ON THE SEMANTIC FIELD 'PUT–THROW'
IN LATIN*

IT is well known that *mitto* comes to mean 'put' in late Latin and that it shows reflexes with this sense in the Romance languages (e.g. It. *mettere*, Fr. *mettre*, Sp. *meter*).[1] But the nature of this semantic change has not been fully explained, nor has the relationship of the word with other placing-terms in Latin. E. Löfstedt has stated simply that it 'takes over the meaning of *ponere*'.[2] But as *pono* itself remains common in all types of Latin, the question arises whether the two words did really come into conflict. It is the purpose of the first two sections of this article to show that for a considerable period *pono* and *mitto* occupied complementary places in a lexical system. This system exhibits a definite structure which remains unaltered from early Latin to at least the sixth century A.D., though its component terms undergo some changes. In section I *pono* and the words which in earlier Latin performed the functions later assumed by *mitto* will be discussed. In section II we shall move on to *mitto* itself. It will be necessary to consider the nature and motivation of the transition 'throw>put' as it appears in Latin.

Certain other problems will also be treated. Why did *colloco* undergo specialization in late Latin and Romance (e.g. Fr. *coucher*)? How did *pauso* (= 'stop') acquire the sense 'put' which it has in various Romance languages (e.g. It. *posare*, Fr. *poser*, Pg. *pousar*)? A section (V) will also be devoted to the history of words for 'throw' in Latin, since they are relevant to *mitto* and its development; and, finally (VI), a miscellaneous usage involving a word for 'throw' will be discussed briefly.

I

A number of words meaning 'throw' in various languages develop the sense 'put', including βάλλω in Greek.[3] It would be easy to assume that *mitto*, the standard throwing-term at one period of later Latin (see below, V), changed its meaning by a hyperbolic transfer, for it is a well-attested characteristic of popular Latin that the desire for expressivity caused the weakening of many vigorous action verbs. But in fact, as we shall see, it is necessary rather to invoke the phenomenon of the gradual semantic 'shift' to explain the transition.[4] Nor were the shifts which we shall illustrate unmotivated: they are to be seen against the structure of a semantic field.

Discussion of putting-terms in Latin (and other languages) is easily under-mined by the vagueness of Eng. 'put' and Fr. *mettre* (which it is simple, but

misleading, to equate with *mitto*). Few I.-E. languages possess such general words.[1] It is not unusual, for instance, for a language to have not one but various terms expressing the different positions in which an object may be placed. Thus alongside 'put' English has three words ('set', 'stand', 'lay') which are all included in the one French verb *mettre*, and German possesses a similar set.

It is also possible to distinguish a number of different actions which are covered by 'put' or *mettre*: e.g.

(1) He put the glass in the box.
(2) She put the ingredients in the saucepan.
(3) He put the syringe in the patient's ear.

(1) describes a careful placing-action: the object is not released until it is in contact with a hard surface such as the bottom of the box. (2) describes an action closer to dropping: usually the objects will be released at a point above the saucepan. (3) describes an inserting-action: the object is put into something, in this case an orifice, by means of pushing. 'Put' can be used of pushing-actions which contain varying degrees of force (cf., e.g., 'She put the tray in the hot oven', 'he put the needle in the patient's arm', 'she put the cotton in the eye of the needle').[2]

It would no doubt be easy to define other actions included in 'put', but the above three are sufficient to enable us to state some interesting characteristics of the semantic field in Latin.

It is a feature of Latin that *pono* when literal[3] is employed mainly of careful placing-actions (1). This restriction of use is not always easy to see in ordinary prose, where the context may be uninformative, but it is obvious in technical Latin, both early and late, in which diverse putting-actions have to be expressed. Accordingly the first two sections of this article will be concerned largely with technical prose. An examination of a large number of contexts in which Eng. 'put' would be possible reveals that there are certain conditions under which *pono* is rarely, if ever, admitted. These conditions are those which are present in sentences (2) and (3) above. Thus culinary, medical and agricultural writers, who frequently give recipes for the preparation of concoctions to be eaten or taken by humans or animals, hardly ever employ *pono* of the dropping of the ingredients in a container, though they regularly apply it to the placing down of the container itself. This distinction is maintained so faithfully over a long period that we can safely say that two types of actions were envisaged, and that *pono* was appropriate only of the more careful one. Again, medical writers avoid the use of *pono* to express the inserting-actions which they have to describe, but constantly employ it of the external application of medicaments to wounds, etc., an action both careful and devoid of any idea of thrust.

The force of *pono* emerges clearly from its compound *impono*. As a rule this verb is not used at any period of inserting- or dropping-actions, but rather expresses the placing of one thing on or in another.[4] Those cases which may be translated 'put into'[5] refer not to insertions into a narrow opening, but to the

---

[1] Buck, op. cit. 831.
[2] In origin 'put' meant 'push' (cf. 'put the shot').
[3] In this article I shall be concerned almost exclusively with the literal uses of putting-terms.

[4] See *T.L.L.* vii. 1. 651. 48 ff. There are some exceptions not mentioned by the *T.L.L.* article (but see 651. 41 ff.), but these are very rare indeed.
[5] *T.L.L.* vii. 1. 650. 57 ff.

placing down of an object within something (e.g. Plaut. *Men.* 26 'imponit geminum alterum in navim pater').

The use of the two words may be illustrated for the early period from Cato's *de Agricultura*. There are 28 literal examples of *pono* in the work, of which many refer to the setting down of a container of some sort, often in the phrase *in sole ponito*: e.g. 87 'eam patinam in sole ponito'; 108. 2 'vinum ponito sub divo'; 156. 3 'postea ponito pocillum in sereno noctu'.[1] Otherwise the word denotes the placing down of various types of solid objects (note 162. 2 'deinde alteram (pernam) insuper ponito'; the careful action required is emphasized in the following sentence: 'caveto ne caro carnem tangat'),[2] the serving of food,[3] the setting of transplanted shoots or saplings in a prepared trench,[4] and, once, the placing of a vine against a tree.[5] But it is nowhere employed of inserting, of the putting down of rough material which might be dropped, or of the adding of ingredients to a mixture, though Cato often deals with such actions (see below). *Impono* occurs 12 times, in 11 places with the sense 'put on' (of one beam on another, a layer on a cake, a cover on a dish, a container on hot coals, and a poultice on wounds).[6] The remaining example is applied to the placing down of solid material in a dish.[7]

From later Latin numerous distinctive examples of *pono* standing in contrast to a complementary putting-term will be quoted below (II). Here it is sufficient to point out that scarcely any exceptions to the above rules are to be found in Scribonius Largus,[8] Celsus,[9] or Vitruvius from the early Empire, or Apicius,[10] Dioscorides Latinus,[10] Theodorus Priscianus,[10] the *Antidotarium Bruxellense*,[10] the *Mulomedicina Chironis*,[11] Marcellus Empiricus,[12] Vegetius' *Mulomedicina*,[13] or the medical work ascribed to Pliny[14] from the later period. Yet together these authors refer to actions of types (2) and (3) in many hundreds of places. In non-technical prose, where precision is less important, the lines of demarcation between the actions which we have distinguished are likely to be more blurred,

---

[1] Cf. 66. 1, 88. 1, 88. 2 (3 times), 105. 2, 116, 154.

[2] Cf. 7. 4, 76. 3, 76. 4, 112. 2, 113. 1, 130, 151. 2, 162. 1.

[3] 79, 81.

[4] 28. 2, 45. 3, 46. 1, 49. 2, 52. 2.

[5] 47. Clearly this example does not really fall within the three categories of actions listed above, but it does not violate the general rule which has been stated.

[6] 18. 5 (twice), 48. 2, 76. 4, 77, 104, 108. 1, 112. 1, 157. 3 (3 times).

[7] 76. 2.

[8] For *pono* (referring usually to containers set down or medicaments applied to the body), see 37, 45, 97, 163, 208, 225. *Impono* (usually in reference to actions of the latter kind, but also 3 times of the setting down of containers) is more frequent: 11, 44, 56 (twice), 80 (twice), 120, 122, 130 (twice), 131 (twice), 132 (twice), 173 (twice), 174, 179, 228 (twice).

[9] There is a complete *index verborum* in E. Milligan, *A. Corn. Celsi Medicinae*[2] (Edinburgh, 1831). *Impono* is very frequent, and is used in much the same way as by

Scribonius. The example of *pono* at 7. 29 may be an exception to the rule.

[10] See below, II.

[11] *Pono* is used 15 times literally in this work, always in sense (1). *Impono* is very common indeed, and almost without exception abides by the rules stated above (but see 82).

[12] *Impono* is used incessantly by Marcellus; it appears never to violate our rules. Its sense is well illustrated by its tendency to alternate with *superpono* (e.g. 4. 13/4. 14; 8. 134/8. 159). *Pono* is used 39 times in chaps. 1–21, almost always in sense (1). For a few isolated cases which may bear senses (2) or (3), see 8. 127, 14. 19, 14. 21, 14. 54.

[13] *Impono* is used 77 times, never in violation of the rules. *Pono* has sense (3) at 2. 79. 18, but is otherwise restricted to (1).

