posuit. While *abusive* then is our 'figuratively' rather than 'abusively', yet when it comes to the use of names like Asina the difference ceases to be perceptible.

Professor Courbaud thinks that, while Vinnius Asella may have been a mere invention of Horace, giving a basis for this Epistle, by which he hoped to call forth a smile on the face of the new Atlas, there may have been among the tenants of Horace near Varia one named Asella, whose name suggested to Horace the jest on which the Epistle is based. But was his name really Asella? There is nothing in the Epistle to suggest to Acron the name Fronto, a name confirmed by the Codex Parisinus. Cicero (N. D. 1. 80. 29) among defective human faces specifies: silos, flaccos, frontones, capitones, which Mayor translates 'with snub nose, flat ears, beetle brows, big heads'. Fronto is a formation like Capito, and probably means 'with broad brow'. Many Latin cognomina are derived from such defects; and Fronto is such a cognomen, well represented in the late Republic and early Empire. We may assume that in Fronto we have the real cognomen of Vinnius, but that his intellectual agility was so far from corresponding to his breadth of brow, that his neighbours compared it in sport with the broad forehead of his little donkey, and jocularly styled him Asella, and it was this jest of his fellow coloni that suggested to Horace the use he made of him in this Epistle.

We have here then a case real or invented by Horace, in which rude or uncouth behaviour on the part of Asella may lead to unpleasant hypotheses based on his nickname. This very nickname suggests to the bard that he is a fitting person to bear a burden a long distance. So to him the poet entrusts the first three books of his Odes with instructions to bear them to Augustus in his summer home. His instructions are adapted to his nickname; he is not to stumble and smash the poetry, but to keep right up and down hillsides, through streams, through puddles; if he finds the burden he is saddled with galling him by the end of his journey, he is not to bang it down in a passion, and turn his father's cognomen of Asina into a laugh, and become a byword. It is as though Horace had said to him: If you do my message so rudely, people will say: With good reason were you called Asella (the little donkey); your father's name must have been Asina (the big donkey). Or to put it prosaically: 'fortes creari fortibus et bonis' ipse scripsi; pari ratione stulti ex stultis et ineptis gigni videntur. Te igitur, Asella noster, si asinorum more te gesseris, credendum erit non nomine modo, sed natura et re vera Asellam esse, et tibi paternum nomen fuisse Asinam. Of course the name thus invented in sport for the father makes it certain that the great majority of the manuscripts are right, and that the name is not Asellus, but Asella.

While Asella is a diminutive of Asina, do ancient records afford any reason for our thinking that, if the son's name happened to be Asella, the Romans would conclude even in jest that his father's name must have been Asina? Take libertus and libertinus; Horace's father was once a slave; when he obtained his freedom, he was a libertus to his former master, but a libertinus to other Romans. Is not libertinus a diminutive of libertus, just as κοραῖνος is of κόραξ? According to this theory Horace's father would be the libertus, and Horace himself the libertinus. In Roman story Claudius is the great friend and patron of liberti and libertini; you will remember the favour he showed to Pallas and Narcissus. Suetonius tells us (Claud. 24) that he even bestowed the laticlave on the son of a libertinus, and fearing blame for this, pleaded the example of his great ancestor, Appius the Blind, who, he said, had added to the Senate sons of libertini: ignarus temporibus Appi et deinceps aliquamdiu libertinos dictos non ipsos qui manumitterentur, sed ingenuos ex his procreatos. Primarily then the libertinus was the son of the libertus, and only the grandson of the libertus and his descendants could claim the title of ingenuus.

## II

WE read in Horace:

Forte per angustam tenuis volpecula rimam  
Repserat in cumeram frumenti, pastaque rursus  
Ire foras pleno tendebat corpore frustra;  
Cui mustela procul, 'si vis', ait, 'effugere istinc,  
Macra cavum repetes artum, quem macra subisti' (Ep. 1. 7. 29-33).

Of all his emendations, Bentley seems to have plumed himself most on that achieved here. 'Arrige aures, lector', he begins, 'et intento fac sis animo; dum locum hunc excutimus et ad vivum secamus.' Quid dignum tanto feret hiatu? After

acknowledging that all previous editions and all manuscripts give *volpecula*, and that Isidore of Seville confirms that reading, and showing that Dacier's correction of *cumeram*, a reading confirmed by Acron, to *cameram*, affords no relief—for *cameram frumenti* is impossible; *camera* is a roof or lid, and you might write *camera vasis*, but not *camera vini*—he proceeds to show how utterly at variance with all vulpine ways is the conduct of the *volpecula* here. He eats grain, an office for which the fox's teeth are clearly unfit, he has entered the grain-basket by a narrow chink, and he remains there for days—and weeks it may be—till he has grown fat (*pleno corpore*), and can no longer get out by the chink. All his habits show the mouse, not the fox; cunning is the characteristic of the fox, Cicero tells us (*Off.* 1. 41. 13), as might is of the lion; but this *volpecula* is silly and stupid, and needs instruction from the weasel. In the hexameter to substitute *nitedula* for *volpecula* is easy; *nitedula* is another form of *nitela*, a field-mouse; and so Bentley solves the difficulty.

One weak point in his argument is his proof that the mouse remains for days in the grain-basket; in this he shows that he has little conception of the relation of prose to poetic diction. He does not see that *pleno corpore* is merely the poet's resort to the vague to avoid the *tapinosis* in: *pleno ventre*; he cites Celsus to prove that *pleno corpore* must mean 'grown fat', but Celsus is writing prose, and so proves nothing. *Pleno corpore* is opposed to *tenuis* here, and means 'having dined'. Kiessling sees this and notes: *pleno corpore* = *pleno ventre*. Probably *pleno corpore* is Horace's poetic variation for Aesop's: *plenum muris ventrem* cited by Bentley to support his emendation. Both Kiessling and Lucian Müller adopt Bentley's emendation, Müller with all its mistakes, but Kiessling is right in stressing the primary meaning of *mustela*, 'the mouse-catcher'. Lucian Müller presents the weasel in the rôle of mouse-instructor, who stands at a fair distance off (*procul*), so that the mouse, when it does get out, will be able to run into its hole in time; in any event there are plenty of other mice for the weasel, who will not wait for days for the exit of this one. It is delightful to meet the benevolent weasel under escort of the kindly Herr Müller, who could with advantage examine further the use of *procul* in Horace and Virgil.

Bentley cares little for the authority of manuscripts and scholia; he has never given thought to the question of what evidence we have as to what Virgil and Horace wrote; when he came to emend Milton, this defect became evident. It is possible to imagine a weary scribe writing *nitedula* here for *volpecula* under the influence of the rest of the passage; but what scribe could be so stupid, so utterly oblivious of the sense of the context as to substitute *volpecula* for *nitedula*? Then what would the blunder of a single scribe signify in such a multitude of manuscripts (for over 250 manuscripts of Horace's poems have come down to us)? There can be no doubt that because of its very difficulty we must retain *volpecula*, and Keller and Holder retain it, marking it with an asterisk. Bentley in his rejection of it is followed by Lachmann, Haupt, Conington, Kiessling, and L. Müller, but not one of them has accounted for the substitution of *volpecula*, so incongruous with the context, for *nitedula* to which the context so plainly points.

Munro, who defends the manuscript reading, says: 'Bentley's famous *nitedula* for *volpecula* deserves all praise—it is brilliant, is what Horace ought to have written, but I sadly fear did not write; not from ignorance, probably, but because he had in his thoughts some old-world foxes, whose foxes were not as our foxes' (cited by Wickham ad loc.). Bentley's treatment of the passage does deserve praise, especially when we compare it with that of Munro. We have other testimony about old-world foxes—that just cited from Cicero, and the censure passed on Herod the Tetrarch. Munro should have gone a little further and shown us that it was the habit of the weasel to hunt foxes in those days. Munro's view of our change of attitude towards the lower kinds seems valid for geese rather than foxes. Think of the noble birds that saved the Capitol from the Gauls; what of the guardians of Minerva's shrine to-day?

In the last section we noticed the tendency among the Romans to give their fellow citizens *cognomina* connected with some physical or mental defect. So we have Pompeius Strabo, Licinius Crassus, Horatius Flaccus, Aemilius Scaurus, Thrasea Paetus, Quintilius Varus. But men were wont to assume *cognomina* setting forth their excellent qualities as well. We have Laelius Sapiens, Pompeius Magnus, Metellus Celer, Lucretius Carus, Furius Philo, Clodius Pulcher, to notice a few. Those who tell us stories of animals in ancient times do not represent them with the truth and reality with which they are presented to us to-day. Aesop made his animals talk as though they were men. Yes, and Horace made his animals think and speak as though they were Romans; and so we have this *mus* following at a distance the example of C. Laelius and calling himself *Volpecula*, without the same justification, I fear. Horace tells us:

Dixeris egregie, notum si callida verbum  
Reddiderit iunctura novum (A. P. 47-8).

A *callida iunctura* here has given the word *volpecula* a new setting, a setting so novel that none of our modern scholars has seen it. He trusted that we might catch the truth from his use of *frumentum*, which foxes do not eat, of the *angusta rima*

in the basket, from the stupid greed of the ‘fox’ in the basket, and finally from the attitude of the weasel to this volpecula—indeed in the name mustela he reveals to us the real name of his hero.

### III

We read at the close of the sixth Aeneid:

Sunt geminae somni portae, quarum altera fertur  
Cornea, qua veris facilis datur exitus umbris,  
Altera candenti perfecta nitens elephanto,  
Sed falsa ad caelum mittunt insomnia Manes.  
His ibi tum natum Anchises unaque Sibyllam  
Prosequitur dictis portaque emittit eburna (vv. 893-8).

It is quite plain where Virgil gets his two pairs of gates. We read in the Odyssey: Twain are the gates of shadowy dreams, the one is fashioned of horn and one of ivory. Such dreams as pass through the portals of sawn ivory are deceitful, and bear tidings that are unfulfilled. But the dreams that come forth through the gates of polished horn, bear a true issue whosoever of mortals beholds them (19. 562-7, B. and L.’s Transl.)

It seems plain too why Homer has assigned the gates of horn to fulfilled, and the ivory gates to unfulfilled dreams. Homer is playing on the likeness of form in ἐλέφας ‘the elephant’ or ‘ivory’, and ἐλεφαίρομαι ‘I destroy’; for it is the unfulfilled dream that destroys men; so Homer sends it forth through the ivory gate. The word ἐλέφας has no real connexion with ἐλεφαίρομαι; ἐλέφας is the Greek transliteration of the Arabic alaba, the elephant, while ἐλεφαίρομαι has in it the same root as ὀλοφώϊος ‘destructive’, ἐλεφ- being the primary grade of the reflex ὀλοφ-. Probably his choice of the gates of horn for fulfilled dreams rests on a like resemblance between κέρας ‘horn’, and κραίνω ‘I fulfil’. Homer’s choice of gates for his dreams rests on a play on the sound of words, i.e. on a pun. Virgil adopts this choice of Homer’s; does his choice of the gates for the passage of Aeneas and the Sibyl rest on a like play on sound? or on sense?

It is quite plain that in the verses:

Sed revocare gradum superasque evadere ad auras  
Hoc opus, hic labor est (Aen. 6. 128-9),

Virgil calls forth in the mind of his reader the expectation of a long and difficult return. He is the poet of surprises, and by using the ivory gates he brings about the return in three verses. But the shock to the minds of his editors is a sad one. Most of them refrain from giving expression to their feeling, but Sidgwick says bluntly: ‘there is no point in Aeneas being let out of the gate of false dreams’. And Heyne gives expression to his feelings on this in his Excursus XV: *Porti Somnae: . . . quod inventum . . . omnino parum felix et idoneum esse videtur . . . nihil umquam a quopiam poeta magis sinistrum profectum esse arbitror . . . parum memor quid inde sequeretur, si eadem illi porta cum somniis vanis et falsis educerentur.* Ninon de l’Enclos, speaking of St. Denis’s walk with his head in his hands, remarked: *Il n’est que le premier pas qui coûte*; Heyne had taken the first step, as we shall see; it was the second step that failed in his case.

We have seen that Homer’s choice of gates for his true and false dreams rested on a play on sound; it is on a play on sense that Virgil’s choice of gates for the Sibyl and Aeneas rests; he has ascended a step higher than Homer, and I was surprised just now to see how near Heyne had come to the truth. I had neglected his excursus till now through my disappointment with most of his explanations; and even here his partial success does not seem to have been of much help to his successors. You will see that in the verses in question, while in v. 896 he uses insomnia, the equivalent to Homer’s ὄνειρα, in v. 894 he varies this to umbris. He does this to facilitate for the reader the solution of what might momentarily prove a puzzle. Servius notes the change, but it merely aggravates the puzzle for him: *volt enim intellegi falsa esse omnia quae dixit.* But Heyne did better: *iam eae duplices sunt, altera per quam veris umbris exitus datur; per hanc Aeneas et Sibylla, qui non erant verae umbrae, emitti nequibant; restabat itaque ut per alteram portam dimitterentur.* And now his eyes are blinded by Servius’s note: *atque hoc poeta posuit, aut parum memor quid inde sequeretur, etc.*

Virgil’s solution rests on the double meaning of verus, and consequently of falsus. Verus means either ‘true’ or ‘real’. He cannot send Aeneas and the Sibyl to the upper world through the gates of horn, because they are not real shades. When he turns to the gates of ivory assigned to falsa insomnia, he remembers that falsa is equivalent to non vera (cf. falsi . . . genitoris, Aen. 1. 716). Now Aeneas and the Sibyl are not real dreams either, and so they are permitted to pass through

the gates of ivory. And the poet who had found so easy and laughable a solution for the dread prophecy of the Harpy: malis absumere mensas, must have looked down with strangely mixed feelings on the perplexity and sorrow of so loyal an interpreter as Heyne. That Virgil saw a high poetic value in such jeux d'esprit is clear from the verse in which he forebodes its solution: fata viam invenient, aderitque vocatus Apollo (Aen. 3. 395).

#### IV

VERY striking is the prodigy recorded in:

Hic oculis subitum obicitur magnoque futurum  
Augurio monstrum: docuit post exitus ingens,  
Seraque terrifici cecinerunt omina vates.  
Namque volans liquidis in nubibus arsit harundo,  
Signavitque viam flammis tenuesque recessit  
Consumpta in ventos, caelo ceu saepe refixa  
Transcurren crinemque volantia sidera ducunt (5. 522-8).

Servius is reminded by the story of: stella facem ducens (2. 694), and signavit viam points the way to: signantem . . . que or vias (2. 697). We are thus led back to the stella cadens of 2. 692-8, which comes in answer to Anchises' prayer to Jove to confirm the augury given in 2. 680-6. Let us determine as we can what it is that is really sought and promised in these verses.

Beginning with the first, Aeneas, after witnessing the storming of Priam's palace and the slaughter of the king, i.e. the loss of the elder branch of the royal line of Troy, returns home to rescue his father, his wife, and his little boy Iulus. Anchises refuses to leave burning Troy, but will perish with his city. Creusa, holding out to Aeneas the child Iulus, appeals to him not to overwhelm them all in one common destruction; and while she is holding Iulus to his sire with the prayer: hanc primum tutare domum (2. 677),

Ecce levis summo de vertice visus Iuli  
Fundere lumen apex, tactoque innoxia molles  
Lambere flamma comas et circum tempora pasci.  
Nos pavidi trepidare metu crinemque flagrantem  
Excutere et sanctos restinguere fontibus ignes (2. 682-6).

Anchises is at once moved from his resolve to remain and perish with Troy and appeals to Jove: da deinde augurium . . . atque haec omina firma (2. 691).

Hardly had he spoken when 'with sudden crash it thundered on the left and a star ran gliding through the shades from the sky': facem ducens multa cum luce.

Illam summa super labentem culmina tecti,  
Cernimus Idaea claram se condere silva  
Signantemque vias; tum longo limite sulcus  
Dat lucem, et late circum loca sulphure fumant (2. 695-8).

The sight confirms Anchises, 'there is no longer any delay', nor does he object to accompanying Aeneas on his journey; his prayer is:

Di patrii, servate domum, servate nepotem (2. 702).

It is very plain that in both auguries what moves Anchises is the hope that after all his grandson Iulus may find a new home beyond seas, and found a 'House of Iulus', a new line of Trojan sovereigns.

Virgil's story of the apex is evidently borrowed from that told by Livy of Servius Tullius in 1. 39. 1-3: puero dormienti . . . caput arsisse ferunt . . . cum quidam familiarium aquam ad restinguendum ferret, ab regina retentum, sedatoque iam tumultu moveri vetuisse puerum, donec sua sponte experrectus esset; mox cum somno et flammam abiisset. The boy was Servius Tullius, and the flame foretold his future reign. So here the apex flammae foretells the future reign of Iulus; and his mother's and his grandsire's prayers quoted above connect this with the domus Iulia. We have a like prodigy related of Lavinia in Aen. 7. 73-9; but there the flame is no longer innoxia:

Visa . . . omnem ornatum flamma crepitante cremari,



. . . tum fumida lumine fulvo

Involvi ac totis Vulcanum spargere tectis.

Here the flame was not merely wonderful but dread, and seemed to the people to portend war as well as splendour. But the tuft of Iulus foretells the future sway of the Julian line, and the words: *crinem flagrantem* seem to connect with the *crinem* of Aen. 5. 528.

Turning to the *stella* that glides over the roofs to the grove on Ida where Aeneas built his ships, that, Servius tells us, foretold the voyage of Aeneas; that the Trojans who gather round him there will found noble Roman gentes is indicated by *claram* and *multa cum luce*; *quod 'signantem vias'*, *scintillas quasdam dicit relictas*, *quae ostendunt remansuros in diversis partibus socios*; *quod 'longo limite'*, *ostendit errorem*; *quod 'sulcum' dicit*, *significat 'longum maris aequor arandum'* (2. 780); *quod ait 'sulphure fumant'*, *divini ignis odor ostenditur*, *fulgura enim odor sulphuris sequitur*; *ex fumo autem (ostenditur) mors Anchisae* . . . the smoke is the reek of his funeral pyre. But some made the smoke a prophecy of the war with Turnus. Anchises' prayer to the gods for the fulfilment of this augury is:

Di patrii, servate dorum, servate nepotem,

and it is plain that only the preservation of the *domus* and the discovery of a new *patria* induce the palsied old man to undertake the journey. Here again the phrase: *signantem vias* points us on to the prodigy with which we began, where we have: *signavit viam*.

