

### Accentuation Before Enclitics in Latin

R. WHITNEY TUCKER

HERNDON, VIRGINIA

In the familiar Allen and Greenough Latin grammar for schools<sup>1</sup> there is the following statement:

When an enclitic is joined to a word, the accent falls on the syllable next before the enclitic, whether long or short: as, *dēāque*, *āmārēve*, *tibīne*, *itāque* (*and . . . so*), as distinguished from *itāque* (*therefore*).

This is the traditional rule given by the Roman grammarians and accepted by the Stolz-Schmalz grammar<sup>2</sup> and others.<sup>3</sup> Bennett, on the other hand, defying the ancient authorities, says:

When the enclitics -que, -ne, -ve, -ce, -met, -dum are appended to words, if the syllable preceding the enclitic is long (either originally or as a result of adding the enclitic) it is accented; as, *miserōque*, *hominisque*. But if the syllable still remains short after the enclitic has been added, it is not accented unless the word originally took the accent on the antepenult. Thus, *pórtaque*; but *míserāque*.<sup>4</sup>

Much the same view is expressed by Elmer, Lane, Gildersleeve and Lodge, and McLemore.<sup>5</sup> Lane, to be sure, marks a secondary accent, in a word like *periculàque*,<sup>6</sup> while Elmer gives *óperane*

<sup>1</sup> Allen and Greenough's *New Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges*, ed. J. B. Greenough, G. L. Kittredge, A. A. Howard, and B. L. D'Ooge (Boston 1903) p. 7 (para. 12a).

<sup>2</sup> Stolz-Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*<sup>5</sup>, by Manu Leumann and J. B. Hofmann (Munich 1928) 181-82.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., Ernst Kieckers, *Historische lateinische Grammatik*, Part 1 (Munich 1930) 20.

<sup>4</sup> C. E. Bennett, *New Latin Grammar* (Boston 1918) p. 5 (para. 6.3).

<sup>5</sup> H. C. Elmer, *Latin Grammar* (New York 1928) p. 7 (para. 8.3); G. M. Lane, *Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges*<sup>2</sup> (New York 1903) p. 12 (para. 93); B. L. Gildersleeve and G. Lodge, *Latin Grammar*<sup>3</sup> (New York 1894) p. 8 (para. 15.2). James McLemore, *The Tradition of the Latin Accent* (Univ. of Virginia, 1917) 96, rejects *Musāne*, *Musāve*, although this treatment is given by Pompeius (late 5th century) p. 131 K.; McLemore says it "does not seem to be correct."

<sup>6</sup> This theory is propounded also by C. Wagener in *Neue philologische Rundschau* 1904, 505-11.

with only one accent. Kent, however, says that "in the type *līmīna-que*, ending in three short syllables, the accentuation was probably *līmīnaque*,"<sup>7</sup> thus adhering rigidly to the notion that the composite is accented exactly as if it were one normal word.

So, in a combination like *genera* plus *-que*, we are offered six possibilities: *généraque*, *genéraque*, *generáque*, *généraque*, *généraque*, *gèneráque*. (The last from Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd ed., p. 721.) I do not believe that more than one of these can be correct for any given period of the language; but it is certainly possible that the practice, or rule, changed from one century to another—just as we know of several other shifts in accentuation in the history of Latin—and that therefore two or more of the above possibilities actually did exist, only at different times. It should be noted that, although the Roman grammarians, when giving information about orthography, morphology, syntax, or vocabulary, frequently quote from earlier literature going all the way back to Ennius, in matters of pronunciation they can hardly have had any knowledge beyond the speech of their own day.

We must also remember that in Latin enclitics are of several different types, and that it is at least theoretically possible that these were treated differently with respect to accentuation. They may be listed as follows:

1. Inseparable enclitics, those which exist only in connection with a limited number of base-words, with no independent meaning of their own, where the resulting combination has a new and different meaning. The base-word and the enclitic may be said to have coalesced into a new word. Examples are *-dam* as in *quīdam*, *-dem* as in *īdem* or *quīdem*, *-que* (generalizing) as in *quisque*, *-quis*, etc. as in *quisquis*, *-piam* as in *quispiam*, and *-cumque* as in *quicumque* or *ubicumque*.