[14] For the text see A. Önnerfors, *Plinii Secundi Iunioris qui feruntur de Medicina libri tres* (Berlin, 1964). It contains some 206 literal examples of *pono* and *impono*, all but 3 of which have sense (1) (3. 36. 2, 3. 37. 5, 3. 37. 13).

but it is nevertheless difficult to find clear cases of *pono* or *impono* violating the rules. Nor is it conceivable that so many technical authors in different genres and writing at different periods clung to an artificial rule of usage which did not have a basis in ordinary speech.

Pono is a compound of *sino*, with a prefix *po-* which is probably connected with ἀπό.[1] In origin it appears to have meant 'put aside', 'leave aside', a sense which is still clearly present in the numerous examples in Cato and elsewhere of the type 'in sole ponito biduum' (7. 4).[2] In such contexts the word usually signifies the leaving to one side of an object for a definite period and for a definite purpose, with the implication that the subject intends to return to it when the purpose has been fulfilled: e.g. Vitr. 8. 3. 18 'ovum in aceto si diutius positum fuerit, cortex eius mollescet'; Diosc.[3] 199. 12 'ponis in sole, quamdiu calore solis solvat'; 200. 15 'pones in sole, donec albus illi color sit'. It may have been because of this nuance that it was felt to be more appropriate of careful placing-actions than of those of type (2). In any case it obviously did not in origin possess any hint of the thrust or force which is a component of sense (3).

The question now arises what word or words were employed in senses (2) and (3). We shall see that while *pono* remained in use over a long period the complementary terms were not so permanent.[4]

In old Latin the gap is filled by *indo* (of root **dhe*, 'put'), which is frequent in both senses.[5] In Cato it is required especially often in sense (2), as for example at 23. 3 'marmor si indes, in culleum libram indito; id indito in urnam. misceto cum musto. id indito in doleum. resinam si indes, in culleum musti p. III bene comminuito, indito in fiscellam' (of various types of dust) and 39. 2 'haec omnia in calicem novum indito' (of ingredients for a cement). Cf. Plaut. *Merc.* 205 'in aquam indideris salem'. There are some 30 instances of the word with this function in Cato. It is also worth noting that *addo* is sometimes used in the same way,[6] though it more commonly means 'put in/on in addition'.[7]

[1] A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Latine*[4] (Paris, 1959), 518. The same prefix is found in *porceo* (*po+arceo*): ibid. 43.

[2] So in Plautus 8 of the literal instances of the word can be interpreted as equivalent to *depono* (G. Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum*, 340 *a*, 2).

[3] Quotations (with page and line numbers) are given from H. Stadler's text of the second book, in *Rom. Forsch.* x (1899), 181 ff.

[4] Just as the meaning of the general term 'put' may be said to include that of the slightly more specific *pono*, so the meaning of a word expressing action (2) or (3) might include that of certain more specific words. The phenomenon of inclusion is sometimes called hyponomy (see J. Lyons, *Structural Semantics* (Oxford, 1963), 69 ff.). A writer with a desire for precision might, for example, alternate between *infundo* and *instillo* instead of using a more general word with sense (2) which included both actions.

I am concerned here only with the general level of expression.

[5] See *T.L.L.* vii. 1. 1213. 54 ff. *Insero*, I (see *T.L.L.* vii. 1. 1869) can also be used in sense (3), but in earlier Latin it is rare (e.g. it is absent from Cato, Plautus, Varro, Vitruvius, and Scribonius Largus; Celsus, however, uses it a few times), and in later Latin it is constantly confused with *insero*, II (= 'graft on, plant'), a confusion which leaves its mark in the Romance languages (see Ernout and Meillet, op. cit. 618; on the confusion see *T.L.L.* vii. 1. 1869. 38 ff.). Its rarity in the writers listed above was probably due to the homonymic clash. In this article I shall deal only with the more common alternatives.

[6] 5. 8, 29, 33. 3, 48. 2.

[7] Cato often employs *indo* of the first ingredients put in a container, and *addo* of the later ingredients: e.g. 87 'in alveum indat, eo addat aquam' (cf. 23. 2, 23. 4, 24, 75, 76. 1, 86, 89, 104. 1–2, 151. 4).

The complementary spheres of *indo* and *(im)pono* can be well seen from the following passages, where *indo* has as its object the ingredients added to a container, and *(im)pono* the container itself: 108. 1 'dimidium acetabuli in caliculum novum indito . . . et imponito in carbones;' 156. 3 'eo indito salis micam . . . postea ponito pocillum in sereno noctu'.

For the use of the word to express the pushing of something into a narrow orifice, see 21. 1 'crassam quam columella ferrea erit, eam mediam pertundito, uti columellam indere possis' (the inserting of an iron pivot into a hole) ; 21. 3 'eas inter sese configito, ne foramina maiora fiant quo cupulae minusculae indentur'; 102 'id per nares indito, et ad ipsum morsum stercus suillum adponito' (observe the contrast with *adpono*, which refers to a substance administered externally).

It should be pointed out that *indo* and *(im)pono* are not absolute complements. *Indo* is a more general term, which alongside of the above senses also possesses the same sense as *impono*.[1] Note especially 18. 5, where both words are employed of the placing of a beam on a surface: 'trabem planam imponito . . . vel duplices (trabes) indito.' It would be understandable if *indo*, as the multipurpose word, had displaced *impono*, but in fact it was *indo* which tended to drop out of use, leaving *(im)pono* to be supplemented.

Indo occurs 26 times in Plautus, and even more frequently in Cato, but already in Terence it is not found at all. Varro's agricultural work, when compared with that of Cato, well underlines the change, for it contains no instances of *indo*. So too Caesar avoids the word completely, and Cicero uses it only once in his earliest work, if at all.[2] There are, however, 5 examples in Vitruvius and Celsus, but in both it is outnumbered, as we shall see, by its replacements. So in later technical prose it still turns up sporadically (e.g. 3 times in Vegetius' *Mulomedicina*, 4 times in the *Mulomedicina Chironis*, and 13 times in Marcellus Empiricus 1–21), but its incidence is insignificant in comparison with that of its rivals (see below).[3] Such occasional examples may have been due to the influence of sources.[4]

The reason for the fading of *indo* is not certain, but it may have to do with the clash between *do* = 'give' and *do* = 'put'.[5] It is noteworthy that many of the compounds in *-do* (whichever their root) that enjoyed some vitality are either easily interpreted as compounds of *-do* = 'give' (*dedo, trado, reddo, prodo, edo*) or else have acquired technical senses which obscure the root (e.g. *abdo, condo, perdo*). But in the case of *indo*, while the verbal component is noticeably not *dare*, the sense is not so specialized that the desire to interpret the root as *dare* would have ceased to operate.

One of the words which took over from *indo* was *conicio*. It provides a clear case of a shift of meaning which fully established itself not in isolation but in response to another event in the semantic field.[6]

---

[1] See *T.L.L.* vii. 1. 1215. 37 ff.

[2] *de Inv.* 2. 149 (text doubtful).

[3] Note that the archaizer Tacitus has it no fewer than 22 times, always in the historical works.

[4] It is remarkable that Marcellus Empiricus does not employ the word at all in chaps. 1–8, but in 9 has it 9 times. It may well have been suggested to him by a work which he had read.

[5] On the two distinct roots, see Ernout and Meillet, op. cit. 178 ff.

[6] On the importance of considering words not as isolated units but as interdependent elements sometimes forming systems, see S. Ullmann, *Semantics, an Introduction to the Science of Meaning* (Oxford, 1962), 236 ff. A semantic change in any one word may be part of a chain-reaction of events affecting a number of associated

It is necessary to distinguish between a slight shift (see above, p. 142 n. 4) and a larger transfer of the kind which we should have if *conicio* were often used hyperbolically in sense (1). Shifts are facilitated by semantic vagueness, of which there are various sources.[1] In this case we need only point to the indeterminacy of the boundaries which separate not only different actions but even different concrete objects. Thus the lack of a sharp line of demarcation between the thigh and the hip underlies the development of Fr. *cuisse* from Lat. *coxa*.

The vagueness of 'throw' scarcely needs emphasizing. It usually implies a thrusting action delivered behind an object, followed by motion of the object through space. But at what point does the thrust cease to be forceful enough to allow the action to be designated as throwing? It is the absence of a definite boundary which opened the way for *conicio* to be used not only of the propelling of objects such as spears but of the adding of ingredients to a pot, an action in which the speaker may envisage varying degrees of force.

Already in Cato *conicio* is in partial rivalry with *indo* as a result of a shift of this kind: e.g. 31. 1 'fac in stercus aut in aquam coniciantur' (cf. 54. 1); 83 'id in unum vas liceto coicere et vinum item in unum vas liceto coicere'; 115. 1 'in vinum mustum veratri atri manipulum coicito in amphoram'; 117 'in acetum coiciat et oleum addat' (note that *addo* follows *coicio* here just as it often follows *indo*: see above, p. 145 n. 7). But it is not yet used in sense (3). It is likely that when the gap left by *indo* had to be filled, *conicio*, which was already encroaching on one of the senses of *indo*, acquired the other by analogy.