The scene of the prodigy is the contest with the bow in the funeral games of Anchises. Four competitors appear; but the lot of Acestes, the Sicilian chief, lingers in the bottom of the helmet. The arrow of Hippocoon strikes the pole, scaring the bird fastened there; as it flutters up, that of Mnestheus cuts the cord that bound it; as it seeks the clouds, that of Eurytion pierces it through and brings it to the ground. The contest is over and won; and once more Acestes' lot has kept him too late; but to show his strength and the range of his bow he directs his arrow into the air; and in its flight his arrow kindles into flames—mark the oxymoron in: *liquidis in nubibus arsit*—and after traversing the heavens like a comet is consumed and fades into the winds. The prodigy amazes all onlookers, and the seers foretell dread events for the distant future. But Aeneas shows no dread; he welcomes the omen, embraces the glad Acestes, and as his shot was exsors and directed after Eurytion had won the prize, he awards him a royal prize, also exsors and forming no part of the prizes specified for the match. The prize is a crater which Cisseus, king of Thrace and father of Hecuba, had given to Anchises. Once it connected the royal family of Troy with the younger branch of Assaracus; now it connects Iulus with Acestes' arrow.

We come to a difficulty: *seraque terrifici cecinerunt omina vates*. Servius notes: *sera gravia*; Sallustius '*serum enim bellum in angustiis futurum*', id est grave. Et quod improbant vates Aeneas amplectitur, deceptus augurii similitudine quod apud Troiam probaverat pater, ut: *stella facem ducens*. *Serus* may well mean *gravis* in Servius's quotation from Sallust's Histories; it would naturally acquire such a meaning in such a union as: *sera senectus*. But in our verses it is more likely that it gives the date of fulfilment of the prodigy. Heyne thought Sicily of main importance here, and saw the event foretold in the capture of Syracuse by Marcellus. But Sicily is probably here for Virgil merely the threshold of Italy, where the Julian gens after a brief season of eminent sway is merged in obscurity. If *sera* has aught to do with the date of fulfilment of the omens, it will bring this down to times within Virgil's memory. Maurer sees in the prodigy a prophecy of the death of Caesar; Ladewig in: *crinemque volantia sidera ducunt*, a reference to the *Iulium sidus*, the *stella crinita* which, during the games consecrated to the divine Julius by Augustus, shone for seven days, rising about an hour before sunset (Suet. Jul. 88). Such a reference seems very likely in this connexion; so while the arrow of Acestes foretold the death of Caesar, it likewise foretold his deification, when: *simulacro eius in vertice additur stella* (Suet. l.c.). This implies the succession of Augustus, the new Pater Romanus, the Jove on earth for Horace and Virgil; and so there is probably no error in Aeneas's joyous acceptance of the omen.

If this is so, the kindling of Acestes' arrow prefigures the coming to light anew and to supreme power in the Roman world of the *domus Julia*. For many centuries it had lain dormant, like Acestes' lot at the bottom of the helmet. One has a similar feeling when one turns to the youth of the great Julius. All avenues to political influence are closed to him with the defeat of the Marian party; and the greatest man that ever attained to supreme power in any state is said to be reduced to the necessity of caballing with a madman like Catiline. While quaestor in Further Spain, Caesar, now in his fortieth year, sees a statue of Alexander in a temple of Hercules (Suet. Jul. 7), and stricken with self-loathing at having as yet done nothing worthy of remembrance at an age when Alexander had already conquered the world, he lays down his

office and returns to Rome. One thinks of the mighty archer, who, when the contest was over and the prizes won and out of his reach, when Pompey was master of the East and Cicero lord of the Forum, bends his bow against what seems the empty air to prove himself the ‘foremost man of all this world’, to win office exors like the perpetual dictatorship, and to be gifted with royal prize by the Roman people. The oligarchs of Rome murdered him, but their envy was of no avail against the spirit he had awakened in the army and empire; and the rekindled splendour of the gens Iulia filled the world with its light.

Like Eurytion in the match, Agrippa, after his great naval victories, willingly subordinates his glory to that of Caesar’s successor. Sume, pater (5. 533) points to Augustus, the new and greater Pater Romanus; Servius tells us that this was a phrase of the iuris consultus, used when a legacy is placed at the disposal of an heir to accept or decline. The pomp that follows the contest with the bow, a pomp where Atys is associated with Iulus, marking the union of the gens Atia with the gens Iulia, typifies the succession of Augustus after Caesar’s death. But if I am asked whether Eurytion represents Agrippa, or Acestes Augustus, my answer is, No! In the Aeneid Drances does not stand for Cicero, nor Turnus for Antony, nor Dido for Cleopatra, as was once imagined. Augustus is called Augustus, Pompey is called Pompey, Cato, Cato. We have mention repeatedly of them and their exploits in the review in Hades for example, or on the shield of Aeneas. The characters in the Aeneid are creations and not caricatures. But in the course of its narrative prodigies occur like the arrow of Acestes, that have their significance for the future, and that this is the case Virgil plainly intimates. Just what that significance is he may leave to the nimble intellects of his readers to conjecture. That his name is formed on the analogy of Segesta, which allied itself with the Romans during the first Punic war, is evident from its foundation being attributed to him by Virgil, but that the name thus derived may have been moulded to Acestes on the analogy of the new name of the Pater Romanus, the title Augustus, is also possible.

## APPENDIX A

I HAVE already called attention to the way in which the Sanskrit pleonastic dual in Mitrāu—Varuṇā is paralleled in Finnish, e.g. in: jegenen ankenen, the two fathers, the two mothers, or: tetenen tungen, the two summers, the two winters. For further examples see Gauthiot, *Du Nombre Duel*, pp. 132-3. There is scarcely a possibility that either of these parallel syntaxes was influenced by the other; it seems in each case a natural development of the dual. In the Irish *Memories of Oenone Somerville and Martin Ross* (p. 171) I read: ‘We searched the National Schools for red-haired children, for whom I had a special craving, and, after considerable search, were directed to ask in Doone for the house of one Kenealy, which harboured “a Twin”, “a foxy Twin”; and there found “The Twin”, i.e. two little girls of surpassing ugliness, but with hair, &c.’ We find here ‘a twin’ used by an Irish peasant to denote a pair of twins; this seems to me a relic of the use of the old Irish dual.

This idiom seems of importance to me when I read in Mark: And when he was come out of the ship, immediately there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit (5. 2), but in Matthew: And when he was come to the other side into the country of the Gergesenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs (8. 28), and in Luke: And when he went forth to land, there met him out of the city a certain man, which had devils long time and ware no clothes, neither abode in any house, but in the tombs (8. 27). If my memory serves me, Professor Huxley, in his controversy with Mr. Gladstone about the loss of the Gadarene swine, pointed to the difference in number here as a proof that the text of the New Testament does not afford accurate testimony about the events it narrates.

Again we read in Mark: And entering into the sepulchre they saw a young man sitting on the right side clothed in a long white garment (16. 5), but in Luke: Behold two men stood by them in shining garments (24. 4). Matthew speaks of the Angel of the Lord from heaven, that rolled back the stone and sat upon it (28. 2). In Luke we read: As he was come nigh unto Jericho, a certain blind man sat by the wayside begging (18. 35), and Matthew: And behold two blind men sitting by the wayside . . . cried out, saying, Have mercy on us, O Lord, thou son of David (20. 30). Mark agrees with Luke about the number, but adds the name Bartimaeus (10. 46). The fact that Mark in all three passages speaks of one man, while in Matthew we have two men in two cases, but in one an angel, and in Luke one in two cases but in the first case two, is as embarrassing as it is interesting.

My old friend and student, the Rev. Thos. Voaden, who called my attention to the first of these cases, thought of Mark as

writing his gospel for the Romans, who, as I was trying to show him, often used the singular for the dual. But the Latin dual, while it often passes into the singular, becomes a plural usually. Probably Mark obtained much of his material from the lips of Peter, who would relate it in his native Aramaic. I have no knowledge of Aramaic. But I read of it in the Encyclopaedia Britannica: The dual is not recognized in the Syriac grammar, but there are plain traces of it in the language. And if my memory serves me, Dr. Rendel Harris found still clearer evidence of it in old Aramaic inscriptions. If this is so it may have affected the speech of Peter much in the way it still seems to affect the speech of the Irish peasant; and so in speaking to Mark of a pair of men he may have expressed this by the singular. I have tried to show how many signs of such a use the syntax of Latin and of Greek affords, and have ventured here to call the attention of students of the New Testament text to this possibility in Aramaic.

In Hebrew the dual is used instead of the plural for objects usually thought of in pairs; so we have in: They set the priests in their apparel with trumpets, and the Levites, the sons of Asaph, with cymbals (Ezra 3. 10) *trumpets* in the plural, but *cymbals* in the dual. So in: All hands shall be feeble, and all knees shall be weak as water (Ezek. 7. 17) *hands* and *knees* are in the dual. The use is parallel to that of ἴπποτιν (Il. 23. 362) noted on p. 24. When to this use of the dual we join a definite numeral, as in: each one (seraph) had six wings (Isaiah 6. 2), creeping things, which have four feet (Levit. 11. 23), upon one stone are seven eyes (Zech. 3. 9), the effect is to reduce the dual to a singular in meaning, each pair of wings expressing a single wing, and each pair of feet a single foot; it is evident that in this way the dual could assume a singular meaning. But I have found no such examples in Greek or Latin to indicate that the singular meanings of the dual found there could have developed in this fashion. In: duo de numero cum corpora nostro (Aen. 3. 623), and: septena . . . corpora natorum (6. 21) we have the exact opposite of this Hebrew usage. Rather should we note that in the dual number we have so singular a mingling of the plural with the singular, that the easiest and most obvious extension of its use often leads to the most curious irregularity of expression; erroribus illaqueatus multiplicatur.

## APPENDIX B

We read: Scaeeaeque amplector limina portae (Aen. 3. 351). Aeneas is entering Helenus's parva Troia, and he embraces the lintel and the doorstep of the gate. How does he achieve this feat? In explanation Servius quotes: amplexaeque tenent postes atque oscula figunt (2. 490), and adds: quasi ad Troiam pervenisset. Heyne and Forbiger follow Servius, but Ladewig, feeling that he must not neglect limina, explains that when one returns to his parents' house or to his native land from abroad, his custom was to embrace the floor, the threshold, the gate (Thor). I grant that amplector here is one for two, for amplector et exosculator; but how embrace the threshold? how kiss the lintel? To embrace and kiss the postes is easy; and I conclude that we have here a metonymy of limina for postes, the crosspieces for the uprights. Of the four timbers that enclose the door Virgil has given us the other pair.

In Aen. 6. 618 Virgil has given us two for four; but only one is wrong; Theseus had ascended to the upper world. But in: quid memorem Lapithas, Ixiona Pirithoumque (v. 601) he seems to have given us the wrong pair. This becomes still more probable when to: lucent genialibus altis (v. 603) Servius begins: aliud est, and adds a long note on Tantalus, who is not mentioned by Virgil, but to whom vv. 602-7 plainly refer. Manibus prohibet contingere mensas, this is sheer tantalizing. Ribbeck feels that the right verse has been lost, and that Varius and Tucca introduced this, a verse not belonging to the passage; for the verse that Virgil wrote here must have mentioned Tantalus. So he brackets this verse as an interpolation, and false to his duty as a text critic he writes: quo super (v. 602), which he finds in the Codex Romanus. Quos super read the Codex Mediceus, the Palatinus, all other good MSS.; Servius and Diomedes, Probus and Macrobius give us quos, and quo is evidently a mere slip of the scribe. Conington is in utter confusion, and brings all the Lapithae on the scene, Ixion and Pirithous in the front rank, and some think it is they who are in question in: lucent . . . ore. But Servius says: aliud est, and Nettleship is right in his belief that the reference is to Tantalus. We read: ἄν οἱ πατήρ ὕπερ κρέμασε καρτερὸν αὐτῷ λίθον (Pind. Ol. 1. 90); indeed ὁ Ταντάλου λίθος of Archilochus seems to have passed into a proverb. Heyne comes nearest the truth; from v. 601 he would supply: quid memorem eos with: quos super atra silex, etc. But by eos he understands Tantalus and Sisyphus as described by Homer in Od. 11. 582 ff. and 593 ff.

Virgil does not name the pair; but we may name them from the context and from the pair he does name, as we did in Aen. 6. 618. The new pair must be suggested by the context, and be parallel to one another in their crimes, and in their relation to the pair already named. We have here the variety of antallage of which we have an example in Hamlet: While the

grass grows (the steed starves) (iii. 2). Sisyphus does not fit with Tantalus, for Ixion and Pirithous are father and son. But: quos super atra silex—Atreus is the wretch we are in quest of; Ixion and Pirithous are father and son; Tantalus and Atreus are grandfather and grandson. Ixion essays to ravish the Queen of Heaven, Pirithous the Queen of Hades; Tantalus serves up his own son Pelops as a meal to the gods, Atreus serves up to Thyestes his son—a meal on which Phoebus turns his back.

How is it that all our modern editors from Heyne down set aside Servius's explanation of: nec tam aversus equos Tyria sol iungit ab urbe (Aen. 1. 568)? Neither at home in Tyre nor here in Carthage are the Poeni in reality so far removed from the sun's path that any modern, even Mr. Henry, need think of them as Hyperboreans, living in literal darkness. There must be a figure involved in the verse, and Servius is no doubt right in explaining aversus of the sun turning his back on the banquet of Thyestes; indeed his: sol . . . aufugit is probably for: sol aversus refugit, and the meaning is: we are no cannibals, nor cursed with the cruelty of Pelops's line.

More serious is the difficulty in: ipse manu multo suspensum numine ducit (3. 372). Moved by Servius's scholium some have read suspensus; but all the best MSS. read suspensum, as does Servius himself. By: multo suspensum numine Burmann understands: quid vates responderet valde sollicitum. Heyne explains: horrore praesentiae dei turbatum, which Conington translates 'bewildered by the presence of the god'. Sidgwick ventures on no opinion, but Page fittingly calls attention to a double meaning in suspensum; it is either of the mind, anxious, agitated, or of the body, as in: suspensio gradu; and so while accompanying Helenus to the shrine Aeneas 'seems to walk on air'. But this elation seems strange in Aeneas, whom we have just seen in vv. 365-7 worried and depressed by Celaeno's prophecy and looking forward to the hardest kind of board. Servius's scholium is: *suspensum* si suspensus, ipse numinis plenus, si suspensum me sollicitum et attentum. It is quite clear that Servius sees in suspensum two opposed meanings, elatus and anxious; but his ipse and me relate the former to Helenus, the latter to Aeneas. We have here antallage combined with zeugma, and: multo suspensum numine is for: multo numine (suspensus multa cura) suspensum. Servius's explanation comes so curiously near to this that we feel we must credit him with some sense of the fourfold figure here, perhaps a memory of the older interpretation.

## APPENDIX C

My friend and former student, Professor Cohoon of Mt. Allison, calls my attention to the ellipsis in: non modo (non . . . sed) ne quidem. We have the full fourfold expression in: cuius rei non modo non praeteriit tempus, sed ne maturum quidem etiam nunc . . . fuit (Cic. Fam. 10. 10), quae tum non modo non venditabant, cum iudicia fiebant, verum etiam coemebant (Verr. 2. 4. 133. 59). It is threefold in: huic oberit tuum maledictum, qui istius facti non modo suspicione, sed ne infamia quidem est aspersus (Cael. 23. 10), cui facile persuasi . . . ne licere quidem, non modo non lubere (Att. 14. 19. 4). It is twofold in: Epicurus vero tuus . . . quid dicit, quod non modo philosophia dignum esset sed mediocri sapientia? (N. D. 1. 61. 22), ne sui quidem id velint, non modo ipse (Tusc. 1. 92. 38). I ask the indulgence of my readers, in that I have tried to solve the ellipses with nisi and ni, but have not dealt with si in its puzzling forms. I believe they will be solved along similar lines, but am forced by lack of space to set aside their treatment for the present.

## APPENDIX D

On p. 130 we noticed that licet ire and licet eas or ut eas are equivalents in syntax, because ire seems an infinitive used as an imperative. A third equivalent found at times is the imperative itself. With memento we have usually the infinitive, as in: tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento (Aen. 6. 851), but we have the subjunctive in: ut horridis utrumque verberes latus, Auster, memento fluctibus (Epod. 10. 4), and the imperative in: memento hoc iter ad lapides cana veni memores (Prop. 2. 13. 40), where Baehrens changes veni of all MSS. to vehi. The influence of the present infinitive with memento on the tense of the infinitive with meminisci is interesting.

In: nunc uxorem me esse meministi tuam? (Pl. Asin. 926) esse seems for fuisse et esse, and in: quam meminit levor praestare salutem (Lucr. 4. 153) praestare for praestitisse et praestare; so the use of the present infinitive is natural here.