2. Separable, or movable, or optional enclitics, which may be attached at will to certain words, or to any word, when their specific meaning needs to be added. These are *-que* 'and,' *-ve*, *-ne*, *-ce*, *-met* and *-te* (as in *tūte*), *-pse* and *-pte*, *-nam*, *-dum*. The first four of these are the classic examples usually cited by the ancient grammarians.

<sup>7</sup> R. G. Kent, *The Sounds of Latin* (Baltimore 1932) note on p. 68. See also W. S. Allen, *Vox latina* (Cambridge 1965) 87–88.

3. Normal words which may sometimes be used as enclitics; these are often difficult to identify, but still there are many cases where their enclitic character is unmistakable. Examples: various forms of *esse* and *fieri*, especially in the present tense; the personal and reflexive pronouns, and sometimes the demonstratives; *cum*; *quis* (as in *siquis*); *per* in *parumper*; *inde* as in *dēinde* and *proinde*.<sup>8</sup>

There are also miscellaneous phrases in which the second word was originally treated as an enclitic, which have developed into new words, such as *nescio*, *nōlō* < \**nevolō*, *dēnuō* < \**dēnovō*.

The ancient grammarians are not in full agreement on this matter. For one thing, they restrict their statements to only a few of the possible enclitics. Martianus Capella, supposedly copying Varro, applies the rule only to *-que*, *-ne*, and *-ve*.<sup>9</sup> Diomedes<sup>10</sup> also mentions only these three particles, but Servius adds *-ce*<sup>11</sup> and *-dem* in *ibidem*.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, although Pompeius<sup>13</sup> says that even a short syllable (in the penult resulting from enclisis) is accented, Diomedes specifies that it receives the accent when it becomes long by position<sup>14</sup>—thus presumably *Mūsámque* but *Músaque*. And Priscian<sup>15</sup> says the accent is not shifted when an enclitic follows a preposition, as *própterque illum*, *interve homines*.<sup>16</sup>

It is interesting to observe that several of the grammarians, when they say that the accent is shifted, indicate that they feel that it ought not to be. Servius says it is “contra usum

<sup>8</sup> Stolz-Schmalz (above, note 2) gives *dēinde*, *éxinde*, explaining the accents as derived from the analogy of the short forms *déin*, *éxin*. Editors usually indicate synizesis in *dein(de)*, *proin(de)*, *dehinc*, *deorsum*, but it would sometimes be possible to scan with iambic shortening *dēinde*, etc.

<sup>9</sup> Martianus Capella (early 5th century) ch. III, p. 67.25 (Eyssenhardt). If Varro really is the source, he would be the earliest authority to discuss the question; but there is no direct evidence to prove that he is being quoted.

<sup>10</sup> (Late 4th century); 1.433.19 ff. K.

<sup>11</sup> (4th century); *In Donatum* 427.6 K.

<sup>12</sup> *Ad Aen.* 1.116.

<sup>13</sup> (Late 5th century); 5.131 K.

<sup>14</sup> *Loc. cit.* (above, note 10): *verbi antecedentis longius positum cacumen*.

<sup>15</sup> *Partit.* 6.125, p. 488.19 K. Do the elisions play any role in these phrases?

<sup>16</sup> Annianus (1st century?) ap. Gellium, *N. A.* 6(7).7.1-4, argues for *affātim* and *exádvēsum*; this would make the last element in these words enclitic. If argumentation was necessary, presumably there was a difference of opinion as to the pronunciation. In this connection it may be asked whether we are right in pronouncing *próptēreā* and *praetēreā*.

Latinum";<sup>17</sup> Priscian says that *doctúsque* has *changed* the accent in pronunciation, but that it *ought* to be on the first syllable;<sup>18</sup> a much later work (anonymous, presumably quoting or imitating an ancient writer), in speaking of *dixítque*, *putásne*, etc., says "improprie";<sup>19</sup> and another mediaeval work says "contra legem."<sup>20</sup>

The Romance languages provide little information on the subject, and conflicting information at that. The regular Latin enclitics have disappeared, and inseparable words with enclitics have also largely disappeared or been remodeled. Where words in the modern languages are used enclitically, they do not affect the accent. For instance, the personal pronouns are enclitic when they follow the verb (mainly in the imperative), and we have It. *dátemi* and Fr. *donne-le-lui*, in the latter case with (historical) accents, primary or secondary, on the first and last syllables of the phrase, but certainly none on the final syllable of the verb.<sup>21</sup> The adverbs derived from adjectives with *mente* likewise show a development based on two accents, one on each of the original words; in no instance does the accent stand on the original final syllable—that is, the ablative case ending—of the Latin adjective. These phrases, including their accentual patterns, may be inherited from Latin (adverbial phrases with *mente* appear in Apuleius).

