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.

69561

IN MEMORIAM SAMUELIS SOBIESKI NELLES
ET IOHANNIS THORBURN, VIRORUM ET
DOCTISSIMORUM ET SANCTISSIMORUM,
HUNC LIBRUM D.D.D. A.J.B.

2584

PREFACE

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 mis-
translation 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 investi-
gations 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 gram-
marians 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

II. GREEK AND LATIN DUALS

III. LATIN POETIC DICTION

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: gemini 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 lympha 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 iuvencis. 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 Iovem
> 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 Tibe-
rium 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 attri-
bute 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 Kar‖thaginis impiae.

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

  Reiectaeque retrors' ‖ Hannibalis minae,

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

  Dum flagrantia de‖torquet 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 Scipiadas, 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. akì, 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. 1. 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 ?

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 :

> Κάστορά θ' ἱππόδαμον καὶ πὺξ 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 Teucri* 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 pugnis 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 monstris
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 Teucri,
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 Teucri 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 men-
tioned 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 Iove 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 durum̃ 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 (ἠφάνισε) 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.'
> <div align="right">(Aen. 6. 616–20).</div>

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, Ixiona Pirithoumque (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 synedoche; the steeds are of like merit.

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 Pilumnum et Pitumnum 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 ψίθυρος '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 pūtidus. 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 sublatos (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 praematuro 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 (ἐνικός), 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. ἀμφότεροι (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 ἄλφιτα 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, Ἐλευσίνια, 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' ἵπποιϊν 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 ἁλόντε with γένησθε in:

μήπως, ὡς ἀψῖσι λίνου ἁλόντε πανάγρου

ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσιν ἕλωρ 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 benĕ and malĕ. 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 ἵππος 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 Com-
mentum Einsidlense (Suppl. 256. 3, K.) we find legēre confused with
the infinitive legĕre: 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 hence-
forth 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 Constanti-

nople 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 Ϝίκατι) and the Sanskrit viṅçati; 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 dedero (C. I. L. 14. 2891) Cestio is a dual.

The ending o found in ambo, octo, Pomplio, Cestio, seems the
ending in ἵππω and in the Skt. açvau, 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 divido. 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. açve, 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 aśve 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
laetitias insperatas modo mi irrepsere in sinum; under the lemma:
accusativus pro nominativo (500. 33, M.). But a comparison with
Umbrian and Oscan makes it probable that laetitias here is really
the old nominative plural, which was superseded by the dual laetitiae.
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 pro-
nominal 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 $\chi\omega\rho\acute{a}\omega\nu$, but $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\acute{o}\omega\nu$ 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.

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 intercalar 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 νῶϊ and σφῶϊ, 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 -ā for α stems, and in -ε for the rest; and the gen.-dat. ending in -αιν for α stems and in -οιν 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 νῶε for νῶϊ, which suggests that -ε is a degeneration from -ῑ, the ending still in use for pronouns and ϝίκατι. Probably this -ῑ is for ϝι, identical with vi, of which the reduced form v is part of the ending -ω (= au). In the gen.-dat. ἵπποιν is shortened from the Homeric ἵπποιῑν (= ἵπποιϝιν), and the relation of this -ϝιν to -ϝι 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 γούνός (= γονϝός) 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 σφῶϊ 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 νῶϊ, 'we two'. Homer has an older form, νώ (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 νῶϊ, and from it he forms a gen.-dat. νῶϊν. We feel that νώ is an old dual like in ending to δύω and ἄμφω; what then is νῶϊ? Brugmann thinks it is for an older νῶϝι, the -ϝι being the same as the ϝι in ϝίκατι and the vi- in viginti; so that νῶϝι is equivalent to 'we two two'. The Greek νώ 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 νώ 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. nå. 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 (= n̥s), 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 (= n̥sman), and in the Aeolic
ἄμμε (= n̥sme), the Skt. asma-, found in the dat. asmabhyām 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 ὕμμε, and
the Doric ὕμε, corresponding phonetically to the Skt. yuṣma- in the
instr. yuṣmābhis ' with you '. It passes to the Attic ὑμεῖς, formed like
ἡμεῖς, except that the rough breathing is not got by analogy, but
represents the Skt. y. The ν added in νῶϊν, σφῶϊν, ἡμῖν, and ὑμῖν is
probably the same that we have in ποσίν and ἀνδράσιν, though that
does not explain it, for it seems older in νῶϊν.

D

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 νῶϊ and νῶε are used for 'we two'; σφῶϊ is used for 'you two', and σφῶε for 'they two'. Brugmann's idea, that in σφῶϊ the φ is for an older ϝ and that it must be connected with σύ, seems most improbable. Both σφῶϊ and σφῶε are dual forms got from σφι after the analogy of νῶϊ and νῶε. Brugmann shows us (Vergl. Gr. II², p. 413) how from οὗ (= σϝοῦ) we get an instrumental σφι or σφιν, mistaken later for a dative and expanded to σφίσι or σφίσιν; how this develops a genitive σφέων, an accusative σφέας or σφέα, and a nominative σφεῖς. There can be little doubt that σφῶϊ and σφῶε 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 ἡμεῖς 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 ὑμεῖς 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 ἴθύνετε, φαίδιμ' Ὀδυσσεῦ (Od. 12. 82), προσέλθετ' ὦ παῖ (Soph. O. C. 1104), heus foras exite huc aliquis (Pl. Epid. 399), ibitis Aegeaeas 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, ἔντερα, 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 :

<div style="text-align:center">ubi Lydius arva</div>

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 :

<div style="text-align:center">hunc inter (lucum) fluvio Tiberinus amoeno
Verticibus rapidis et multa flavus arena
In mare prorumpit. (Aen. 7. 30–2.)</div>

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

Principio delubra adeunt pacemque per aras exquirunt

<div style="text-align:right">(Aen. 4. 56–7),</div>

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), ἀλλότριος, and reduplicated in ἀλλήλων, where the duals ἄλλω-ἄλλω passed to neuter plurals ἄλλα-ἄλλα, contracted to ἄλλᾱλα (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 follibus auras
> Accipiunt redduntque, alii stridentia tingunt
> Aera lacu. Gemit impositis incudibus antrum.
> Illi ·inter sese multa vi bracchia 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 ἔνιοι; it was once *onþer*; but the n is lost in 'other' just as the n of Gans and hanser is lost in goose. In Greek ἔνιοι 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
ἔνιοι '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; evi-
dently 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 ἔνιοι, 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 ali-
quando 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 . . . difficilius reperient (Quintil. 4. 2. 38), quamvis non alius flectere equum sciens aeque conspicitur gramine Martio, nec quisquam citus aeque Tusco denatat alveo (Od. 3. 7. 25-8) (where alius is balanced by quisquam), Eridanus, quo non alius per pinguia 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 pulcrior (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 conversaque 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 exspectes, alteri quod feceris (Com. Inc. 82), geminae . . . portae, quarum altera . . . aliam (Val. Fl. 1. 833-5), duo agmina parant quorum altero populatores 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 σκαϝιός, Latin scaevus).   No doubt δεξι- and σκαϝι- 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 quicum-
que 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 rogitabam . . . 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 forsan 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. Cette 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 ἕτεροι 'and the others'. For ἕτεροι the Doric ἅτεροι seems the older form, being for smteroi 'the one party of the two' (cf. ἕν 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:

> Obstipuere 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 triticum the use of the nominative is easy, but caeterus vir would be impossible. Still we have masculine collectives; and Gesner [1] 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 traiectus (Liv. 21. 27. 6). Ceterum the conjunction, and cetera are got from the same construction as we have in: cetera Graius (Aen. 3. 594).

---

[1] 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 *quoteros, 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. II², 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 anteferret (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 ἔτι 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 'when-
soever', 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
officiat (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 invidorum
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 filiatra 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.

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, ὀφθαλμώ, χεῖρε, πόδε, μηρώ in Greek, showed how it passed on to two objects usually found paired, like ἵππω 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, aud 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 Πολύδωρον,
> 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 ἄρνε δύω 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 :

> ὄσσε δ' ἄρα σφέων
> δακρυόφιν πίμπλαντο, γόον δ' ὤίετο 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 θύραι εἰσίν (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 :

αἴ 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, ὡς ἀψῖσι λίνου ἁλόντε πανάγρου,
ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσιν ἕλωρ 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 :

ὡς δ' ὅτε χείμαρροι 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' ἐθέλοιμεν Ἀχαιοί τε Τρῶές τε
ὅρκια πιστὰ ταμόντες ἀριθμηθήμεναι 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 (11. 9-10). When we compare: tum pendere poenas Cecropidae iussi, miserum, septena quotannis corpora natorum (6. 20-2) with Theseus's words in Euripides:

$$\sigma\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\varsigma\ \kappa\acute{o}\rho\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$$
$$\delta\grave{\iota}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\tau\acute{\alpha},\ \tau\alpha\hat{\upsilon}\rho\sigma\nu\ K\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\sigma\iota\sigma\nu\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\tau\alpha\nu\acute{\omega}\nu\ \text{(H. F. 1326-7)},$$

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: $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\omega\ \kappa\alpha\nu\acute{o}\nu\epsilon\sigma\sigma'\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\rho\upsilon\hat{\iota}\alpha\nu$ (Il. 13. 407), I have no right to say that $\kappa\alpha\nu\acute{o}\nu\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ is a dative plural used for an older dative dual $\kappa\alpha\nu\acute{o}\nu\sigma\iota\iota\nu$: Homer has no such dual. Of natural pairs $\acute{o}\sigma\sigma\epsilon$ is the only one he uses always in the dual; he never uses $\pi\acute{o}\delta\epsilon$, though he has $\pi\sigma\delta\sigma\hat{\iota}\iota\nu$; $\chi\epsilon\hat{\iota}\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ is far commoner with him than $\chi\epsilon\hat{\iota}\rho\epsilon$, and in:

$$\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \dot{\rho}'\ \dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\mu\acute{o}\rho\xi\alpha\tau\sigma\ \chi\epsilon\rho\sigma\grave{\iota}\ \pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\grave{\alpha}\varsigma\ \phi\acute{\omega}\nu\eta\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\epsilon\ \text{(Od. 18. 200),}$$

' 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 $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ was a mark of the later use of the dual, as opposed to the natural use; that $\ddot{\iota}\pi\pi\omega$ meant the team, but

