

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

TRANSACTIONS
AND
PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
AMERICAN
PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

1904.

VOLUME XXXV.

666.28
28/9/05.

PUBLISHED FOR THE ASSOCIATION BY
GINN & COMPANY,
29 BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

EUROPEAN AGENTS:

ENGLAND: EDWARD ARNOLD, 37 BEDFORD STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

GERMANY: OTTO HARRASSOWITZ, LEIPZIG.

FRANCE: H. WELTER, 59 RUE BONAPARTE, PARIS.

P
11
A5
v.35

Norwood Press:
J. S. Cushing & Co. — Berwick & Smith
Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXXV.

TRANSACTIONS.

I. Historical Value of the Twelfth Chapter of Plutarch's Life of Pericles	5
W. S. FERGUSON.	
II. On the Distinction between Comitia and Concilium . . .	21
GEORGE WILLIS BOTSFORD.	
III. Studies in Latin Accent and Metric	33
ROBERT S. RADFORD.	
IV. The Accentus of the Ancient Latin Grammarians	65
CHARLES W. L. JOHNSON.	
V. The Çāntikalpa of the Atharva-Veda	77
GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.	
VI. Notes on Ovid	128
EDWARD KENNARD RAND.	
VII. The Etymology of Mephistopheles	148
JULIUS GOEBEL.	

PROCEEDINGS.

Proceedings of the Annual Session, September, 1904	i-li
A Misinterpreted Greek Optative	iv
J. E. HARRY.	
Horace as a Nature Poet	v
KARL P. HARRINGTON.	
Critical Note on Catullus, LXVIII. 93	vii
F. W. SHIPLEY.	
Accent and Ictus in Late Latin Hexameters	x
FRANK G. MOORE.	
On the Meaning of <i>προμαντεία</i>	xi
M. L. D'OOGHE.	
The Homeric Hades and the Dead	xiii
THOMAS D. SEYMOUR.	

The Problem of ἀλλοίωσις in Pre-Socratic Philosophy	xiv
W. A. HEIDEL.	
Supplementary Note on the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum	xiv
ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL.	
The Oxyrhynchus Epitome of Livy, Julius Obsequens, and Cassiodorus	xvi
CLIFFORD H. MOORE.	
Notes on the Influence of Lucretius on Vitruvius	xvi
W. A. MERRILL.	
The Criticism of the Atharva-Veda	xxi
CHARLES R. LANMAN.	
Plato's Simile of the Cave	xxii
JOHN H. WRIGHT.	
A Proposed Supplement to the <i>Thesaurus Linguae Latinae</i>	xxii
WALTER HULLIHEN.	
Some Grammatical Myths	xxiv
J. E. HARRY.	
On the Minor and Problematic Indo-European Languages	xxvii
MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.	
A Suggestion for a New Latin Dictionary	xxxiv
H. C. ELMER.	
Contributions to the Study of <i>Suppletivwesen</i>	xxxvii
MARY C. WELLES.	
Critical Note on <i>προβίονσι</i> , <i>Iliad</i> I, 291	xlii
H. C. TOLMAN.	
A Quantitative Difficulty in the New Metric	xliii
EDWARD B. CLAPP.	
Method of Publishing the Papers of the Association	xlvi
CHARLES P. G. SCOTT.	

Proceedings of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, December, 1903	lii-lxxiv
The Plural of Segolates	liii
MAX L. MARGOLIS.	
Concessive <i>Si</i> -Clauses in Plautus	liv
H. C. NUTTING.	
The Subjunctive in the So-called Restrictive <i>Quod</i> -Clauses	lv
J. ELMORE.	
The Chinese Drama	lv
JOHN FRYER.	