OFr. *iluec*, Vegl. *luk* < Lat. *illóc*, and Fr. It. *là*, etc. < Lat. *illác* show the accentuation laid down by the grammarians. (The preservation or loss of the final *e* of *-ce* plays no role here; in any case, the words are supposed to be accented as though the *e* were there, i.e. on the ultima, as one of the exceptions to the standard rule. We shall revert to this point later.)

Sp. *alguien*, Port. *alguem* point to a Latin *aliquém*; this is an example of remodeling, already mentioned. On the other hand, Sp. *algo*, Rhaeto-Rom. *alk*, *altš*, etc., OPov. *alques*, OFr. *alques*, *auques* come from *aliquid*. Perhaps something needs to be said about this word. Is *aliquis* to be regarded as a form of the stem *ali-* with the enclitic *quis* (as in *siquis*, *numquis*), or as *quis* with a

<sup>17</sup> *Loc. cit.* (above, note 11).

<sup>18</sup> *De acc.* 8–10, p. 520.25 ff. K.

<sup>19</sup> *Anecd. Helvet.* p. 228.33 H.

<sup>20</sup> Cod. Bern. 123 (10th century) in *Anecd. Helvet.* p. xxxiii H., folio 34<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>21</sup> An apparent contrary case is *donné-je*?, but this form results from a specific early Modern French development in certain dialects.

prefix *ali-*? In the former case, can one possibly pronounce it, under the grammarians' rule, as *aliquis*? I think no evidence can be adduced to support such a notion—certainly the Romance forms just quoted do not support it—and the scansion in Seneca and Plautus, to be discussed below, indicates *aliquis*. But how should one accent *aliquibus* and *alicubi*? Must they be like *exercitibus*, i.e. *altiquibus*, *alticubi*?

In Old Roumanian there is a dative form *nescui*, supposed to be from *nescioci*. If the etymology is correct, it indicates accents on the first and last syllables, certainly none on either the second or the third. *Nescioquis* is listed in the dictionaries as a word (an indefinite pronoun); by the rule as usually stated it would have to be pronounced *nesciôquis*, or by Bennett's variant of the rule *nescioquis*, and in either case the dat. abl. plu. would be *nesciôquibus*.

And do these words indicate that we must say *quandôquidem*, *quodâmodo*, and *quinqûeviri*?

Thus the later grammarians and the Romance languages give inadequate and in part conflicting testimony as to the accentuation in the last period of Classical Latin as a living spoken language.

We may now move back to the first century A.D. Seneca's tragedies and the anonymous *Octavia*, which belongs to much the same period and the same metrical doctrine, show a special rule of scansion: in iambic trimeter lines (senarii), in the third foot, the long syllable of the iambus is the accented syllable of a word; or, if it is resolved into two short syllables, the first of these is the accented syllable of a word. (Sometimes it is a monosyllabic word.) This rule is observed also by Horace and Phaedrus, but not by Plautus and Terence.<sup>22</sup> The few exceptions in Seneca can be explained away:

1. In one single instance a Greek proper name, *Sigeon* (*Tro.* 932), is accented on the first syllable although the second is properly long (and thus would violate the rule of the verse in

<sup>22</sup> To cite a few examples: in the *Captivi* the word-accent falls in a different place in lines 24, 51, 93, 190, 192, 664, 672, and 725; and I have counted at least eighteen clear-cut instances in *Phormio*. In the example in line 51 of the *Captivi*, the third foot is filled by the word *quanti*, and in line 664, *confidenter* occupies the second and third feet, and there is no caesura in either the third or the fourth. For a statement of the rule as it applies to Seneca, see H. M. Kingery, *Three Tragedies of Seneca* (New York 1908) 18–19; it is not mentioned by Crusius, or by D. S. Raven in *Latin Metre* (London 1965).