With the increasing rarity of *indo conicio* becomes comparatively more frequent. Varro, who, as we have seen, avoids *indo* in his agricultural work, uses *conicio* 7 times with the function in question. At 1. 54. 3 'folliculi in dolia coiciuntur' he has it in a context in which Cato had employed *indo* (*Agr.* 23. 3, quoted p. 145 above). Vitruvius prefers *conicio* by 10:5, and at 10. 2. 2 gives it the meaning 'insert': 'figuntur chelonia, in quae coiciuntur sucularum capita' (insertions into sockets). In Celsus there are about 35 examples of the word in senses (2) and (3) against the 5 instances of *indo* which have been mentioned: e.g. (2) 2. 17 'in vasa fictilia . . . aqua conicitur'; 4. 19 'in grande vas conicienda sunt pira atque mala silvestria' (cf. ibid. 'omnia, quae indita sunt'); 7. 12. 1 'vinum . . . in quod galla candens coniecta sit'; (3) 7. 11 'calamum in narem esse coniciendum';[2] 7. 16 'in duas acus fila conicienda'; 6. 7. 9 'idque in aurem coniciendum'; 8. 12 'digiti pollices . . . in os eius coniciendi'. Finally, Scribonius Largus has dropped *indo* completely and uses *conicio* 9 times: e.g. 57 'in quo lapathi radices conici debebunt'; 73 'vase fictili coniciuntur'; 75 'in pilam conicere'; 82 'in caccabum coiciuntur'; 220 'medicamentum coniciatur in novo fictili caccabo'.

Similar examples occur in various other early Imperial authors, especially those writing on technical subjects, such as Pliny the Elder and Columella.[3] An interesting case in Pliny, to which we shall return in sect. II (p. 151), is that at 20. 99 expressing the thrusting of an object into an oven: 'in olla quae coiciatur in clibanum aut furnum'. Cato had used *indo* in the same way at *Agr.* 38. 2 ('in

---

words. See especially p. 242 on the motivation of the shift 'hip > thigh' seen in *coxa* > Fr. *cuisse*.

  [1] See Ullmann, op. cit. 116 ff.
  [2] Note that Celsus here has the word in a

context in which Cato uses *indo* (*Agr.* 102).
  [3] A selection of examples can be found at *T.L.L.* iv. 310, but no attempt has been made to distinguish the various senses.

fornacem . . . indito'). At a later date *conicio* survives in both senses in Marcellus Empiricus and the *Mulomedicina Chironis*,[1] among others, but by then it too was obsolescent (see below, II).

Most of the authors mentioned above are writers of educated Latin. It is worth pointing out that Löfstedt was under the impression that the weakening of *conicio* was a feature of vulgar Latin.[2] He quotes as evidence for this view two examples of the expression *in os conicio* found in freedmen's speeches in the *Cena Trimalchionis*. But the same phrase occurs in Cicero (*de Orat.* 1. 261) and Celsus (8. 12, quoted above), and is simply the modern substitute for *in os indo*, which is used by both Cato (*Agr.* 89) and Plautus (*Cas.* 247).

Two other compounds of *iacio*, *adicio* and *inicio*, also acted as partial replacements for *indo*. *Adicio*, however, like *addo*, tended from an early period to take on the special meaning 'add'.[3] *Inicio* is especially frequent in sense (3), and indeed in some writers (e.g. Scribonius Largus, Marcellus Empiricus, and Vegetius' *Mulomedicina*) outnumbers *conicio* with this meaning.[4] But it also occurs with sense (2): e.g. Celsus 3. 19 'satis utilis est quilibet ex via pulvis iniectus'; 7. 22 'tum super farina ex aqua frigida subacta inicienda est'; Scrib. Larg. 122 'iniciuntur in eandem calicem . . . coclearia tria'; Marc. Emp. 5. 16 'inice (in ollam) nucem pineam'.

For sense (3) see, e.g., Celsus 7. 16 'manibus suis . . . interiori membranae iniectis'; 7. 29 'intus emortuo corpori manus iniecta'; Scrib. Larg. 142 'perunguendus erit anus specillo lycio Patarico vel Indico, vel hoc collyrium iniciendum'; Marc. Emp. 1. 28 'fronti impositum aut naribus iniectum' (note the contrasted verbs); Soran. p. 91. 8[5] 'in orificium matricis manum sinistram intus inicere'; Veget. *Mul.* 1. 35. 2 'per anum iniecta manu'; 1. 61. 1 'item alium conteres et in anum inicies'; ps.-Theod. Prisc. p. 277[6] 'pyrethri radiculam cavo denti inicito'; Isid. *Etym.* 19. 34. 12 'socci . . . saccum habeant, in quo pars plantae inicitur'.[7]

Occasionally by a further shift *conicio* and *inicio* encroach on the sphere of *pono*.[8] But this shift is not widespread: indeed, it seems to be confined mainly to the Latin of Celsus, who sometimes uses both words in the manner of *impono* to signify the careful external application of medicaments to the body: e.g. 5. 26. 36 'super eminentem carnem exedentia medicamenta conicienda sunt' (cf. e.g. 5. 28. 7 'medicamenta imponuntur'); 4. 10 'malagmata iniciuntur' (cf. 4. 22 'imponere noctu malagmata'); 5. 27. 1 'emplastrum iniciendum'

---

[1] e.g. (2) *Mul.* 325, 561, 589, 837, 863, Marc. Emp. 8. 125, 8. 199, 14. 5; (3) *Mul.* 530, 557, 584, 772, Marc. Emp. 10. 28, 10. 65.

[2] *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (Uppsala, 1911), 265.

[3] See *O.L.D.* s.v. for a good elucidation of the various senses of this word.

[4] In Scribonius the two words complement each other: *conicio* has only sense (2), and *inicio* mainly sense (3) (about 7 times out of 9). The situation is almost identical in Marcellus. Vegetius, who has dropped *conicio*, employs *inicio* 18 times, 17 times in sense (3).

[5] Ed. V. Rose, *Sorani Gynaeciorum, Vetus Translatio Latina* (Leipzig, 1882).

[6] Ed. V. Rose, *Theodori Prisciani Euporiston libri III* (Leipzig, 1894).

[7] Two further compounds of *iacio* are used of insertions of specific types: *subicio* ('insert from beneath') and *traicio* ('push through'). See, e.g. Varro *Rust.* 1. 14. 2, *Mul. Chir.* 44, 59, 60, 102, 107, 218, 228, 402, 723, 881, Veg. *Mul.* 1. 51, 2. 82. 3. Note too *obicio* at *Mul. Chir.* 763 'manum siccam in verginali obicies' (cf. 772 'coicies in virginalem').

[8] As too does *adicio*, but only very rarely: e.g. *C.I.L.* ix. 4822 'quisque heres meus corpus meu(m) in hoc sarcofago non adiecerit' (quoted by *O.L.D.* s.v.); cf. *Vet. Lat.* Luke 12: 31 'haec omnia adicientur vobis' (= *adponetur* r[1]).

(cf. 5. 17. 2 'emplastrum imponitur'); 5. 28. 2 'ceratum ex rosa iniciendum est' (cf. 6. 9 'imponendumque ceratum ex cyrino aut irino factum'); 6. 9 'calida cataplasmata super maxillam iniciuntur' (cf. 3. 19 'imponere . . . cataplasmata'). The fact that *conicio* and *inicio* are not as a rule used in this way shows that shifts of meaning will not necessarily occur simply because of the semantic vagueness which has been referred to. An external factor (the disappearance of *indo*) caused them to become frequent in senses (2) and (3). But though it is only a small step to sense (1), the shift failed to take place because there was no corresponding factor to motivate it: *pono* and various compounds were in regular use.

Before we discuss in sect. II a further development in the semantic field, we may mention an interesting miscellaneous case of the weakening of a throwing-term. In the Latin translation of one of the medical works of Soranus (see above, p. 148 n. 5), *iacto*, which eventually became the standard term for 'throw' in late Latin (see below, V), is frequently used of the laying down of patients and infants. The author certainly had in mind a careful action; moreover, he uses *colloco* (on which see below, III) interchangeably in identical contexts: e.g. p. 25. 18 'iactanda est in lecto (feta)' (cf. *colloco* at 22. 1 'in illum autem qui mollius est stratus, post laborem fetam collocamus'); 50. 13 '(mulier) iactanda est in cubiculo mediocriter calido et lucido' (cf. 59. 22 '(mulier) collocanda est in cubiculo calido et claro'); 90. 19 (cf. 106. 6, 111. 11, 118. 3) 'supinam eam iactans' (cf. 84. 3 'supinam collocare'). The shifts by which this sense emerged were probably roughly as follows.

A transitional stage must have been the reflexive expression *se iactare*, expressing a hasty or careless casting of oneself down on a bed or elsewhere. Throwing-terms are readily applicable to the propelling of one's body forward or downwards with varying degrees of thrust. A reflexive usage of this kind can be clearly illustrated from the *Mulomedicina Chironis*, Vegetius' *Mulomedicina* and Pelagonius, where *se proicere* is employed constantly and *se iactare* occasionally of sick horses lying down. The usage no doubt suggested itself because of the awkward and apparently careless action concerned. E.g. *Mul. Chir.* 119 'ad terram se proicit'; 178 'se difficiliter proiciunt ad terram'; 244 'difficiliter se iactabit'; Veg. *Mul.* 1. 42. 1 'iumenta se proiciunt'; Pelag. 267 'cum se proiecerint et rursus levare voluerint'.[1]

From here the sense of *se iactare* could run into that of *se collocare*, for the distinction between a forceful and a careful action is indeterminate. Note, for example, *Exc. Vales.* 74, where *se iactare* is juxtaposed with *se collocare*: 'unus quidem in uno lecto se iactavit, duo enim in alio amore fraterno se conlocaverunt.' Similarly the example of *se proicere* at ps.-Theod. Prisc. p. 350 ('in lectum se calidum proiciat'; the reference is to a sick person) scarcely contains any hint of thrustful action.