The Etruscan Nekropolis of Abbadia del Fiume	lviii
ALFRED EMERSON.	
Lucretiana	lxii
W. A. MERRILL.	
Cabala and Alchemy in Goethe's <i>Faust</i>	lxii
JULIUS GOEBEL.	
On Hiatus in Greek Melic Poetry	lxiii
E. B. CLAPP.	
The Pronunciation of Gallic Clerical Latin	lxiv
C. C. RICE.	
The Parodos of Sophocles' <i>Antigone</i>	lxv
B. I. WHEELER.	
Numeral Systems of the Native Languages of California . . .	lxix
A. L. KROEBER.	
The Study of English Etymology during the Seventeenth Century	lxx
EWALD FLÜGEL.	
The Construction of Juvenal, <i>Satire</i> I	lxxi
J. E. CHURCH, JR.	
<i>Cretati pedes</i>	lxxiv
CHARLES J. O'CONNOR.	
—————	
Proceedings of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, December, 1904	lxxv-xcvii
On <i>Iliad</i> IX, 334-343	lxxv
A. T. MURRAY.	
Athenian Politics in the Early Third Century before Christ . .	lxxix
W. S. FERGUSON.	
Luigi Pulci, the First of the Courtly <i>Cantastorie</i>	lxxix
C. SEARLES.	
The Siamese Vocabulary: its Formal and Conceptual Features .	lxxx
CORNELIUS BEACH BRADLEY.	
The Vowel <i>R</i> and the Coronal Vowels in English	lxxx
SAMUEL A. CHAMBERS.	
Notes on the Conspiracy of Catiline	lxxxiii
H. C. NUTTING.	
The Derivation and Meaning of <i>Luscinia</i>	lxxxvi
E. W. MARTIN.	

A Plan for the Republication in a Revised Form of the Hebrew-Aramaic Equivalents in the Oxford Concordance to the Septuagint	lxxxvii
M. L. MARGOLIS.	
The Master Playwright of Wakefield	lxxxix
C. M. GAYLEY.	
The Figurative Expressions in the Works of Heinrich von Kleist	lxxxix
J. H. SENGER.	
Romance Etymologies	xc
CARL C. RICE.	
Duration of English Vowels in Monosyllabic Words	xc
P. E. GODDARD.	
The Correction of Diphthongs and Long Vowels in Hiatus, in Greek Hexameter Poetry	xcii
EDWARD B. CLAPP.	
Notes on Horace, <i>Sat.</i> I. 6. 126, and Aristophanes, <i>Peace</i> , 990	xcii
J. ELMORE.	
Sources of the Lay of Yonec	xciv
OLIVER M. JOHNSTON.	
Direct Speech in Lucan as an Element of Epic Technic	xciv
J. W. BASORE.	
Old Problems in Horace and Vergil	xcvi
J. E. CHURCH, JR.	
The Name of the Slave in Plautus' <i>Aulularia</i>	xcvii
H. W. PRESCOTT.	

TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

1904.

I. — *Historical Value of the Twelfth Chapter of Plutarch's
Life of Pericles.*

BY PROF. W. S. FERGUSON,
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

THE following is the substance of our chapter: That which alone remains, according to Plutarch, to bear witness to the ancient power of Greece is the 'offering of sacred edifices' made in the days of Pericles. Yet no proposal of that statesman was more severely criticised by his adversaries than that which outlined his building policy. They cried out *ὡς ὁ μὲν δῆμος ἀδοξεῖ καὶ κακῶς ἀκούει τὰ κοινὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων χρήματα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκ Δήλου μεταγαγών, ἢ δ' ἔνεστιν αὐτῷ πρὸς τοὺς ἐγκαλοῦντας εὐπρεπεστάτη τῶν προφάσεων, δείσαντα τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐκεῖθεν ἀνελέσθαι καὶ φυλάττειν ἐν ὀχυρῷ τὰ κοινά, ταύτην ἀνήρηκε Περικλῆς· καὶ δοκεῖ δεινὴν ὕβριν ἢ Ἑλλὰς ὑβρίζεσθαι καὶ τυραννείσθαι περιφανῶς, ὀρώσα τοῖς εἰσφερομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἀναγκαίως πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἡμᾶς τὴν πόλιν καταχρυσούντας καὶ καλλωπίζοντας ὥσπερ ἀλαζόνα γυναῖκα, περιαιπτομένην λίθους πολυτελεῖς καὶ ἀγάλματα καὶ ναοὺς χιλιοταλάντους.* Whereupon Pericles made the following defence: "We owe the allies," he said, "no account of the funds, so long as we fight for them and protect them from the Persians, while they contribute neither horse, ship, nor hoplite, but money alone. What they pay belongs not to the givers, but to the receivers, provided these perform what they receive it for; *δεῖ δὲ* (he continued) *τῆς πόλεως κατε-*