δύω ἵππω any two horses from the herd. But uses like δύω Αἴαντε (Il. 18. 163), Ἀτρείδα δύω (Il. 1. 16) make me feel that the effect of δύω, 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 νῖκαι, 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, δεσπόται 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 τέγεοι θάλα-μοι (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 incomitata 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 tmesis 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 Tyn-daridarum 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. II². 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. dliged, 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, ἡ, and ῥίν, τό, as well as ῥῖνες 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 spectat acervos (Od. 2. 2. 23–4) or: solus multisne coheres, veloci percurre oculo (Sat. 2. 5. 54–5)? We read in Horace: non istic 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 utrum-
que 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 : gemini ... inmensis orbibus angues (Aen. 2. 203–4),
geminae columbae (6. 190), geminae belli portae (7. 607), geminae
somni portae (6. 893), geminae quercus (9. 681), huc geminas nunc
flecte acies (6. 788), geminae stant 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 bracchia 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 : gemini (gemino) sub ubere nati, an abbrevia-
tion 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 (geminae) 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 ā for α-stems following the analogy of duals like ἵππω. We see this beginning in Homer, not for feminines, but for masculines like Ἀτρείδᾱ; 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 χεροῖν and τοῖν χεροῖν, τὰ κόρα and τὼ στήλα. Attraction played its part, as we see from ἀμφοῖν τοῖν χεροῖν, but ταύταιν ταῖν ἀδελφαῖν. The form ταῖν seems to have developed for the article before τά; Plato and the Orators have ταῖν ὁδοῖν, but τὼ ὁδώ, Sophocles and Aristophanes write τὰ κόρα, but τὼ 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 vertas 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 geminae nares (Geo. 4. 300), geminas aures (Culex

150), geminos lacertos (Moretum 21), geminas acies (Aen. 6. 788), showing that gemini 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 geminae 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 :

$$\tau \grave{o} \nu \ . \ . \ . \ \grave{o} \ \mu \grave{e} \nu \ i \hat{\omega}$$
$$\beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \acute{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \iota \ \tau \epsilon \lambda \alpha \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \alpha \ \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\iota} \ \sigma \tau \acute{\eta} \theta \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota \ \phi \alpha \epsilon \iota \nu \acute{o} \nu \ (\text{Il. 12. 400-1}),$$

and :

$$\eta \ \tau' \ \grave{a} \nu \grave{a} \ \nu \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha \ \theta \acute{\epsilon} o \upsilon \sigma \alpha \ \delta \iota \alpha \mu \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\epsilon} s \ \alpha \dot{\upsilon} \chi \acute{\epsilon} \nu' \ \iota \kappa \acute{a} \nu \epsilon \iota \ (\text{Il. 13. 547}),$$

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 Varuṇā, the two Mitras, the two Varuṇas, for Mitra and Varuṇa; or in pitarau-mātarau, 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 Varuṇa, just as in Greek ᾿Ατρείδα for Agamemnon and Menelaus (Il. 1. 16), or in Latin Castores for Castor and Pollux. But at times uses like Mitrā 'the two Mitras' 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 Varuṇaś ca navam (R. V. 7. 88. 3) 'when we two and Varuṇa get on board the ship', with the meaning 'when I and Varuṇa 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, πολέμου ἀκορήτω,
ἑσταότας, Τεῦκρόν τε νέον κλισίηθεν ἰόντα (Il. 12. 335–6),

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

τὶν δ' ἐν ᾿Ισθμῷ διπλόα θάλλοισ' ἀρετά,
Φυλακίδα, κεῖται, Νεμέᾳ δὲ καὶ ἀμφοῖν
Πυθέᾳ 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 Πυθέᾳ τε by ἀμφοτέροις ὑμῖν, σοί τε καὶ τῷ Πυθέᾳ, 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 Alcmanicum, as we see it in :

$$\text{ἧχι ῥοὰς Σιμόεις συμβάλλετον ἠδὲ Σκάμανδρος}\ (\text{Il. 5. 774}),$$

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. Aśvinau, 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 trī, '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 ἄλογος, have often only two forms, and that some, like ἴφθιμος, are of either two or three forms in Homer; cf. ἰφθίμους ψυχάς (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 multeity 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 αἵματα, and Latin cruor and cruores; in Greek we have ζειά and ζειαί, in Latin far and farra; Greek has for 'fat' only στέαρ, but Latin adeps and adipes; 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 pones super concisas 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. Ὕδωρ 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 Ὕδατα 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 κρῖ occurs eight times in the Homeric poems. No Greek word ends in θ, and so he cannot write κρῖθ, of which κριθή 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 . . . ἀγροιῶται (Il. 11. 676); but in Attic Greek the reverse is the case. Plato has still ὁ πολὺς λεώς, but the herald's cry: ἀκούετε λεώ, 'hear, O people !', our Oyez, oyez, shows the prevalence of the plural.   In Aristophanes λεώ seems the equivalent of plebs; in N.T. Greek λαοί becomes specialized as the opposite of κλῆροι.   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 plebeii 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 : ὀκτακισχιλίην ἀσπίδα (Herod. 5. 30), or : παρμένοντας αἰχμᾷ (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 :

ὣς 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 : φανερὰ ἦσαν καὶ ἵππων καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἴχνη 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 ὑγρὰ 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 μέγαρα 'the hall', and then passes to ἡ οἰκία in Attic
with a new plural αἱ αἰκίαι, 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 con-
currebant (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 saecli 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 habitudost corporis (Ter. Eun. 242), passes to 'blossoms' in : aurave distinctos educit verna colores (Catull. 64. 90), and to 'gauds' in : furtivis nudata 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).

USE OF THE PLURAL FOR THE SINGULAR

HOMER uses οἰκία and μέγαρα, neuters plural, for a single house and a single hall. As in Greek we have οἶκος ὁ and οἰκία τά for a single house, so in Sanskrit we have gṛham, a neuter singular, and gṛhās, masculine plural, for a house; and Boehtlingk-Roth explain this use of gṛhās 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. αἴθω ' I burn '), but in the plural a house, which consisted of several rooms. In Horace's: te . . . Glycerae 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. 'Ορχομενός, Δαφνοῦς (= δαφνόεις ' abounding in laurel '), Σικυών ' the cucumber bed ', Μαραθών ' abounding in fennel'; many of them being clearly epithets of τόπος. But some, like 'Αθῆναι 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 Fidena 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 Μυκήνη 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 Veiique in armis erant (5. 1. 1). Veientes like Falisci is evidently a later formation. And in Greek we read of Delphi in Herodotus: Κροῖσος . . . πέμψας αὖτις ἐς Πυθώ, Δελφοὺς δωρέεται (1. 54).

Turning to common names of places, we have λιμήν or λιμένες for the harbour in Greek, ὄχθη or ὄχθαι for the river bank, δυσμή the sunset but δυσμαί the west, ἀκτή 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 βιός, 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 πυράγρα 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 braccae is used for the breeches, as is brax as well as braces. Clitellae is usual for the saddle, but the singular forms cletella, cretella, cratella occur in the glosses. Molae 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 ἅρμα and ἅρματα. Scala is a step, and scalae a collec-tion 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. Kalendae is used for the first day of the month, Idus for the middle, and Nonae 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 ἦμαρ (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 :

<div style="text-align:center">

παρῴχωκεν δὲ πλέων νὺξ

τῶν δύο μοιράων, τριτάτη δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται (Il. 10. 252–3).
</div>

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 nundinae the market day, nuptiae the wedding, and exsequiae the funeral seem to be epithets. By analogy we get epulae the banquet, funera the funeral, tenebrae 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, ὦτα, ῥῖνες, oculi, genae, 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 ἰατρικῆς

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 ὅμως ἔτι ἥσσω 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 expolitior 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 : τῇδε γὰρ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ μυρίους ὄψονται ἀνθ' ἑνὸς Κλεάρχους (Anab. 3. 2. 31), and in : οὐκ ἔφη νοῦν ἔχειν αὐτοὺς εἰ μὴ πολλοὺς ἐν τῷ παιδὶ τούτῳ Μαρίους 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 minutos 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 parasitos 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 luscos 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 focis (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 ὠδῖνες, 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 μήν, primarily the moon, has
come to mean the month, and there is formed from it a secondary
ἡ μήνη 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 (= οὖς), 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.

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. νώ, 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 νώ, 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 σφωί-τερος, 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 σφωι θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε 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, ἕ, and so with all plurals, ἡμᾶς, ὑμᾶς, 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 ἕ (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 σφῶι: that is clear from its accent. Its ending is the -ω that we have in ἵππω ; νώ and σφώ are old duals meaning ' we two ' and ' they two ', to which the suffix -ι (=Ϝι), 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, ὔμμε, 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 σφὼ . . . ἐριδαίνετον (Il. 1. 574) Hephaestus is addressing Hera, but speaking of Zeus and her. In : σφὼ δὲ μαλ᾽ 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 ὔμμ' for Achilles and Patroclus, expressed by σφώ 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, σφὼ μέν τε σαώσετε (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 : τοῖιν δ' ἔγνω πρόσθεν Ὀϊλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας (v. 66). Finally in : Ζεὺς σφὼ εἰς Ἴδην κέλετ' ἐλθέμεν (Il. 15. 146) we have both Apollo and Iris addressed by Hera, and the two plurals ἔλθητε and ἴδησθε (v. 147) referring back to σφώ as their subject ; so that σφώ here is treated as identical with ὑμᾶς. But in three of the four uses of σφώ, of the two persons, the one inferior in rank or importance is the one addressed.

Homer uses σφῶϊ five times in the nominative. In : ἔμβητον καὶ σφῶϊ (Il. 23. 403) it is addressed to the horses of Antilochus, and in : φράζεσθον δὴ σφῶϊ, Πόσειδαον 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 σφῶϊ . . . ἔπετον κρέα (Il. 11. 776), of Achilles and Patroclus, Patroclus is addressed ; and in : σφῶϊ δ' ἀποστρέψαντε πόδας (Od. 22. 173), of Eumaeus and Melanthius, Melanthius is addressed ; but in :

Αἶαν, σφῶϊ μὲν αὖθι, σὺ καὶ κρατερὸς Λυκομήδης,
ἑσταότες Δαναοὺς ὀτρύνετον (Il. 12. 366-7),

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

Homer uses σφῶϊ 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 Talthybius and Eurybates. One (Il. 7. 280) is used by the two

chief heralds of the Greeks and Trojans, Talthybius 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 Diomede 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 σφῶϊ, but σφῶε, being perhaps determined by the analogy of νῶϊ and νῶε.