The final stage would be the emergence on the analogy of *colloco* of a non-reflexive usage such as that in Soranus. For a comparable example of *proicio*, see *Lib. Hist. Francorum* p. 300. 32[2] 'deinceps Chlotbertus, filius eorum alius, cum nimis egrotaretur, componentes eum in feretro, Suessionis basilicam sancti Medarchi duxerunt. proicientesque eum ad sanctum sepulchrum, voverunt vota pro eo' (the placing of a sick person at the tomb of a saint). But just as *conicio* and *inicio* did not become genuine synonyms of *pono*, so *iacto* and *proicio*

---

[1] Cf. e.g. *Mul. Chir.* 170, 239, 244, 276, 316, 368, 372, 376, 429, 442, 445.

[2] Ed. B. Krusch, *M.G.H.*, *Script. Rer. Merov.* II.

remained unusual in this sense. The more normal usage is that appearing in the *Mulomedicina Chironis*.

II

We are now in a position to consider the meaning and use of *mitto* in late Latin. So far from simply taking on the sense of *pono*, as Löfstedt believed, it gradually displaced *conicio* and *inicio* as the term denoting putting-actions involving dropping, inserting or thrusting of various kinds. Thus in much late Latin *mitto* and *pono* are clearly distinguishable. The semantic change 'throw>put' which *mitto* underwent (on *mitto* = 'throw', see below, V) was not a haphazard and inexplicable event, but was conditioned partly by the restricted meaning of *pono*, and partly by the obsolescence of *conicio* and *inicio*.

The disappearance of *conicio* and *inicio* is clear enough (neither word leaves a reflex in Romance), but it does not seem capable of explanation. We can only demonstrate the gradually changing situation. If, for example, the distribution of *conicio* is compared with that of *mitto* (in our senses) over a period, it emerges that *conicio* was falling into disuse during the second half of the fourth and early fifth centuries, and that by the next century it had been completely replaced. Thus in the *Mulomedicina Chironis* (second half of the fourth century) and Marcellus Empiricus (early fifth century) the two words are in rivalry (though it is already *mitto* that predominates, by 48:25 in the *Mul. Chir.* and even more markedly—by 79:13—in Marc. Emp., chaps. 1–21), but in Anthimus (early sixth century), Dioscorides Lat. (Lombard), Apicius and the *Antidotarium Bruxellense* (sixth century),[1] among others, *conicio* has been dropped. It is also absent from the *Mulomed.* of Vegetius (*mitto* 53 times), who wrote after and made use of the *Mul. Chir.*[2] Vegetius did, however, often employ *inicio* in sense (3) (see above, p. 148 n. 4).[3]

We shall now illustrate in detail the sense of *mitto* and that of *pono* in a number of authors in whom the usage *mitto* = *pono* has often been thought to occur. It will also be suggested that in some late Greek (Oribasius) βάλλω tends to differ from τίθημι in the same way as *mitto* from *pono*.

Apicius provides extensive evidence of a distinction existing between *mitto* and *pono* identical to that which has been seen between *indo* and *conicio* on the one hand and *pono* on the other. In his culinary work *mitto* is the standard term for the adding of ingredients to a preparation,[4] but is not used in sense (1). With that meaning *pono* is preferred. The difference between the two words can

[1] Text in V. Rose's edition of Theodorus Priscianus, 363 ff. (see above, p. 148 n. 6).

[2] In the medical work ascribed to Pliny (see above, p. 144 n. 14), *conicio* is still preferred to *mitto* (10:4). This fact would tend to suggest a date for the work somewhat earlier than that of the *Mul. Chir.* Önnerfors dates it on various grounds to the fourth century (p. viii).

[3] While the general pattern of transition from *indo* to *conicio/inicio* to *mitto* is certain enough, it would be wrong to assume that each stage in the development was completely clear-cut. Overlapping of the old with the new is inevitable in the process of linguistic change. Though writers such as

Varro and Celsus almost always use *conicio/inicio* where Cato would have used *indo*, Marcellus Empiricus (among others) presents a more confused picture. He employs the new term *mitto*, it is true, far more often than any other word in senses (2) and (3), but even *indo* has not been dropped completely; indeed, it is as common as *conicio* (14:13 in chaps. 1–21), though *inicio* (10 times, usually in sense (3)) and *conicio* together outnumber it. Marcellus was probably influenced both by the current language and by early writings in the genre.

[4] It occurs so constantly with this sense that it would be pointless to list examples.

be seen in the following passages: 1. 12. 10 'alternis scobem siccam mittis et gipsas et loco frigido pones'; 2. 2. 4 'aquae undecim mittis et ad vaporem ignis pones'; 4. 2. 8 'tantum in patinam mittes olei unc. iv, pones in termo-spodio et facies ut ferveat'; 4. 2. 9 'eam (patinam) impones cineri calido et sic inpensam supra scriptam mittes'; Exc. 15 'teres piper, ligisticum, origanum . . . mittis in caccabo, ponis ut ferveat'. Even when *pono* is not employed of the container into which ingredients are put, it is still easily distinguishable from *mitto*. It is sometimes applied to placing-actions which are envisaged as espe-cially careful, as at 1. 12. 4 ('omnia cum peciolis diligenter legito et in melle ponito ne se contingant'),[1] or it may denote the placing or arrangement in a container of the whole object (chicken, fish, etc.) under preparation: e.g. 6. 9. 5 '(pullum) ornabis et in cumana ponis.'[2] Similarly *impono* is always used of careful actions with the sense 'put on'.[3]

In the *Antidotarium Bruxellense* there are 33 examples of *pono* and *impono*, all of which have sense (1).[4] Of the 50 examples of *mitto*, 40 have sense (2), 3 clearly mean 'throw',[5] and the remaining 7 refer to insertions (or to the putting of material into an orifice with an action closer to that of (2)).[6] Note that the example at 42 ('intra os mittitur') occurs in an expression in which we have seen both *indo* and *conicio* employed. *In os mittere* is common in late Latin.[7]

Theodorus Priscianus has *mitto* 8 times in his *Euporiston*, always of ingredients dropped in a mixture.[8] *Pono* and *impono* are used rather of ointments, etc., applied to the body.[9]

In the second book of Dioscorides Latinus *mitto* occurs 26 times, always with senses (2) or (3).[10] Twice we find it used of the thrusting of an object into an oven (194. 11 'coopertum munis argilla et mittes in caminum'; 240. 1 'accepta argilla includis aut absungia et mittes in fornu'), an application in which both *indo* and *conicio* have already been illustrated from earlier Latin.[11] The contrast between *mitto* and *pono* as they appear in Dioscorides is particularly clear in the following passages: 200. 15 'in alio caccabo mittis, pones in sole'; 201. 29 'mittes in caccabo ubi adipes misisti et carbonibus pones'; 233. 27 'nobum testum carbonibus ponis et misso piper agitas semper'; 380. 6 'quem sucum mittere debes in vaso fictili . . . ponet in sole'; 208. 7 'mittis in caccabo novo, et missa aqua maritima impones in foco'.[12]

In Oribasius Latinus *mitto*, for the most part translating βάλλω, is similarly used in sense (2) (of ingredients):[13] e.g. *Syn.* 3. 2 'aliqui enim pro roseu et

---

[1] Cf. 2. 1. 7.

[2] Cf. 4. 2. 18, 4. 2. 24, 6. 9. 11, 8. 6. 9. *Compono* is also common in reference to the arrangement of food on a dish before cooking or serving (e.g. 4. 2. 10, 4. 2. 11, 4. 2. 21, 4. 2. 22, 4. 2. 23, 4. 2. 24).

[3] 4. 2. 4, 4. 2. 5, 4. 2. 9, 4. 4. 1, 6. 2. 1, 8. 8. 9.

[4] *Impono* predominates: usually the refer-ence is to external treatment.

[5] 9, 64, 83.

[6] 42, 53, 54, 62, 67, 68, 69.

[7] Cf. e.g. Veg. *Mul.* 2. 88. 15, *Vit. Patr.* 5. 4. 7, 5. 4. 10 (twice), 5. 4. 70, Isid. *Etym.* 11. 1. 49, 16. 9. 4 (cf. *T.L.L.* viii. 1170. 45).

[8] *Eupor. Faen.* 9, 15 (twice), 38, 79, 84 (twice), *Gyn.* 19.

[9] e.g. *Eupor. Faen.* 27, 60, 65, 79, 84.

[10] For the most part with sense (2). But see e.g. 207. 7 'cum miseris digitu, citius ascendit.'

[11] This use of *mitto*, though scarcely men-tioned by *T.L.L.*, is found often in later Latin: e.g. Vulg. Matth. 13: 42, 13: 50, Apic. 8. 6. 10, 8. 7. 1, 8. 7. 8, ps.-Plin. *Med.* 2. 6. 5, ps.-Theod. Prisc. p. 287, *Pass. Matth.* 14, *Vit. Patr.* 5. 14. 18, Oribas. Lat. *Syn.* 3. 13 (transl. ἔμβαλε), Marc. Emp. 8. 88, 8. 199, 13. 6.