making the fourth foot a spondee). It may well be that the word was commonly pronounced according to the Latin rule that a vowel immediately before another vowel is short. In any case, Greek words were frequently given the Greek accentuation, sometimes with shortening of an unaccented long vowel, and not solely by pedants; witness *ancōra* < Gk. ἄγκυρα (Doric *ánkūra*), Vulg. Lat. *éremus* < Gk. ἔρημος, It. *Tárantō* < Gk. (acc.) *Táπαντα*. The question is discussed by several of the Roman grammarians.<sup>23</sup>

2. In one instance (*Med.* 481) *cōnjugi*, gen. of *conjugium*, appears. Words of this type are supposed to be irregularly accented on the short penult; but this is disputed—perhaps this passage affords some evidence on the point.

3. There are two instances of a four-syllable word (one of them formed by an enclitic) where the first and third syllables are long and the accent under this metrical rule is on the first syllable: *máchinatrix* (*Med.* 266) and *clássibusque* (*Agam.* 221). Here we evidently have both a primary and a secondary accent, and perhaps either one is acceptable to satisfy the rule. There are numerous examples of this type in Horace and several in Phaedrus.

4. Four-syllable words where the first three syllables are short bear the accent on the first syllable: *Dánaides* (*H. F.* 757), *máleficae* (*Tro.* 752), *miserias* (*Med.* 253), *Dómitio* (*Oct.* 249), *fácinore* (*Hipp.* 1186). I have found ten examples of this treatment in Seneca and eight in the *Octavia*, with only one contrary case, *statúerit* in *Med.* 200. This is the accentuation with which we are familiar in Plautus, a survival in words of this pattern of the prehistoric initial accent. The occurrences in Seneca may suggest that this accentuation survived much longer (over two centuries longer) than is generally supposed.<sup>24</sup>

It may be argued that the placement of the word-accent under this rule is an automatic consequence of the placement of caesurae. Thus Crusius states, "Durch die Bildungsgesetze der Cäsur kommt es, dass in Versmitte der Wortton fast stets mit dem

<sup>23</sup> Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* 1.5.60 ff., advocates applying the normal Latin rule (thus *tyránnus*, not *tyrannus*); but it is clear that some persons disagreed. Diomedes says (1.433.4 K.) that Greek words are regularly pronounced "Graecis accentibus"; so also Servius, *Comm. in Donatum* (4.427.10–13 K.). Sergius, *Explan. in Donatum*, Bk. 1 (4.526.24–527.26 K.), says the accent is optional in some cases.

<sup>24</sup> If this is true, then Cicero is wrong even by his own lights in saying that a "law of nature" prevents the accent from falling on any syllable more than three syllables from the end of the word (*Orator* 18.58). In his consciousness of Greek parallels he may have been forgetting words of this type.

Iktus übereinstimmt.”<sup>25</sup> This is true if we accept the assumption that a caesura *must* occur in the third or fourth foot (especially the latter); and indeed in Seneca’s iambic lines it does so occur. But perhaps the situation is the reverse, and the caesura is an automatic consequence of the location of the accent; in fact, whenever the word at this point in the line is of two syllables, we have caesurae in both the third foot and the fourth, and of course an accent on the long syllable of the third foot. It is probably impossible to determine which is cause and which is effect, but the two features certainly go together. I would point out only that the term and the concept “caesura” were invented by grammarians, not by poets, and suppose that most likely the accent is the controlling factor.

Aside from the cases described, Seneca is perfectly consistent in the application of the rule stated above; and where words have enclitics attached to them, he is equally consistent in treating the composite just like a normal word: the new penult is accented if long by nature or position, otherwise the new antepenult is accented; and these composites stand in the same positions with relation to caesurae and boundaries of metrical feet as do normal words with similar scansion. Examples, with a long penult: *nātósque* (*H. F.* 310), *magisque* (*Thy.* 992), *utróque* (*Phoen.* 489), *gracilique* (*Thy.* 1063), *victricémque* (*Agam.* 754), *ēmīstique* (*Hipp.* 403), *quōcúmque* (*Oed.* 648, and numerous other examples of various forms of this word); with a short penult: *vérbague* (*Hipp.* 1175), *úndique* (*Tro.* 584), *áliquis* (*Med.* 251, and numerous other examples; see above), *mémbraque* (*Oct.* 172), *nescío quid* (*Oed.* 334, *Hipp.* 266),<sup>26</sup> *síbimet* (*Oed.* 594).