In: *nec serae meminit decedere nocti* (Buc. 8. 88) *meminit decedere* 'he remembered to depart' is the natural response to: *memento decedere*. In: *saepe ego longos cantando puerum memini me condere soles* (Buc. 9. 52) we have the transition from: *memini cantando condere soles*, the response to a like command, to: *memini me cantando condere* (= *condidisse*) *soles*, a narration of the performance. So with a change of person in: *meministin asinos Arcadichos mercatori vendere* (= *vendidisse*) *Pellaeo nostrum atriensem?* (Pl. Asin. 333). This change is old; we read: *memini me fiere pavom* (Enn. Ann. 9, M.), and most of the infinitives following *memini* in Plautus, Terence, Cicero, Virgil, and Horace, though past in meaning, are present in form. But we read: *memini me . . . Corycium vidisse senem* (Geo. 4. 127), to which Servius notes: *vidisse senem* ordo est 'memini vidisse'; dicimus autem et 'memini videre'. To: *Teucrum memini Sidona venire* (Aen. 1. 619) he notes: *quidam 'memini venire' pro 'memini venisse' accipiunt*. He plainly feels that the perfect infinitive is the natural mode of expression here; indeed the best writers use it at times, as we see in: *meministis me ita distribuisse initio causam* (Cic. Rosc. Am., 22. 42), *quod solos obtrectasse gloriae suae . . . meminerat* (Liv. 36. 34. 3). This was to be expected, when we see that all relative or interrogative clauses, that take the place of these present infinitives, have their verbs in past tenses, as in: *memini cum dicto haud audebat* (Pl. Capt. 303), *sed ecquit nam meministi, ere, qua de re ego tecum mentionem feceram?* (Pers. 109), *meministin olim ut fuerit vostra oratio?* (Ter. Phorm. 224), *meministi enim . . . quanta esset hominum vel admiratio vel querela* (Cic. Lael. 2. 1), *memini cum mihi desipere videbare* (Fam. 7. 28). So from the pf. *memini* we have the pres. part. *meminens* in: *aevi quod periit meminens* (Auson. Prof. 1. 40) on the analogy of *memento*. In: *pureque lavari te memini, et puro secubuisse toro?* (Tib 1. 3. 25-6) we have a union of the present and perfect infinitives.

# INDEX OF PASSAGES EXPLAINED

List of names added by transcriber. In the main Index of Passages, each author's name links back here. Longer entries, notably the Aeneid, will have "reminder" sidenotes in the left margin.

Accius	Demosthenes	Lucan	Quadrigarius
Acron	Digest.	Lucilius	Quintilian
Aeschines	Diomedes	Lucretius	Q. Smyrnaeus
Aeschylus	Diphilus	Macrobius	Sallust
Afranius	Donatus	Manilius	Sedulius
Alcman	Ennius	Martial	Seneca
Ammianus	Euripides	Martianus Capella	Servius
Andocides	Fenestella	Mela, Pomp.	Sidonius Apoll.
Apuleius	Festus	Minucius Felix	Silius
Archilochus	Florus	Naevius	Sophocles
Aristophanes	Frontinus	Neleus	Spartianus
Arnobius	Fronto	Nepos, Corn.	Statius
Augustine	Gaius	New Test.	Suetonius
Ausonius	Gellius	Novius	Sulpicia
Bacchylides	C. Gracch.	Ovid	Tacitus
Bell. Alex.	Gratius Faliscus	Pacuvius	Terence
Caecilius	Gregorius Turon.	Palladius	Tertullian
Caesar	Hemina	Persius	Theocritus
Caper	Herodotus	Petronius	Thucydides
Capitolinus	Hesiod	Phaedrus	Tibullus
Cassiodorus	Hipponax	Pherecrates	Titinius
Cato	Homer	Pindar	Turpilius
Catullus	Horace	Plato	Ulpian
Celsus	Isaeus	Plautus	Val. Antias
Cicero	Justin	Pliny	Val. Flaccus
Claudian	Juvenal	Pliny, Jr.	Val. Maximus
Columella	Laberius	Plutarch	Varro
Com. Inc.	Lactantius	Pomponius	Velleius
Commodianus	Laevidius	Porphyrio	Vincent. Lerin.
Cornificius	Lampridius	Priscian	Virgil
Q. Curtius	Livius Andr.	Propertius	Vulgate
	Livy	Prosper	Xenophon

	PAGE
Accius:	
Trag. 144, R.	234
146, R.	195
413, R.	152
428, R.	91
503, R.	234
667, R.	229
Carm. 24, M.	195
Acron ad Od. 4. 8. 17	7
Aeschines in Ctes. 60	117
Aeschylus: Pers. 318-19	85
Afranius:	
Com. 6, R.	91
23, R.	41
215, R.	227
255, R.	343
270, R.	234
293, R.	235
312, R.	234
320, R.	234
Alcman: 9, B.	97
Ammianus:	
21. 14. 1	235
31. 15. 15	43

<a href="#">Andocides: 1. 145</a>	85
<a href="#">Apuleius:</a>	
Apol. 59 fin.	102
103	108
Met. 7. 5 init.	195
7. 14	132
<a href="#">Archilochus: 16, B.</a>	93
<a href="#">Aristophanes:</a>	
Acharn. 319	118
Av. 1186-7	117
Pax 512	117
Plut. 894	68
Ran. 552-4	117
Vesp. 58-9	85
1410	97
<a href="#">Arnobius: 2. 71</a>	102
<a href="#">Augustine: Civ. D. 11. 6</a>	195
<a href="#">Ausonius:</a>	
Edyll. 10. 22	391
10. 60	392
11. 12-14	109
11. 53	104
11. 66	109
Prof. 1. 40	427
<a href="#">Bacchylides: 36, B.</a>	95
<a href="#">Bellum Alexandrinum: 24. 3</a>	50
<a href="#">Caecilius:</a>	
2, R.	234
41, R.	251
117, R.	228
179, R.	248
<a href="#">Caesar:</a>	
B. G. 1. 1	41
1. 31. 2	154
1. 39. 7	246
1. 42. 6	178
1. 43. 8	123
2. 19. 7	188
2. 32. 3	210
3. 6. 1	93
4. 1. 8	114
4. 13. 5	93
4. 17. 3	108
4. 21. 2	244
4. 21. 5	210
4. 26. 5	170
5. 13. 7	104
5. 28. 6	123
5. 56. 5	333
6. 6. 3	186
7. 35. 1	49
7. 47. 5	92
7. 73. 4	323
B. C. 1. 62. 2	235
2. 39. 6	178

3. 9. 4	322
3. 21. 1-2	41
3. 30. 3	49
3. 32. 2	240, 342
3. 46. 5	190
<a href="#">Caper</a> : VII. 108. 8, K.	105
<a href="#">Capitolinus</a> :	
Alb. 1. 2	43
Aurel. 24. 2	235
<a href="#">Cassiodorus</a> : Inst. Div. 4	109
<a href="#">Cato</a> :	
R. R. 5. 3	251
5. 4	238
14. 4	251
21. 3	91
22. 3	46
26	106
28. 2	91
43. 2	106
77	195
88. 2	219
112. 2	42
113. 2	91
146. 2	356
161. 3	154
apud Gell. 14. 2. 26	115
<a href="#">Catullus</a> :	
3. 1	24, 64
3. 2	172
4. 2	132
5. 4	78
7. 7	391
11. 1	209
12. 17	146, 171
13. 14	366
26. 1-2	75
35. 7	393
39. 20	75
45. 1	20
45. 21-2	9
51. 11	60
62. 1	155
64. 5	302
64. 21	330, 398
64. 44	72
64. 53	339
64. 63	194
64. 64	378
64. 90	71, 143
64. 93	36
64. 103	378
64. 110	193, 374
64. 140	130
64. 178	213
64. 181	184
64. 238-40	384
64. 255	255



64. 268	338
64. 280-1	168
64. 390	193
66. 18	274, 278
67. 1	377
68. 63	376
68. 65	376
76. 16	332
84. 10	152
107. 5-6	90
<b>Celsus:</b>	
6. 6. 14	55
8. 15	106
<b>Cicero:</b>	
Orat. pro Caecin. 60. 21	181
102. 35	250
Pro Cael. 23. 10	426
In Cat. 1. 4. 2	19
1. 17. 7	338
3. 16. 7	219
4. 14. 7	196
4. 16. 8	186
Pro Cluent. 6. 2	306
28. 9	169
136. 49	188
168. 60	250
Div. Caecil. 28. 9	114
Pro Domo 30. 11	196
Pro Font. 21. 10	171
29. 13	171
De Har. Resp. 32. 15	231
De Leg. Agr. 2. 36 init.	336
Pro Leg. Man 1. 1	167
31. 11	163
33. 12	19, 154
36. 13	171
68. 23	37
Pro Marcell. 21. 7	113
Pro Mil. 3. 1	287, 392
3. 2	219
10. 4	181
23. 9	47
47. 18	344
53. 20	102
55. 21	118
79. 29	140
91. 33	4
Pro Mur. 29. 13	165
73. 35	186
Phil. 2. 47. 19	235
2. 94. 37	252
4. 9. 4	69, 307
5. 6. 3	92
6. 12. 5	171
6. 15. 5	102
8. 21. 7	177

8. 33. 11	282
12. 27. 11	115
13. 5. 3	153
13. 23. 10	249
In Pis. 67. 27	107
Pro Planc. 86. 35	229
Pro Quinct. 57. 18	250
Pro Rab. Post. 5. 2	173
Pro Rosc. Am. 66. 24	94
91. 32	238
96. 34	19
105. 36	118
122. 42	427
Pro Rosc. Com. 8. 3	226
Pro Sulla 72. 26	118
Orat. in Verr. 1. 11. 4	255
1. 37. 13	37
2. 1. 34. 13	170
2. 1. 116. 45	236
2. 2. 15. 5	114
2. 2. 77. 31	92
2. 3. 35. 14	48
2. 3. 61. 25	242
2. 3. 114. 48	106
2. 3. 121. 52	196
2. 4. 104. 47	92
2. 5. 34. 13	196
2. 5. 142. 44	231
2. 5. 167. 65	131
Acad. Prior. 2. 74. 23	235
2. 86. 27	170
Acad. Post. 1. 3. 1	170
Brut. 163. 44	40
216. 59	103
333. 97	107
Carm. Fr. 8. 2	338
Div. 1. 59. 28	173
1. 84. 39	251
2. 10. 4	49
2. 62. 29	50
Ep. ad Att. 2. 12. 2	228, 242
2. 19. 2	20, 388
4. 11. 1	251
4. 17. 4	155
6. 1. 8	229
7. 12. 1	41
8. 2. 3	19, 56
8. 11 fin.	169
8. 11 b	238
9. 7 c init.	240
10. 16. 1	242
11. 23. 1	45
11. 24. 4	114
12. 44. 2	123
13. 44. 3	248
14. 9. 3	45

14. 13. 2	250
14. 19	426
15. 4. 2	155
15. 22	114
Ep. ad Fam. 1. 1. 3	248
1. 9. 21	244
5. 8. 1	94
6. 18. 1	169
7. 5. 1	44
7. 23. 1	236
7. 28	427
8. 13. 2	156
9. 7 init.	177
10. 33. 3	107
11. 16. 1	187
12. 1. 1	282
12. 10. 3	354
16. 22	238
Ep. ad Q. Fr. 1. 1. 7	238
2. 6	232
3. 1. 5	289
Ep. Fr. apud Serv. ad Aen. 8. 168	104
Arat. 568	104
De Fin. 1. 60. 18	92
1. 67. 20	170
2. 33. 11	170
2. 73. 22	323
2. 105. 32	281
3. 44. 13	235
5. 19. 7	92
5. 28. 10	169
De Inv. 1. 33. 23	281
1. 71. 39	45
1. 81. 43	153
2. 5. 2	92
Lael. 2. 1	427
20. 5	165
23. 7	173
47. 13	249
80. 21	44
95. 25	37
De Leg. 1. 41. 14	44
2. 34. 14	230
De Nat. Deor. 1. 61. 22	426
2. 37. 14	195
2. 97. 38	48
2. 102. 40	237
3. 81. 33	249
3. 82. 33	219
De Off. 1. 5. 2	113
1. 33. 10	333
1. 81. 23	94, 188
1. 92. 26	274, 347
1. 127. 35	347
1. 148. 41	95
2. 23. 7	232

2. 73. 21	250
2. 75. 21	237
2. 78. 22	333
3. 2. 7	185
3. 22. 5	94
3. 46. 10	94
3. 90. 23	229
3. 116. 33	177
De Orat. 1. 197. 44	195
1. 215. 49	166
2. 14. 3	173
2. 117. 27	169
2. 171. 40	248
3. 55. 14	185
3. 80. 21	40
3. 92. 24	166
3. 104. 26	247
3. 127. 32	323
Orator 28. 9	235
De Rep. 1. 16	147
1. 43	391
2. 4	388
3. 35	196
De Sen 4. 2	251
22. 7	238
56. 16	69
57. 16	185
Tusc. Disp. 1. 32. 15	173
1. 38. 16	114
1. 75. 31	290
1. 92. 38	425
2. 12. 4	345
2. 42. 18	118
3. 18. 8	290
<b>Claudian:</b>	
In Eutrop. 1. 203-4	331
De III Cons. Hon. 126	172
De IV Cons. Hon. 109	153
413	77
647	155
In Ruf. 1. 200	77
Laud. Ser. 88	109
<b>Columella:</b>	
5. 1. 10	102
8. 9. 2	68
9. 11. 1	69
<b>Com. Inc. 82, R.</b>	41
<b>Commodianus:</b>	
Apol. Carm. 794-5	355
<b>Cornificius:</b>	
Her. 1. 5 fin.	248
4. 9. 6	92
<b>Q. Curtius:</b>	
4. 14. 25	153
<b>Demosthenes:</b>	

De Cor. 23	112
Olynth. 2. 17	112
Or. 37. 4	87
Digest.: 4. 4. 39. 1	167
Diomedes: I. 334-5, K.	29
Diphilus: XXIV. 2. 40, M.	115
Donatus:	
Ad And. 384	243
461	222
Ad. Hec. 115	232
Ad Phorm. 732	222
Ars. IV. 389, K.	331
Ennius:	
Annales 1, M.	168
72	218
90	104, 258
204-5	150
238	389
249	175
288	390
314	150
328	43
337	338
344	104
346	177
353	219
425	150, 360
437	338
484	176
491	168
552	159
554-6	338
561	336
Fabulae 210	140
269	236
282	292
305	251
377-8	196
Saturae 14	151
Testimonia XLVII	185
Euripides:	
Alc. 357	93
360-2, N.	95
Bacch. 173-4	117
346 ff.	117
Helen. 1358	86
Heracl. 212	100
Ion 1146	86
Rhes. 681 ff.	117
Suppl. 144	97
Fenestella: Ann. II	91
Festus: 3, M.	181
Florus:	
2. 7. 8	178
3. 20. 3	102
Frontinus:	

De Aq. Praef. init.	95
128	95
Fronto: Ep. ad Amic. 2. 24	93
Gaius: 2. 225	103
Gellius:	
1. 3. 16	91
1. 3. 30	91
1. 21	381
4. 15. 1	93
5. 10. 5	93
6. 3. 29	91
6. 7. 12	241
9. 4. 6	38
12. 14. 3	348
18. 5	175
C. Gracch. ap Gell. 1. 7. 7	131
Gratius Faliscus: Cyn. 1. 133	167
Gregorius Turon.: 3. 15	180
Hemina ap. Non. 1. 519, M.	227
Herodotus: 1. 18	113
1. 24 init.	113
1. 26	86
1. 32 fin.	113
1. 54	73
1. 88	123
1. 91	70
1. 97	118
2. 63	112
2. 118	85
3. 42	114
3. 45	87
3. 82	114
5. 30	69
5. 63. 3	103
6. 86. 2	85
7. 34	86
7. 103	112, 113
7. 137	88
9. 11	113
9. 69	58
9. 90	114
Hesiod:	
Opp. 199	99
391	121
Theo. 321	86
824-5	85
Hipponax: Fr. 29, B.	84
Homer:	
Iliad 1. 3	67
1. 8	80
1. 29-30	126
1. 45	73
1. 97-8	125, 126
1. 216	83
1. 312	70
1. 322-3	121

1. 357	68
1. 460-4	70
1. 574	80
2. 91-2	69
2. 123-4	54
2. 135	96
2. 331	118
2. 412-14	127
3. 276-7	120
3. 459	118
4. 452-3	54
5. 287-9	82, 129
5. 487-8	24, 54, 100
5. 490	74
5. 774	66, 97
6. 80-2	128
7. 78-9	121
7. 179	121
7. 280	82
7. 350	120
7. 480-1	128
8. 378	98
8. 455	98
9. 182	100
9. 386-7	126
9. 401-3	125, 129
9. 650-2	127
10. 65	121
10. 97	120
10. 252-3	74
10. 523-4	93
10. 552	82
11. 776	81
11. 781-2	81, 82
11. 788-9	121
12. 335-6	65
12. 366-7	81
12. 400-1	64
13. 47	81
13. 481	120
13. 547	64
15. 90	143
15. 146-7	81
15. 217	54, 99
15. 416-17	95
15. 556-8	129
16. 61-3	129
16. 139	98
16. 839-41	127
17. 385-8	84
17. 501	121
18. 189-90	127
18. 334-5	127
19. 169-70	128
20. 138	98
21. 294-6	128

21. 340-1	129
21. 580	127
23. 362	24
23. 381	84
23. 413	54, 100
23. 477	85
23. 485	99
24. 551	127
Odyssey 2. 338-9	93
2. 373-4	129
4. 408	121
8. 11	120
10. 383-5	126
10. 431	123
10. 513-14	98
12. 42-3	96, 100
13. 109	68
14. 216	98
15. 364	67
16. 171	82
17. 354	121
18. 200	55
19. 337	85
19. 562-7	416
19. 585-7	128
22. 173	81
24. 376-81	121
Hymn in Cer. 279	85
<b>Horace:</b>	
Odes 1. 1. 2	270
1. 1. 16	267
1. 1. 17	285, 392
1. 1. 23	289
1. 1. 25	222
1. 2. 1	268
1. 2. 26	319
1. 2. 31	315
1. 2. 39-40	411
1. 3. 6-7	12, 296
1. 3. 21	292
1. 3. 22	208
1. 3. 40	326
1. 4. 13	203, 329, 393
1. 4. 16	266
1. 4. 17	170
1. 5. 3	159
1. 5. 6	199, 264
1. 5. 11	390
1. 5. 13-14	329
1. 6. 19	268
1. 7. 8	207
1. 8. 6	216, 329
1. 8. 12	208
1. 9. 1	148, 318
1. 9. 6	12
1. 9. 10	391
1. 9. 12	268