[12] When it is not used as in the final example, *impono* usually has its common medical sense.

[13] The text is that of Molinier, *Œuvres d'Oribase*, vols. v and vi (Paris, 1873 and 1876).

cicinu mittent oleum susinum' (τινὲς δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ῥοδίνου καὶ τοῦ κικίνου ἐνέβαλον σούσινον) ; 3. 4 'et sic mittis cera et resina' (καὶ οὕτω βαλὼν κηρὸν καὶ ῥητίνην) ; ibid. 'mittis libanum primo' (ἐπίβαλλε τὸν λιβανωτὸν μὲν πρῶτον) ; 3. 5 'mittas in mortario' (βαλὼν εἰς ἴγδιν) ; 3. 12 'oleu et acetu modicum in ulla rude mittis (ἔλαιον, ὄξους ὀλίγον εἰς χύτραν καινὴν βάλλων). *Pono* and certain compounds, on the other hand, usually translating τίθημι or a compound, are employed of medicaments applied externally or of the setting down of vessels: e.g. *Syn.* 3. 12 'vulnus in quo ponitur'; ibid. 'glutinat enim magnifice si excoriatur aliquod membrum sublato humore, si imponitur' (ἐπίθῃς) ; 3. 14 'fronti ante accessionem positus' (ἐπιτεθέν) ; 3. 33 'et ponis ipsum vas in stercolino' (τεθέν-τος). The distinction can be seen at *Eupor.* 2. 12: 'sucum autem ipsum in patella mittis et ad solem ponis.'

The same distinction is also consistently maintained between the two words by Caelius Aurelianus, who uses both frequently. They may be compared at *Acut.* 3. 43 'sub sole . . . viginti diebus ponemus, tunc iisdem diebus mittimus medicamentum in pilam.'

In the short treatise *de Vesicae Vitiis*[1] *impono* is used 4 times, always in sense (1), and *mitto* 4 times, always in sense (2).

Vegetius' *Mulomedicina* provides just over 50 instances of *mitto* which could be translated by Eng. 'put'. Of these 29 have sense (2) and 18 are used of inserting.[2] There are about 5 cases which do not fall into any of the categories identified earlier, but they are not necessarily equivalent to *pono*.[3] Finally there is one clear case of *mitto* = *pono*: 4. 4. 2 'cum libra mellis atque aquae congio miscent, quae una nocte sub divo mittunt.' Some overlapping is only to be expected.

There are about 48 relevant examples of *mitto* in the *Mulomedicina Chironis*. 29 have sense (2), 14 sense (3),[4] and the remaining handful present difficulties of classification, but are again not obviously substitutable by *pono*.[5]

Of the 79 examples of *mitto* in Marcellus Empiricus 1–21 which would be included in Eng. 'put', 71 are used in sense (2) and the remainder in sense (3). For the distinction between *mitto* and *pono* see, e.g., 7. 15 'omnia haec in unum vas mittes et diebus XL sub divo positum . . .'; 7. 19 'post haec omnia mittes oleum . . . et iterum igni non nimio adposita olla . . .'; 8. 178 'mitte in vas aereum positumque ad solem tamdiu agita . . .'. The rarity of *mitto* in sense (3) is worthy of emphasis. It is noticeable that though Marcellus sometimes uses *mitto* or *inicio* of insertions, he also makes frequent use of various hyponyms.[6] He was content to use a general verb when presenting recipes, but felt the need for greater precision when describing their internal use.[7]

---

[1] Text in V. Rose's edition of Theodorus Priscianus, 261 ff. (see above, p. 148 n. 6).

[2] For this sense, which has not been illustrated to any extent above, see 1. 46. 2 (twice), 1. 49, 1. 50, 1. 52. 1, 1. 61. 2, 2. 70. 1, 2. 79. 3, 2. 79. 21, 2. 88. 7.

[3] e.g. 2. 121. 2.

[4] e.g. 230, 231, 232, 236, 418, 685.

[5] The case at 674, for instance ('iumentum . . . in machinam mittito') is apparently applied to a pushing action (cf. 584 'in machinam coicito eum').

[6] e.g. *instigo, insufflo, imprimo, intorqueo, instillo, immergo.*

[7] It is sometimes interesting to observe the extent to which an author makes use of hyponyms of *mitto* etc., whether in sense (2) or (3). Apicius, for example, employs numerous specific alternatives to *mitto* in recipes (e.g. *mergo, aspergo, instillo, misceo* and compounds, *fundo* and compounds), an indication that precision was important for him in a sphere which did not greatly concern Marcellus, whose focus of attention lay elsewhere. However, another medical writer, Scribonius Largus, is no less precise than Apicius in recipes: he seems to use hyponyms of *inicio* and *conicio* more often than the

We may mention finally a few writers of different types, for it is not only in medical Latin that *mitto* is used as a complement rather than as a synonym of *pono*. In the sixth century *Itinerarium Antonini Placentini*, for example, *mitto* when weakened has sense (2) in 3 places[1] and the meaning 'thrust' in another.[2] The only other relevant case is worth quoting, for it is of a common type which we have not encountered before: 36 'sareca missa ante se petebant panem a transeuntibus' (a *sareca* is a type of tunic). The translation 'put' is possible, but the word is certainly not equivalent to *pono*. The motion involved in the laying down of coverings or the putting on of clothes may be seen as containing an element of casting, and it is for this reason that *mitto* (like throwing-terms in other languages) is often used in such contexts.[3] Cf. *Vit. Patr.* 3. 145 'si haberemus aliquid de veteramentis, *mitteremus* super illud' = 5. 14. 17 'si habuissemus aliquid vetustum, *iactaremus* super corpus illud' (ἐβάλομεν, *Rev. Or. Chrét.* 1909, p. 378, no. 294).[4]

The numerous examples of *mitto* in Isidore's *Etymologiae*[5] and in the *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*[6] can also usually be brought under our rules. In the latter work the example at *Mart. Matth.* 24 ('iussit celerius locello ferreo adduci et mitti in eo corpus sancti Mathei') when compared with that at 23 ('in quo ponerent sanctum Matheum') may seem to be an exception, but in fact in the former passage *mitto* translates ἐμβάλλω and in the other *pono* translates ἐπιτί-θημι. The context suggests (note *celerius*) that an action akin to that of sentence (2) is meant at 24. Worthy of special note is *Mart. Matth.* 20 'sic deos deposuit . . . iussit ut illos carbones igneos super eum mitterent', where *deposuit* is applied to the careful setting down of silver statues, and *mitterent* to the dropping of hot coals. Elsewhere in the *Acta*, as well as in Isidore and the *Itin. Ant. Plac.*, *pono* and its compounds are typically used thus.

It is now clear that there is a semantic system of a sort within the limited sphere which has been examined. The parcelling out of this sphere in Latin is distinctive mainly because *pono* retained enough of its original force to be incapable of expressing certain actions. A full treatment of the field 'put' would obviously have to take into account numerous hyponyms of *indo* and *mitto*. These two sections have deliberately been restricted to the more general level of expression in order to demonstrate that the semantic change 'throw>put' seen in certain Latin words is most satisfactorily explained not as an isolated phenomenon but as taking place under the impulse of events affecting associated words. *Mitto* has been clearly shown to have possessed a sense quite distinct

general terms. At the other extreme stands the vulgar Latin of Anthimus, whose almost unvarying use of *mitto* in sense (2) may reflect a limitation of vocabulary. (For examples see the index of E. Leichtenhan, *Anthimi de observatione ciborum ad Theodoricum regem Francorum epistula*, p. 71, where, however, *mitto* is erroneously interpreted as equivalent to *pono*.)

[1] 18, 36, 46.

[2] 35.

[3] See *T.L.L.* viii. 1169. 8 ff., 1168. 82 ff.

[4] The examples of *mitto* at 7 and 12 (twice), which are interpreted at *Corp. Christianorum* clxxvi, Index p. 775 as = *pono*,

are more likely to mean 'send', and that at 24 I have taken as = 'throw'.

[5] 4. 10. 5, 11. 1. 49, 15. 8. 17, 16. 3. 7, 16. 9. 4, 16. 22. 1, 17. 3. 5, 17. 7. 17, 17. 7. 21, 17. 9. 79, 19. 25. 3, 20. 9. 1, 20. 9. 7. At 16. 25. 14 the word has shifted further towards *pono* (cf. *pono* at 16. 25. 15).

[6] Ed. R. A. Lipsius (Leipzig, 1891–1903). See *Pass. Apost. Petri et Pauli* 2, *Pass. Andreae* 14, *Pass. Barthol.* 3, 6, *Mart. Matth.* 14, 20, 24. The example at *Pass. Apost. Petri et Pauli* 2 may = *pono*: 'in quo lampada ardens missa est' (cf. *Vit. Patr.* 3. 18 'lucernam posuit').

from that of *pono*. Moreover, it exhibits this sense in the Latin of various social strata and not merely in vulgar Latin, as has usually been thought: hence it is used just as often by Vegetius as in the *Mulomed. Chir.*

Something must finally be said on the question whether *mitto* underwent a further shift in the direction of *pono*. We have already seen a few cases of *mitto* = *pono* (e.g. in Vegetius; cf. above, p. 153 n. 5, n. 6), but these have always been exceptional in the writers concerned. They have represented not a genuine change of meaning but the sporadic overlapping of one vague term with another, occurring by chance and without the external impulse which is often identifiable in the case of a real shift.