Σφῶϊν 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 σφῶϊν 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 σφῷν 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, σφώ 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'.

Σφώ is probably derived from σφίν (= σϝ-φιν) the instrumental of

οὗ (= σϝ-ου) on the analogy of νώ. The pronoun οὗ 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 σφωΐτερος, which is 'of you two' in Il. 1. 216. Just as σφε is used for σφώ or σφωέ, so σφωΐτερος 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 ζῷα τρέχει, thinks Riemann, certain poets, and especi-
ally 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 ἥδισται
ὅταν γαμῇ τις κἀκφέρῃ 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 ἱδρῷ νωλεμὲς αἰεὶ
γούνατά τε κνῆμαί τε πόδες θ᾽ ὑπένερθεν ἑκάστου
χεῖρές τ᾽ ὀφθαλμοί τε παλάσσετο μαρναμένοιϊν
ἀμφ᾽ ἀγαθὸν θεράποντα ποδώκεος Αἰακίδαο (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 ὄσσε takes the singular thrice in Homer. This view of the
construction is strengthened when we turn to :

πνοιῇ δ᾽ Εὐμήλοιο μετάφρενον εὐρέε τ᾽ ὤμω
θέρμετ᾽ (Il. 23. 380–1),

and we feel it natural to compare this with:

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

and still more when we turn to: εἰ ἔστιν τούτω διττὼ τὼ βίω (Plat. Gorg. 500 D), or to:

ἡμῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἔστ᾽ οὔτε κάρυ᾽ ἐκ φορμίδος
δούλω διαρρίπτοῦντε 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 μέν νυν καὶ τὰ Κύπρια ἔπεα χαιρέτω (Hdt. 2. 118).

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

ἦ τοι ἐμοὶ χλαῖναι καὶ ῥήγεα σιγαλόεντα
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 δικαίω εἶναι γίγνηται ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης ἀρχαί τε καὶ γάμοι (Plat. Rep. 363 A), or in: ἔστι μέν που καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλεσιν ἄρχοντές τε καὶ δῆμος (ib. 463 A), or in: σκέλη μὲν οὖν χεῖρές τε ταύτῃ καὶ διὰ ταῦτα προσέφυ πᾶσιν (Plat. Tim. 45 A), or in: ἀφ᾽ ὧν ἐμοὶ ξενίαι καὶ φιλότητες πρὸς πολλοὺς καὶ βασιλέας 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᾽ ἔπι χεῖρες οὐδὲ πόδες (Hdt. 6. 86 γ´ 2) ἔπι 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 ὤμους (Hym. in Cer. 279),

and in :

ἐκ δέ οἱ ὤμων
ἦν ἑκατὸν κεφαλαὶ ὄφιος (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 :

<div align="center">

ἐν δ᾽ ἀγαθοῖσι κεῖται

πατρῶϊαι κεδναὶ πολίων κυβερνάσιες (Pind. Pyth. 10. 71–2),
</div>

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 :

<div align="center">

μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι

ὑστέρων ἀρχαὶ λόγων

τέλλεται   (Ol. 11. 4–6).
</div>

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

<div align="center">

ἦν δ᾽ ἀμφίπλεκτοι κλίμακες

ἦν δὲ μετώπων ὀλόεντα

πλήγματα καὶ στόνος ἀμφοῖν (Soph. Trach. 520–2),
</div>

or :   ἐνῆν δ᾽ ὑφαντὰι γράμμασιν τοιαίδ᾽ ὑφαί (Eur. Ion 1146),
or : διήγεται σάρκες (Pind. Fr. 183), where σάρκες is the Latin caro,
or in :

<div align="center">

μέγα τοι δύναται νεβρῶν παμποίκιλοι στολίδες

(Eur. Hel. 1358),
</div>

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 μεταξὺ 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 ὡσεὶ 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 ὁρμῆς αἱ Πελοποννησίων νῆες ἐς
Ἰωνίαν ἐκείνοις βοηθοὶ τολμήσασαι παρακινδυνεῦσαι (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 ἐμαί, τάλαντον δ' Εὐέργου (Dem. 37. 4).

Our reference to il est leads us naturally to the use of ἔστιν οἵ for ἔνιοι, as we see it in : ἐνταῦθα δὴ οἱ βάλλοντες ταῖς βολαῖς ἔστιν οἳ καὶ ἐτύγχανον καὶ θωράκων καὶ γέρρων, οἱ δὲ καὶ μηροῦ καὶ κνημῖδος (Xen. Cyr. 2. 3. 18). We find ἔστιν ἅ for ἔνια in : καὶ (Κλεόπομπος) ἀποβάσεις ποιησάμενος τῆς τε παραθαλασσίου ἔστιν ἃ (χωρία) ἐδήωσε καὶ Θρόνιον εἷλεν (Thuc. 2. 26. 2). Ἔστιν ἅ 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 ἅ the primary meaning of the first two syllables would be obscured to some extent, just as in ἔνια the primary force of ἔνι- 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 οἵ was the last.

The idiom belongs to prose, and appears first in Herodotus. But neither Herodotus nor Thucydides gives us ἔστιν οἵ, which we find first in Xenophon. Herodotus has : εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ λέγουσι τοὺς ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου νικῆσαι Πολυκράτεα (3. 45) ; and Thucydides : εἰσὶ δὲ αἳ καὶ οἰκήτορας μετέβαλον ἁλισκόμεναι (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 : αὐχμοί 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 οὓς ἐγὼ ἐπαινῶ καὶ φιλῶ (Prot. 346 E) and in Xenophon : ἔστι δὲ ἃς ἂν καὶ πόλεις τῆς ἀναγραφῆς ὀρεγομένας (Vect. 3. 11). Last of all we come to ἔστιν οἵ in the example first cited ; but even in later Greek εἰσὶν οἵ seems more usual. Propertius has imitated ἔστιν οἷς in :

   Est quibus Eleae concurrit 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 ἅ, parallel to ἔνια, in about fifty years we come to ἔστιν οἵ, 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 ἐνίοτε (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 θειότατον 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 τόν 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 ἔπλεον, ἐν τοῖς πλεῖσται δὴ νῆες ἅμ' αὐτοῖς ἐνεργοὶ κάλλει ἐγένοντο, παραπλήσιαι 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 ὠμὴ ἡ στάσις προυχώρησε, καὶ ἔδοξε μᾶλλον, διότι ἐν τοῖς πρώτη ἐγένετο (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 ἡ 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 πλείστου 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 ἐγώ, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκῶ, ἐν τοῖς βαρύτατ' 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
ὡμολογηκὼς 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 ψυχή) 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) παρεγεγόνει δ' ἐν
τῇ συνουσίᾳ, Σωκράτους ἐραστὴς 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
ἑταῖρον εἶναί 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 Ἅγνωνος ἐν τοῖς ξυγκαταλύουσι 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 τόν 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 re-
strictive 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 πλεῖσται 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 πρῶτον 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 πρῶτον.   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 δὲ 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 con-
struction.   In:

Nescio quid profecto absente nobis turbatumst domi

<div align="right">(Ter. Eun. 649),</div>

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 ἀρχαϊσμός est 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 ab-
solute, 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 preposi-
tion 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 sub-
stantival infinitive as found in : τούτων οὐχὶ νῦν ὁρῶ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ
λέγειν (Dem. 2. 4). But what is the relation of τοῦ λέγειν to nomi-
nandi ? 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 exem-
plorum eligendi potestas (Inv. 2. 5. 2), quarum potiendi spe in-
flammati (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 diripiendi-
que pomorum et opsoniorum rerumque omnium missilium (Suet. Aug.

98. 3). Fronto has : tantus usus studiorum bonarumque artium com-
municandi (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 gerun-
dive 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 copiast (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 ὦρτο 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 :

ὅθι νητὸς χρυσὸς καὶ χαλκὸς ἔκειτο
ἐσθής τ’ ἐν χηλοῖσιν ἅλις τ’ εὐῶδες ἔλαιον (Od. 2. 338–9),

or in :

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

or :

ἀλλ’ εὐγενὴς μὲν ὁ κτανών τε χὠ θανών (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
ἀρετή (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 con-
structed 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 (Rosc. 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 compro-
baverint (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 dis-
crimine 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 ἤ, 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:

<div align="center">

οὐδ' ἐδύναντο
οὔθ' ὁ τὸν ἐξελάσαι καὶ ἐνιπρῆσαι πυρὶ νῆα
οὔθ' ὁ τὸν ἂψ ὤσασθαι (Il. 15. 416–8),

</div>

and in a fragment of Bacchylides: θνατοῖσι δ' οὐκ αὐθαίρετοι οὔτ'
ὄλβος οὔτ' ἄκαμπτος Ἄρης οὔτε πάμφθερσις στάσις (Fr. 36, B.), and in
Euripides: καί μ' οὔθ' ὁ Πλούτωνος κύων οὔθ' οὑπὶ κώπῃ ψυχοπομπὸς ἂν
Χάρων ἔσχον (Alc. 360–2); and with ἤ in: ὅταν ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἀδελφή τῳ
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 . . . ἆθλά τε
καὶ μισθοὶ καὶ δῶρα γίγνεται (Plat. Rep. 614 A). But in: ἡμεῖς δή, 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 εἴδη 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 Varuṇā, 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 Varuṇā '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 πώλων ὠκέων δματῆρες, ἱππόται σοφοί, καὶ Πολυδεύκης κυδρός (Fr. 9); this was probably before the retrogressive assimilation: Κάστορές τε πώλων 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: Λᾶσός 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:

ᾗχι ῥοὰς Σιμόεις συμβάλλετον ἠδὲ Σκάμανδρος (Il. 5. 774),
where we still see the dual, the primary number of the figure. This dual has become plural in:

H

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 ἤ for καί or δέ in:

εἰ δέ κ' Ἄρης ἄρχωσι μάχης ἢ 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 ἥβᾳ, τὸν δ' Ἔρυτον

(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, other-
wise 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: Ἀτρείδα ... δύω (Il. 1. 16), or Αἴαντε 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: Αἴαντές τε δύω (Il. 13. 313), δύω κήρυκας
(Il. 3. 116), δύω ἵππους (Il. 8. 290), δύω νύκτας δύο τ' ἤματα (Od. 9. 74),
and Αἴαντε δύω, θεράποντες Ἄρηος (Il. 10. 228). With ἄμφω the dual
is more the rule, since the plural ἀμφότεροι is in use; but we find it
with the plural in the Odyssey: ἄμφω χεῖρας (8. 135), ὀφθαλμοί τε καὶ
οὔατα 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), ὄσσε
φαεινά (Il. 13. 435).