1. 9. 16	270
1. 10. 9-10	354
1. 11. 3	146
1. 11. 8	393
1. 12. 1	267, 284
1. 12. 6	267
1. 12. 42	250
1. 12. 45	296
1. 12. 51	284
1. 12. 57	164
1. 13. 18	208
1. 15. 7	312
1. 16. 4	268
1. 16. 7-8	269
1. 16. 19	148
1. 16. 22	183
1. 20. 9	269
1. 23. 5	190
1. 23. 8	268
1. 27. 11-12	272
1. 28. 31	240
1. 29. 2	331
1. 30. 4	72
1. 30. 6	266
1. 32. 1	213, 385
1. 32. 15	49
1. 37. 7	326
1. 37. 29	199
2. 1. 1.	254, 280
2. 2. 18	186
2. 2. 23-4	59, 220
2. 3. 2	258
2. 3. 9-10	341
2. 5. 1-2	360
2. 5. 10-12	316
2. 6. 15	223, 332, 333
2. 6. 21	267
2. 7. 22	336
2. 7. 25	267
2. 7. 27	144
2. 8. 3	361
2. 8. 8	205
2. 8. 24	390
2. 9. 1	385
2. 9. 9	284
2. 10. 21	165
2. 11. 9-10	169
2. 11. 11	296
2. 11. 16	332
2. 12. 12	219, 258
2. 13. 11	204
2. 13. 17	216
2. 13. 29	296
2. 13. 31-2	316, 391
2. 13. 39-40	270
2. 14. 11	279

2. 15. 13	165
2. 17. 2	156
2. 17. 12	393
2. 17. 28	249
2. 20. 10-12	9
3. 1. 28	3
3. 3. 9-10	4
3. 3. 32-3	309
3. 3. 37	164
3. 3. 62	317
3. 4. 8	312
3. 4. 17-20	285
3. 4. 50	366
3. 4. 53	267
3. 6. 6	270, 335
3. 6. 46	250
3. 7. 25-8	41
3. 8. 3	323
3. 9. 3	330
3. 9. 6	332
3. 11. 1	208
3. 11. 6	267
3. 11. 9	268, 278
3. 11. 23	159
3. 11. 29	255
3. 11. 35	392
3. 11. 43	255
3. 12. 9	269
3. 13. 6-7	341
3. 14. 14	158
3. 16. 1-7	354
3. 16. 29-32	223
3. 16. 36	191
3. 17. 2	250
3. 19. 12	320
3. 19. 20	268
3. 21. 5	254
3. 21. 13	392
3. 21. 19	319
3. 23. 1	246
3. 23. 20	259
3. 24. 3-4	9, 372
3. 24. 9-11	267
3. 24. 24	268
3. 24. 62	255
3. 25. 2	268, 270
3. 25. 12	146
3. 25. 20	142
3. 27. 27	329
3. 27. 28	391
3. 27. 31	270
3. 27. 43	164
3. 27. 50	155
3. 27. 57	391
3. 27. 73	132
3. 27. 76	78
3. 28. 6	149, 391

3. 29. 1	319
3. 29. 10	326
3. 29. 33	202, 319
3. 29. 42	253
3. 29. 44	332
3. 29. 48	391
3. 29. 62-4	3, 64
3. 30. 4	319
3. 30. 6	168
3. 30. 15	254
4. 1. 10	319
4. 1. 22	157
4. 1. 25	106
4. 2. 4	78
4. 2. 17-19	179, 206
4. 2. 25	168
4. 2. 26	253
4. 2. 30	326
4. 2. 46	173
4. 2. 49-54	244
4. 3. 6	206
4. 3. 8	319
4. 3. 16	216
4. 4. 17-18	4
4. 4. 22	164
4. 4. 29	5, 279
4. 4. 57-60	184, 193
4. 5. 17-18	174
4. 6. 18	258
4. 7. 21	326
4. 8. 1	323
4. 8. 15-20	6
4. 8. 31	8
4. 9. 33	254
4. 9. 36	164
4. 10. 6	44
4. 11. 10	280
4. 12. 6	259
4. 12. 28	187
4. 14. 31	9
4. 15. 23	267
Carm. Saec. 73	195
Epodes 2. 11	203
2. 37	271
5. 55	326
5. 87-8	61
7. 13	268
9. 17	103
10. 3-4	427
11. 4	143
15. 7-8	285
16. 12	176, 177
Satires 1. 1. 7	274
1. 1. 61	173
1. 1. 88	284
1. 1. 94	284

1. 1. 95	281
1. 1. 100	57
1. 1. 101	274, 281
1. 1. 104	273
1. 1. 105	366
1. 1. 106	341
1. 1. 107	281
1. 1. 111	274
1. 1. 119	338
1. 2. 6	265
1. 2. 30	149
1. 3. 7	168
1. 3. 9-10	311
1. 3. 15	284
1. 3. 43	274
1. 3. 61	279
1. 3. 63	281
1. 3. 70	280
1. 3. 72	285
1. 3. 99	281
1. 4. 2	271
1. 4. 5	255
1. 4. 11	248
1. 4. 14	296
1. 4. 27	274, 348
1. 4. 28	255, 289
1. 4. 39	279
1. 4. 49	199, 393
1. 4. 68	267
1. 4. 86	106
1. 4. 87	195, 273
1. 4. 92	350, 379
1. 4. 107	268
1. 4. 115	266
1. 4. 126	216
1. 4. 136	223
1. 4. 139	255
1. 5. 5-6	27, 201
1. 5. 11	274, 375
1. 5. 25	255
1. 5. 32	194
1. 5. 33	281
1. 5. 39	167
1. 5. 69	269
1. 5. 71	223
1. 5. 96	216
1. 6. 17	143
1. 6. 36	201
1. 6. 42-4	266
1. 6. 70	153, 267
1. 6. 73	280
1. 6. 75	361
1. 6. 77	256
1. 6. 92	223
1. 6. 112	348
1. 6. 130	279
1. 7. 3	341

1. 7. 10-13	37, 286
1. 7. 26	154
1. 7. 28	269
1. 7. 31	168
1. 8. 2	268
1. 8. 3	147
1. 8. 8	165
1. 8. 30	280
1. 8. 46	284
1. 9. 3	235
1. 9. 12	391
1. 9. 15	282
1. 9. 28	256
1. 9. 47	215
1. 9. 54	235
1. 10. 19	222
1. 10. 24	202, 223
1. 10. 28	344
1. 10. 44	274, 373
1. 10. 71	199
1. 10. 82	267
1. 10. 87	267
1. 10. 88	274
1. 10. 89	290
2. 1. 21	285
2. 1. 24-5	285
2. 1. 45	124
2. 1. 46	199
2. 2. 8	293
2. 2. 35	185
2. 2. 37	165
2. 2. 58	202
2. 2. 65	233
2. 2. 115	342
2. 3. 2	218, 258
2. 3. 3	360, 363
2. 3. 6	147
2. 3. 7	265
2. 3. 9	392
2. 3. 12	171
2. 3. 17	399
2. 3. 29	267
2. 3. 33	223
2. 3. 35	216
2. 3. 42	392
2. 3. 50	169
2. 3. 63	280
2. 3. 69	345
2. 3. 70	368
2. 3. 72-3	278
2. 3. 74	347
2. 3. 82	167
2. 3. 124	299
2. 3. 157	266
2. 3. 182	266
2. 3. 197	102

2. 3. 229	280
2. 3. 326	363
2. 4. 4	274
2. 4. 76	107
2. 5. 40	393
2. 5. 53	194
2. 5. 55	59
2. 5. 92	374
2. 5. 101	202
2. 6. 48	50
2. 7. 25	294
2. 7. 27	291
2. 7. 64	267
2. 7. 91	195
2. 8. 54	221
2. 8. 61	247
Epistles 1. 1. 1	408
1. 1. 4	377
1. 1. 6	301
1. 1. 8	293
1. 1. 12	271
1. 1. 19	408
1. 1. 21	348
1. 1. 22	335
1. 1. 25	377
1. 1. 26	170
1. 1. 32	332
1. 1. 33	371
1. 1. 41-2	359
1. 1. 42-4	313
1. 1. 48	271
1. 1. 93	399
1. 1. 94	329
1. 2. 1	270
1. 2. 2	369
1. 2. 7	70, 373
1. 2. 11-12	37, 367
1. 2. 20	164
1. 2. 22	323, 371
1. 2. 27	200
1. 2. 28	205, 371
1. 2. 31	140, 331
1. 2. 44	331
1. 2. 56	297
1. 2. 57	391
1. 2. 59-61	183
1. 3. 11	368
1. 3. 15	374
1. 3. 20	71
1. 3. 29	274
1. 3. 32	291
1. 4. 6	184
1. 5. 3	198, 408
1. 6. 6	379
1. 6. 13	369
1. 6. 19	8, 59
1. 6. 32	44

1. 6. 38	172
1. 6. 44	248, 267
1. 6. 49	185
1. 7. 1	75
1. 7. 9	75
1. 7. 16	248
1. 7. 22	132
1. 7. 26	165
1. 7. 29-33	415
1. 7. 41	369
1. 7. 70	351
1. 7. 77	180
1. 7. 80	377
1. 7. 89	350
1. 7. 91	371
1. 7. 98	180
1. 8. 2	369
1. 8. 3	392
1. 9. 11	330
1. 10. 37	350
1. 11. 26	164
1. 12. 2	332
1. 12. 3	248
1. 12. 9	390
1. 12. 17	408
1. 12. 24	392
1. 13. 7-9	410
1. 14. 9	369
1. 14. 35	165
1. 14. 37	59
1. 14. 43	370
1. 15. 3	270
1. 15. 37	290
1. 16. 14	360
1. 16. 20	42, 369
1. 16. 21	374
1. 16. 25	302
1. 16. 43	335
<u>1. 16. 59</u>	368
1. 16. 62	369
1. 17. 12	340, 369
1. 17. 37	149
1. 17. 38-9	408
1. 18. 21	379
1. 18. 25	198
1. 18. 89	368
1. 18. 111	330
1. 19. 7	181
1. 19. 8-10	213
1. 19. 13	345
1. 20. 8	165
1. 20. 19	60
2. 1. 1	377
2. 1. 5	369
2. 1. 5-9	309, 335
2. 1. 50	362

2. 1. 55	47
2. 1. 67	377
2. 1. 70	408
2. 1. 93	181
2. 1. 128	331, 338
2. 1. 138	379
2. 1. 213	330
2. 1. 232-4	346
2. 1. 240	42
2. 1. 244	366
2. 2. 4	194
2. 2. 18	301
2. 2. 33	346
2. 2. 49	170
2. 2. 66	269
2. 2. 87-8	281
2. 2. 97-8	281
2. 2. 157	153
2. 2. 162	146
2. 2. 203	377
2. 2. 204	363, 365
2. 2. 213	338, 375
2. 2. 214	377
Ars Poetica 28	371
34	331, 338
63	369
69	240
101	269, 290
118	374
139	379
147	64
152	365, 368
187	371
222	392
251	377
272	235
282	168
358	377
359	49
413	377
462	393
465	392
476	281
Isaeus: 8. 7	95
11. 10	95
Justin: 41. 1	108
Juvenal:	
1. 73	165
2. 81	360
2. 164	195
3. 165	165
6. 166	148
6. 452	71
7. 49	386
7. 137	186



10. 33	148
10. 188-9	347
10. 197	166
10. 249	252
11. 105	3
12. 9	63
14. 17	361
14. 260	4
<a href="#">Laberius</a> : 51, R.	131
<a href="#">Lactantius</a> : 4. 15. 17	172
<a href="#">Laevius</a> ap. Gell. 19. 7. 10	343
<a href="#">Lampridius</a> : Hel. 30. 4	45
<a href="#">Livius Andronicus</a> :	
Fr. 20, M.	356
Fr. 29. M.	241
ap. Macrob. 6. 5. 10	387
<a href="#">Livy</a> :	
1. 6. 4	95
1. 9. 15	241
1. 24. 2	94
1. 27. 11	40
1. 31. 7	94
1. 32. 13	307
1. 34. 8	387
1. 42. 3	146
1. 51. 8	229
2. 1. 9	241
2. 4. 4	123
2. 7. 12	221
2. 10. 2	354
2. 22. 6	229
2. 29. 11	118
2. 30. 12	188
2. 36. 6	229
2. 39. 5	190
2. 43. 8	240
2. 64. 5	184
3. 14. 1	181
3. 23. 4	243
3. 62. 4	119
3. 67. 11	312
3. 69. 8	107
4. 3. 1	232
4. 16. 2	346
4. 18. 7	170
5. 1. 1	73
5. 7. 2	236
5. 9. 3	230
5. 33. 9	110
5. 37. 5	117
5. 54. 6	42
6. 1. 6	170
6. 36. 11	107
7. 9. 8	118
7. 20. 5	123
7. 23. 6	218

7. 28. 4	400
7. 30. 15	333
7. 33. 13	240
7. 40. 14	189
8. 32. 9	236
9. 11. 2	152
9. 36. 6	106
9. 41. 7	107
10. 5. 1	246
10. 20. 10	94
21. 4. 1	220
21. 11. 7	133
21. 11. 9	164
21. 11. 13	222
21. 12. 6	196
21. 13. 7	107, 346
21. 15. 6	199
21. 27. 1	178
21. 27. 6	46
21. 28. 10-11	356
21. 33. 6	265
21. 33. 7	221
21. 34. 6	286
21. 34. 9	254
21. 35. 4	194
21. 35. 6	221
21. 35. 8	310
21. 36. 1	270
21. 36. 6	201
21. 37. 2	202
21. 41. 1	93
21. 44. 7	333
21. 45. 1	195
21. 56. 2	198
21. 58. 10	279
21. 60. 3	287
21. 60. 7	115
22. 10. 6	94
22. 12. 6	226
23. 14. 2	250
23. 42. 9	107
24. 31. 1	229
24. 9. 6	168
24. 20. 11	241
25. 3. 3	106
26. 6. 2	195
27. 4. 2	232
28. 26. 5	109
28. 26. 14	170
30. 8. 7	112
30. 17. 3	105
30. 30. 4	218
30. 32. 2	115
30. 33. 12	232
31. 1. 5	282
31. 13. 7	346

31. 14. 4	232
32. 21. 5	239
33. 4. 5	106
33. 5. 2	187
33. 12. 11	282
34. 3. 2	225
34. 16. 1	355
34. 27. 5	322
36. 20. 5	37
36. 32. 5	94
36. 34. 3	427
37. 45. 14	94
38. 25. 3	187
38. 47. 11	119
40. 32. 1	232
40. 46. 12	154
42. 48. 4	282
43. 6. 11	104
44. 41. 9	323
45. 7. 4	357
45. 29. 2	240
Lucan:	
1. 98	165
1. 131	345
1. 135	148
1. 181	217
1. 347	283
2. 103	148
2. 225	166
2. 304	154
2. 524	283
2. 682	181
3. 380	148
3. 535	195
4. 144	154
5. 409	181
7. 570	180
8. 445	109
9. 302	210
9. 955	4
10. 68-9	77
Lucilius:	
5. 4, M.	151
5. 5, M.	151
Inc. 69-71, M.	175
Inc. 155, M.	180
Lucretius:	
1. 14	392
1. 71	234
1. 86	218, 258
1. 88	278
1. 119	153
1. 132-3	288
1. 152-3	271
1. 200	203, 205, 389
1. 203	280
1. 261	391

1. 287	370
1. 311	220
1. 338-9	309, 391
1. 354-5	37
1. 361	140
1. 362	365
1. 363	153
1. 374	309, 338
1. 388-9	281
1. 397	140, 338
1. 449	153
1. 452	338, 366
1. 457	160
1. 486	160
1. 533	107
1. 555	365
1. 557	328
1. 566	252
1. 580	153
1. 592-4	141
1. 620	332
1. 641	338
1. 659	361
1. 670	365
1. 671	365
1. 746-7	148
1. 758	252
1. 775	319
1. 826	338
1. 842	339
1. 895-6	366
1. 941	338
1. 970	318
1. 987	365
1. 995	160
1. 1012	45
1. 1012-16	141
2. 114-15	49
2. 351	153
2. 631	186
2. 1054	200
3. 21	269
3. 48	361
3. 261	338
3. 364	392
3. 480	389
3. 526	143, 330
3. 581	143
3. 591	389
3. 860	338
3. 869	392
3. 890	370
3. 962	200
3. 1006	338
3. 1035	338
3. 1038	196

3. 1048	391
4. 153	427
4. 260-1	281
4. 408	103
4. 687-8	44
4. 956	167
5. 14	250
5. 45-6	171
5. 106	168
5. 199	148
5. 253	388
5. 264	281
5. 275-6	388
5. 284	281
5. 291	281
5. 304	281
5. 470	195
5. 554-5	339
5. 571	185
5. 835	44
5. 1225	92
5. 1363	204
 <b>Macrobius:</b>	
Saturn. 1. 2. 1	242
1. 7. 3	242
3. 2. 6	400
6. 1	176
Somn. Scip. 1. 6	105
<b>Manilius:</b> 2. 814-15	255
 <b>Martial:</b>	
Ep. Lib. 29. 2	157
29. 3	158
Epigrams 1. 2. 3	164
1. 2. 4	254
1. 3. 3	158
1. 12. 8	258
1. 12. 10	391
1. 12. 12	254, 256
1. 42. 1	157
1. 42. 2	157
1. 42. 3	345
1. 42. 6	345
1. 70. 3	4
1. 70. 9-10	148
1. 70. 14	319
1. 70. 18	132
1. 85. 7	156
1. 89. 4	391
1. 103. 1	104
1. 117. 9	160, 362
2. 14. 1	272
2. 14. 13	160
4. 42. 9	165
4. 49. 5	204
4. 57. 4	106
4. 75. 3	157

4. 75. 5	300
5. 38. 4	387
7. 36. 4	154
7. 47. 6	157
7. 47. 9	201
7. 47. 10	218
7. 63. 1	318
7. 63. 8	223
7. 63. 10	255
7. 88. 6	287
7. 88. 8	272
8. 3. 4	254
8. 3. 21	165
8. 45. 4	109
8. 51. 2	187
9. 15. 2	332
9. 18. 5	393
9. 61. 17	319
10. 24. 4-5	346
10. 25. 2	76
10. 47. 12-13	130
11. 5. 8	256
11. 5. 11	287
11. 18. 19-20	148
11. 18. 23	254, 348
11. 21. 1	179
11. 39. 2	210
12. 24. 10	60
14. 17. 1	109
<a href="#">Martianus Capella: 2. 107</a>	109
<a href="#">Mela, Pomp.: 1. 57. 9</a>	45
<a href="#">Minucius Felix: 7. 3</a>	178
<a href="#">Naevius:</a>	
Bell. Pun. 53, M.	227
Com. 98, R.	225
Trag. 61, R.	234
<a href="#">Neleus: Carm. 1, R.</a>	234
<a href="#">Nepos, Corn.:</a>	
Ages 3. 1	167
Att. 12. 4	167
Dat. 4. 5	250
Dio 4. 1	45
Eum. 5. 2	188
Ham. 4	178
Hann. 7. 4	107
Pelop. 4. 3	43
Phoc. 2. 2	115
<a href="#">New Test.:</a>	
Luke 9. 28	86
Acts 15. 23	121
<a href="#">Novius: 57, R.</a>	91
<a href="#">Ovid:</a>	
Amores 1. 9. 37	218
1. 14. 56	240
2. 2. 30	196