σκευασμένης ἱκανῶς τοῖς ἀναγκαίοις πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον, εἰς ταῦτα τὴν εὐπορίαν τρέπειν αὐτῆς, ἀφ' ὧν δόξα μὲν γενομένων ἀίδιος, εὐπορία δὲ γινομένων ἐτοίμη παρέσται, παντοδαπῆς ἐργασίας φανείσης καὶ ποικίλων χρειῶν, αἱ πᾶσαν μὲν τέχνην ἐγείρουσαι, πᾶσαν δὲ χεῖρα κινουσαι, σχεδὸν ὄλην ποιούσιν ἔμμισθον τὴν πόλιν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἅμα κοσμουμένην καὶ τρεφομένην."

Pericles' phrase — "distribute wages to practically the whole city" — is explained¹ by the observation that wages were already paid to men of military age and strength for service in the army, navy, and garrisons, and by calling attention to the diversity and extent of the interests involved in the construction of statues and temples. "The materials used were marble, bronze, ivory, gold, ebony, cypress-wood: the arts which put them into shape and place engaged carpenters, moulders in clay and bronze, stone-cutters, stainers of gold and softeners of ivory, painters, enamellers, and engravers: those that were concerned in furnishing and transporting the materials were, on the sea, merchants, sailors, pilots; on the land, wheelwrights, ox-breeders, teamsters, rope-makers, weavers, leather-dressers, road-makers, and miners. And each art, like a general with his army, had under it its mob of day-laborers and unskilled workmen — an instrument and body, as it were, for the service." As a matter of fact, concludes Plutarch, the result was the εὐπορία, or material well-being of the whole state.

There are difficulties of interpretation in the passage, but they do not affect the general sense, and need not be discussed here. It is to the historical value of the subject-matter that we are to devote our attention.

To determine this it is necessary to inquire into the sources of Plutarch's knowledge. It may be stated at the outset that the controversy whether Plutarch based his several biographies upon older historical works, merely adding here and there a thought culled in the course of his desultory reading, or, not unlike modern scholars, used extracts made from

¹ Zu diesen Worten verhält sich was sich daran anschliesst über die Verwirklichung dieses Gedankens des Perikles, wie die Erklärung zum Texte. Sauppe, H., *Ausgewählte Schriften*, p. 499.

books of all kinds, of history, comedy, philosophy, romance, biography, travel, of speeches, decrees, etc., — this controversy, it should be said, has not much affected the conclusions hitherto reached in regard to the present passage. For it was recognized from the first that the kernel of Chapter XII, the debate between Pericles and his adversaries, was different in character from what preceded and followed it.¹ Hence even those who thought that the bulk of the *Life of Pericles* was taken from Theopompos, or some other historian, admitted for the debate a distinct source.

It will fairly summarize the work already done in the quest of this collateral source to say that three opinions have been entertained: 1st, that Plutarch used either the memoirs of Ion of Chios, or the book on Themistocles, Thucydides, and Pericles by Stesimbrotos of Thasos, both of whom are held to have recorded similar disputes between Athenian statesmen; 2d, that Plutarch used more or less rhetorical and imaginary speeches inserted by Ephoros into his *Universal History*, or by Theopompos into the excursus on demagogues appended to his *Philippica*; 3d, that Plutarch, or his immediate authority, used the work of Theopompos, but that Theopompos composed the speeches from materials derived in part from the reliable reports of Stesimbrotos or Ion; in part, and specifically in respect to the purpose of Pericles in inaugurating his building policy, from the partisan oligarchic pamphlet written, according to Professor U. von Wilamowitz² by Theramenes, according to Professor Dümmler³ by Critias, according to more conservative scholars⁴ by some unknown aristocrat, and used, alas! by Aristotle in his *Constitution of Athens*.

For the first of these views stood Sauppe,⁵ Oncken,⁶ Adolf Schmidt,⁷ and Dr. L. Holzapfel,⁸ the two former advocating Ion, the two latter Stesimbrotos. Positive proofs none of

¹ See Sauppe, *o.c.*, p. 498 ff.