Similarly almost all instances of *mitto* with sense (1) which I have noted down to at least the sixth century can be seen as exceptional if we examine the writer's use of the word elsewhere.[1] We may illustrate from two late works containing examples of *mitto* = *pono*.

A common situation is that obtaining in the *Vitae Patrum*, in which both *mitto* and *pono* are frequent. For the most part the usual distinction exists between them: e.g. 5. 10. 92 'mitte in eo oleum . . . et pone vas in locum suum' (cf. 5. 10. 97 'apposuit eis panem siccum et sal . . . et misit parum aceti in salibus illis').[2] Yet in a few other places *mitto* is applied to the serving of food (in containers) (= *adpono*).[3]

In the scholia to Juvenal a typical contrast between the two words is found in a note on 14. 261, where *mitto* is used of the putting of coins in a chest (probably sense (2)), and *pono* of the setting of the chest in a certain position: 'antea solebant arcas aeratas facere et ibi mittere pecuniam suam senatores et sic in foro Martis ponere.' Of the other relevant instances of *mitto*,[4] one expresses the casting of a toga over someone on a bed (3. 172), another the dropping of an object in a container (14. 5), and two refer to an inserting-action (5. 43, 5. 44).[5] At 6. 102, however, *pono* could probably have replaced it: 'ad funes manum mittere' (commenting on 'duros gaudet tractare rudentis'). The expression *manum mitto* can be used both of violent acts[6] and of the thrusting of the hand into something,[7] but it failed to maintain its distinctive force. Already in an old Latin version of Genesis 24:2 we find *mitte manus* translating θὲς τὴν χεῖρα (Vulg. *pone manum tuam*),[8] and in Medieval Latin the phrase is constantly used with the same sense as *manum pono*.[9]

[1] It is possible to quote a few apparent cases of *mitto* = *pono* from a remarkably early period. The example found at Ovid, *Fasti* 2. 634 ('nutriat incinctos missa patella Lares', = *adposita*, 'served'; cf. 6. 310) probably resulted not from a series of shifts of the kind that we have dealt with but from the hyperbolic use of a throwing-term in sense (1). It is of course in poetry that we should expect such hyperbole. The apparent example at Celsus 5. 27. 13 ('isque, si febre vacat, in calidum balneum mittendus') should probably be taken in the sense 'send', for Celsus nowhere uses *mitto* in senses (2) or (3).

[2] For *pono* used of the placing down of large or breakable objects see, e.g., 3. 11, 3. 18, 3. 47, 3. 98, 5. 4. 12, 5. 5. 29, 5. 5. 39, 5. 6. 19, 5. 8. 8, 5. 8. 15, 5. 10. 85, 5. 10. 113.

For some typical examples of *mitto*, see 3. 51 (twice), 5. 4. 7, 5. 4. 10 (three times), 5. 4. 59, 5. 4. 70, 5. 14. 3, 5. 15. 17, 5. 17. 17.

[3] 3. 19, 5. 15. 66.

[4] See P. Wessner, *Scholia in Iuvenalem vetustiora* (B. T.), Index, p. 317 (where *mitto* is taken as being equivalent to *pono*).

[5] For the use of *mitto* expressing insertions into the fabric of something (as in these passages), cf. Vopisc. *Aurel.* 46. 1; cf. *T.L.L.* viii. 1170. 36 ff.

[6] e.g. *Pass. Barthol.* 3.

[7] e.g. at Soran. p. 24. 18, and often in Vegetius, *Mul.* and the *Mul. Chir.*

[8] For the *V.L.* of Genesis, see B. Fischer, *Vetus Latina, die Reste der altlateinische Bibel* (Freiburg, 1951–4).

[9] See e.g. *Vit. Caes. Arel.* 1. 47 (comparing *pono* at 2. 2).

In view of the tenacity of the distinctive nuance of *mitto*, it is not surprising to find some continuity between the use of the word in late Latin and the use of its reflexes in Romance. Thus in Spanish *meter* is not employed of the careful action of placing something down (as in Latin, *poner* is preferred), but it is the set term for the thrusting of an object into something.

It is not the purpose of this article to go beyond about the sixth century. Nevertheless, it is worth while to point out in conclusion that at some stage later than our period *mitto* must have undergone a further shift in the Latin of Gaul, for in French *mettre* combines the senses of *pono* and *mitto*.[1] The motivation behind this development may be conjectured. In Gaul, as the Romance evidence shows, *pono* became specialized in the speech of farmers, and its specialized sense eventually ousted the other uses of the word (Fr. *pondre*, 'lay eggs').[2] Under the circumstances it is understandable that *mitto* should have widened its sphere to cover that of *pono*.

<h2 style="text-align:center">III</h2>

According to Varro, *loco*, which survived in a specialized sense,[3] had been replaced by the compound *colloco* as a placing-verb (*Ling.* 5. 14 'locus est ubi locatum quid esse potest, ut nunc dicunt, collocatum'), and this remark is largely borne out by the evidence. Varro himself in the *de Re Rustica* uses only *colloco*, and Caesar has the simple verb only once, against numerous instances of *colloco*.[4] Later Vitruvius, whose Latin may be taken as a rough guide to the ordinary educated language of his day, prefers the latter by about 195:0. The archaizer Tacitus, however, leans to *loco* (23:10).

Certain reflexes of *colloco* in Romance have the sense 'lay down' or, reflexively, 'lie down, go to bed' (e.g. Fr. *coucher*).[5] The emergence of this specialized meaning deserves explanation.

Specialization usually takes place within a particular social or professional group.[6] Such a group will often apply a general term to a particular idea or object of special interest to itself with such persistence that the word takes on a restricted sense. The result is usually the acquisition by the word of a new sense to stand alongside its old ones (hence, for example, 'operation' means different things to different professional groups). But in some cases the specialized meaning passes beyond its narrow social milieu and ousts the former meanings completely. Thus in French, as we have seen, *pono* leaves not a general placing-term but the specialized *pondre*: a restriction which must originally have occurred in the language of farmers passed into general use.

It has not been noticed that in the case of *colloco* specialization first took place in the language of doctors. As early as the first century A.D., when many writers

---

[1] Hence it could be used to translate 'put' in all three of the sentences quoted at the outset. So in contexts such as 'mettre l'assiette sur la table' and 'mettre de la pommade sur une blessure', *pono* and *impono* would have been preferred to *mitto* in the late Latin of our period.

[2] The specialized usage occasionally makes an appearance in literature: Col. 8. 2. 12 'cum pauca ova posuerunt': Isid. *Etym.* 12. 6. 64 'aliae ponunt ova'. Compare the analogous usage at ps.-Theod. Prisc.

p. 349 'muliere quae integrum partum non ponit'.

[3] On which see E. Benveniste, *Le Vocabulaire des Institutions Indo-Européennes* (Paris, 1969), i. 158 f.

[4] In the *B. Afr.*, however, *loco* is used 3 times.

[5] See Meyer-Lübke, op. cit. 2052.

[6] See e.g. A. Meillet, *Linguistique Historique et Linguistique Générale*[2] (Paris, 1926), i. 244 ff.; S. Ullmann, *Semantics, an Introduction to the Science of Meaning*, 161 f., 228 f.

(e.g. Vitruvius: see above) were using *colloco* freely as a general term, the medical writer Celsus employs it almost exclusively to describe the laying down or positioning of a patient in a bed or elsewhere. There are 35 examples of the word in his work, of which about 31 have the specialized meaning: e.g. 3. 7. 2 'multa veste operiendus est et collocandus ut dormiat'; 7. 29 'illa conclavi collocanda est modicum calorem sine ullo perflatu habente.'[1] So in the later period, at a time when *colloco* was still appearing in non-medical Latin with a general sense,[2] all 13 instances in the gynaecological work of Soranus Latinus are similarly specialized,[3] as are the single instances in the *Ant. Brux.* (37 'ex eo mane unam potionem bibat et sero qua hora se collocat unam') and ps.-Plin. *Med.* (2. 14. 7 'cum se collocat'), all 5 instances in the veterinary work of Vegetius,[4] and both of those in the *Mul. Chir.*[5] The same restriction is also observable in Caelius Aurelianus.[6]

We thus have a clear case of specialization developing in the speech of a professional class, while in the everyday language, for a while at least, the general sense continued to survive. It is well to remember that at a period when remedies were simple, considerable reliance was placed on the correct positioning of an invalid: hence the need for a special word.