The use of the masculine dual in: τώ γ' ὡς 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:

ἴτον προλιπόντ' ἀνθρώπους Αἰδὼς καὶ Νέμεσις (199–200).

We must remember that by this time the old dual for -a stems had become a nominative plural, and the new dual in -a was not yet developed except for masculines like Ἀτρείδα (Il. 1. 16), αἰχμητά (Il. 7. 281), ἵππω ὠκύπετα (Il. 8. 41–2), Αἴαντε 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 τὼ πόλεε (5. 23. 1), in Xenophon : ἄμφω τούτω τὼ ἡμέρα (Cyr. 1. 2. 11), but Sophocles gives us :

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

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

For the first dual Homer uses νῶϊ (νώ 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 περιδώμεθον (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. 1ʳᵉ 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 ἑάς for ἡμετέρας, following the use of ἑαυτόν for ἐμαυτόν. 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:

αἴ 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:

σκευή τε γάρ σε καὶ τὸ δύστηνον κάρα
δηλοῦτον ἡμῖν ὄνθ' ὃς εἶ (Soph. O. C. 555–6),

σκευή is felt as a collective singular. In:

αὐτανεψίω πατὴρ ἂν εἴη σός τε καὶ τούτων γεγώς
(Eur. Heraclid. 211–12),

the use of γεγώς for γεγῶτε in agreement with αὐτανεψίω is due to the attraction of the intervening εἴη. In Il. 5. 487–8 we noticed the union of ἁλόντε with γένησθε, where the Scholiast explained ἁλόντε as in agreement with σὺ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι to be supplied. Pindar gives us:

σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυᾷ·
μαθόντες δὲ λάβροι
παγγλωσσίᾳ κόρακες ὣς 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, ἀφεμένω τούτου τράποιντο πρὸς τὸ διακωλύειν ἀλλήλω, ἢ εἰ τὼ πόδε θείᾳ μοίρᾳ πεποιημένω 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 νὼϊ 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:

<blockquote>Non milli nummum potes uno quaerere centum,</blockquote>

'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 sm-ghes-le, corresponding mutatis mutandis to the Skt. sa-has-ra, and cognate with χίλιοι (older *χεσλιοι). Gellius cites χίλιον in this connexion, and we have in Herodotus χιλίην ἵππον 'a thousand horse' (5. 63. 3). Sm is the reduced form of sem ($= ἕν$), 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 dekm dkmtom '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 διςμύριος 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 ἀγρός) 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 his 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:

<div align="center">en quattuor aras:</div>
<div align="center">Ecce duas tibi, Daphni, duas altaria Phoebo (Buc. 5. 65–6),</div>

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 Phoebo, 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 divide- rentur (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 in dies (Pl. Pers. 471), nam ex eis praediis talenta argenti bina statim capiebat (Ter. Phorm. 789–90), where statim is for quo- tannis. So in : quotannis annui bini reges creabantur (Nep. Hann. 7. 4), neque ... quicquam ... findi in bina secando (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 : militibus 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 trans-
figi 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 serta 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 incoluere 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 :

<div align="center">
αὐτὰρ ὀπίσσω
ἡ πληθὺς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν ἀπονέοντο (Il. 15. 304–5),
</div>

and : ἅμα δὲ ἔῳ γιγνομένῃ 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 οἴκόνδε ἔκαστος (Il. 1. 606) and : τότε μὲν δὴ ταῦτ' εἰπόντες ἀπῆλθον ἑκάτερος ἐπὶ τὰ προσήκοντα (Xen. Cyr. 5. 2. 22); in : loquere, uter meruistis 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 σῖτον ὅπως ἐδύνατο ἐκ τῶν ὑποζυγίων κόπτοντες τοὺς βοῦς καὶ ὄνους (Xen. Anab. 2. 1. 6), παντί τε τρόπῳ ἀνηρέθιστο ἡ 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 revenerat, miracula narrabant (Tac. Ann. 2. 24. 6).

Far more common is the parallel construction with τὶς in Greek, as we see it in : ἦ ἄρα δή τις, ὅσαι θεαί εἰσ' ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ (Il. 18. 429), and : ἧσσόν τις ἐμοὶ πρόσεισι, δυσχερὲς ποιούμενοι (Thuc. 4. 85. 6), ἦ μάλα τις θεὸς ἔνδον, οἳ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν (Od. 19. 40), αὐχμηρός γέ τις ὢν καὶ ἀπὸ παντὸς περιουσίαν ποιούμενος θησαυροποιὸς ἀνήρ· οὓς δὴ καὶ ἐπαινεῖ τὸ πλῆθος (Plat. Rep. 554 A). So, too, we find τὶς

in a dependent clause, joined with a plural pronoun in the principal sentence, in: ἐάν τις φανερὸς γένηται κλέπτων ἢ λωποδυτῶν ἢ βαλαντιοτομῶν ... τούτοις θάνατός ἐστιν ἡ ζημία (Xen. Mem. 1. 2. 62), ἢν 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 τὶς, as in:

> ἄλλους μὲν γὰρ παῖδας ἐμοὺς πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεὺς
> πέρνασχ᾽, ὅν τιν᾽ ἕλεσκε, πέρην ἁλὸς ἀτρυγέτοιο
>
> (Il. 24. 751–2),

and in:

> οἵτε καὶ ἄλλους
> ἀνθρώπους πέμπουσιν, ὅτις σφέας εἰσαφίκηται (Od. 20. 187–8),

and: πάντας ἑξῆς, ὅτῳ ἐντύχοιεν, ... καὶ γυναῖκας κτείνοντες (Thuc. 7. 29. 4), and: ὧτινι 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, quoius mos maximest consimilis vostrum, ei se ad vos adplicant (Ter. Heaut. 392–3), where quoius 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 ποιέοιεν 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 οὐδείς implies πάντες with which πενθοῦντες is really in agreement. So with ἤρασσον in: εἶτ᾽ ὀνείδεσιν ἤρασσον ἔνθεν κἄνθεν οὔ τις ἔσθ᾽ ὃς οὔ (Soph. Ajax 724–5). But οὐδείς, which in older Greek is used only in the singular, and in Homer only in the neuter singular except in the phrase: τὸ ὃν μένος οὐδενὶ εἴκων, in later Greek develops a plural οὐδένες. So we read: ἄρχουσι δὲ οὐδένες ἔτι αὐτῶν ἀλλ᾽ αὐτονόμους ἀφιᾶσι (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 οὐδείς, but οὐδαμός (= oude-sṃ-mos), and usually makes it plural, as in: οὐδαμοὶ Ἰώνων (1. 18), οὐδαμοῖσι τῶν νῦν σφέας περιοικεόντων (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 δεινά and δῆλα by the following plurals δεινά and σύμμαχοι. So, too, in: οὐκ ἂν ποιέοιεν τούτων οὐδέτερα (Herod. 7. 103). We have similar attraction, though not now through dependent genitives, but through preceding plurals, in: δεῖξαι αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὐκ Ἴωνες τάδε εἰσίν (Thuc. 6. 77) and: οὓς οὐ παραδοτέα τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἐστίν, οὐδὲ 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 ποιεύμενος 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 δή ἐστιν ἄττα 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), intellegetis 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 vigilias 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 . . . certiorem 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 fecis-
sent Gellius cum Turio (14. 2. 26), and we read in Terence :

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

Nepos has : Demosthenes cum ceteris . . . in exsilium 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 siccat
(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᾽ ἑταίρα μεθ᾽ ἑτέρων (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).

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE IMPERATIVE
IN LATIN

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 :

$$\mathring{\eta} \ \pi\epsilon\rho \ \mathring{a}\nu \ \mathring{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\hat{\iota}s$$
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 huc 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 exite 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 εἰσάγγελλε 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 ὡς τάχος
ἐλθὼν δὲ θάκους τοῦδ᾽ ἵν᾽ οἰωνοσκοπεῖ
μοχλοῖς τριαίνου κἀνάτρεψον ἔμπαλιν
ἄνω κάτω τὰ πάντα συγχέας ὁμοῦ,
καὶ στέμματ᾽ ἀνέμοις καὶ θυέλλαισιν μέθες (ib. 346 ff.).