I call attention especially to the less commonly recognized enclitics, as in *fórsitan* (*Tro.* 687, etc.), *pérvium est* (*Tro.* 433), *quálibet* (*Phoen.* 490), *hóstium es* (*Phoen.* 510), *mé quidem* (*Hipp.* 872), *pér scelus* (*Oct.* 102), *fémīnae est* (*Oct.* 147), *eí mihi* (*Oct.* 150), *quás regit* (*Oct.* 237), *secúta es* (*Oct.* 748). Of interest also is *vidēn* (*H. O.* 1207); this appears frequently, of course, in Plautus and Terence (see below). In *Agam.* 250 we find *suápte* in two syllables; this can be read with synizesis as *suápte*, or the *u* can be treated as a

<sup>25</sup> F. Crusius and H. Rubenbauer, *Römische Metrik*<sup>6</sup> (Munich 1961) 78–79.

<sup>26</sup> These seem to be the only examples of the type of *limina-que*; and there are none where the enclitic produces four short syllables, although we might expect them, if they existed, to be treated like *Dánaides*, etc., discussed above.

semivowel—and we might actually write it *svapte*; this interpretation would be parallel to the usual treatment of *suāvis* and *suādeo*.

I take these pronunciations suggested by Seneca's scansion as an indication that in the first century A.D. the grammarians' rule did *not* hold, and that words with enclitics may have been treated like other words: the penult was not accented if it was short, except in dissyllables.

Little, if anything, can be learned on this subject from the formal verse of the Golden Age;<sup>27</sup> but much relevant material is available in Plautus and Terence. The application of the principle of iambic shortening provides a quantity of evidence; before examining it, however, we may as well get some ambiguous cases out of the way:

1. In some words the iambic shortening becomes permanent in classical Latin, as *egō*, *benē*, *sibī*, *ubī*; the original long vowels sometimes appear in early Latin, and we may wonder whether *égōmet*, *tībīne*, *útiquam* in the comic poets, and especially *égōn*, *tībīn*, represent the old pronunciation with an ad hoc shortening, or the new.

2. In words ending in -s after a short vowel, when an enclitic is added, if the final syllable is short, is it because of iambic shortening or because the -s does not "make position"? (This treatment of s occurs at the *end* of a word; but is it the end in this sense if it is followed by an enclitic?) Examples: *prīusquam*, *quibūscum*

<sup>27</sup> I leave out of account a suggestion mentioned by Kent (*op. cit.* [above, note 7] p. 18, note) which seems to advocate *témplaque Vestae* in Horace C. 1.2.16, *Lavināque venit* in Vergil, *Aen.* 1.2, *eréptaque rostra carinis*, *Aen.* 7.186, and *sudátaque ligno* in Ovid, *Met.* 10.308. (Unless, in the last two citations, Kent is referring to the beginnings of the lines and reads *sptculaqué* and *cinnamaqué* respectively.) To be sure, I do agree that the words should be accented as indicated, but I do not believe that this proposition can be proved, since the accent plays no part in the metrics of the poets quoted, except perhaps in showing emphasis; and I have tried in this article to avoid arguing that a pronunciation is right because it sounds right to me. In the fourth line of the Sapphic stanza there are eleven examples in Horace where the short second syllable bears a word-accent, e.g. 4.11.4, *est héderae vis*; also one similar example in Catullus 11.16, and at least two examples in Seneca; all these conflict with the pattern in Kent's quotation from Horace. The hexameter citations are from the fourth and fifth feet of their lines, and a contradictory accentuation may in rare instances be found here too, as in *Aen.* 1.65, *dívom pater atque hómīnum rex*, and 1.105, *praeruptus áquae mons*. Even in Ovid, in spite of his smoother versification, there are some examples, as in *Met.* 4.556, which ends *in mátis undas*, or 7.520, *longa ambage mórer vos*.