As the language had no term for laying down (prone) as distinct from standing upright (*statuo*) or putting down regardless of position (*pono*), conditions were ideal for the spread of the usage beyond the medical sphere. It turns up sporadically in non-medical Latin at an early date (Terence, Afranius),[7] but only begins to occupy a proportionately more significant position in late Latin. In the *Excerpta Valesiana*, in which *pono* is found a number of times in general applications, the only instance of *colloco* refers reflexively to the act of lying down (see above, p. 149). So in the old Latin versions of Mark, Luke, and John, in which *pono* appears constantly, *colloco* is attested in only one place, and there with the specialized sense.[8]

The question why it was *colloco* rather than another placing-word which medical Latin chose as its specialized term can be answered with some certainty. Although *pono* and *colloco* are often virtually interchangeable, *colloco* seems to have been the term *par excellence* for the deliberate arranging or placing of an object in a particular place or position,[9] whereas *pono* simply meant 'put something somewhere, in any position'.[10] The distinction is stated by E. Benveniste thus:[11] '*locare* n'est pas «mettre quelque chose quelque part», mais

---

[1] See above, p. 144 n. 9, on an *index verborum* to Celsus. Cf. *O.L.D.* s.v. (6) for some examples.

[2] Some clear cases can be found in the Latin translation of Herm. Past.: e.g. *Similit.* 9. 12 (Cod. *a*) 'lapides illos . . . in structuram turris collocatos'; 9. 15(*a*) '(lapides) qui in fundamentis collocati sunt'; cf. 9. 30(*a*).

[3] pp. 21. 18, 22. 1, 22. 3, 22. 10, 42. 1, 56. 16, 59. 22, 67. 12, 83. 7, 83. 22, 84. 3, 84. 5, 110. 2.

[4] 1. 56. 21, 2. 12. 3, 2. 17. 2, 2. 69. 2, 2. 109. 1. Cf. the sole example of *loco* at 2. 47. 2.

[5] 481, 598.

[6] Caelius also uses *loco* in the same sense.

See *Acut.* 2. 149, 3. 58, 3. 198, 3. 222, *Chron.* 1. 5, 1. 9, 2. 17, 2. 67, 2. 73, 2. 183.

[7] See *O.L.D.* s.v. (6) for references.

[8] Luke 2: 7 (Cod. *a*). For some other non-medical examples of the usage see e.g. *Vita Genovefae* 5, Jul. Val. 1. 4, *Vit. Patr.* 5. 13. 11, Pallad. *Hist. Mon.* 1. 2 p. 258, Fredegar p. 167. 29, Herm. Past. *Similit.* 9. 11(*a*).

[9] The verb constantly occurs in the vicinity of *locus*, an indication that the connection between the two words continued to be felt.

[10] *Pono* need not be accompanied by a locative expression.

[11] Loc. cit.

«faire que quelque chose trouve sa place naturelle, l'emplacement qui lui est dû» . . . Ainsi, *locare* est très différent de *ponere* «abandonner, laisser quelque chose à une place quelconque».' It is noteworthy that Vitruvius, unlike most writers, uses *colloco* far more frequently than *pono*, presumably because it was suited to the exactitude required in the description of architectural design or construction. There are long sections of his work (such as 4. 2 and 3) in which it appears constantly to the virtual exclusion of *pono*. Note that at 4. 1. 2 'cetera membra quae supra columnas inponuntur, aut e doricis symmetriis aut ionicis moribus in corinthiis columnis conlocantur', there may be a conscious distinction between *impono*, denoting the placing in an unspecified manner of certain objects on others, and *colloco*, which is applied to the exact arrangement of these objects in a definite style.

Hence it is not surprising that medical writers adopted it as their technical term.

IV

The semantic development of *pauso* is curious, but we can nevertheless piece together certain clues and explain the emergence of the sense 'put' with reasonable certainty. However, occurrences of this sense in extant literature are so infrequent that it is impossible to assign the word a place in the lexical system dealt with in the first two sections.

Pauso makes its first appearance in late Latin,[1] where it is usually intransitive and means either 'cease' or 'rest' (in the latter sense referring either to a temporary state or euphemistically to death): e.g. (1) *Ant. Brux.* 213 'hemicranius pausat, si vermes . . . linantur loco dolenti'; ps.-Theod. Prisc. p. 321 'quamdiu dolor de epate pauset'; Herm. Past. *Vis.* 1. 3. 8 (*b*) 'cum pausassem interrogans';[2] (2) *Mul. Chir.* 221 'et iacens quasi videtur pausare pusillum';[3] Benedict. *Reg.* 48. 5 'surgentes a mensa pausent in lecta sua'; Ambrosiast. *in Rom.* 8. 19 'pausare in otio'.[4] The compound *repauso* can also be used in this second meaning.[5] The crucial event for our purposes was the emergence of *pauso* as a transitive verb.[6] Sometimes it is the meaning 'cease' which is transitivized,[7] but usually it is in the other sense that the word is affected. An example

[1] It is apparently a Greek borrowing, modelled on the aorist of παύω (cf. *campsare, malaxare, catapsare*): Ernout and Meillet, op. cit. 490. The date of its introduction into Latin is obscure, though Ernout and Meillet assert (loc. cit.) that it is 'sans doute ancien dans la langue parlée'. (At Plaut. *Trin.* 187 read παῦσαι.)

[2] Cf. e.g. *Ves. Vit.* p. 266, Hippocr. *Progn.* 24 (ed. G. Kaibel and C. Robert [Berlin, 1890]), Oribas. Lat. *Syn.* 3. 187, 5. 45 *Ab*, 7. 23 *Aa*.

[3] Note that Vegetius in the equivalent context substitutes *requiesco*: 1. 43. 2 'et iacens videtur quasi pusillum requiescere.' See E. Lommatzsch, *A.L.L.* xii (1902), 554.

[4] This latter usage, usually with the accompanying expression *in pace*, is particularly common in sepulchral inscriptions. For examples see E. Diehl, *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres* (Berlin, 1925–31), iii, Index vii, p. 377. For further examples

of *pauso* = 'cease', cf. Benedict. *Reg.* 22. 3, *Vit. Patr.* 5. 4. 64, Oribas. Lat. *Syn.* 5. 37 *La*, *Vita Caesar. Arel.* 2. 31. See also p. 381. 18 in the *Excerpta Monac.* of ps.-Quint. *Decl. Maior.*, where the word occurs in a context in which the original declamation (p. 254. 23) had not used it. In an old Latin version of Matth. 25: 5 *pauso* means not 'rest' but 'become sleepy' (νυστάζω, *dormito*): see H. Rönsch, *Semasiologische Beiträge* iii (Leipzig, 1889), 62.

[5] e.g. *Vita Caesar. Arel.* 2. 11, *Vit. Patr.* 5. 10. 97, *Actus Petri cum Simone* 22.

[6] On the transitivizing of intransitive verbs in Latin, see J. B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich, 1965), 31 f.; Svennung, op. cit. (see p. 142 n. 1), 445.

[7] See Anon. *Med.* 200 (ed. J. Piechotta, in *Jahresbericht des königlichen katholischen Gymnasiums zur Leobschutz*, 1886–7); Philum. 54. 1.

of the reflexive usage (= 'rest oneself'), which was probably the starting-point in the development, is found at *Vita Caesar. Arel.* 2. 33 'ab abstantibus vero vel a cubiculariis suggerebatur propter lassitudinem suam . . . ut se pausaret.' The non-reflexive usage (= 'rest someone'>'lay someone to rest') occurs already in Arnobius: *adv. Nat.* 5. 7 'tunc arborem pinum, sub qua Attis nomine spoliaverat se viri, in antrum suum defert et sociatis planctibus cum Agdesti tundit et sauciat pectus pausatae circum arboris robur' (= 'sepulturae datae').[1] Cf. *Vita Radegundis* 2. 24 'dum pausaretur sanctum corpus'; *Pass. Domnin.* 992. 33 'et quantum ad iactum lapidis transtulit caput suum ibique eum pausavit, ubi nunc corpus permanet'.[2]

It will be observed that the latter 4 examples of *pauso* occur in ambiguous contexts.[3] The usual word for placing oneself, or another, down (to rest) was *colloco*, or, in the case of burial, *pono*.[4] In contexts such as those above *pauso* could readily be interpreted as equivalent to *colloco* or *pono*.[5] It would then be a simple matter for it to be taken beyond its narrow sphere of burial and resting and to be used of placing in general. It thus underwent a semantic development (generalization) almost exactly opposite to the specialization suffered by *colloco*. For a general instance of the word = 'place', see *Leg. Alamann.* p. 105. 10 (Codd. *B*) 'pausavit arma sua iosum'.[6]

V

In this section words for 'throw' in late Latin are dealt with.

From the earliest period *mitto* had often been used of throwing as well as sending (cf. ἵημι). In Caesar, for example, it is employed 16 times with *tela* or *pila* as object, as against 30 examples of *tela* or *pila* +*conicio*. The simple verb *iacio* is found 4 times with *tela*, and not at all with *pila*.

In popular Latin by the time of the old Latin translations of the Bible *mitto* seems to have displaced both *iacio* and *conicio* as a throwing-term. In the Vulgate *conicio* occurs only twice and *iacio* 30 times (27 times in the O.T., which, since it was translated directly from the Hebrew by Jerome, bears less resemblance in vocabulary to the *Vetus Latina* than does the Vulgate version of the N.T., in which Jerome made extensive use of the old versions). Yet *mitto* is used incessantly, both in the *Vetus Latina* and in Jerome's version.[7]

---

[1] See A. Reifferscheid, *C.S.E.L.* iv, Index p. 336.

[2] Quoted at *A.L.M.A.* xxi (1951), 219.

[3] On ambiguous contexts as a factor in producing semantic change, see Ullmann, op. cit. 195. If a word is used constantly in contexts in which it might equally well be taken in two different senses, some confusion might arise concerning its meaning.