The use of τὶς for σύ in:

τοῦτ᾽ εἰς ἀνίαν τοὔπος ἔρχεταί τινι (Soph. Aj. 1138),

and in: κακὸν ἥκει τινί ... δώσει τις δίκην (Ar. Ran. 552-4) makes it easier to understand the use of τὶς with the second person. Its transference to the third is intelligible from such uses as: καὶ μηδείς 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 τὶς, 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 ... ἕρπε πᾶς κατ᾽ ἴχνος αὐτῶν (Eur. Rhes. 681 ff.),

or:

ἄγε νῦν ἄγε πᾶς (Ar. Pax 512),

or:

χώρει 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, ἁμαρτάνοις ἄν we may say : εἰ τοῦτο ποιεῖς, ἁμάρτανε. 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, ὡς δὲ σὺ ῥέζειν (Il. 22. 259), and in return we have the imperative used for the infinitive in : ὥστε μὴ λίαν στένε (Soph. El. 1172), or : ἐγὼ νὴ Δί' ἐρῶ καὶ γράψω δέ, ὥστε, ἂν βούλησθε, χειροτονήσατε (Dem. 129. 83 b). So, if ἁμάρτανε is used for ἁμαρτάνοις ἄν, we may get ἁμάρτανε ἄν, ἁμάρτανε being felt as equivalent to ἁμαρτάνοις. 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 τὶς and quis lie older interrogatives ; so that in παῖε πᾶς τις ἄν we have ' let all strike ; who in that case will ? ' ; or in : ἴτω τις ' 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 μίμνετε πάντες (Il. 2. 331), but : ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' οἳ ἐξ πρῶτον ἀκοντίσατ' (Od. 22. 252), εἰπέ μοι, τί φειδόμεσθα τῶν λίθων, ὦ δημόται (Ar. Acharn. 319), φέρε, στήσωμεν ἡμέων αὐτῶν βασιλέα (Herod. 1. 97), but : φέρετε, τούτους ἀνευρόντες συγχέειν πειρᾶσθε αὐτούς (id. 4. 127), ἴδ' οἷον, ὦ παῖδες, προσέμειξεν ἄφαρ τοὔπος τὸ θεοπρόπον ἡμῖν (Soph. Trach. 821–2), εἰπέ μοι, ὦ Σώκρατές τε καὶ Ἱππόκρατες, ὡς τίνι ὄντι τῷ Πρωταγόρᾳ ἐν νῷ ἔχετε χρήματα τελεῖν (Plat. Prot. 311 D), εἰπέ μοι, ἔφη, ὦ Σώκατές 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 (Rosc. 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 de-
signating 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 . . . ἰθύνετε, φαίδιμ’ Ὀδυσσεῦ (Od. 12. 82), or :
προσέλθετ’, ὦ παῖ, πατρί (Soph. O. C. 1104), or :

> χωρεῖτε τοίνυν, ὦ Διόνυσ’, εἴσω. τί δαί;
> ἵνα ξενίσω σφὼ πρὶν ἀποπλεῖν (Ar. Ran. 1479–80),

or : ἴτ’, ἔφη, ὑμεῖς, ὦ Ἡριππίδα, καὶ διδάσκετε (Xen. Hell. 4. 1. 11).
It is extended to the indicative in : ὦ τέκνον, ἦ παρέστον ; (Soph. O. C.
1102), or : Ἀντίνο’, οὔπως ἔστιν ὑπερφιάλοισι μεθ’ ὑμῖν δαίνυσθαι (Od. 2.
310–11), or : Τιμόσθενες, ὔμμε δ’ ἐκλάρωσεν πότμος Ζηνὶ γενεθλίῳ (Pind.
Ol. 8. 19–20), or : καθῆσθαί μοι δοκεῖ εἰς τὸ Θησεῖον πλεούσαις (Ar.

Eq. 1311–12). We have the opposite in: ξεῖνοι, μὴ δῆτ' ἀδικηθῶ σοι πιστεύσας καὶ μετανάστας (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, Ἴδηθεν μεδέων, κύδιστε, μέγιστε,
Ἥλιός θ' ὃς 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 δεύρω 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 οὗτος, being a reduced form of αὖ 'again'. For the shortening to the usual form δεῦρο, compare ἄμᾰ 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 καταβήομεν (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: αὖθι μένειν (Il. 10. 65), or co-ordinate with an imperative, as in: ἔρχεσθον κλισίην . . . Ἀχιλῆος . . . ἀγέμεν Βρισηΐδα (Il. 1. 322-3), and with a future indicative in: εὐνάσω ἐξείης· σὺ δ᾽ εὖ κρίνασθαι ἑταίρους (Od. 4. 408). It is used in a prohibition in: μὴ δή μοι ἀπόπροθεν ἰσχέμεν ἵππους (Il. 17. 501), and is repeated in this use in: ἀλλ᾽ εὖ οἱ φάσθαι πυκινὸν ἔπος ἠδ᾽ ὑποθέσθαι καί 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, ἢ Ἀίαντα λαχεῖν (Il. 7. 179) it seems used for the optative; and in αἲ γάρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ . . . οἷος Νήρικον εἷλον . . . 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), πείθεσθε οὖν . . . καὶ παραστῆναι (Thuc. 6. 34. 9), οἳ δ᾽ ἱκάνομεν, φάσκειν Μυκήνας τὰς πολυχρύσους ὁρᾶν (Soph. El. 8-9), ἀκούετε λεῴ, 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 'vaṁ 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 . . . dividuom 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: ἆ δειλοί, πόσ᾽ ἴμεν ; τί
κακῶν ἱμείρετε τούτων; (Od. 10. 431), where the person of ἱμείρετε
forbids our taking ἴμεν as the first plural, and : ὦ βασιλεῦ, κότερον
λέγειν πρὸς σὲ τὰ νοέων τυγχάνω, ἢ σιγᾶν ἐν τῷ παρεόντι 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 ex-
clamation 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 red-
denda 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 ἰδέειν (probably old ἰδέϝεν), giving
us the usual Greek infinitive ἰδεῖν; 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 αὖθι
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: Αἴαντα λαχεῖν 'let Ajax win', or
Hesiod's γυμνὸν σπείρειν. When we compare these with: σὺ δ' εὖ
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 εὕδειν
(Od. 15. 392), ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥρη εὕδειν (Od. 11. 330–1), οὐ γὰρ ἔοικ' ὀτρυνέμεν
(Il. 4. 286), ἔμε δὲ χρὴ γήραϊ ... πείθεσθαι (Il. 23. 644–5), modal infini-
tives 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 χρή, 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 ὡρισάμην περιπατεῖν, in περιπατοῖμι, ηὐξάμην 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 δόϜεναι, which is a dative, but the simple stem form δόμεν or ἔμμεν or ἰδεῖν; 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 -Ϝεν 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 πρίν 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 πρίν should take an ablative, not a dative. But in: πρὶν ἐλθεῖν υἷας 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 . . . ἔν τε συνθέσει καὶ συντάξει (18); i. e. he feels that σύν is as much a preposition in συντίθημι as in σὺν θεῷ. Far less can we treat πρίν as a preposition in our sense of the word in considering the early union of sentences which joined πρίν 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 ὣς 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᾽ ὅ γε πρὶν Δαναοῖσιν ἀεικέα λοιγὸν ἀπώσει,
> πρίν γ᾽ ἀπὸ πατρὶ φίλῳ δόμεναι ἑλικώπιδα 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 ἀνήρ, ὃς ἐναίσιμος εἴη,
> πρὶν τλαίη πάσσασθαι ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος,
> πρὶν λύσασθ᾽ ἑτάρους 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' οὔ με φίλη πρίν γ' εἴα θωρήσσεσθαι,
πρίν γ' αὐτὴν ἐλθοῦσαν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι ἴδωμαι (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, πρὶν 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 πρὶν πάθῃσθα simply took the place of
πρὶν 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 sub-
junctive to the optative after a past tense, as in :

οὐκ ἔθελεν φεύγειν, πρὶν πειρήσαιτ' Ἀχιλῆος (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 πρὶν ἐπ' ἠέλιον δῦναι καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἐλθεῖν,
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 πρὶν ἰέναι, Πατρόκλεες ἱπποκέλευθε,
νῆας ἔπι γλαφυράς, πρὶν Ἕκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο
αἱματόεντα χιτῶνα περὶ στήθεσσι δαΐξαι (Il. 16. 839–41),

'come not sooner to me, Patroclus driver of steeds, to the hollow
ships. Sooner shalt 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,
πρίν γ' υἱὸν Πριάμοιο δαΐφρονος, Ἕκτορα δῖον,
Μυρμιδόνων. ἐπί τε κλισίας καὶ νῆας ἱκέσθαι (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 :

οὔ σε πρὶν κτεριῶ, πρίν γ' Ἕκτορος ἐνθάδ' ἐνεῖκαι
τεύχεα καὶ κεφαλήν, 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 ὁμοιίου πολέμοιο,
> πρὶν κατὰ Ἰλιόφι κλυτὰ τείχεα λαὸν ἐέλσαι
> Τρωϊκόν, ὅς κε φύγῃσι (Il. 21. 294–6),

'hold not thy hand from hazardous battle. Sooner shalt 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 πιέειν, πρὶν λεῖψαι ὑπερμενέϊ Κρονίωνι (Il. 7. 480–1),

'nor did any endure sooner to drink. Sooner must he make libation to sovereign Zeus', we have in πιέειν a future proper, but in λεῖψαι 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 ἐΰξοον ἀμφαφόωντας
> νευρήν τ' ἐντανύσαι διοϊστεῦσαί 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
> πάντῃ ἐποιχόμενοι, πρὶν αὖτ' ἐν χερσὶ γυναικῶν
> φεύγοντας πεσέειν, δηΐοισι 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 πρίν with a future that implies prevention.

In:

οὐδ' ὅσα φασὶν
Ἴλιον ἐκτῆσθαι, εὖ ναιόμενον πτολίεθρον,
τὸ πρὶν ἐπ' εἰρήνης, πρὶν ἐλθεῖν 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' ἕπευ· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἔστιν ἀποσταδὸν Ἀργείοισι
μάρνασθαι, πρίν γ' ἠὲ κατακτάμεν ἠὲ κατ' ἄκρης
Ἴλιον αἰπεινὴν ἑλέειν 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 ἠέ . . . ἠέ. In:

ἀτὰρ οὐ μὲν σφῶί γ' ὀίω
πρίν γ' ἀποπαύσεσθαι, πρίν γ' ἢ ἕτερόν γε πεσόντα
αἵματος ἆσαι 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 πρὶν ἀπόπαυε τεὸν μένος, ἀλλ' ὁπότ' ἂν δὴ
φθέγξομ' 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 co-
ordinated with τότε and an infinitive, a construction that should make
it plain that such infinitives are used as imperatives. In:

ἀλλ' ὄμοσον μὴ μητρὶ φίλῃ τάδε μυθήσασθαι
πρίν γ' ὅτ' ἂν ἑνδεκάτη τε δυωδεκάτη 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:

ἦ τοι ἔφην γε
οὐ πρὶν μηνιθμὸν καταπαυσέμεν, ἀλλ' ὁπότ' ἂν δὴ
νῆας ἐμὰς ἀφίκηται ἀϋτή 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 πρὶν μυθήσασθαι or πρὶν 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 . . . relicta, 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 oraclo 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 (indu-parare), 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.