² *Aristoteles u. Athen*, I., p. 165.

³ *Hermes*, 27 (1892), p. 260 ff.

⁴ Professors Meyer and Busolt, for example.

⁵ *o.c.*

⁶ *Staatslehre des Aristoteles*, II., p. 509 ff.

⁷ *Das perikleische Zeitalter*, II., p. 222 ff.

⁸ *Untersuchungen über d. Darstellung d. griech. Gesch. von 489 bis 413 vor Chr.*, p. 144 ff.

them has adduced. The general probability of such an origin was all they sought to make out.

For the second of these views stood Rühl,¹ Köhler,² and Professor Curt Wachsmuth.³ The most telling argument against a contemporary and in favor of a fourth-century source was made by Köhler, who claimed that the statement attributed to Pericles, that "the allies contributed neither horse, ship, nor hoplite, but money alone," contained too gross an error to have originated while the Athenian empire existed.

For the third of these views stands most notably Professor Busolt.⁴ The ultimate origin of the debate in contemporary reports of discussions which actually took place between Pericles and Thucydides, son of Melesias, he holds for self-evident. That Theopompos was concerned in the tradition of the material to Plutarch he argues from a number of causes⁵: 1. The appearance of redundant synonyms in this chapter of Plutarch betrays the style of Theopompos. 2. The error pointed out by Köhler is repeated in a portion of Plutarch's *Cimon* which probably originated in Theopompos. 3. The survival of ἡμᾶς in the attack of Pericles' adversaries shows that the composer of the indictment was one who identified himself with the aristocratic party in Athens.⁶ 4. The design of distributing wages to all Athenians, imputed to Pericles by both Aristotle and Plutarch, reveals the work of the oligarchic pamphleteer used by Aristotle and Theopompos.

At this point a new turn was given to our present inquiry by Professor Eduard Meyer's study of Plutarch's methods of writing biography.⁷ Professor Meyer, in his wonted catholic fashion, was the first to formulate the net results of modern investigations into Plutarch's sources for his *Lives* of Greeks.⁸

¹ *Jahrbücher für class. Philologie*, 1868, p. 670 ff.

² *Abhandlungen der berliner Akademie*, I., 2, p. 99.

³ *Stadt Athen in Alterthum*, I., p. 529, n. 2.

⁴ See *Griech. Gesch.* III. I, p. vii.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 439, n. I.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 350, notes.

⁷ *Forsch. zur alten Geschichte*, II., pp. 22 ff., 65 ff.

⁸ Professor A. Gudeman in a similar summary made as early as 1889 (*Tr. A.P.A.* XX., p. 139 ff.), showed that Plutarch used biographical literature, not Livy, Sallust, Asinius Pollio, Cicero, for the *Lives* of Romans.

Plutarch used neither Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*, Ephoros, nor Theopompos. Those who attempt to connect his work directly with that of these historians forget that in the course of four hundred years before Plutarch's time the material suited for biography had been collected and sifted by generations and generations of scholars, notably by the Alexandrians. All Plutarch did was to make over in each case one of the already existent biographies. In his *Vorlage* were the quotations, the citations, the documents, the discussions, the anecdotes, etc. Plutarch chose such material as pleased him, and gave it new written expression. The style is mainly his. Fortunately for the modern historian Plutarch is not responsible for the ideas, except where these are ethical and conjunctive. Nor is he the originator of the form in which his biographies are regularly set. This Professor Friederich Leo¹ has recently shown. The rules for biography were as well established as those for oratory. The type to which Plutarch conformed had been created centuries earlier, and, as Professor Leo has convincingly set forth, through the activity of the Peripatetic School of Philosophy. This being the case, it is obvious that, while the value of Plutarch's material is enhanced, the possibility of determining his sources is lessened.² To put the matter concisely, what likelihood is there that the style of Theopompos, of Thucydides, of the comic poets, can be detected in the twelfth chapter of his *Life of Pericles*? This has been repeatedly attempted. Thus Sauppe noticed in the comparison between Athens decking herself out with thousand-talent temples and a courtesan, a reminiscence of the trenchant phraseology of some comedian,³ while Professor Dümmler saw in it the contempt of an embittered oligarch.⁴ Thus Professor Busolt lays the many lax synonyms of the chapter to the charge of Theopompos,⁵—beyond all doubt erroneously, as Professor Wilamowitz's remark⁶ in confirmation

¹ *Die griech.-römische Biographie*, p. 146 ff.