(Pl. *Rud.* 1111, 1363), *sátisne*, and especially *sátin* (*satín* according to Lane, in spite of the many clear contrary instances in the comic poets).

3. In many instances, forms of *is*, *deus*, *meus*, *tuos*, and *suos* are marked by editors as having synizesis: *di déaēque*, *ēūmpse*, *eisdem*, etc.; but they could equally well be scanned as examples of iambic shortening: *di déaēque*, *ēūmpse*, *ēīsdem*.<sup>28</sup>

4. Very little can be made out of the various forms of *ille* and *iste*, because the first syllable often seems to be scanned as short in early Latin even in cases where iambic shortening does not enter into the picture. Many of the derivatives in the Romance languages have lost the first syllable, and we must assume that it was unaccented—indeed, the entire word presumably had no accented syllable; thus *illum videt* < (e.g.) It. *lo véde*. Sometimes, on the other hand, editors scan *ille* as one long syllable (likewise *inde*, *nempe*, etc.). Incidentally, it might be asked whether the *s* in *iste* could possibly be treated as if it were final (*-te* having originally been an enclitic; see above), so that it fails to “make position.” Thus there are varying possible explanations for the short initial syllable in examples like *Quid istuc(c) est?* (Pl. *Capt.* 541) or *Ubi illic est?* (Pac. 155 W. = 134 R.),<sup>29</sup> both at the beginning of trochaic lines. If iambic shortening is involved here, I think we must read the lines with the stress on *quid* and *ubi*, as the important words of the sentences, and regard *istucc* and *illic* as enclitics (containing, of course, another enclitic *-ce*), rather than say that the shortening results from a word-accent on the second syllable.

In what follows, none of the ambiguous cases are quoted; the examples are drawn exclusively from those cases where there can be no question as to the scansion.

Iambic shortening, while optional in the metrics of the early dramatic poets, is a very common phenomenon. As a general rule it cannot occur unless the long syllable to be shortened is unaccented;<sup>30</sup> this point is important and needs to be emphasized

<sup>28</sup> In this connection see E. H. Sturtevant, *Contraction in the Case Forms of the Latin io- and ia- Stems and of deus, is, and idem* (Chicago 1902).

<sup>29</sup> W. designates E. H. Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin* (London 1935–41); R. designates O. Ribbeck, *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig 1897–98).

<sup>30</sup> There are a few anomalous cases, such as *dedisti eam* (*Men.* 689), *volūptas* (*Most.* 249 and 294), *senēcta* (*Most.* 217), *molēste est* (*Most.* 73); in the first and last of these cases it is sometimes assumed that elision has produced, in effect, a two-syllable word with the accent on the first syllable; or possibly we have here another survival of the

—the essence of iambic shortening requires a word-accent on the preceding or the following syllable, but none on the syllable to be shortened. It is not (normally) a metrical phenomenon, but rather a sound-law of early Latin, which was constantly and extensively interfered with by analogical influences, and hence not always observed even by Plautus. However, where it is reflected in the scansion so as to produce any relevant examples with enclitics, these should afford reliable evidence as to the place of the accent. (Monosyllables and words with a long penult are of course not relevant.) There are, in fact, scores of instances where, even before an enclitic, the accent evidently remains on the syllable normally accented: the word is pronounced in the normal way and the enclitic has no effect on it. Some of the instances can be classified as follows:

1. Both the base-word and the enclitic are used in their normal full forms (with the possibility of “elision” at the end). Examples: *périnde*<sup>31</sup> (Pl. *Sti.* 520), *símŭlque ad cursuram* (*Sti.* 306), *túomne* (Ter. *Eun.* 428), *vidélicet* (*Sti.* 555 and 557, Ter. *H. T.* 514, and elsewhere), *énimvero*<sup>32</sup> (*H. T.* 320), *táčē dum parumper* (Pl. *Men.* 348), *séd estne frater* (Ter. *Ad.* 569) (two enclitics, with the accent on *sed*), *séd ínterim* (*H. T.* 882) (evidently with *interim* as an enclitic), *sólētnē mulier* (Caecilius, *Plocium* 157 W. = 164 R.) (trochaic), *párŭmne* (Ter. *Phorm.* 546), *ibídem* (*Sti.* 665, 756, *Rud.* 591), *mánēdum* (Ter. *Hec.* 844), *iúbēdum* (*Rud.* 786), *férōque ei* (*Rud.* 958), *dátŭrne illa* (Ter. *An.* 301), *módōne* (*An.* 882).