2. 10. 33	386
3. 7. 21	318
Ars Am. 1. 317	283
1. 746	64
2. 457	283
Fasti 1. 1. 1	215
1. 218	150
2. 574	165
2. 643-4	109
3. 350	154
4. 54	115
5. 55	195
6. 471	388
6. 507	345
Heroides 1. 72	164
3. 81	238
4. 105	108
5. 116	386
5. 117	209
7. 181	184
7. 188	165
11. 46	109
12. 150	60
19. 47	389
19. 62	50
20. 74	93
Met. 1. 24	220
1. 149	184
1. 578	306
1. 670	130
1. 734	64
2. 257	115
2. 312	308
2. 822	193
3. 275	345
4. 325	166
4. 735	115
7. 287	337
8. 47	181
10. 32	108
12. 15	104
13. 185	323
13. 192	184
13. 376	77
13. 753	106
14. 360	316
15. 337	149
15. 824	365
Pont. 4. 10. 1	106
Rem. Am. 424	220
Trist. 1. 2. 76	386
2. 94	104
4. 3. 37-8	336
4. 10. 4	104
4. 10. 118	154
5. 2. 39	282

5. 10. 7-8	165
5. 11. 7	166
<a href="#">Pacuvius</a> : 365, R.	229
<a href="#">Palladius</a> : Sept. 8. 6	44
Apr. 3. 3	169
<a href="#">Persius</a> :	
1. 56-7	348
1. 60	344
1. 89	350
2. 50-1	292, 348
3. 15	346
3. 19	349
3. 20-2	348
4. 2	246
5. 6	109
5. 88	342
5. 92	343
5. 120	344
6. 10-11	342
<a href="#">Petronius</a> :	
Sat. 4	71
9	167
42	154
44	252
54	232
83	187
98	167
118	167
118 fin.	188
<a href="#">Phaedrus</a> :	
2. 8. 8	239
3. Prol. 41	42
3. 7. 6	167
4. 20. 1-2	240
4. 22. 4	392
<a href="#">Pherecrates</a> : Doul. 1, <i>B</i>	68
<a href="#">Pindar</a> :	
Ol. 1. 68	86
2. 94-7	100
10 (11). 2	68
10 (11). 4-6	86
Pyth. 4. 178-9	98
8. 58 (40)	69
10. 71-2	86
Isthm. 4 (5). 17 ff.	65
Fr. 183, <i>B</i> .	86
<a href="#">Plato</a> :	
Crito 43 c	88
52 a	88
Epist. 358 c	89
Euthyd. 283 b	118
291 c	93
320 c	86
Gorg. 500 d	85
Leg. 838 a	95
Menex. 243 c	94



Phaedo 57 a	114
62 a	87
Prot. 311 d	118
314 c	70
346 e	87
Rep. 363 a	85
463 a	85
Symp. 173 b	89
186 b	75
188 b	86
Theaet. 152 e	54
186 a	89
Tim. 45 a	85
82 c	85
<b>Plautus:</b>	
Amph. 163-5	383
180	155, 234
200	230
294	334
308	249
331	230
338	227
400	40, 91
501	249
572	230
669	242
700	243
714	228
984	337
987	338
990	337
Asin. 5	239
58	229
168	236
333	427
440	345
634	132
698	292
926	427
930	392
Aul. 239	154, 238
527	251
529	251
610	249
Bacch. 161	155
303-4	228
535	246
649-51	76
726	70
928	103
1050	106
1176	219
Capt. 12	149
20	169
76	243
121	124
156-7	112

303	427
339	356
434	226
458	196
469	227
537	140
540	120
559	225
657	243
723-6	348
786	225, 226
796	189
836	172
852-3	92
1005	43
1008	93
Cas. 18	219
113	323
331-4	76
593	242
647	234
654	333
693	131
Cist. 69	186
518	227
525	235
603	170
609	143
Curc. 80	225
375	258
543-6	76
623	123
Epid. 51	253
66	243
324	41, 228
331-2	40
361	225, 228
399	34, 116
563-4	228
620	51
Men. 33.	249
69	321
287	234
320-2	76
562	239
674	116
764	241
779	111
780	243
799	153
835	244
922	239
992-4	118
1010	243
1020	236
1099	169
Merc. 130	116

255	170
304	108
362	228
755	219, 392
830	169
908-9	116
910	228
953	283
Mil. 78	118
204	252
297	239
644	242
781	332
861	248
992	239
1176-7	226, 228
1198	242
1400	234
Most. 88	251, 267
200	235
286	259
358	109
683	238, 239
792	169
824	166
1064	228
Pers. 109	427
204	219
211	103
317	108
398	120
471	107
497	229
Poen. 117	118
318	283
469	322
500	248
1183	195
1272	234
1421	40
Pseud. 239	239
264	235
276	241
1148	283
1284	116
Rud. 309	242
796-8	239
808	118
1127	239
1245	50
Stich. 67	116
656	322
731	47, 49
743	283
Trin. 5	132
98	239
242	226

401	242
584	239
609	226, 237
615	241
780	241
806	230
963	120
1010	283
1046	195
1059	227
Truc. 370	93
399	249
403-4	95
621	219
628	239
631	116
885	196
Fr. 299, W.	334
<b>Pliny:</b>	
Nat. Hist. 2. 47. 119	106
7. 1. 8	103
7. 16. 71	107
11. 18. 64	336
17. 10. 80	109
21. 3. 10	346
36. 22. 168	186
<b>Pliny, Jr.:</b>	
Epist. 3. 5. 11	44
4. 24. 5	152
8. 4. 6	282
9. 13. 21	196
10. 6. 9	41
Pan. 75	95
<b>Plutarch:</b>	
Pyrrh. 20	58
Caes. 1	76
<b>Pomponius:</b>	
47, R.	91
141, R.	28
168, R.	91
<b>Porphyrio:</b> Ad Od. 1. 1. 16	40
<b>Priscian:</b> Gram. II. 126. 23	104
<b>Propertius:</b>	
1. 1. 20	290
1. 1. 27	371
1. 1. 28	379
1. 1. 29	360
1. 2. 12	379
1. 2. 17	407
1. 3. 26	338
1. 4. 21	335
1. 5. 10	168, 172
1. 5. 11	375
1. 5. 32	154
1. 6. 33	375
1. 7. 7	361
1. 8. 19	331

1. 9. 27	371
1. 9. 31-2	382, 391
1. 10. 19-20	382
1. 11. 13	44
1. 12. 3-4	172
1. 14. 23-4	361
1. 15. 29-30	372
1. 16. 2	71
1. 16. 6	132
1. 16. 12	71
1. 16. 24	367
1. 16. 26	391
1. 16. 38	392
1. 16. 42	338
1. 16. 45-6	382
1. 18. 7	237
1. 18. 27-8	382
1. 20. 3	371
1. 20. 12	331
2. 1. 10	317
2. 1. 22	108
2. 1. 23	367
2. 1. 24	363
2. 1. 37-8	363
2. 1. 40	165
2. 1. 66	407
2. 1. 75-6	372
2. 6. 16	365
2. 7. 20	215
2. 9. 7	132
2. 9. 31	374
2. 9. 36	368
2. 10. 21-2	332
2. 13. 23	363
2. 13. 40	427
2. 13. 42	217
2. 13. 55-6	382
2. 14. 20	360
2. 15. 24	363
2. 15. 36	367
2. 15. 49	238
2. 16. 2	367
2. 16. 24	367
2. 16. 46	361
2. 16. 49	390
2. 16. 51	378
2. 18. 38	363
2. 19. 10	371
2. 19. 21-2	382
2. 29. 18	371
2. 20. 34	361
2. 20. 35	379
2. 20. 36	367
2. 21. 11	363
2. 22. 34	376
2. 24. 4	361
2. 24. 21	360

2. 24. 49	361
2. 25. 4	375
2. 26. 6	318
2. 26. 19	339, 374
2. 26. 23	361
2. 26. 28	368
2. 26. 34	368
2. 26. 44	124, 368
2. 26. 46	363, 372
2. 26. 53-4	382
2. 26. 56	3
2. 27. 9	361
2. 28. 7	361
2. 28. 16	378
2. 28. 19	367
2. 28. 42	376
2. 28. 43	379
2. 28. 45	376
2. 29. 40	8
2. 29. 41-2	114
2. 30. 29	363
2. 31. 13-14	382
2. 34. 11	375
2. 34. 31	200
2. 34. 45	153
2. 34. 78	376
2. 34. 81	154
2. 34. 88	363
2. 34. 92	199
3. 1. 1	363, 376
3. 1. 13	338
3. 1. 23	367
3. 1. 26	155
3. 1. 28	378
3. 3. 5-8	382
3. 3. 13	191
3. 3. 23	376
3. 4. 7-8	179
3. 5. 2	149
3. 6. 35	365
3. 7. 2	321
3. 7. 6	365
3. 7. 9	216
3. 7. 31	370
3. 7. 32	285, 376
3. 7. 46	333
3. 7. 47-50	287, 382
3. 7. 56	216
3. 8. 24	377
3. 9. 17	88
3. 9. 25	219, 258
3. 9. 31	222
3. 9. 37	215
3. 9. 46	367
3. 9. 50	199
3. 9. 56	207
3. 9. 60	154

3. 11. 59	371
3. 11. 65	360
3. 13. 13	360
3. 15. 29-30	376
3. 21. 3	93
3. 21. 21	122
3. 21. 29-30	187
4. 2. 28	143
4. 2. 34	216
4. 2. 39	224
4. 2. 64	367
4. 3. 36	179
4. 4. 26	367
4. 5. 59	184
4. 6. 22	407
4. 6. 27	149
4. 6. 30	224
4. 6. 49-50	296
4. 6. 57	375
4. 6. 58	191
4. 6. 63	375
4. 6. 64	274, 348
4. 6. 65	274
4. 6. 72	219, 258
4. 6. 80	377
4. 6. 83	144, 375
4. 6. 85	376
4. 7. 36	364
4. 7. 57-8	378
4. 9. 9	374
4. 11. 31	367
4. 11. 80	255
4. 11. 81	256
Prosper: In Ps. 113. 4	44
Quadrigarius:	
ap. Gell. 1. 7. 9	131
9. 13. 8	49
Quintilian:	
1. 1. 14	49
4. 2. 38	41
4. 2. 42	249
5. 10. 62	185
6. 1. 23	231
6. 1. 31	232
9. 2. 68	166
10. 1. 54	271
10. 1. 67	167
10. 1. 70	167
11. 3. 23	168
12. 11. 21	250
Quintus Smyrnaeus:	
9. 492	100
13. 344	100
Sallust:	
Cat. 20. 2	94
20. 11	108

31. 9	221
43. 1	115
51. 7	310
52. 2	166
56. 5	70, 298
Jug. 1. 2	40
5. 4	189
18. 6	201
37. 4	218
49. 5	307
54. 5	355
63. 6	187
83. 1	224
96. 3	114
101. 5	115
Hist. Fr. 3. 94, Kr.	92
2. 50. 5, Kr.	94
Inc. 21, Kr.	406
Or. Phil. 2	181
<a href="#">Sedulius</a> : Carm. Pasch. 3. 90	109
<a href="#">Seneca</a> : Ben. 3. 3. 3	231
Controv. Top. 22	40
Epist. 5. 8	154
49	333
55. 10	232
66. 42	44
95. 14	232
96. 1	232
120. 18	231
Ad Helv. 6. 5	243
Nat. Quaest. 16. 17. 2	282
Agam. 944	180
H. F. 784	108
H. Oet. 282	153
1850	109
Med. 688	154
Thyest. 452	165
<a href="#">Servius</a> :	
Ad Aen. 1. 129	221
3. 305	105
4. 1	396
4. 45	156
8. 168	104
8. 249	182
9. 507	182
10. 253	152
10. 689	137
10. 717	405
12. 408	151
<a href="#">Sidonius Apoll.</a> : Carm. 2. 22	172
<a href="#">Silius</a> :	
3. 662	388
7. 614	184
10. 623	149
11. 169	119
12. 64	296
12. 72-3	45



12. 95	388
13. 708	166
16. 366	181
17. 400	152
<b>Sophocles:</b>	
Ajax 725	112
1138	117
Ant. 576	70
678	114
El. 1172	118
Oed. Col. 174-5	120
555-6	100
1600-1	99
Oed. Tyr. 1329	114
Phil. 336	93
Trach. 520-2	86
821-2	118
<b>Spartianus:</b> Hadr. 3. 8	106
<b>Statius:</b>	
Achill. 2. 88	226
Silv. 1. 2. 4-6	311
1. 2. 10	321
3. 3. 197	218
4. 3. 49	171
4. 3. 153	172
4. 4. 43	109
4. 6. 15	3
4. 9. 15	109
5. 3. 185-8	44
Theb. 1. 442	165
2. 669	345
6. 682-3	303
6. 701	166
6. 857	283
7. 792	132
8. 16	45
9. 559	166
9. 656	191
10. 741	180
10. 823	149
11. 500	182
<b>Suetonius:</b>	
Jul. 4. 2	254
24. 3	332
84. 3	106
Aug. 16. 2	154
63. 1	236, 246
71. 3	189
86. 3	115
94. 4	247
98. 2	236
98. 3	92
Tib. 11. 3	235
47	246
52. 1	236
Cal. 7	246
13. 1	307

Ner. 5 fin.	249
39	246
Sulpicia:	
12-13	349
28	349
36	350
Tacitus:	
Agr. 10	388
15	170
16	181
25	169, 258
44	311
Germ. 7	308
36	312
45	330
Hist. 1. 1	306
1. 2	108
1. 64	354
2. 37	181
2. 54	186
2. 68	41
3. 2	330
3. 4	232
3. 8	202
3. 22	313
3. 74	142
4. 29	308
5. 22	311
Ann. 1. 1. 1	199
1. 1. 4	356
1. 3. 1	239
1. 3. 3	338
1. 4. 4	40
1. 5. 4	201
1. 6. 1	270
1. 6. 3	254, 345
1. 6. 6	146, 268, 286
1. 8. 3	213
1. 8. 4	270, 305
1. 10. 3	76
1. 14. 6	280
1. 17. 4	253
1. 17. 6	308
1. 18. 2	144
1. 19. 5	199
1. 22. 1	71
1. 23. 1	390
1. 23. 3	353
1. 23. 6	352, 357
1. 24. 3	133
1. 25. 2	313
1. 26. 1	254, 280
1. 26. 5	202, 217
1. 27. 1	206, 219
1. 27. 2	218
1. 28. 6	203, 254

1. 28. 7	169, 207
1. 28. 8	244
1. 30. 4	196
1. 31. 2	331
1. 33. 6	353
1. 35. 2	313
1. 35. 4	354
1. 35. 5	286, 354, 355
1. 36. 2-3	132
1. 37. 1	253, 342
1. 39. 4	331
1. 39. 8	199, 309, 335
1. 41. 3	194
1. 42. 2	19
1. 44. 3	313
1. 44. 7	364
1. 46. 2	328
1. 46. 3	327
1. 46. 4	158
1. 47. 2	48
1. 49. 1	186
1. 49. 3	133
1. 49. 6	195
1. 57. 1	273
1. 57. 2	345
1. 58. 2	313
1. 59. 1	266
1. 63. 1	255
1. 63. 3	357
1. 63. 7	228, 244, 253, 267, 349
1. 64. 7	253
1. 65. 2	392
1. 65. 4	153
1. 65. 10	213
1. 68. 1-2	213, 344
1. 68. 6	307
1. 69. 1	391
1. 69. 2	341
1. 69. 4	223
1. 69. 5	290
1. 70. 2	350
1. 71. 5	313
1. 74. 7	250
1. 75. 5	207
1. 76. 1	308
1. 76. 6	244
2. 5. 3	269
2. 8. 2	191
2. 10. 2	355
2. 11. 4	199
2. 16. 2	258
2. 17. 1	132
2. 17. 2	223, 253
2. 17. 4	194
2. 20. 2	287, 311
2. 20. 3	199
2. 20. 4	199

2. 21. 4	207
2. 22. 3	354
2. 23. 3	223, 269
2. 24. 1	270
2. 24. 2	223
2. 24. 3	258
2. 24. 5	216, 256
2. 24. 6	111
2. 25. 1	207
2. 25. 4	254
2. 25. 5	327
2. 26. 1	328
2. 27. 2	71
2. 29. 2	310
2. 33. 3	165
2. 40. 3	313
2. 41. 2	330
2. 42. 7	202
2. 43. 1	254
2. 43. 6	194
2. 43. 7	217
2. 44. 3	313
2. 45. 2	357
2. 45. 4	310
2. 53. 3	168
2. 54. 1	253
2. 54. 2	312
2. 55. 2	217
2. 55. 4	253
2. 55. 6	344
2. 56. 1	202
2. 56. 2	254
2. 56. 4	210, 223
2. 57. 3	19
2. 57. 4	289
2. 58. 1	217
2. 58. 3	311
2. 64. 6	230
2. 71. 2	19
3. 1. 3	218
3. 1. 5	169
3. 2. 3	286
3. 5. 2	218
3. 6. 1	218, 258
3. 6. 3	207
3. 8. 1	210, 284
3. 8. 2	256
3. 12. 6	289
3. 12. 8	266
3. 14. 2	287
3. 14. 3	295
3. 14. 6	263, 355
3. 14. 7	341
3. 15. 2	345
3. 17. 1	311
3. 19. 1	256