² Cf. Professor Meyer, *o.c.*, p. 69.

⁴ *Hermes*, 27 (1892), p. 274.

⁶ *Griech. Lesebuch, Erläutgn.* I., p. 38.

³ *o.c.*, p. 500, note.

⁵ *o.c.*, p. 439, n. 1.

of my own observation has convinced me,—and Professor Bruno Keil¹ finds in it a flavor of the fourth-century rhetoric. Professor Busolt, moreover, sees in the speech of Pericles words and phrases which point to conscious or unconscious imitation of Thucydides.² How far is it justifiable to dissect Plutarch in this fashion with stylistic instruments? It is not an entirely unwarranted procedure. That Professor Meyer grants. Plutarch had a fine appreciation for the effectiveness of an antique turn of thought, and no scruples against using it without acknowledgment. He had, of course, read his classics, such as Herodotus and Thucydides, and had a retentive memory for striking expressions. He found in his biographical authorities an abundance of quotations which he borrowed freely. His composition, however, is a web, not a patchwork. Hence thought, not style, must be the prime test of the derivation of passages in Plutarch.³

Let us apply this test anew to our chapter. There can be no doubt that if we establish the substantial correctness of Plutarch's narrative, we shall strengthen the contention that a reliable contemporary of Pericles was the biographer's ultimate authority, while that contention will be weakened, if not overthrown, as Köhler perceived, by the detection of considerable errors.

It should be observed, in the first place, that the adversaries of Pericles mentioned in the chapter are Thucydides, son of Melesias, and his party. That is clear from Chapters XI and XIV. Thucydides became the leader of the oligarchs at Athens after the death of Cimon in 449/8 B.C., and was influential till he was ostracized in 443. Thucydides, Plutarch tells us, pointed out the odium incurred by the transference of the treasury of the Confederacy from Delos, and, at the same time, impeached the building policy of Pericles. When it was held to be established that the treasury was transferred in 454, and the Parthenon, the first of the Periclean buildings, was begun in 447, it was apparently an inaccuracy on

¹ *Anonymus Argentinensis*, p. 32, n. 2.

² *o.c.*, p. 444, n. 1.

³ See also Professor Wachsmuth, *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte*, p. 222.

Plutarch's part that the two events are represented as jointly criticised by Thucydides. Nor did it seem reasonable that Pericles should be abused for the removal of the treasury, so long as we believed, on the authority of Theophrastos, whom Plutarch elsewhere quotes with approval,¹ that it was effected on the motion of the Samians. Now, however, thanks to the *Anonymus Argentinensis*,² we are better informed. In the first place we learn that ten years intervened between the adoption of the plan for the Parthenon and the beginning of its execution in 447. Inasmuch as we had learned before that the temple of Niké Apteros was decreed apparently in or about 450,³ it is clear that the building policy of Pericles was under discussion earlier than 447. Hence, even if the transfer of the treasury was made in 454, as Professor Eduard Meyer⁴ and others still maintain, it would not be objectionable that the two events should be associated by Plutarch. It would indeed be awkward to suppose Thucydides in a position to lodge an indictment against them in that year. Hence it must be regarded as a pleasant confirmation of Plutarch to observe that the *Anonymus Argentinensis*, by which alone a date is assigned to the occurrence, sets the transfer of the treasury in 450/49,⁵ *i.e.* just at the time we should infer from Plutarch that Thucydides organized his party in opposition to Pericles. And it is equally reassuring to find, as we do from this same document, that Pericles, after all, not Samos, was responsible for the transfer.

How, in the second place, does it stand with the inaccuracy detected by Köhler in the statement that "the allies contributed neither horse, ship, nor hoplite, but money alone"?

¹ *Aristides*, 25.

² Edited by Professor Bruno Keil, Strassburg, 1902.

³ Professor W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge* 2, No. 911. ⁴ *Gesch. d. Alter. V.*, p. vi.