[4] For the use of *pono* in reference to burial, see e.g. Vulg. Luke 23: 53, John 19: 41, *Itin. Ant. Plac.* 18, 29.

[5] For such a misinterpretation to be possible we would have to assume that *pauso* occurred frequently as a transitive verb in burial contexts. Such an assumption is plausible, in view of the constant connection of the intransitive use of the word with burial.

[6] Cf. *Vita Radegundis* 2. 24 'ut subtus turrem repausaretur feretrum'.

[7] According to A. V. Billen, *The Old Latin Texts of the Heptateuch* (Cambridge, 1927), 194, *iacio* as well as *mitto* is widely used for βάλλω in the old Latin versions, but this assertion is not borne out by the evidence as it appears in the latest and most reliable editions of the *V.L.* In Mark, Luke, and John (for which see A. Jülicher, *Itala, das neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung* [Berlin, 1938–]) there are some 26 places where *mitto* is the term used in all extant codices, including the *Afra* (Mark 6: 17, 9: 22, 9: 42, 9: 45, 12: 42, 12: 43, 12: 44, 15: 24, Luke 3: 9, 4: 9, 5: 6 (Cod. *d, Afra*), 12: 5, 12: 28, 12: 58, 13: 8, 13: 19, 21: 1, 21: 2, 21: 3, 23: 34, John 5: 7, 12: 6, 15: 6, 19: 24, 21: 6 [twice]). In these Gospels

Conicio = 'throw' is also surprisingly rare in certain later writers of higher social strata, in whom it might have been expected to occur. It is not used at all by Vegetius in the *Epit. Rei Mil.*, and is found only twice in the *Historia Augusta*. Yet, as we have seen, it is still used in the fourth century in a weakened sense. It is this fact which helps to explain its disappearance as a throwing-term. After the shifts which have been dealt with took place, the word possessed a number of related senses which were well capable of confusion in given contexts (semantic overloading). Such a situation is always intolerable,[1] and in this case it led to the loss of the original sense.

The disappearance of *iacio*, on the other hand, may have resulted from a partial homonymic clash with *iaceo*. Since *iaceo* may express the result of a throwing-action, the spheres of the two words sometimes overlap, and there are certain contexts in which both can occur meaningfully (e.g. 'the shield lies on the ground', 'he throws the shield on the ground'). The slight differences in inflection may not have been sufficient to keep the two terms distinct in many speakers' minds.[2]

Mitto, then, became the stock throwing-term because of the fading of its rivals. But it in turn underwent a semantic shift, as we have seen, and itself required replacing because of semantic overloading. Its replacement was the frequentative *iacto*, a term which is important in the Romance languages (cf. e.g. It. *gettare*, Fr. *jeter*, Sp. *echar*).

Even in early and late Republican Latin there are occasional instances of *iacto* which are indistinguishable in sense from *iacio*.[3] But for a long period it was used with frequentative force ('toss to and fro'), either literally or metaphorically.[4] However, many frequentatives failed to maintain their original sense in later Latin. They were often preferred to the corresponding simplex because of the regularity of their conjugation.[5] In this case the weakening to which *mitto* was prone must have provided the impulse for the emergence of *iacto* as the standard throwing-term.

At the time of the *Vetus Latina iacto* seems to have been coming into use, for it is found in a number of places in various codices.[6] But it is much less frequent than *mitto*, and does not appear to be the only word attested in all extant codices at any one place.

The growing importance of the word can be seen clearly in extant vulgar texts later than the *V.L.* In some it coexists with and is no less frequent than *mitto*, and in others it has almost displaced it. Allowing for the unaccountable

---

iacio is attested in only 3 places, and there only in a minority of codices (Mark 4: 26 *l*; cf. *mitto a b c f ff²* Afra; *iacto q i r¹*; John 8 : 7 *c*; cf. *mitto d aur; iacto ff²*; John 8 : 59 *c*; cf. *mitto b d l r¹* Afra; *iacto aur ff²* *q*).

[1] See e.g. Ullmann, *The Principles of Semantics*, 122 f.

[2] On the confusion between *iacio* and *iaceo* in manuscripts, see *T.L.L.* vii. 1. 53 ff. See further *T.L.L.* vii. 1. 33. 30 ff. on the declining frequency of *iacio*. It was, however, retained by certain learned authors (see e.g. Isid. *Etym.* 12. 6. 7, 14. 5. 7, 17. 2. 3, 17. 6. 1, 18. 10. 2, 18. 21, 20. 2. 26, 20. 4. 9; cf. also the figures quoted above from the O.T.).

[3] e.g. Enn. *Scaen.* 82, *Ann.* 74, Lucil. 776, Plaut. *Curc.* 359, *Rud.* 373, Cic. *Har. Resp.* 39, Caes. *Gall.* 7. 47. 5, *B. Hisp.* 12. 4. See *T.L.L.* vii. 1. 49. 10 ff., 35 ff.; 50. 26 ff.

[4] Roughly equivalent to *agito*, = *huc illuc moveo*: *T.L.L.* vii. 1. 51. 43 ff. (lit.), 54. 52 ff., 56. 1 ff., 59. 42 ff. (met.). In a metaphorical sense it is particularly common of verbal utterances (cf. *dictito*).

[5] See e.g. A. Ernout, *Aspects du Vocabulaire Latin* (Paris, 1954), 162.

[6] e.g. Mark 1 : 16 (*ff² c*), 4 : 26 (see above, p. 158 n. 7), 11 : 23 (*a*), 12 : 41 (*b q r¹ l*), Luke 4 : 35 (*f*), 14 : 35 (*Afra*), 19 : 35 (*aur s*), John 8 : 7 (see above, p. 158 n. 7), 8. 59 (see above, p. 158 n. 7).

eccentricities of taste that are always likely to occur in individuals, we can safely say that by about the seventh century in Italy and Gaul *iacto* was the usual word for 'throw'.

In the sixth-century *Vitae Patrum* (books 3, 5, 7) *iacto* occurs about a dozen times (lit.), against 4 instances of *mitto*.[1] *Iacto* is also slightly more common in the *Itin. Ant. Plac.*, but again *mitto* is still in use.[2] In the Lombard laws of A.D. 643 onwards there is a definite distinction of use between the two words. *Iacto* is employed of the throwing of objects,[3] *mitto* of metaphorical casting.[4] Obviously *iacto* had established itself as the appropriate word for the physical action, even if *mitto* did linger in a weakened sense. In the *Pactus Legis Salicae* (65 chap. text) *mitto* is usually weakened (e.g. 14. 9 'si quis hominem mortuum, antequam in terra mittatur')[5] or has a meaning irrelevant to our purposes. It means 'throw' in two places,[6] but is greatly outnumbered by *iacto* (16 times). Finally, in the *Leges Alamannorum iacto* is used a number of times, but *mitto* nowhere definitely has the sense in question.[7]

It will be seen that the history of words for 'throw' in Latin is to some extent one of weakening and replacement.

VI

In this concluding section I deal with a special use of a throwing-term.

At *Itin. Ant. Plac.* 3 the best manuscripts read 'si suspensa fuerit mulieri vel cuicumque animali, *iactum* numquam faciet' (*dactum* G). In this context *iactus* must mean *abortus*, 'miscarriage'. Heraeus, however, suggested *abactum*, and this conjecture is described by Koestermann at *T.L.L.* vii. 1. 69. 45 as probable : he does not accept 'miscarriage' as a genuine sense of the word.

A relevant use of *iacto* has gone unnoticed elsewhere in the *T.L.L.* : *Leg. Alamann.* p. 134. 5 'si quis autem aliquis homo iecto ferierit prignum iumentum, et ipsa abortivum fecerit, *iectans* ipsum puletrum mortuum, unum solidum conponat.' This example, expressing miscarriage, makes the reading *iactum* above certain. Phrases of the type *facio* + substantive for a specialized verb are a marked feature of vulgar Latin.[8] *Iactum facio* is a substitute for *iacto*. We may also compare the common use of *eicio* in this sense.[9]

University of Manchester   J. N. ADAMS

---

[1] *Iacto*: 3. 67, 5. 5. 39, 5. 7. 12, 5. 11. 48 (3 times), 5. 14. 8 (twice), 5. 14. 17, 5. 14. 18, 5. 15. 86, 7. 2. 1 ; *mitto*: 3. 118, 5. 5. 4, 5. 7. 18, 7. 12. 7.

[2] *Iacto*: 8, 10, 19, 31, 37 ; *mitto*: 24, 36.

[3] *Edict. Rothari* 34, 330, 379.

[4] *Edict. Rothari* 9 ('crimen mittat' ; cf. ibid. 'crimen iniectum'), 164, 198, 213 (twice).

[5] For *pono* used of burial, see above, p. 158. The present example anticipates *mettre*.

[6] 41. 2 'si vero eum in puteum aut sub aqua miserit' (cf. *iacto* at 41. 12 'si quis hominem ingenuum in puteum iactaverit'), 41. 6.

[7] For an example denoting burial, see p. 33. 7 (cf. *pono* at 32. 22).

[8] See Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, 163 f.

[9] *T.L.L.* v. 2. 304. 10 ff. Cf. Eng. 'cast a foal'.