3. 19. 3	278
3. 24. 4	207
3. 27. 2	286
3. 28. 3	311
3. 29. 1	253
3. 36. 1	158, 188, 311
3. 38. 1	290
3. 40. 1	158
3. 44. 2	284
3. 52. 3	309
3. 55. 1	181
3. 59. 4	232
4. 27. 2	232
4. 48. 4	41
4. 64. 1	355
4. 72. 4	312
6. 3. 5	354
6. 9. 6	354
6. 32. 2	238
11. 10. 1	355
12. 28. 1	313
12. 42. 1	357
12. 42. 5	353
12. 64. 6	311
13. 45. 2	196
13. 52. 2	228
14. 53. 5	200
15. 19. 2	310
15. 34. 2	312
15. 44. 5	199
Terence:	
Adelph. 65	166
84	306
103	95
156	228
172	120
240-1	122
246	243
264	332
289	236
340	94
361	143
528	243
543	230
570	202, 243
791	226
809	249
891	20
904-7	76
Andria 29	239
70	298
89	44
141	251
184	239
214	286
219	249

226	222
231	230
310	140
320	218
443	250
461	222
514	228
539	171
575	256
594	237
607	219
610	217
797-8	122
821-3	229
823	231
902	238
Eun. 54	227
196	233
216	114
270	323
271	149
320	238
343	242
347	227
354-5	229
545	222
601	194
608	229
632	251
645	233
649	91
714	236
734	283
1031	153
1054	124
1092	243
Heaut. 29-30	92
32	338
205	169
214	228
217	243
229	239
344	292
364	187
392-3	112
454	240
473	115
510	222
537	187
601	102
606	102
636	345
669	165
788	231
842	167
1022	307
Hec. 2	94

115	232
208	240
212	20
372	93
458	236
581	273
755	336
844	239
875-7	229
Phorm. 37	283
68	235, 345
198	236
208	226, 227
303	333
555	230
594	240
732	222
741	337
789	107
800	49
823	170
857	250
<b>Tertullian:</b>	
Apol. 40 init.	172
50 fin.	172
<b>Theocritus: 5. 47</b>	101
<b>Thucydides:</b>	
1. 6. 3.	88, 89
1. 23. 2	87
1. 23. 3	87
1. 86. 3	113
2. 4. 2	68
2. 26. 2	87
3. 17. 1	88
3. 36. 2	86
3. 82. 1	88
3. 109. 2	115
4. 88. 1	69
4. 90. 2	68
5. 23. 1	99
6. 77	113
7. 24. 3	88
7. 48. 5	75
7. 71. 3	88
8. 68. 4	89
8. 90. 1	88
<b>Tibullus:</b>	
1. 1. 2	168
1. 1. 24	267
1. 1. 25	237
1. 1. 51	379
1. 1. 64	148
1. 1. 75	373
1. 2. 57	195
1. 2. 76	154
1. 3. 25-6	427
1. 3. 56	374

1. 3. 93-4	201
1. 4. 11	165
1. 4. 66	388
1. 5. 17	44
1. 6. 34	60
2. 1. 31	274
2. 3. 67	239
2. 4. 55	376
2. 5. 69-70	262, 375
2. 5. 118	374
2. 6. 16	266
3. 4. 90	250
3. 6. 55	90
3. 6. 63-4	282, 283
 <b>Titinius:</b>	
23, R.	251
64, R.	242
 <b>Turpilius:</b>	
34, R.	234
105, R.	228
151, R.	234
195, R.	248
 <b>Ulpian:</b>	
Dig. 8. 4. 6 pr.	105
25. 4. 1. 10	106
 <b>Val. Antias:</b> Ap. Gell. 1. 7. 10	
	131
 <b>Val. Flaccus:</b>	
1. 835	41
2. 287	312
2. 563	172
3. 261	172
3. 412	122
5. 266	238
6. 456	283
7. 269-70	310
 <b>Val. Maximus:</b>	
2. 9. 7	173
3. 2. 24 fin.	240
7. 4. 5	237
8. 11. ext. 7	235
 <b>Varro:</b>	
R. R. 1. 1. 5	193
1. 27. 2	107
1. 55. 5	282
2. 1. 3	92
2. 9. 9	249
3. 6. 1	346
3. 7. 9	107
3. 16. 7	234
L. L. 8. 72 Sp.	186
7. 1. 2 Sp.	168
7. 1. 3 (87) Sp.	249
8. 24 Sp.	108
Serm. Lat. V, Fr 82, Wilm.	91
Ap. Non. 1. 572, M.	234
 <b>Velleius:</b>	



2. 51 fin.	167
2. 62 fin.	249
2. 63	237
2. 74 init	167
2. 79. 4	254
2. 117	236
Vincent. Lerin. 13. 19, p. 20	44
Virgil:	
Catal. 9. 25-6	353
Ciris 129-31	352
Buc. 1. 6-7	75
1. 46	375
1. 80	122
2. 25	342
2. 42	107
2. 62	197
3. 5.	106
3. 34	349
3. 49	202, 243
3. 78	197
3. 87	63
3. 104	168
3. 106	141
3. 109-10	183
5. 15	130
5. 34	249
5. 51-2	247
5. 66	105
5. 79-80	400
6. 16	237
6. 74-7	11, 358
6. 78-81	10
7. 9	307
7. 44	360
8. 5	363
8. 39	43
8. 67	307
8. 77	108
8. 88	427
9. 21	325
9. 23	238
9. 25	63
9. 51	249
9. 52	427
10. 6	190
10. 55	252
10. 57	322
10. 72	168
Geo. 1. 54	154
1. 92-3	312
1. 96	292
1. 141	164
1. 154	68
1. 358	163
1. 514	180, 249
2. 11	154
2. 62	168

2. 85	185
2. 170	200
2. 192	257
2. 246-7	381
2. 279-82	164
2. 308	250
2. 344	153, 392
2. 475	197
2. 510	132
3. 10	197
3. 17	182
3. 84	152
3. 89-90	9, 174
3. 115-17	175
3. 196	171
3. 201	169
3. 223	164
3. 236	342
3. 282	262
3. 290	165
3. 343	150
3. 348	198
3. 358	180
3. 381	57
3. 421	248
3. 456	149
3. 518	215
4. 19	388
4. 116-19	352
4. 127	427
4. 144	343
4. 158	207
4. 163	326
4. 166	205
4. 206	165
4. 212	169
4. 361	185
4. 372-3	41
4. 400	335
4. 447	332
4. 455-6	354
4. 484	219
4. 519	252
4. 535	206
4. 547	206
Aen. 1. 1	181
1. 2	211
1. 5	238
1. 13	165
1. 15	197
1. 21	163
1. 30	202
1. 34	387
1. 37	123
1. 56	149
1. 58	387
1. 61	257

1. 72	185
1. 97	123
1. 103	280, 317
1. 107	256
1. 108	256
1. 114	284
1. 117	294, 320
1. 118-19	285
1. 129	221
1. 137	255
1. 140	75
1. 144	169
1. 156	189
1. 164	255
1. 167	392
1. 176	255
1. 177	222
1. 181	201
1. 195	323
1. 198	199
1. 204	280
1. 213	255, 262
1. 218	146
1. 224	338
1. 233	284
1. 234-7	11
1. 236	370
1. 237	321
1. 242	375
1. 250	285
1. 255	308
1. 258	280
1. 260	321
1. 261	233
1. 262	262
1. 263	262
1. 264	308
1. 269	220
1. 272	104
1. 274	261
1. 279	233
1. 283	274
1. 285	261
1. 291	181
1. 292	115, 374
1. 310	200
1. 312-13	107
1. 315	309
1. 318	182
1. 320	63, 200
1. 328	290
1. 335	171
1. 336	182
1. 341	285
1. 347	159, 196
1. 350	190
1. 355-6.	309

1. 357	256
1. 360	308, 338
1. 363-4	205
1. 366	52, 264
1. 367	284
1. 368	366
1. 370	287
1. 376	320
1. 385	333
1. 390-1	295
1. 390-2	355
1. 393	328
1. 396	209
1. 417	255
1. 426	312
1. 427	387
1. 429	280
1. 431	321
1. 436	255
1. 455	284
1. 456	194
1. 458	8, 54, 64, 363
1. 471	216
1. 480	262
1. 485	229
1. 491	317
1. 504	309
1. 506	202
1. 515	220
1. 516	274, 350
1. 519	182
1. 524	388
1. 528	339
1. 530	374
1. 532	363
1. 534	201
1. 538	388
1. 543	392
1. 556	207
1. 559	274
1. 568	425
1. 574	95, 156
1. 576	155, 289
1. 579	64
1. 592	187
1. 600	256
1. 601	157
1. 604	332
1. 606	171
1. 619	427
1. 626	256
1. 630	358
1. 632	202
1. 639	313
1. 641	284
1. 646	148
1. 648	261, 313

1. 655	199
1. 656	203, 350
1. 661	329
1. 665	329
1. 667-9	113
1. 684	256
1. 688	350, 360
1. 692	248
1. 705	327
1. 707	269
1. 718	240
1. 720	222
1. 721	216
1. 724	344
1. 725	224
1. 734	71, 299
1. 735	318
1. 741	285
1. 744	57
1. 745-6	285
1. 747	254
1. 753	258
2. 1	384
2. 2	377
2. 6	157
2. 9	158
2. 11	284
2. 18	258
2. 19	8, 326
2. 25	132, 198
2. 29	253
2. 49	146
2. 51	280
2. 54	269, 361
2. 56	380
2. 57	64
2. 59	280
2. 60	373
2. 72	184
2. 73	216
2. 74	140, 201
2. 77	347
2. 83	224
2. 86-7	285
2. 91	338
2. 93	256
2. 99	181, 287
2. 103	283
2. 107	207
2. 109	256
2. 111	209
2. 114	364
2. 118-21	285
2. 121	280
2. 124	255
2. 126	321
2. 131	202, 248

2. 149	50
2. 150	319
2. 162	284
2. 164	363
2. 171	216
2. 181	210
2. 201	280, 289
2. 217	296
2. 223	171
2. 236	219, 258
2. 240	368
2. 252	363
2. 255	318
2. 258-9	309
2. 275	363
2. 287	377
2. 294	210
2. 302	319
2. 308	194, 254
2. 309-10	284
2. 312	164, 222
2. 314	206
2. 320-1	312
2. 324	197
2. 328-9	285
2. 331	242
2. 332	218, 258
2. 333	152
2. 344	204
2. 349-50	122
2. 366	184
2. 368	391
2. 375	143
2. 376	226
2. 377	132
2. 387-8	281
2. 388	321
2. 398	218, 258
2. 405-6	310, 391
2. 408	321
2. 411	204
2. 416	280, 367
2. 423	252
2. 426	197
2. 429	167
2. 432-3	132
2. 434	189
2. 438	46, 196, 202
2. 439	204
2. 443	207
2. 446	233
2. 449	280, 365
2. 455-7	56, 364
2. 459	377
2. 460	194
2. 468	256
2. 473	198

2. 475	74, 321
2. 482	163
2. 487	329
2. 488	255
2. 489	203
2. 492-3	224
2. 495	163
2. 501	56
2. 504	261, 317
2. 505	147
2. 510	322
2. 511	324
2. 516	198
2. 517	343
2. 521-2	274, 350
2. 523	274
2. 528	252
2. 529	343
2. 539	156, 287, 370
2. 541	207
2. 542	254
2. 544-6	159, 291
2. 547	153
2. 549	289
2. 558	159
2. 566	321
2. 567	197
2. 574	263
2. 575	183
2. 576	216, 343
2. 579	19, 56
2. 583	207
2. 584	216
2. 585	216, 343
2. 586	255
2. 589	198
2. 591	345
2. 600	255
2. 601	185
2. 609	266
2. 611	284
2. 620	243
2. 621	256
2. 627	193
2. 628	255
2. 631	285
2. 635	72, 248
2. 636	360
2. 643	284
2. 645	189
2. 646	201
2. 648	344
2. 650	202
2. 651	329
2. 654	153, 311
2. 657	210
2. 660-1	280

2. 662	184
2. 664-7	42
2. 668	284
2. 670	202, 243
2. 681	37
2. 688	310
2. 689-90	285
2. 695-8	163, 418
2. 703	157
2. 711	166, 284
2. 714	319
2. 725	218, 258
2. 731-2	326, 390
2. 743-4	391
2. 748	364
2. 750	149
2. 755	273
2. 759	255
2. 765	289, 329
2. 774	153
2. 780	309, 319
2. 781-2	38, 146
2. 799	329
2. 800	253
2. 801	319
3. 16	148
3. 20	204
3. 24	191
3. 26	267
3. 30	261
3. 32	255
3. 34	253
3. 36	159, 256
3. 38	280
3. 41-2	257, 308
3. 43	284
3. 44	257, 329
3. 60-1	130, 317, 322
3. 62	255
3. 63	322
3. 69	320
3. 72	397
3. 82	158
3. 94-6	284
3. 116	239
3. 118	202
3. 120	361
3. 123	148
3. 125	326
3. 134	207
3. 138	322
3. 141	206
3. 142	345
3. 157	159
3. 158-9	19, 155, 247
3. 161-2	285
3. 170	256



3. 174	216
3. 176-7	284, 310
3. 181	392
3. 187	158
3. 188	293, 374
3. 203	319
3. 210	147
3. 225	318
3. 226	387
3. 227	269
3. 231	269
3. 233	255, 258
3. 246	216
3. 249	333
3. 250	254, 262
3. 257	370
3. 258	364
3. 260-1	183, 287, 311
3. 262	268
3. 264	262
3. 266	200
3. 267	280
3. 271	326
3. 275	222
3. 279	269
3. 280	320
3. 281	203
3. 283	319
3. 288	274
3. 294	319
3. 303-5	206, 313
3. 304	325, 363
3. 310	321
3. 314	262
3. 321	197
3. 322	216
3. 331	205
3. 339	391
3. 351	424
3. 354-5	218, 262
3. 356	269
3. 359-61	312
3. 362	318
3. 372	425
3. 373	319
3. 377	252
3. 383	164
3. 396	219, 258
3. 402	360
3. 403	148
3. 407	186
3. 411	391
3. 417	144
3. 418	223
3. 419	327
3. 421	219, 319
3. 428	364

<u>3. 435</u>	362
3. 442	326
3. 446	186
3. 448-9	263
3. 453	147
3. 457	309, 367
3. 458-9	310
3. 464	327
3. 466	258
3. 467	261
3. 491	223
3. 493-4	83
3. 505	146
3. 506	57, 331
3. 510	385
3. 511	207, 216
3. 515	252
3. 516	57
3. 517	254
3. 519	387
3. 520	219
3. 522	261
3. 535	60, 64
3. 539-40	393
3. 552	222
3. 559	361
3. 560	269
3. 562	318
3. 563	387
3. 567	320
3. 572	290
3. 573	392
3. 581	321
3. 582	323
3. 585	219
3. 588	318
3. 589	203
3. 591	258
3. 597	152
3. 601	249
3. 606	392
3. 616	216
3. 623	423
3. 625	256, 290, 320
3. 626	328
3. 651	320
3. 659	200
3. 663	203, 391
3. 668	319
3. 670	342
3. 677	205, 292, 383
3. 680	367
3. 682	366
3. 689	150
3. 706	140, 201
3. 716-17	12
3. 718	384

4. 1	200
4. 3	168
4. 6-7	271
4. 8	293
4. 11	285, 309
4. 15	149, 207
4. 17	158
4. 20	319
4. 34	216
4. 35	204
4. 36	398
4. 37	402
4. 40	376
4. 41	200
4. 44	393
4. 45-6	201, 402
4. 49	402
4. 50	183, 239, 377
4. 51	280
4. 53	388
4. 56-7	38, 183
4. 61	203
4. 64	392
4. 65	392
4. 67	391
4. 80	321, 392
4. 83	317
4. 88	219, 258, 392
4. 99	259
4. 100	311
4. 111	147
4. 115	148
4. 124	364
4. 127	298
4. 131-2	258, 311, 376
4. 133	401
4. 135	321
4. 157	237
4. 169	321
4. 174	41
4. 178-9	295
4. 180	328
4. 193	274, 344
4. 199	163
4. 209	391
4. 212	386
4. 213	217
4. 215	216
4. 226	334
4. 229	205
4. 236	215
4. 242-4	334
4. 253	333
4. 270	324
4. 271	217
4. 274	362
4. 277	158, 324

4. 289	253
4. 293	158
4. 296-8	284, 387
4. 303	319
4. 305-6	210, 233
4. 344	188
4. 358	326
4. 359	391
4. 364	325
4. 383	299
4. 384	373, 391, 404
4. 385	317
4. 387	77
4. 389-92	299
4. 397	253
4. 399	205
4. 407	158
4. 423	375
4. 427	311
4. 428	138
4. 433	207
4. 437	158
4. 439	205
4. 443	302
4. 449	320, 367
4. 452	198
4. 470	60, 64
4. 475	187
4. 477	320
4. 479	217
4. 487	211
4. 494	321
4. 495	181
4. 513	194
4. 514	392
4. 518	43
4. 538	309, 335
4. 539	152
4. 543	329
4. 576	209
4. 578	200, 264, 270
4. 611	299
4. 614	152
4. 625	116
4. 628	370
4. 634	294
4. 641	379
4. 660	368
4. 666	38
4. 671	368
4. 673	367
4. 681	202, 298
4. 683	280
4. 687	389
4. 695	309
4. 697	348
5. 1	194

5. 2	199, 217
5. 5-7	189, 265
5. 13	171
5. 18	132, 211
5. 37	143, 144
5. 40-1	320, 341, 375, 383
5. 45	326
5. 46	372
5. 48	320
5. 58	119, 320
5. 62	346
5. 77-8	216, 384
5. 80-1	384
5. 84	200
5. 85	108
5. 88	310
5. 91	299, 370
5. 97	203
5. 98	379
5. 103	370
5. 108	370
5. 113	365
5. 115	372
5. 117	204
5. 119	215, 219, 341
5. 120	109
5. 122	370
5. 124	317
5. 127	194
5. 128	324, 379
5. 129	199
5. 133	163
5. 134	372
5. 149	326
5. 151	197, 319
5. 155	203
5. 179	318
5. 181	368
5. 199	145, 386
5. 204	366
5. 207	320
5. 211-12	324, 367
5. 214	379
5. 217	391
5. 218-19	384
5. 229	205
5. 231	159, 369
5. 232-4	353
5. 233	112
5. 238	203
5. 255	206
5. 264	281
5. 265	249
5. 274	317
5. 279	370
5. 280	321
5. 284	281