⁵ Mr. Underhill, in the *English Historical Review*, 1903, p. 760, denies that the reference in the *Anonymus* is to the transfer of the treasury from Delos. He reminds us that Δή(λ)φ is a modern conjecture for δῆμφ in the papyrus, which, in turn, is a correction made in antiquity for the original δημμ. That is true. But the conjecture is no doubt right. In what other connection could the assessment of Aristides and the enormous sum of five thousand talents have been mentioned? Professor Meyer, *l.c.*, calls the date of the *Anonymus*, 450/49, *völlig unmöglich*. But he gives no good reason for his judgment. Professor Keil's argumentation, *o.c.*, p. 116 ff., seems to me sound.

Did the allies who paid tribute furnish either horse, ship, or hoplite for the defence of the confederacy? That is the question, as Dr. Holzapfel¹ pointed out years ago. It is not universally answered in the affirmative even yet.² But granted that they did, as seems to me probable, the error is not a positive one. It is simply an exaggeration of the truth; for it is certain that the Athenians performed the bulk of the military service themselves, and rarely employed the land forces of the tributary allies. Therefore, an epitomizer might well think he had presented, in what we possess, the essential content of the statement, even if he omitted the reservations with which it had, perhaps, been originally accompanied.³

Next, let us ask the questions: Was the calculation that the construction of statues and public buildings would distribute wages to practically the whole city a reasonable one for a statesman like Pericles to make? Was it such as a party leader like Pericles would publicly announce?

It is the prevalent opinion that Athens in the fifth century had gone fully over to a capitalistic development of industry. Thus, for example, Professor Eduard Meyer says:⁴ "In Wirklichkeit steht Athen im fünften und vierten Jahrhundert ebenso sehr unter dem Zeichen des Capitalismus wie England seit dem achtzehnten und Deutschland seit dem neunzehnten Jahrhundert." Many apparently free handicraftsmen the capitalists had reduced to economic dependence upon themselves. Such as otherwise might have withstood the competition of the factory were being destroyed by the competition of the metics, upon whom the military and political tasks fell

¹ *o.c.*, p. 150.

² See Professor Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alter.* IV. 409 A.

³ See *Ibid.* 407 A. Professor Bruno Keil, who grants that the inaccuracy exists (*o.c.*, p. 32 n.), writes at p. 158: "Wenn die Oligarchen in Athen und von aussen die Bündner schrieen dass Perikles den Bundesschatz nicht für Bundeszwecke verwende und Athen mit fremdem Gelde wie eine Dirne putze: auf diese Massregeln [addition to the fleet, reorganization of the cavalry, etc.] liess sich hinweisen, auf sie hin behaupten, dass Athen gewappnet dastehe, jeder Zeit bereit das Schwert zu ziehen *für die Bündner die nicht Schiff, nicht Mann, nicht Ross im Kampfe wagten.*"

⁴ *Gesch. d. Alter.* III., § 303 A.

less heavily, and whom, as being less pretentious, the capitalists favored in distributing work. And, moreover, the capitalists imported slaves to make labor still cheaper. By means of slaves they worked the mines, ran the factories, and even pushed the free handicraftsmen from their tiny shops. Now, if that was the case, it would have been natural for such a regular business as building at the time of Pericles to fall entirely into the hands of wealthy contractors, who would, of course, have employed slaves and metics rather than citizens. And if this was the issue, state subvention of building enterprises would have been to the detriment rather than to the advantage of the ὄχλος, or mob of Athenian citizens.¹ As it is hardly conceivable that Pericles sought to promote the interests of the capitalists alone, or that by ὄχλος is meant the alien population, we cannot, in the premises, think that Plutarch is right in attributing to Pericles economic as well as ideal ends.

But was industry capitalistically organized in the fifth and fourth centuries? M. Francotte,² by a very careful collection and arrangement of the evidence, has made it clear, to me at least, that it was not. The irregularity of the foreign demand, due to the incessant wars, made factory production unprofitable, especially when slaves were employed. For even though they were stimulated by the receipt of living wages to the hope of some day purchasing their freedom, and hence worked quite as well as free men, slaves remained a dead weight upon the shoulders of their employer, whenever war interrupted business. The local demand required factory production no more than it does now. Hence the forge as distinguished from the factory maintained itself as the characteristic form of industrial life.