2. The enclitic is contracted by the loss of its vowel, either initial as in 's, 'st for *es(s)*, *est*, or final as in -n for -ne and -c for -ce (which later came to be usual). There are numerous examples, such as *égōn patri* (Pl. *Pseud.* 290) or *míhīn domist?* (Ter. *Phorm.* 506); in these and similar cases it is irrelevant whether the final vowel of *ego* or *mihi* is thought of as long or short by nature (see above, p. 456), since the syllable is long also by position—the iambic shortening

original initial accent. The treatment of *voluptas* might be influenced by other inflectional forms of the same word, such as (frequently with iambic shortening) *volŭptáte*. In *mihi exhibent* (*Most.* 565) the main stress of the sentence is probably on *mihi*, with the verb treated as an enclitic with no accent of its own.

<sup>31</sup> See note 8 above. Here we have a perfectly clear case, which may support the hypothesis that *deinde* should frequently, at least in early Latin, be read as *dēinde*.

<sup>32</sup> We could perhaps read *enimvero* and *videlicet*, or even accent both components; the one reading which is impossible is the *enimvero*, *videlicet* which the grammarians' rule would call for.

shows that the syllable is unaccented. Further examples: *úbist* (Ter. *Ad.* 260, 265), *quǎn me* (Pl. *Most.* 1132), *itǎn tandem* (*Phorm.* 413), *itǎst* (*Sti.* 744), *mérǎst* (*Sti.* 748), *nísist* (*Pseud.* 1104).

3. The base-word is also contracted, by the dropping of a final *s*. This is the type of *vidēn* < *vidēsne*, which survived into the Classical period and even occurs in Seneca, as we saw above (p. 455).<sup>33</sup> The word occurs repeatedly in the early poets, along with *sátin* < *sátisne* (alongside *sátine* in Caecilius, *Venator* 221 W. = 129 R., and with elision in Ter. *Ad.* 329; but the question already raised as to the handling of the *s* applies to either form), *júbēn* < *júbēsne* (e.g. in Pl. *Capt.* 846), *ábīn* < *ábīsne* (e.g. *Most.* 850), *hábēn* < *hábēsne* (Ter. *Eun.* 674), *ópūst* < *opus est* (e.g. Pl. *Rud.* 590), *tácēn* < *tácēsne* (*Rud.* 1399); perhaps also *pótīn* or *pótine*, if it is to be regarded as representing *potis-ne* rather than *pote-ne* (compare *faterīn* [*Capt.* 317] < *fateris-ne* or *fatere-ne*), and *ain* < *aisne*, unless it is scanned as one syllable with synizesis or a diphthong. Now if we accept the accentuation of *vidēn*, *tácēn*, etc. as proved by the iambic shortening, should we not, to be consistent, accent similarly *sǎnun*, *cértōn*, *stúltas*, *désitumst*, *cónsciū's*, *némon*, *cénsen*, *fáctumst*, *hórunc*, *videon*, *meministin*, *addúxtin*,<sup>34</sup> and the like? Merely because the words have a long penult, or have the accent on the antepenult, they are not susceptible of the same kind of proof.

There are numerous instances where a final *e* becomes *i* before the enclitic. Examples are *servirīn* (*Men.* 796) < *servire-ne*, *undique*, *indidem*, *usquīn* (*Most.* 449), *facilīn* (*Men.* 928) < *facile-ne*; but most of the occurrences are in the first of two enclitics, or even three, attached to the same word, as *hīcīne*, *hīcine*, *istōcīne*, *istīc*, *quippīnī* (e.g. *Men.* 948), *hancīne* and *hoscīn* in the same line (*Ad.* 758), *sicīn*, *illancīn* (Ter. *H. T.* 751), *tutīn* (*Sti.* 373), *illicīnest* (*Pseud.* 954) < *ille-ce-ne-est*, *antidhac*. (Exception: *illene* [*H. T.* 199].) This change from *e* to *i* is in accordance with a regular sound-law of Latin affecting unaccented vowels before a single consonant, as in *incipio* < *in-capio*; thus when *hiscē* has *-ne* attached to it, it automatically becomes *hiscīne*. To be sure, this law operated in early Latin when the accent was always on the initial syllable, so that it

<sup>33</sup> It is in this connection that Kieckers (above, note 3) 19, recognizes the possibility of a variation from the conventional rule: he says the final syllable is accented when *-n* < *-ne* is attached, "aber nicht durchgehend, denn *vidēn* 'siehst du?' muss auf der ersten Silbe betont gewesen sein, da sonst die Kürzung des *ē* in *vidēsne* nicht verständlich ist."