XXII

AIT FUISSE NAVIUM CELERRIMUS

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 occisu-esom '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 $\pi o\iota \acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$ in $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\eta\ \pi o\iota\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$. Nether 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 profecturos 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 ĉelerrimus (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, Stertinium cum ceteris turmis circumgredi tergaque 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, salutator scribere non potuit (Mart. 1. 70. 17–18) salutator is evidently short for: si 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 develop-
ment 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

LATIN POETIC DICTION

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 pendĕre for pendēre 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 ἄν. We read in Virgil:

> Continuoque ineant pugnas et proelia temptent,
> Ni roseus fessos iam gurgite Phoebus Hibero
> 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 con-
struction 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 (1. 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 con-
struction 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 men-
tem 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 pre-

positions, 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 nunc 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 βαίνω, the cognate of venio,
seems to have taken on this general meaning; though in: Ἥρη, τίπτε
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 texit (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 battle-field. 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 pericli-
taretur (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 aeque (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 Danai, 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 fuero, 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 stetere 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 Prognes
> 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 sceptra 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). ˍ 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 Aeacidae 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 viai (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 stetere 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 stares, 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 con-
territus haesit continuitque gradum (Aen. 3. 597), attonitis haesere ani-
mis (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 inmobilis 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 terras-
que 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 aeque
> 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.

Hor. 109). It seems rather for fieri in : incipit res melius ire quam puta-
ram (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 manu-
scripts 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: venturos 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 rôle 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 geminent (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 habebo (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 habebo (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 vir-
tually 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 sub-
jective, 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 : temptaturum aditus et quae
mollissima fandi tempora (Aen. 4. 293–4) aditus is clearly for : quanam
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 invenient (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: meliorem 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 cor-
rected 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 volnere 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 sapientiorem, the prose being: animum gerens sapientiorem
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 Phillyrides,
> 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, inluvie 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 fene-

stram (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.   , 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 battle-field 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 publi- cam 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' sim-
pliciter 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 impro-
biores sunt quam a primo credidi (Pl. Most. 824), multum ad agen-
dum 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 beatior 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
tumultuosiorem (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 super-
lative 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 plurima-
rum 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: magnaque 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 ferme (Ter. Heaut. 205), illa cum uno tempore audisset (Cluent.
28. 9), ille sinistrorsum, hic dextrorsum abit; 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 diliget (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 some-
how 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 codi-
cillos, 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 ἅπαξ
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) expedivit (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 aeque . . . aeque in : aeque pauperibus prodest, locupletibus
aeque (Hor. Ep. 1. 1. 25), aeque discordiam praepositorum, aeque con-
cordiam subiectis exitiosam (Tac. Agr. 15). We find aeque et in :
nisi aeque amicos et nosmet ipsos diligamus (Cic. Fin. 1. 67. 20);
and aeque . . . que in : (quod) aeque 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 aeque 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 volnere 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 collec-
tive 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 vivont 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 num-
matum (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 magnaque pars servabat foedera casti (Lucr. 5. 1025), equestris

quoque ordinis bona magnaque 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 justifi-
cation, 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 nutriri 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 l 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 elephanti
> 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 ecum 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 inepteque 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: *equĭtem* 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 :

> Barbarus 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 inepte 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 1. 157 : The body consisted only of two
hundred foot, twenty horse, and twenty Indians.   And with this collec-
tive 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 con-
fecta 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 inmensum obtinentes loci (5. 37. 5); Nepos gives

N

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 anheli, 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 equi·
tibus 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 plaustris (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 volucremque currum (Hor. Od.
1. 34. 8), iret alter consul sublimis curru multiiugis, 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 aequore 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 ὄχεα and ἅρματα 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 signi-
ficat, 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: positis . . . 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. ἀραρίσκω),
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 ensem 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 ensem (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 Chloreus: 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 plenaeque 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 under-
stand the use of amor in: sic omnes amor unus habet decernere 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. 230) 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 Teucri (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 caelestum 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 pulcer 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 ornatius (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 invisa Lacaenae (2. 601), where Servius explains facies as pulcritudo. In : forma quoque hinc solis 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: 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 numero 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 eam 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 posuissem 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 in servorum 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 confligere (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: inmiscentque manus manibus, pugnamque lacessunt (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* internecione; potest enim et pace finiri; 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 pedum 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 principio (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 sceptra for sceptra in: sceptra 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 pinguia 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).

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 gulps 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 iuvencis (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 conciti. 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 (Acc. 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 cernet 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 inviso meos (Pl. Capt. 458),
si alia membra vino madeant, cor sit saltem sobrium (Truc. 855),
quorum unus Homerus sceptra potitus eadem aliis sopitus quietest
(Lucr. 3. 1038), inde alias animas . . . deturbat (Aen. 6. 411),
obstupuere 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 pulcer 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 Iapyx (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 exspectatum positis stat in agmine castris (Geo. 3. 348), where ante exspectatum is for the prose spe citius. Curious is the ellipsis of pluribus in: saepe decem vitiis instructior (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 Mycenas (Aen. 2. 25), positis 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, volneribus 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 pavidi (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 duros bello (Geo. 2.
170), durum a stirpe genus (Aen. 9. 603), adsis o placidusque iuves
(4. 578), et placidi servate pios (3. 266), Cererique sacrum Poly-
boeten (6. 484), truncos inhonesto volnere 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 circumdedisti (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 agedum 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 volneratus ; 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 amni, 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 per-
vium in: ne pervium illa Germanicis exercitibus foret (Hist. 3. 8. 3).
The use of aequus for aequo animo in: quod adest memento com-
ponere 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: relliquias Danaum atque inmitis Achilli (1. 30), for:
relliquias 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 iuvencos (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 macstum funeris ignem
lustravere 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 liquidas is proleptic; when I supply futuras with liquidas I have at once a full expression of the meaning. Very plain is the same ellipsis in: mox Italus Mnestheus (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 immerentis (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 auspicibus (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 pro-
futuros.   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 sumpsi (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 volunta-
tive 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 trans-
ferred 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 exscinden-
dos. 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) invigi-
lant (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 (obeun-
dam) 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 inmobile. 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 : indeprensus et inremeabilis error (Aen. 5. 591) and : ardet inexcita Ausonia atque inmobilis 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 abscidit 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 : inobserva- bilis error (Catull. 64. 115) and : soloque inmobilis haeret (Aen. 7. 250). But in : solus ubi in silvis Italis ignobilis aevum exigeret (7. 776) ignobilis is not ignoble, but is used for ignotus. So sutilis (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 incohatione 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 εἴσομαι ; 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 euntem 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 Danai 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 title 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 moveri 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, laevaque 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 : infernis 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 Naevius, 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 causidicus. 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 Mycenas
> Ipsumque Aeaciden, genus armipotentis 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
Aeacides is Pyrrhus. But the prophecy of Anchises seems to me
quite correct here; Aeacides 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: poscimur; 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.

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), Alphea 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, infernas 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 : posteri diei tempestas ; piae terrae (Prop. 3. 7. 9) for : cadaveri pii fili. 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 legat 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 concordes 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 volnere 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 : proviso 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 metonomy 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 adipes, 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 gravidi 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 dites 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, conchylia 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 descendentibus cum ruina iumen-
torum 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 aulaea 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 trans-
late: 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; magnos aequabunt ista Camillos iudicia (Prop. 3. 9. 31), for magnorum 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 Venafro (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 timidis vadentem passibus aequat (Aen. 6. 263), for: ducis passus; nunc aequali tecum pubesceret aevo (3. 491), for: cum tuo aevo; nunc tertia palma Diores (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 silvaque iugerum
> Paucorum et segetis certa fides meae
> Fulgentem imperio fertilis Africae
>   Fallit sorte beatior (Od. 3. 16. 29–32).

Bentley was on the right line when he simplified this to: ager meus Sabinus fallit proconsulem Africae sorte beatior; 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 pro-consul, 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 curvare, 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 manu-script 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 proditione Pelasgi . . . demisere neci (2. 83) for : falso sub crimine proditionis ; 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.

ILICET EXTEMPLO

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

Q

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 quam-do '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, ilĭcō, 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 αὐτόθεν, 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 con-
scendit 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 audivi 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 (Acc.
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
praedicas. 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. Tune 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 οἰκονομία si perturbatior 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 inter-
cedere (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 adsentiare, 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.
Brut. 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 fugie- bam 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 uncon- sciously 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 ἐπεὶ 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 'count-

less ', 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 quando-quidem, 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. Nimium 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 sequos '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 sccus 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 negatived in : modo non montes auri pollicens (Ter. Phorm. 68), which Donatus says is equivalent to μόνον οὔ. 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 (Enn. 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
(segnior) 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 gratiis (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 conspicere 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 $\dot{\alpha}\pi'$ $\ddot{\alpha}\rho\tau\iota$ in : non me videbitis amodo, donec dicatis : benedictus qui venit in nomine domini (Matt. 23. 39), and to translate $\dot{\alpha}\pi\dot{o}$ $\tau o\hat{v}$ $\nu\hat{v}\nu$ in : amodo videbitis filium hominis sedentem a dextris virtutis dei (ib. 26. 64). The fact that amodum 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: incommoditate abstinere me apud
convivas commodo conmemini (Mil. 644), and Macrobius in: com-
modo 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 com-
modum 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 ingredientes
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.'
> <div align="right">(Sat. 1. 1. 49-51),</div>

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. Num-
quam quicquam (Ter. Ad. 528) is : *numquam quicquam*, παρέλκον
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 pluri-
mum (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 num-
quam 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 commodo (= 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 abstinuerit 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 Julus 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), incepi, 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 . . . incomitata 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 intensi-
fied, 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 sublatus Ambiorix (B. G.
5. 38. 1), ultro animos tollit dictis (Aen. 9. 127), tollitur in caelum
clamor (11. 745) with effero in : clamorem utrimque ecferunt (Pl.
Amph. 228), hic me magnifice ecfero (Ter. Heaut. 709), quos recenti
victoria efferri sciret (B. G. 5. 47. 4), quorum animi altius se extulerunt
(Cic. Rep. 3. 4. 3).

But effero also means 'to bear out for burial', as in : tum tu idem
optumumst loces ecferendum : 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 effero in this sense also.