¹ When capitalists imported slaves *en masse* for agricultural purposes they were strongly opposed; see the story of Mnason in Timaeus, *Fr.* 67 (Athenaeus, VI, 264 c = 272 b). Is it to be supposed that the industrial classes favored a policy which must have caused (in the premises) an extensive importation of slaves?

² *L'industrie dans la grèce ancienne* (*Bibliothèque de la faculté de philosophie de l'université de Liège. Fasc. VII. et VIII., 1900, 1901*); see also Dr. Friederich Cauet in *Berl. Phil. Woch.* XXIV. (1904), p. 78 f.

But who ran the forges and the similar work places? In the case of the building trades we are able to give an answer for the last years of the fifth and for the fourth century B.C. I quote from M. Francotte,¹ who has compiled the statistics of the subject. Among those whom the inscriptions show to have earned money on the Erechtheion in 409 and the following year were 24 Athenians, 40 metics, 17 slaves, and 21 whose status is doubtful, but who were mostly either slaves or metics. Among those whom the inscriptions show to have been paid for services in connection with the temple and portico at Eleusis during the last third of the fourth century were 36 Athenians, 39 metics, 12 foreigners, and 57 of doubtful status, but who were probably metics. In this case the state, *i.e.* the temple, owned 17 slaves, who were regularly employed and, like other workmen, paid for their labor. It is possible that private slaves were employed also, but their number is not determinable. From these statistics it is clear that from 409 to 309 the citizens received much less of the money disbursed by the state for its public buildings than did non-citizens. Was the same true for the time of Pericles? I do not think that, if we disregard the present passage, we have the means of answering this question definitely. But it must not be forgotten that the payments made for public services in the last half of the fifth and in the fourth century alienated from industrial occupations many citizens who, before the time of Pericles, and at the time when his building policy was first proposed, gladly sought remunerative employment of any kind. In the fourth century Lycurgus notoriously spent money on public works. Yet he escaped the charge of seeking to provide work for poor constituents. Nor has Augustus or Hadrian been credited with economic motives. Pericles stands at the beginning of that long period during which paid labor was flouted. He belongs with Pisis-tratus and the enlightened despots of the seventh and sixth centuries B.C.; but, more fortunate than they, he controlled tributary allies, and was thus enabled to disburse public funds

¹ *o.c.* VII., p. 205 ff.

to Athenian citizens without increasing the taxation of his constituents.

In the explanatory remarks¹ which are added to the contention of Pericles that wages would be distributed to practically all the citizens, we are told that all but the *βάνανσος ὄχλος* already received state aid for service in the navy, garrisons, and army. In Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*,² Aristides is made to predict that as a result of the Empire support will be furnished "to all, to some for service in the expeditions, to some for garrison duty, and to others for transacting the public affairs." And Aristotle appends a calculation from which it appears that during the thirty years' peace twenty thousand citizens obtained pay annually for these various services. Of the twenty thousand, the hoplites alone amount to twenty-five hundred. These were doing garrison duty. No other hoplites are specified, and Aristotle informs us that it was only when the Peloponnesian War broke out that the classes liable for hoplite duty regularly obtained pay.³ This contradiction proves at most exaggeration in Plutarch's report; for at an earlier time they may have been paid irregularly, just as the service was irregular, and certainly, if they did not get the usual wage of a drachma a day, they received the usual indemnity of three obols a day.⁴

In the words attributed by Plutarch to Pericles, not only is an economic purpose enunciated for the building policy, but the employment thereby afforded is represented as one of its laudable features. How admirably that harmonizes with the ideas imputed to Pericles by Thucydides when he makes him say:⁵ Πλούτῳ τε ἔργου μᾶλλον καιρῷ ἢ λόγου κόμπῳ χρώμεθα, καὶ τὸ πένεσθαι οὐχ ὁμολογεῖν τινι αἰσχρὸν, ἀλλὰ μὴ διαφεύγειν ἔργῳ αἰσχιον. Ἐνι τε τοῖς αὐτοῖς οἰκείων ἅμα καὶ πολιτικῶν ἐπιμέλεια, καὶ ἑτέροις πρὸς ἔργα τετραμμένοις τὰ πολιτικὰ μὴ ἐνδεῶς γνῶναι. How little it accords with the creed enunciated by Plutarch himself in this same *Life of Pericles*⁶ that even a great artist's work — to say nothing of an artisan's —

¹ See above, p. 3, n. 1.