5. 285	8, 60
5. 286	253
5. 288	331
5. 289-90	297, 378
5. 295	327
5. 298-9	327, 383
5. 302	390
5. 304	281
5. 315-16	271, 384
5. 317	252
5. 327	269
5. 330	194
5. 332	140, 201
5. 334	20, 376
5. 338	379, 403
5. 339	223
5. 343	404
5. 344	154
5. 350	294
5. 355-6	354, 376
5. 356	269
5. 358	201
5. 359	76, 372
5. 365	60, 64
5. 367	373
5. 370	378
5. 378	41
5. 387	303
5. 394	224, 289
5. 401	327
5. 402	198
5. 403	323
5. 406	159, 165, 197
5. 413	265, 375
5. 414	269
5. 416	371
5. 418	199
5. 425	323, 372
5. 429	370
5. 439	295
5. 441	268, 311
5. 444	299, 361
5. 460	319
5. 466	41
5. 476	256
5. 481	228
5. 484	199
5. 492	197
5. 498	222
5. 503	324
5. 522-8	417
5. 524	318
5. 529	152
5. 533	421
5. 540	197
5. 541	223
5. 542	197

5. 543	329
5. 546	210
5. 558	331
5. 560	110
5. 561	55
5. 562	393
5. 570	185, 197, 365
5. 571	365
5. 583-4	269, 366
5. 589	322
5. 591	208
5. 608	183
5. 630	217
5. 640	308
5. 646	374
5. 663	327
5. 664	331
5. 669	387
5. 687	197
5. 696	328
5. 752	256
5. 754	71
5. 793	233
5. 809	301
5. 819	375, 388
5. 821	388
5. 830	156
5. 830-1	238, 268
5. 848-9	123
5. 850-1	296
5. 854	203
5. 856	389
5. 857	318
5. 861	217
6. 2	319
6. 8	256
6. 16	390
6. 17	204, 211
6. 19	390
6. 20-2	55, 60, 110, 423
6. 22	152, 258
6. 24	301
6. 28	205
6. 30	320
6. 30-1	140, 157
6. 33-5	233, 353
6. 38	202
6. 42	320
6. 45	123
6. 51	207
6. 66-7	298
6. 70	200
6. 73	262
6. 75	298
6. 76	262
6. 89	41
6. 92	378

6. 95-6	400
6. 122-3	13, 143
6. 137	328
6. 138	258
6. 140-1	41
6. 145	293, 391
6. 148	392
6. 159	261
6. 160	331
6. 164	41
6. 168	350
6. 203	60
6. 208	185
6. 211	401
6. 225	217
6. 229	323
6. 230	259
6. 233-4	302
6. 237	328
6. 249	327
6. 255	261
6. 257	391
6. 261	64
6. 263	223, 289
6. 265	163
6. 266	155, 157
6. 268	317
6. 269	217
6. 281	217
6. 283-4	132, 301
6. 285	258, 319
6. 289	258
6. 291	216
6. 292	399
6. 296	327
6. 300	149, 369
6. 301	371
6. 306	258, 399
6. 320	270
6. 324	262
6. 329-30	270
6. 350	262
6. 353	320
6. 358	298, 388
6. 365	208
6. 366	212, 271
6. 370	247
6. 375	399
6. 376	211
6. 382-3	215, 384
6. 392	143, 209
6. 395	207
6. 400	331
6. 403	328
6. 406	256, 381
6. 409	219, 258
6. 411-12	46, 196



6. 414	208, 398
6. 416	254, 269
6. 419	320
6. 426	359, 368
6. 448	379
6. 450	327
6. 451-5	304, 369
6. 481	204
6. 484	200
6. 497	200
6. 504	319
6. 516	326
6. 517	255, 345
6. 521	321
6. 524	271
6. 526-7	210
6. 529	206
6. 532	154
6. 543	324
6. 545	335
6. 558	259, 299
6. 567-9	141, 271, 329, 381
6. 578	294
6. 579	219
6. 587	180
6. 588	319
6. 596	332
6. 601-7	424
6. 614-15	141, 260
6. 616-20	13, 15
6. 620	272, 378
6. 621	372
6. 623	311
6. 629	393
6. 632	130, 294
6. 638	143
6. 664	40
6. 672	168
6. 674	328
6. 681	293
6. 685	49
6. 687	332
6. 706	200
6. 716-17	273, 293
6. 735	233, 301, 321
6. 743	77
6. 766	201
6. 773	72
6 778,	233, 327, 363, 375
6. 779	10, 60, 141
6. 780	299, 337, 370
6. 783	341
6. 788	60
6. 810	326, 350
6. 817	203
6. 832	322
6. 838	260

6. 838-40	212
6. 840	288
6. 845	215
6. 847	255, 392
6. 862	347
6. 870	153
6. 881	323
6. 883	374
6. 888	164
6. 893-8	415
6. 895	318
6. 901	149
7. 9	323
7. 11	208
7. 15	260
7. 18	258
7. 28	194
7. 30-2	38
7. 49	393
7. 52	308
7. 55	295
7. 59	294
7. 65	388
7. 73	320
7. 82	224
7. 86	194
7. 93	108
7. 94	260
7. 98	209
7. 114-15	300
7. 117	332
7. 117-19	300
7. 134	271
7. 141-3	261, 300
7. 163	180
7. 174	374
7. 184-6	48
7. 186-7	313
7. 187-8	211
7. 201	149
7. 203	260
7. 245	217
7. 250	153, 208
7. 284-5	302
7. 287	218
7. 288	164
7. 307	310
7. 329	319
7. 343	321, 325
7. 351	208
7. 359	77
7. 372	313
7. 382	208
7. 383	216
7. 392	328
7. 397	217
7. 410	299, 360

7. 417	326
7. 418	268
7. 425-6	303
7. 429-30	300
7. 430	393
7. 431	310
7. 432-4	222, 262, 295
7. 470	54, 154
7. 482	216
7. 483	327
7. 496	233
7. 498	301
7. 507	219
7. 509	208
7. 532	147
7. 533	326
7. 536	207
7. 550	326
7. 553	118, 377
7. 564	208, 341
7. 575	326
7. 595-6	216
7. 623	208, 372
7. 637	298
7. 648-9	371
7. 660	329
7. 667	328
7. 695-6	308
7. 701	163
7. 716	387
7. 751	260
7. 776	208
7. 779-80	199, 309
7. 781	219
7. 814	182
8. 3	178
8. 4	225
8. 8	164
8. 15-17	294
8. 50	253
8. 65	396
8. 66	390
8. 84-5	271
8. 90-1	302, 334
8. 91-2	321, 324
8. 108-9	312, 313
8. 118	326
8. 125	262
8. 141	258
8. 143-4	309
8. 151	332
8. 171	297
8. 175	248
8. 183	324
8. 196	184
8. 208	302
8. 209	202

8. 212	203
8. 237	36, 217
8. 244	216
8. 260	307
8. 261	260, 390
8. 289	259
8. 302	74
8. 321	188, 208
8. 330	328
8. 331-2	301
8. 333	218
8. 335-5	260
8. 341	208
8. 358	147
8. 361	211
8. 365	154
8. 375	202, 216
8. 386	206
8. 407-8	393
8. 413	144
8. 423	365
8. 426	297, 300
8. 439	248
8. 442	220
8. 443	391
8. 448	109, 115
8. 449-53	39
8. 462	215
8. 466	368
8. 483	273
8. 500	219
8. 501	183
8. 515	159
8. 520	132
8. 526	319, 365
8. 530	46, 196
8. 533	297
8. 539	216
8. 542	295, 320
8. 548	327
8. 569-71	297
8. 576	198
8. 578	40
8. 588	208, 270
8. 590	197
8. 591	297
8. 596	160, 216, 319
8. 617	171
8. 630-1	157, 294
8. 643	152
8. 661	55
8. 672	393, 397
8. 673	329
8. 684	255
8. 692	279
8. 693	296
8. 694	208

8. 695	386
8. 701	301, 401
8. 726	329, 388
8. 727	218
8. 730	294
9. 2	338
9. 3-4	16, 149
9. 6	103, 393
9. 7	208
9. 9	211
9. 12	272
9. 21	209
9. 44	189
9. 55	219
9. 57	344
9. 66	183, 323
9. 92	342
9. 94	294, 297
9. 98	308
9. 101	185
9. 115	391
9. 138	205
9. 141	236
9. 156	173
9. 163	328
9. 178	207, 264
9. 182	169
9. 184-5	403
9. 194	345
9. 203	249
9. 205	153
9. 214	407
9. 230	158, 218
9. 237	207
9. 243	209
9. 249	219
9. 250	310
9. 263	108
9. 269-70	141, 153, 319
9. 276	392
9. 279	311
9. 294	215
9. 306	404
9. 311	159, 198
9. 314	57, 190
9. 315	216
9. 319	217
9. 320	391
9. 321	188
9. 336	185, 364
9. 339-41	42, 347, 404
9. 345	363
9. 346	299
9. 359	328
9. 365	328
9. 377-8	339
9. 388	404

9. 411-13	405, 407
9. 414	392
9. 438-9	392, 401
9. 442	217
9. 443	401
9. 455	318
9. 481	201
9. 485	367
9. 506	190
9. 531	328
9. 536	199
9. 547	249
9. 556	166
9. 561	210
9. 576	201, 320
9. 580	258
9. 583	327
9. 629	63
9. 651	328
9. 663	329
9. 674	270
9. 700	219
9. 728	365
9. 743	327
9. 747	182
9. 777	178
9. 782	41
9. 803-5	352
9. 815	329
10. 8	373
10. 11-13	397
10. 28	212, 374
10. 32	343
10. 43	148
10. 53	130
10. 71	309
10. 80	188
10. 101	391
10. 108	156
10. 113	319
10. 120	211
10. 124	4, 55
10. 142	390
10. 148	222
10. 150	373
10. 151	64
10. 153	147
10. 178	327
10. 179	327
10. 180	328
10. 188	50
10. 201	258
10. 204	398
10. 205-6	144, 386
10. 207	109
10. 214	145, 386
10. 221	147, 157

10. 230	318
10. 235	156
10. 242	201
10. 247	388
10. 253	152, 207
10. 269	320
10. 273	215
10. 280	189
10. 288	253
10. 290	398
10. 305	254, 390
10. 317	164
10. 329	108
10. 330	201
10. 331	206
10. 361	153, 373, 374
10. 378	364
10. 382	157
10. 392	208, 272
10. 400	269
10. 410	71
10. 424-5	144, 334
10. 426	326
10. 442	154
10. 444	333, 361, 379
10. 448	155
10. 451	248
10. 452	364
10. 467	152
10. 482	406
10. 492	341
10. 496	219
10. 498	367
10. 500	132
10. 511	157
10. 520	216
10. 533	249
10. 544	155
10. 549	158, 166
10. 564	325
10. 566	108
10. 586	207
10. 619	17
10. 622	204
10. 627	210
10. 648	329, 391
10. 667	310
10. 682	323
10. 697	203
10. 706	140, 201
10. 713	269
10. 714	290, 401
10. 716	183
10. 717-18	407
10. 732-3	257, 263
10. 737	168, 391
10. 745	217

10. 748	327
10. 750	200
10. 758	158
10. 771	152
10. 773	208
10. 784	328, 393
10. 785	319
10. 792	398
10. 802	132, 321
10. 807	295
10. 834	342, 389
10. 839	114
10. 842	216
10. 849-50	237
10. 857	60, 217
10. 859	295
10. 861	257, 279, 380
10. 863	189
10. 867	295
10. 871	169, 266, 317
10. 875	168
10. 881	154
10. 883-4	365, 380
10. 899	183, 318, 391
11. 9	55
11. 18	322
11. 23	159
11. 32-3	153
11. 48	210
11. 59	247, 255
11. 60	130
11. 62	366
11. 63	158
11. 70	240
11. 76-7	43
11. 101	183
11. 104	200
11. 110	183
11. 112	342, 352
11. 115	217
11. 116	189
11. 117	217
11. 121	321
11. 123	155
11. 124	217
11. 135	193
11. 147	390
11. 148	287
11. 152-3	284
11. 161	287
11. 171-2	370, 383
11. 179	322
11. 190	203
11. 199	290
11. 206	247
11. 214	167
11. 236	388



11. 243-4	271
11. 245	174
11. 262	211
11. 264	335
11. 272	212, 388
11. 280	263
11. 285	171
11. 290	152
11. 309	165
11. 311	37, 207
11. 317	201
11. 321	207
11. 332	258
11. 338	207
11. 407	219
11. 418	159
11. 443-4	206, 248
11. 446	308
11. 474	206
11. 496	294
11. 512	158
11. 513	326
11. 523	296
11. 527	150
11. 537	197
11. 547	158
11. 553	327
11. 601	151, 323
11. 607	390
11. 626	326
11. 627	323
11. 628	388
11. 649	43
11. 650	256
11. 654	388
11. 659-60	262
11. 661	332
11. 677	262
11. 680	219
11. 692	203
11. 695	319
11. 698	254
11. 701	218
11. 706	191
11. 709	183
11. 711	272
11. 713	191
11. 739	321
11. 741	204
11. 745	207
11. 751	293
11. 771	207, 313
11. 773-4	182
11. 774	182
11. 784-5	77
11. 786	319
11. 798	206

11. 810	324
11. 821	197
11. 863	225
11. 866	326
11. 871	329
11. 875	160
11. 876	328
11. 901	146
11. 912-14	140, 353
12. 4-6	171, 182
12. 13	209
12. 15	149
12. 17	157
12. 23	189
12. 26	248
12. 39	249
12. 43-5	166
12. 46	391
12. 48-9	184, 300, 383, 399
12. 50	285, 392
12. 52-3	157, 384
12. 55	205
12. 60	189
12. 66	321
12. 71	206
12. 78	222
12. 82-4	18
12. 95	155
12. 96-7	282
12. 104	144, 182, 398
12. 127	374
12. 149	210
12. 156	157
12. 185	181
12. 187	50, 321
12. 191	207
12. 192	157
12. 195-6	262
12. 235	399
12. 254	398
12. 267	321
12. 272	392
12. 275	327
12. 279	205
12. 282	183
12. 287	180
12. 288	146
12. 295	328
12. 301	399
12. 303	63
12. 312	200
12. 316-17	384
12. 326	329
12. 335	215
12. 350	190
12. 350-2	180, 400
12. 391	197

12. 408	151
12. 413	364
12. 432	199
12. 435	265, 309
12. 437	157
12. 451	171
12. 463	317
12. 519	147
12. 546	399
12. 552	258
12. 565	153
12. 568	210
12. 569	261
12. 576	269, 312
12. 584	392
12. 588	391
12. 591	391
12. 627	188
12. 630	329
12. 634	291
12. 643	206
12. 650-1	388
12. 652	200
12. 653	197
12. 655	131, 156
12. 658	20
12. 670	219
12. 672-3	37
12. 688	146
12. 690	319
12. 727	400
12. 728	210, 345
12. 732-3	354
12. 736	180
12. 738	321
12. 739	319
12. 740	393
12. 747	63, 158
12. 755	392
12. 760	158, 392
12. 770	199, 248
12. 779	261
12. 780	207
12. 796	153
12. 799	20
12. 815	312
12. 862	320
12. 863-4	149
12. 944	399
12. 946	391
12. 949	216
Vulgate:	
Gen. 28. 12	73
Exod. 29. 17	68
Ps. 51. 3	50
Matt. 23. 19	241
26. 64	241

Xenophon:

Anab. 1. 7. 17	69
2. 1. 22	114
2. 6. 4	209
3. 2. 31	76
Cyr. 1. 2. 11	99
2. 3. 18	87
7. 5. 73	117
Hell. 1. 6. 35	94
2. 2. 3	112
3. 2. 19	70
5. 4. 2	58
5. 4. 20	113
Lac. Rep. 3. 1	112
Mem. 2. 3. 6	87
2. 3. 18	101
Vect. 3. 11	87

# GENERAL INDEX

A B C D E F G H I J K L M  
N O P Q R S T U V W Y Z

The first word of each letter links back to the beginning of the Index. Page-number links lead to the top of the page.

[ab Andria](#), [222](#).  
ablative, [298](#).  
absente nobis, [91](#).  
accusativus Graecus, [141](#).  
acervus, [220](#).  
Acestes' arrow, [417](#).  
ad Vestae, [221](#).  
admodura and admodo, [241](#).  
adulter, [44](#).  
ae, Virgil's pronunciation of, [302](#).  
Aesop, [414](#).  
age eamus, [118](#).  
Alcmanicum Schema, [66](#), [97](#).  
Alexander the Great, [421](#).  
alii for alii omnes, [196](#).  
aliquando, [40](#).  
aliquis, [40](#).  
aller, [388-9](#).  
altus, [168](#).  
amodo, [241](#).  
amores, [20](#).  
anachronism, [211](#).  
angustus for parvus, [165](#).  
antallage, [13](#), [340](#).  
Antimachus, [79](#).  
Apollonius Dyscolus, [80](#), [125](#).  
Apollonius Rhodius, [83](#), [396](#).  
Appius Caecus, [413](#).  
Apuleius, [51](#), [322](#).  
arcus, [182](#).  
Aristarchus, [24](#), [54](#), [82](#).  
Aristotle, [272](#).  
arma, [181](#).  
Arnold, Dr. Thos., [87](#).  
arrive, [389](#).  
ars, [187](#).  
Arusianus, [92](#), [236](#).  
Asconius, [256](#).  
Asella, [410](#).  
Asinius Pollio, [411](#).  
Asper, [149](#).  
-aster, [51](#).  
at enim, [230](#).  
Atridas for Agamemnonem, [8](#), [54](#).  
Augustine, [137](#).  
Augustus, [421](#).  
Aust, [16](#).  
avunculus, [51](#).  
  