But in : avectaque partim finitimos tollunt in agros urbique remit-
tunt (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 (I. 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 fatis (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 Teucri 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 sustulerât (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 sublatum 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 pulcram 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 sci   tiam 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 fere-
bat (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 dis-putavi (Pl. Most. 88), quae sunt a me in secundo libro de oratore disputata de ridiculis (Cic. Fam. 7. 32. 2), quibus ex rebus breviter dis-putatis 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 lustro (2. 564) with : vestigia . . . lumine lustro (2. 754) and : totum lustrabat lumine corpus (8. 153). We may further compare : quo tutior hospita lustres aequora (3. 377), mixtis lustrabo Maenala nymphis (Buc. 10. 55), arvaque . . . 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 suo volvebat (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: cursuque
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: tramisit
Lesbum (Ann. 2. 54. 1); 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 inquies
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 venera-
bar 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 militibus (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 glaucaque 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 cadentum 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 exsurgens 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 militibus (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 euhoe in: qui tum
alacres . . . furebant euhoe bacchantes, euhoe capita inflectentes
(Catull. 64. 255), where probably furebant is short for furentes clama-
bant, and euhoe is the cognate object of clamabant thus implied. We
may compare euantes orgia (Aen. 6. 517) which is for: celebrantes
orgia et euhoe 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 canebant 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:
tentando exquirere; excudent alii . . . aera (6. 847) for: excudendo
efficient; siccis oscula falle genis (Prop. 4. 11. 80) for: da fallendo; in-
ludo 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: indignum volvebam 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 detrahere; 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᾽ ἑνός; we turn now to its opposite, the figure ἓν 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᾽ ἑνός, 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 ungulis, nescios fari (Od. 4. 6. 18) for infantes, prominentes oras (Ann. 2. 24. 3) for promuntoria, biiugis 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 inmensitatesque 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 inmensa 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), arbuteis texunt
virgis et vimine querno (11. 65). Most common are pairs corre-
sponding 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 iuvencum (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 suscitat 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 Mycenas (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 ahena 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 vinclo 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 ahena (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 armentaque 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 oblivia 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 con-
sertam hamis auroque trilicem (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 ahena locant alii flammasque ministrant (1. 213) for: ahenis in litore locatis flammas alii 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 invisa sedebat (Aen. 2. 574) for: abdita in aede atque aris invisa sedebat, invisa has a double force, and aris may be taken either as instrumental or dative. In: nec veterum memini 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 volnus (10. 732–3), where Servius tells us that by sternere and caecum volnus 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.

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 inmensusque 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 noto citius 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 Mycenas (2. 577), crines incanaque 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 Ido-

menei? (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
> Polluto, notumque furens quid femina possit
> Triste per augurium Teucrorum pectora ducunt
>
> <div align="right">(Aen. 5. 5–7).</div>

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 Chloreus 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 plaustra 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 conchylia magisve rhombus aut scari (Epod. 2. 50), illa tamen se non habitu mutatve loco (Sat. 2. 7. 64), uter aedilis fueritve vestrum praetor (2. 3. 180), quis udo deproperare apio coronas curatve 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) campestres 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 dictu 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), furorne caecus an rapit vis acrior (Epod. 7. 13), incertus scamnum faceretne Priapum (Sat. 1. 8. 2), quae (ludit) velut latis equa trima campis ludit exsultim (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 dites 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 Ilo (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 inimicaeque . . . 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 glaucaque 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 innubilus 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), tenta-
bundus (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 lin-
quunt (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 con-
spectus 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 Argivaque 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 corripiunt spatia audito limenque relinquunt
(5. 316), aut tu mihi terram inice, namque potes, 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 : mala-
rum 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 three-fold unions restored each to fourfold form. So with: ense pedes nudo, puraque interrita parma (11. 711) pedes interrita 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 ἐστίν or τὶς, have lost their primary meaning and accent, and into this class fall preposi- tions and conjunctions as a rule, many pronouns and the copula ἐστίν. 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 iam-
pridem, 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 four-
fold 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 qualia-
cumque 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
Danais 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 shorten-
ing 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 quatiunt 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 four-fold structure; iuvenes protervi—ictibus crebris—iunctas fenestras—parcius quatiunt. 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 dulce 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 prae-

sidium, (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—(appel-
lantur) ‖ (qui)—nostra (lingua)—Galli—appellantur. ‖ Hi omnes—
lingua–institutis–legibus—inter se—differunt. ‖ Gallos—ab Aqui-
tanis—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
> <div align="right">(Sat. 2. 3. 73–4),</div>

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 quatiunt fenestras. We have this alternate distribu-
tion 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 aerio (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 bracchia ‖ 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 vigent 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) montes 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) configunt (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 (talis) 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 salutis
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 parti-
culam 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
flammarum (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 perduci
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 con-
struction 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 serias 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 audivi (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. Dic sodes. Sy. Apud villamst (Ad. 517), audivi, Archylis, iamdudum : Lesbiam adduci iubes (And. 228), to which Donatus's note is : utrum iamdudum audivi an iamdudum iubes incerta distinctio.   He does not know whether to join iamdudum with audivi or with iubes, a difficulty which does not trouble our editors, who here, strange to say, prefer to join it with audivi.   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 pauxillulum 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 huc 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 : *tendo*que *supinas ad caelum* cum voce (sublata) manus (Aen. 3. 177), *vocat* (ad mortem) *lux ultima* victos (2. 668), *fundamenta* quatit *totam*que a sedibus (imis) urbem eruit (2. 611), omnis *spes* Danaum et coepti *fiducia* belli (bene gerendi) (2. 162), mihi parvus Iulus *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 pueritiae) huc misit ab annis (2. 87), arduus (exstans) *armatos* mediis in moenibus astans fundit equus, *victor*que Sinon incendia (caedibus) miscet (2. 328–9), *sanguine* quaerendi reditus, animaque *litandum Argolica* . . . obstipuere animi . . . cui fata parent (Argivo), quem poscat Apollo (inmolandum) (2. 118–21), non *haec* tibi litora (petere) suasit Delius, aut (hic) Cretae iussit *considere* Apollo (3. 161–2), quem *sese ore ferens*, quam *forti pectore* et armis (validis instructus) (4. 11), et nos tela (certa), pater, *ferrum*que *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 dormirem 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 *con*gemuit 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 (voltu 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 con- dicionem 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 ronte a tergo coorti, comminus eminus (eos) petunt (Liv. 21. 34. 6).

But we read: omnem oram . . . partim renovandis (veteribus) societati-
bus, 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 volgum
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 Cassandrae.

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 teme-
rata 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) declinantem 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 deterius 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 mililitibus ; 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 prorum-
pendo.   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 nequid-
quam ‘ 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 nequid-
quam here but that plainly indicated by its composition (ne—quid-

quam). 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 imbelle sine ictu
> Coniecit, rauco quod protinus aere repulsum,
> Et summo clipei nequidquam umbone pependit (Aen. 2. 544–6).

Again Servius explains nequidquam as non, and refers to Persius (2. 51). He adds that some wish to give summo ... pependit 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 pependit. 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 spectat Olympo (Geo. 1. 96), where with nequidquam (ad)spectat we must supply adfutura (= profutura).   So in: cernimus adstantes nequidquam (adfuturos) 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 AMPHIBOLE

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 Phoebo 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 praeceps 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 mihi 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 Diomede, 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 a. 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 ipsi 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 considere Teucros (6. 66–7) meis fatis is a dative with da and indebita, and an ablative with considere 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 adnuit (4. 127), where we may take adversata as the neuter plural, the object of adnuit, 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 : Acrisioneis Danae
fundasse colonis (7. 410) Servius's note is that Acrisioneis 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 Acrisioneis
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 laetitiae Bacchus dator (1. 734) Servius notes :   bene autem
addidit dator laetitiae, quia est et dator furoris.   But the obvious con-
struction of laetitiae is not that of genitive with dator, but of dative with
adsit.   To : quantulum 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 quantu-
lum, and the dative dependent on curtabit ; quantulum summae
curtabit is short for : quantulum 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: ·

<blockquote>
ea vox audita laborum
Prima tulit finem, primamque loquentis ab ore
Eripuit pater ac stupefactus numine pressit (7. 117–19),
</blockquote>

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 Julus; 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:

<blockquote>
Hic pater omnipotens ter caelo clarus ab alto
Intonuit, radiisque ardentem lucis et auro
Ipse manu quatiens ostendit ab aethere nubem (vv. 141–3).
</blockquote>

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 indiciis 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 con-
nected 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;
Tyrrhenas 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 Bezzenberger 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 ζεῦγμα) 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 con-
venit, 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 inter-
esting 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
corrui (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 male-
bant (Sall. Cat. 51. 38), cum ego unaquaque de re dicam, et (unam-
quamque 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 reach-
ing : 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 popu-
lum 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 consu-
lem 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 (Ter. 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 supply-
ing 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 animaque rotis-que 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 centurio-num 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 . . . aciem-que movebat (11. 446) for: ex castris suos in aciem ducebat, in: quo (voltu) caelum tempestatesque serenat (1. 255) for: caelum tempesta-tibus 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 piae 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 monstris 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) Calydona (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 praepara-
tum 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 quatiunt-
que novena lampade sollemnem thalamis coeuntibus ignem et de
Pieriis (spargunt) vocalem fontibus undam (Stat. 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 adde-
rent, 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 vetitosque (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 linguis et pennae praepetis ominibus
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
(diluant) 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 aequique 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 caespite inanem (exstructum) et geminas, causam lacrimis (exstructas), sacraverat aras (3. 304–5), ipse Quirinali lituo (praeditus), parvaque sedebat succinctus trabea, laevaque 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 famaque 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 periclo 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 periclo 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 periclo 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 can-
dentes 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: νεφέλῃ εἰλυμένος ὤμους (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 varius 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 varios 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 three-fold 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 Shakspere 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; 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 tergore 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 horrifico 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 flammas 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: innume-
rabilis 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), Stygiique
per flumina fratris (10. 113), coetu variantis acervi (Lucr. 1. 775).

We find also the epithet transferred from the subject to an ad-
verbial 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 trans-
ferred from the adverbial phrase to the subject, as: quibus ibat in
armis aureus (Aen. 9. 269), eludit gyro interior (11. 695), nocturnus-
que vocat clamore Cithaeron (4. 303), creber utraque manu pulsat
(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 olorum 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: Her-
culeis 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 aequore 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 comprendere 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
Teucri (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 sub-
ject 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 frequenta-
tive 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: meritis 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 quinis 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 bracchia 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 Acestes (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) soccos 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 aûras (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 . . . relinquat? (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 Amyclæ 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 obscuro 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 vastaque
voragine gurges (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 preposi-
tion a or ab, as in : nisi qui a philosophia, a iure civili, ab historia
fuisset instructior (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 la-
boris (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 pernicibus 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 opportuno loco sita, Messapus . . . altus equo (12. 295) for: Messapus alto equo vectus. Further examples are: laetantes agmine cycnos (1. 393) for: cycnos 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: medias 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 ambiguam (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 perfechypallages such as we have repeatedly examined in this chapter.