<sup>34</sup> And in *Most.* 445 probably *áperitīn foris*?

would be conceivable that (for instance) the *i* in the middle syllable of *hiscine* or in the last syllable of *facilin* was only an inherited phenomenon and that the accent was on that syllable, under the grammarians' rule, just as it is on the weakened vowel *i* in the second syllable of *incipio*, under the normal Classical rule. However, this seems dubious, as these words with enclitics presumably were re-compounded, as one might say, each time that they were needed. When so many clear instances show the preservation of the ordinary word-accent, analogy would suggest that it was also preserved in the unclear instances.

I hesitate to add a theoretical argument, which may appear purely subjective; but it seems to me that the normal and natural pronunciation of a word with an enclitic attached could be expected to be the same as that of the word without the enclitic,<sup>35</sup> and anything different would probably be a later, or almost an artificial, development. This would agree with the Greek parallels, where the accent remains on its proper syllable, only with the addition of another accent under some circumstances. I conclude, therefore, on the basis of the evidence here adduced, as far as it goes, and also on the basis of inherent probability, that in the second century B.C. at least, the place of the word-accent was unaffected by the addition of an enclitic (except possibly those which I have described above as "inseparable"); while, apparently, by the first century A.D. there had been a shift so that the composite including an enclitic was accented like an ordinary word, depending on the length of the new penult. Thus we should pronounce *égomet* not *egómet*, *díxin* not *dixín*, *viden* not *vidén*, *virumque* not *virúmque*, *túte's* not *tuté's* (*Most.* 168), *futúrumst* not *futurúmst*, *túōpte* not *tuópte*, *géneraque* not *generáque*, *príncipiūmst* not *principiūmst*; and probably *úndique* not *undique*, *pléríque* not *pléríque*, *quíbusdam* not *quibúsdam*, and perhaps even *illūc* not *illúc* for *illūce*.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>35</sup> A possibly relevant example is *diēique* (*Ter. Eun.* 801), scanned with synizesis  $\bar{v}-\bar{v}$ , which could come naturally enough from *diēique*, but hardly from *diēique*. In speaking of the "normal and natural pronunciation," I would emphasize that in everyday conversation sentences are not necessarily always planned ahead with any precision, so that a Roman speaker should not be expected to think, "Now after *pater* I'm going to say *-que*, so I must be careful not to say *páter* this time, but *patér* instead."

<sup>36</sup> If *illúc* is right, it is probably not because of the presence of the enclitic, but because all forms of *ille* and *iste* tended to have the accent on the second syllable, or else no accent at all.

It may be noted that Harsh, speaking of the period of Plautus, likewise concludes that “-*ne*, either intact or after loss of the final vowel, does not . . . necessarily cause a shift in accent on the preceding word,” and elsewhere again suggests “that the enclitic did not attract the accent of the previous word to the final syllable.”<sup>37</sup> We must assume, then, that the statements of the Roman grammarians, if they are correct at all, have no relevance for the second century B.C. Either a change took place at some later period in the history of the language, or the grammarians are trying, in a muddled way, to transfer to Latin the Greek rule of the extra accent on the final syllable before an enclitic, as in *ἄνθρωποι τε* and *παῖδες τινες*. Or maybe both these possibilities are true. In any case, we should guard against thinking of Latin as something fixed and unchanging; after all, seven centuries elapsed between Plautus and Boethius—a longer period than that between Chaucer and the present day—and the living language was in a constant state of development during all that time. Usually this point is not sufficiently emphasized.

<sup>37</sup> P. W. Harsh, *Iambic Words and Regard for Accent in Plautus* (Stanford 1949) 29 and 83.