[Baehrens](#), [122](#), [171](#), [371](#).  
Bavius, [23](#), [68](#).

Bekker, Im., [90](#).  
Bentley, [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [16](#), [57](#), [61](#), [62](#), [174](#), [190](#), [213](#), [223](#), [244](#), [315](#), [316](#), [367](#), [370](#), [413](#).  
Bergk, [84](#).  
Bezenberger, [305](#).  
Bickersteth, Bp., [13](#).  
bini derived, [104](#).  
bipennis, [193](#).  
Boehtlingk-Roth, [72](#).  
Bonnet, [180](#).  
Brachet, [389](#).  
brevis for parvus, [165](#).  
Brix, [102](#), [241](#).  
Brugmann, [12](#), [27](#), [28](#), [32](#), [33](#), [34](#), [42](#), [47](#), [59](#), [60](#), [63](#), [125](#).  
Bruns, [117](#).  
Bryce, A. H., [265](#), [291](#).  
Burmam, [50](#), [179](#), [358](#), [385](#), [425](#).  
Butler, H. E., [200](#), [370](#), [407](#).  
Buttmann, [120](#).  
  
[caedes](#) for sanguis, [184](#).  
Caesar, [178](#), [420](#).  
calida iunctura, [408](#).  
Calvus, [394](#).  
Camerarius, [103](#).  
Camilla, [395](#).  
Capella, Martianus, [51](#).  
Catullus, [394](#).  
cerus manus, [77](#).  
ceteri, [195](#).  
cette, [45](#).  
Chalcidius, [104](#).  
Charisius, [26](#), [227](#), [236](#).  
Church and Brodribb, [341](#).  
classici, [387](#).  
Cledonius, [26](#), [45](#).  
close union equals unity, [94](#).  
clueo, [153](#).  
Cohon, J. W., [425](#).  
comes, as title, [210](#).  
Commentum Einsidlense, [25](#), [26](#).  
commode, [241-2](#).  
commodum and commodo, [241-2](#).  
Conington, [14](#), [60](#), [63](#), [110](#), [176](#), [265](#), [359](#), [385](#), [398](#), [401](#), [406](#), [407](#), [414](#), [424](#).  
conjunctions developed, [268](#).  
contra, [50](#).  
Corinna, [79](#).  
cornea porta, [415](#).  
cornū-uos, [27](#), [30](#), [63](#).  
Courbaud, [214](#), [411](#).  
Crates of Mallos, [25](#).  
cum as preposition, [170](#).  
cum maxime, [231](#).  
cuncti, [195](#).  
currus et equi, [180](#).  
cuter and uter, [47](#).  
Cornutus, [343](#).  
Cynthia, [395](#).  
  
[Dacier](#), [413](#).  
dative in a, [407](#).

decedunt for cedunt, [333](#).  
decies sestertium, [345](#).  
Delbrück, [45](#), [53](#), [63](#), [66](#), [74](#), [77](#).  
De Witt, N. W., [233](#).  
dexter, [51](#).  
Dido, [212](#), [395](#).  
Dindorf, [120](#).  
Dio Cassius, [179](#).  
Diomedes, [26](#), [32](#).  
Dionysius Thrax, [23](#), [24](#), [143](#), [193](#).  
diu for longe, [164](#).  
dolor for ira, [183](#).  
Donatus, [25](#), [26](#), [228](#).  
donicum, [356](#).  
Draeger, [20](#).  
Drusus for Tiberius, [6](#).  
Ducange, [172](#).  
Duilia Columna, [387](#).  
Duker, [229](#).  
dum, [238](#).  
dummodo, [238](#).  
  
[eburna porta](#), [415](#).  
elliptical plural, [4](#), [56](#).  
Ellis, Robinson, [171](#), [213](#).  
emend ab Andria to ab Andriae, [222](#).  
    „    ierat to erat, [153](#).  
emo, [253](#).  
enimvero, [228](#).  
eo for venio, [143](#).  
eques for equus, [175](#).  
equus for eques, [177](#).  
Erasmus, [231](#).  
Ernesti, [231](#).  
est, [147](#).  
est for potest, [332](#).  
euntes for ituros, [209](#).  
Eustathius, [84](#).  
Eutyches, [266](#), [370](#).  
exile aliquis, [116](#).  
explebo numerum, [335](#).  
  
[Faber](#), Tanaquil, [175](#).  
Fabius Pictor, [138](#).  
facies for forma, [185](#).  
facio omitted, [198](#).  
factus omitted, [199](#).  
Farrar, F. W., [67](#).  
Favonius, [190](#).  
Favorinus, [381](#).  
fero and tuli, union of, [246](#).  
Festus, [51](#), [77](#), [195](#), [337](#), [389](#).  
Fick, [27](#).  
Figgis, Neville, [66](#).  
fini, [91](#).  
Fintan, [65](#), [97](#).  
fio, [147](#).  
first dual in Greek, [99](#).  
Forbiger, [63](#), [209](#), [265](#), [342](#), [358](#), [370](#), [400](#), [406](#).  
foris and foras, [60](#).

forma for species, [185](#).

Francius, Peter, [5](#).

Fronto, [179](#).

frugi, [202](#).

fuerat for erat, [147](#).

Furneaux, [287](#).

futurus omitted, [204](#).

[Gaisford](#), [84](#).

Gaius, [20](#).

Gallus, Cornelius, [394](#).

Gauthiot, [7](#), [66](#), [422](#).

Gellius, [179](#).

geminus sol, [60](#).

genitive of description, [327](#).

Gesner, J. M., [46](#), [149](#), [188](#), [234](#).

Gifanius, [281](#).

Gildersleeve, [85](#), [94](#).

Giussani, [200](#).

Gladstone, [422](#).

Goetz, [236](#).

Graecia Barbariae, [70](#).

Gray, Thos., [330](#).

Gregory of Tours, [179](#).

Grimm's Law, [356](#), [387](#).

[habeo dictum](#), [157](#).

Hall's Chronicles, [177](#).

Hand, [167](#), [226](#), [228](#), [229](#), [231](#), [241](#), [243](#).

Hardouin, [336](#).

Hardy, E. G., [347](#).

Harkness, [173](#).

Harris, Rendel, [16](#), [423](#).

Haupt, M., [62](#), [414](#).

Hauthal, [315](#), [385](#).

Heinsius, [5](#), [385](#), [406](#).

Henry, Jas., [39](#), [334](#).

Hermann, G., [55](#).

Herodes Atticus, [179](#).

Herodian, [120](#).

Hertz, M., [226](#), [288](#), [355](#).

Heyne, [14](#), [15](#), [56](#), [60](#), [176](#), [184](#), [336](#), [343](#), [358](#), [370](#), [385](#), [398](#), [400](#), [405](#), [407](#), [416](#), [420](#), [424](#), [425](#).

hic for huc, [201](#).

Hirt, [31](#), [58](#), [79](#).

Hittite, [99](#).

Hogg, Mrs., [141](#).

horret, [151](#).

Huxley, [422](#).

Hyginus, [168](#), [211](#), [212](#), [381](#).

hypallage perfecta, [317](#), [321](#).

Hypsicrates, [26](#).

hysteron proteron, [271](#).

[iacet](#), [149](#).

ibi, [45](#).

Idomeneos monies, [213](#).

ilico, [227](#).

immo vero, [229](#).

imperator, [130](#).

impero, syntax of, [130](#).

in unum, [198](#).



inferior, [50](#).  
inmotum for immobile, [208](#).  
interdum, [240](#).  
interficere and interire, [36](#).  
inversion of names, [270](#).  
lordanes, [241](#).  
ira for amor, [183](#).  
is in poetry, [146](#).  
-ister, [51](#).  
istorum nominandi copia, [92](#).  
-iter, [45](#).  
iterum and itero, [45](#).  
iubeo, syntax of, [130](#).  
iuncto ponte, [195](#).

[Jebb](#), [99](#).  
[Jelf](#), [84](#), [89](#).  
[Jowett](#), [88](#), [89](#).

[Kalendae](#), [74](#).  
[Keil](#), [46](#).  
[Keller-Holder](#), [4](#), [361](#), [385](#), [410](#), [414](#).  
[Kiessling](#), [3](#), [7](#), [61](#), [340](#), [359](#), [409](#), [414](#).  
[Kipling](#), [93](#).  
[Kluge](#), [350](#).  
[Kreyssig](#), [357](#).  
[Kuhnast](#), [102](#).  
[Kühner](#), [87](#).

[Lachmann](#), [179](#), [370](#), [414](#).  
[Ladewig](#), [63](#), [265](#), [420](#), [424](#).  
[Lambinus](#), [316](#).  
[Lampadio](#), [176](#).  
[Lang, Andrew](#), [141](#).  
[Lang and Leaf](#), [54](#).  
[Leicester](#), [223](#).  
[Lesbia](#), [394](#).  
[Liber and Libera](#), [20](#).  
[Liddell and Scott](#), [306](#).  
loco and in loco, [187](#).  
longe for multo and multum, [166](#), [167](#).  
[Lonsdale and Lee](#), [265](#), [291](#).  
luna primo mense surgens, [304](#).  
[Lycoris](#), [394](#).

[Mackail](#), [37](#), [145](#), [209](#), [248](#), [265](#), [291](#), [293](#), [301](#), [402](#).  
[Macrobius](#), [26](#), [179](#), [381](#).  
[Madwig](#), [140](#), [221](#), [281](#), [282](#).  
magnus for altus, [168](#).  
[Mahābhārata](#), [381](#).  
Majesty, plural of, [75](#).  
manes, [77](#).  
[Mantolini](#), [213](#).  
manus for artes, [187](#).  
manus for pugna, [188](#).  
[Manutius, Paulus](#), [400](#).  
[Marlowe](#), [8](#).  
[Marstrander](#), [99](#).  
[Marvell, Andrew](#), [330](#).  
[Matthiae](#), [88](#).  
[Maurer](#), [420](#).

Maxime Lolli, [270](#).  
Mayor, [412](#).  
melius non tangere, [124](#).  
memorabilis, [208](#).  
mene incepto desistere? [123](#).  
mensas consumere, [300](#).  
menses, [78](#).  
middle position in verse, [371](#).  
Migne, [180](#).  
mile, Latin for, [102](#).  
milleni, [103](#).  
Modesty, plural of, [74](#).  
modo for dum, [238](#).  
modo temporal, [236](#).  
modo non, [235](#).  
Monro, D. B., [82](#), [119](#), [120](#), [121](#), [124](#), [125](#), [127](#).  
Morris, E. P., [341](#).  
mulatto, [51](#).  
Müller, Lucian, [16](#), [57](#), [301](#), [330](#), [410](#), [414](#).  
multi et magni, [168](#).  
multo for longe, [166](#).  
Munro, H. A. J., [37](#), [49](#), [200](#), [281](#), [414](#).  
Muretus, [190](#).  
Murray, Sir J. A. H., [9](#), [177](#), [293](#).  
Myer, Ernest, [65](#).

[Naevius](#), [371](#).  
nedum, [240](#).  
nequam, [202](#).  
Nettleship, H., [405](#), [424](#).  
ni, [351](#).  
Nigidius, [348](#).  
Ninon de Lenclos, [416](#).  
Nipperdey, [305](#).  
nisi for non nisi, [355](#).  
Nonius, [104](#), [405](#).  
notumque, [265](#).  
novaculum, [185](#).  
Numerius, [234](#).  
numero, [234](#).  
numerus, [186](#).  
numquam, [202](#), [243](#).  
nusquam, [202](#).  
nutrit rura, [174](#).

[octo](#), [27](#).  
oculi mille, [8](#), [59](#).  
Ohler, [55](#).  
Orbilius, [408](#).  
Orelli, [213](#).  
Osthoff, [45](#).  
ostro, [182](#).

[Page](#), T. E., [265](#), [349](#), [385](#), [407](#), [425](#).  
Pais, E., [16](#).  
Paley, F. A., [88](#).  
Palmer, A., [50](#).  
Papillon, [265](#).  
parēre, [296](#).  
pastor ad baculum, [224](#).  
paternos for filiorum, [393](#).

patres natosque, [19](#).  
Pfister, [179](#).  
Picus, [16](#).  
Pindar, [15](#).  
pluris interest, [167](#).  
Plutarch, [14](#).  
populari, [333](#).  
poscimur, [385](#).  
Postgate, [131](#), [133](#).  
postmodo, [240](#).  
Prellwitz, [120](#).  
Priscian, [26](#), [49](#), [231](#), [266](#), [370](#).  
Procne-Philomela, [10](#).  
propemodo, [241](#).  
Propertius, [394](#).  
prosa, [137](#).  
pugna, [188](#).  
puteal Libonis, [213](#).

[qualis et quantus](#), [171](#).  
quam extemplo, [226](#).  
quam primum, [244](#).  
quamde, [226](#).  
quando, [226](#), [233](#).  
que, [48](#).  
quinetiam, [233](#).  
Quintilia, [394](#).  
Quintilian, [48](#), [411](#).  
Quintus Ennius, [342](#).  
quis indefinite, [47](#).  
quod sis esse velis, [130](#).  
quot et quanti, [171](#).  
quotannis, [350](#).

[Ramshorn](#), [389](#).  
recipere, [12](#).  
Reichelt, [58](#), [64](#), [122](#).  
revenire, [143](#).  
rhyme, [379](#).  
Ribbeck, [48](#), [63](#), [150](#), [159](#), [174](#), [234](#), [236](#), [266](#), [288](#), [297](#), [308](#), [381](#), [399](#), [401](#), [406](#), [409](#), [424](#).  
Riemann, [84](#).  
Rigveda, [65](#).  
Ritschl, [241](#).  
Roma derived, [51](#).  
Roscher, [16](#).  
Ruddiman, [26](#), [306](#), [307](#).  
ruina, [221](#).  
Rumon, [303](#).

[saepe](#), [233](#).  
saltem, [348](#).  
salutator for salutaturus, [132](#).  
sanguis, [184](#).  
Scaliger, [179](#), [200](#), [226](#).  
scelus viri, [219](#).  
Schmalz, [92](#).  
Schmitz, Leonard, [17](#).  
Schneider, [227](#).  
Schoell, [249](#).  
Schulze, [27](#).  
Schwarz, [230](#).

Schwyzer, [64](#).  
Scipio Maior and Minor, [6](#).  
Scott, Sir Walter, [141](#).  
Scribonius Libo, [214](#).  
Scylla Nisi, [11](#).  
secus, [235](#).  
sedere, [148](#).  
Seleucus, [80](#).  
Sellar, W. G., [304](#).  
septena quotannis, [110](#).  
sequester, [51](#).  
sero, [235](#).  
sese for se, [279](#).  
sesqueopus, [348](#).  
sestertius, [349](#).  
Shakespeare, [318](#), [330](#).  
si and sic, [351](#).  
Sidgwick, [14](#), [38](#), [40](#), [63](#), [265](#), [294](#), [297](#), [300](#), [368](#), [370](#), [385](#), [398](#), [400](#), [401](#), [407](#), [416](#).  
Sidonia Dido, [11](#).  
simul, [169](#).  
sinister, [51](#).  
Sisenna, [383](#).  
Skeat, [350](#).  
Smith, Clement, [272](#), [280](#).  
Smith, Sir Wm., [221](#).  
Somerville, Miss O., [422](#).  
Sommer, [27](#), [30](#), [42](#), [45](#), [47](#), [51](#), [59](#).  
sos, [351](#).  
Spalding, [231](#).  
Speijer, [118](#).  
Stallbaum, [89](#).  
stant lumina flammae, [150](#).  
stare, [147](#).  
Stephenson, H. F., [347](#),  
Stevenson, R. L., [317](#).  
Studemund, [51](#).  
sub, [50](#).  
summus for maximus, [168](#).  
super, [50](#).  
superior, [50](#).  
supremus, [197](#).  
sustuli, [247](#).  
  
[Talleyrand](#), [229](#).  
tam for turn, [226](#).  
tamen, [230](#).  
tametsi, [230](#).  
tantum quod, [236](#).  
tantummodo, [235](#).  
tapinosis, [414](#).  
temperi, [139](#).  
templa intemerata Minervae, [288](#).  
tempore and in tempore, [187](#).  
Tennyson, [315](#).  
terna for trina, [104](#).  
terno ordine, [109](#).  
-teros, [36](#).  
tertius, [42](#).  
Tertullian, [348](#).  
tetuli, [246](#).

Teucer, 11.  
 textit for detexit, 334.  
 Theseus, 13.  
 Thilo, 153, 334, 339.  
 threefold structure, 381.  
 Thumb, 32.  
 truncus, 193.  
 tum vero, 230.  
 Tyndaridarum fortissima, 57.  
 Tyrrell, R. Y., 220.  
  
 umquam for ante, 242.  
 unus et idem, 168.  
 unus for alter, 41.  
 Ursinus, 273.  
  
 Vahlen, 342.  
 Valerius Flaccus, 10.  
 Varro, 26, 185, 234.  
 Varro of Atax, 394.  
 vel, 120.  
 Veneres Cupidinesque, 65.  
 venia for pax, 182.  
 venire for esse, 154.  
 Verrall, A. W., 101.  
 versus, 137.  
 vertex, 194.  
 vicem, humanam, 61.  
 viginti, 27.  
 vixdum, 240.  
 Voaden, T., 423.  
 vocatote aliqui, 116.  
 volpecula, 413.  
 Vossius, 26, 49.  
  
 Wackernagel, 65.  
 Wagner, 63, 343.  
 Walde, 51, 192, 195, 233, 247, 349, 389.  
 Warren, Minton, 348.  
 we derived, 33.  
 Weissenborn, 221, 226.  
 Whitney, 58, 117, 121.  
 Wickham, 37, 57, 245, 340, 341, 359, 366.  
 Wilamowitz, 27.  
 Wilpert, 85, 86.  
 Wissowa, 16.  
 Woelfflin, 333, 398.  
  
 you derived, 33.  
  
 Zenodotus, 24, 82.  
 zeugma from loss of prefix, 335.  
 Zimmer, 65.  
 Zumpt, 198.

Printed in England at the Oxford University Press

[The end of *The Latin Dual and Poetic Diction* by Andrew J. Bell]