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 agèd 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: bracchia 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 de-moliuntur. 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 com-position ; and accordingly we read in Donatus (p. 389, K.): sunt etiam dictiones, quas incertum est utrum coniunctiones an prae-positiones, 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 dece-
dentibus 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 equiva-
lent to licet. The Greek use of ἔστι in : ἔστι μὲν εὕδειν, ἔστι δὲ τερπο-
μένοισιν 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 pel-
lantur 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 dis-
cessere (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 adripare, the
French arriver, and aboculare, the French aveugler.   Woelfflin mis-
took 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 texit for detexit in Virgil without change of meaning, asserted by
Servius for Aen. 10. 424-5 :

> dum texit 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 texit for detexit after the analogy of
populatur. Servius's note is : *dum texit*, dum spoliat ; 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.

Texit 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 qualifica-
tions 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) nosce-
bantur 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, agros 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 explere 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* minuere. 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 levia 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 complere '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: *con-
cessit* 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, summatim, 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 four-
fold 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 com-
mota fugam Dido sociosque (com)parabat (Aen. 1. 360), osculaque
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 optumus 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 divolgato 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 'con-
tingere' caret exemplo. But the example he cites for : dextram ad-
fectare : 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 fiere 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 translatam. De pavone vero
ad Euphorbum, de Euphorbo ad Homerum, de Homero autem ad
Ennium. The apparently twofold expression in v. 11 is really four-
fold 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 somniante ; 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 grand-
mothers 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 pecca-
torum 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 : condenso 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-
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 sitiat canis Apula, tantae (1. 60), where sitiat 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 : proruunt fossas (Ann. 1. 68. 2) we have a short form for : proruunt 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 chorum (se ducere) simulans (Aen. 6. 517), or : simulavit anum (Ov. Met. 3. 275), or : dissimulata deam (Fast. 6. 507). So in : dedidicit 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 daturos) 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 (Stat. 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 versibus 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 plebeii, 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 focis 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,
> Sescentoplago 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
Lycaeo 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, nec 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 prae-
ponderat. 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.

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 ὁ 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 venie- bam, 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) ' nay the eighth and fifteenth legions were for drawing sword on each other, while the former demands for death the centurion Rushlight by nick- name, 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 three- fold structure, but the moment we try to understand its meaning, we find that we have to supply another clause: et re vera ferrum paras- sent '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 Hibero 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 indis-
pensable 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 adhibitis 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
volucrem 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, suscitat, et rapta graviter pro coniuge saevit (Geo. 4. 455–6), where the four clauses are : Orpheus . . . saevit, ac poenas suscitat, et ni fata resistant, poenas sumat. In : inclusam Danaen, etc. (Od. 3. 16 init.) the four terms seem : turris ahenea . . . (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 exemisset (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 spoliavissemus), 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 : effi-

giesque 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 Stertinius adcurrens . . . adtinuisset (2. 10. 2) or: recuperare Armeniam avebat (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 gerundum (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 Andro-
nicus 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 dacrima (= 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 deterrerentur (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 con-
structed with the subjunctive for no visible reason.

This use of the subjunctive with donec first appears to my know-
ledge 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 circumspectantibus 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 sub-
stitution 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 dis-
appeared, 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 Rufrius
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 Inguiomerus 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. I. 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 τοὶ adversa experta, animum habeo pronum 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 turbas 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 iuvenci (Buc. 7. 44) cf. ib. 10. 77, occultum inspires 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 aequore 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. 4 5) and: ultro animos tollit dictis atque increpat ultro (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 Teucri (2. 252), Hectoreum ad tumulum viridi quem caespite 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 lympha (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 Alphesiboei (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: Tydides sed enim scelerumque inventor Ulixes (Aen. 2. 164), Trinacria fines Italos mittere relicta (3. 440), Romulus Assaraci quem sanguinis Ilia Mater (6. 778), marique vasto fert uterque Neptunus (Catull. 31. 3), Phasidos ad fluctus et fines Aeetaeos (64. 3), aequoreae monstrum Nereides admirantes (64. 15), Crannonisque 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 commissa 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 incomitata solebat (2. 456), vivamus, mea Lesbia,
atque amemus (Catull. 5. 1), attrivere ultroque animam sub fasce
dedere (Geo. 4. 204), dixit et in silvam pennis 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 Troiam-
ne 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
scitantem oracula Phoebi (Aen. 2. 114), apparent only, but real in : Delius
aut Cretae iussit considere 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 madefient 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 confluxet 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 pulcer 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 spatiis, 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), Lernaeus turba capitum 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 procurrentibus 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 bracchia 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), aeriae 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 con-
sule 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 laben-
tem (risere) Teucri et risere (illum) natantem (5. 181), tela manu miseri
iactabant irrita (incerta) Teucri (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 (Catull. 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 : Cen-
taurus 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 Alexandro 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), incipe. 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), ambesas 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 lacessunt (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 pulcrior 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 concordes filiae sorores (B. P. 1, M.),
or:

Noctu Troiad exibant capitibus opertis
Flentes ambae abeuntes lacrimis cum multis (B. P. 7–8, M.),
or:

Patrem suum supremum optumum adpellat
Summe deum regnator, quianam me genuisti? (17–18, M.),
or:

Elatis 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 Mycenas (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 inmobilis 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 nigros 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), Idomenea 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 volnere 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), Teucri 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 quid-
quid Etruscos (Sat. 1. 6. 1), Numa quo devenit et Ancus (Ep. 1. 6. 27),
maternis atque paternis (1. 15. 26).

Connected in syntax are : Scaeas 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 tem-
plum (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 follow-
ing 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) recte-
que 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 ' triumphe'
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 Tatius dextras collocat ipse iubas (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 Pilumnus 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 Phoebi, dat femina poenas (4. 6. 57), sunt aliquid manes, letum non omnia finit (4. 7. 1), nox ruit, Aenea ; nos flendo ducimus horas (Aen. 6. 539), sic domito 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 es celebrata 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 Philetae (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 Salius clamoribus implet (Aen. 5. 341), quem petit et summis adnixus 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) Amphiona 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), aeque pauperibus prodest locupletibus (prodest)
aeque (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 ahena
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)

Teucri (2. 459), Hectora (tractum) per campos ter maculasse rotas
(Prop. 3. 1. 28), quas (non oraveris) gentes Italum aut quas non ora-
veris 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,
pulcer Apollo (Aen. 3. 119), sed Troia obscena, 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 mihi cantat Apollo (2. 1. 3),

> Sive illam Hesperiis sive illam ostendet Eois.
> Uret et Eoos, uret et Hesperios (2. 3. 43–4).

They are connected in syntax in : caeruleae cui terga notae macu-
losus et auro (Aen. 5. 87), acrior ad pugnam redit ac vim suscitat 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 contecta 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), con-
surgunt 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 : sceptra Palatini, sedemque petit
Evandri (9. 9), condunt se Teucri 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 extremos 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 Thersilo-
chumque (12. 363), et maribus Cariis et decantata Camillis (Ep. 1. 1. 64),
fecerit auspicium, cras 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
amica 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 bracchia palmis.
> Sic ait et geminum pugnae proponit honorem
> Victori velatum auro vittisque iuvencum (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 maerebat 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 montes (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:

> Parvaque 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.
I. 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 med ingratiis 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
a like 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
> Thesea (liquere) ceu pulsae ventorum flamine nubes
> Aerium nivei montes 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 secat 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 poscimur? Our editions have usually: poscimur, 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 poscimur, 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 Heïnsius 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.

THE OXYMORON

THE oxymoron or acutifatuum 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 quatiunt 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 pucnandod, probably
adapted by Claudius from a tradition of the old inscription ; for Livius
Andronicus in his Helena wrote : tu qui permensus ponti maria alta
velivola (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. Att.
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 : fugiunt vasto aethere nimbi (Aen. 5. 821); longeque
volante sagitta (Ov. Trist. 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 marituma, to which the approach is by sea, so that adnare 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 vădere to vădum has been obscured by the formation from vădum of vădare '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 altae . . . 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 pernicibus 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 cardinibus (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 altus 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
Danai (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 penetrale
fluenti (Auson. Id. 10. 60).   Very close to these are the antitheses in:
mortalem vitam mors ... inmortalis 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 imbelle (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 sub-
repturum 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 futtilis (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 caerula cano (8. 672) caerula 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.

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 ; some-
thing 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 Ascra 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 ἦμαρ 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 super- ficial 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 judge- ment 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 sea-gulls 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: si 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 aeque 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 under-
stand 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: moriens 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 Diores, 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, Mnestheus 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 con-
tains 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 pervi-
caciter 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 pre-
vails 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 sym-
metry 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 partes 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 Phoebo (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 Orbilium 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: morte 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 under-
stand 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 profici-
scentem 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 un-
pleasant 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 hill-
sides, 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 κορακῖνος 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 Pulcer, 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
> Transcurrunt 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 pro-
mised 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 whelm 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, tactuque 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 abiisse.   The boy was Servius Tullius, and the flame fore-
told 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 Volcanum 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 domum, servate nepotem,

and it is plain that only the preservation of the domus and the dis-
covery 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 fore-
tell 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 exsors 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 con-
sultus, 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 ἵππουϊν (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: Scaeaeque 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 exosculor; 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 cross-pieces 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: ἂν οἱ πατὴρ 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 prae-
sentiae 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: suspenso 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 anxium; 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 memini 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. 122. 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

G g

454 INDEX OF PASSAGES EXPLAINED

GENERAL INDEX

ab Andria, 222.
ablative, 298.
absente nobis, 91.
accusativus Graecus, 141.
acervus, 220.
Acestes' arrow, 417.
ad Vestae, 221.
admodum 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.
Bezzenberger, 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.
Burmann, 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.
Cohoon, 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.

This Book is Du