² § 24.

³ *Const. of Athens*, § 27, 2.

⁴ Professor Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.* III. 1, p. 266.

⁵ Thucy. II. 40.

⁶ *Plut. Pericles*, 2.

reduced him to the level of a slave! In Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens* neither the construction of buildings nor the despatch of cleruchies is mentioned among the measures employed by Pericles to better the condition of the masses. The latter, however, Aristotle recognized as a legitimate means of preserving a democracy, and he commended highly a similar procedure of the Carthaginians, but of the former (employment for wages on public works as distinct from setting individuals up in commerce or industry) he speaks as follows:¹ "We may find instances of this practice in the pyramids of Egypt, the votive offerings of the Cypselidae, the erection of the Olympieum by the Pisistratidae, and the great works of Polycrates at Samos, all of which have the same effect, viz., that the subjects are kept in constant occupation and poverty." Aristotle is here interpreting fourth-century Greek opinion.

It is to be noted that it is in the explanatory note in Plutarch that a motive similar to that which underlies the construction of public buildings is predicated of Pericles' policy of paying government officials. Therefore the two rest on different supports. Should the view that payment for office was Pericles' way of bribing the poor be false, and, as is commonly claimed, of oligarchic manufacture, no suspicion is thereby attached to the original statement to which it is appended.

The explanatory remarks continue with a list of the materials and professions employed in "the construction of the sacred offerings" — a list embodied in the narrative of practically all modern historians of Greece. Some parts of it, indeed, have sorely puzzled several of them. It is easy to see how buildings and statues called for carpenters, modellers of clay, bronze-moulders, stone-cutters, etc. But observe the stress laid upon the transport of materials. Observe, too, that there were concerned with it, on the sea, "merchants, sailors, pilots," but not ship-builders, sail-makers, etc.; on the land, "teamsters, ox-breeders, miners, rope-makers, weavers, leather-dressers," but also "wheelwrights and road-makers."

¹ *Politics*, VIII. 11 (Mr. Welldon's Trans.).

The distinction is intentionally made. But Curtius¹ does not correctly explain it by remarking that "the very transport of the materials was the occasion of great progress in mechanical science in that inventive age," etc. The true explanation is given by the inscriptions which deal with the construction of the portico and temple at Eleusis in the fourth century. From them it is clear that three processes were involved in the land transport.² 1. The construction of vehicles. 2. The building of roads. 3. The actual transport. Ships were already in existence. Pack animals, the ordinary means of carrying loads, and trails, the ordinary paths for these, needed to be replaced by stout wagons and level roads when immense blocks of marble had to be transported. The wagons were drawn by oxen, and we have records to show us how it took three days, thirty to forty teams, and as many teamsters to bring each drum for the columns from Mt. Pentelicus to Eleusis. Harness of leather, fastenings of great ropes—the undergirdings from the dockyards were sometimes used—employed leather-dressers and rope-makers; in fact, the state made payments of money directly to each and every class of craftsman in Plutarch's list. The payments, moreover, were made to the workmen—citizens, metics, and slaves—for day labor or for petty contracts. No considerable sum was disbursed to any one man, or for any one piece of work. The interests involved were thus precisely those enumerated by Plutarch. To be sure, this confirmation of Plutarch comes from the fourth century, but it holds good for the latter part of the fifth century also,³ and it is a fair inference that in the age of Pericles circumstances were in this respect not essentially different.

How did Plutarch come to know the building methods of the fifth and fourth century Athens? In the first place, it is quite likely that the whole explanatory note, to which the enumeration belongs, was part of the biographical apparatus

¹ *History of Greece*, II., p. 637.

² *C.I.A.* II., Add. 834 c; also 834 b and IV. 2, 834 b; see M. Francotte, *o.c.* VIII., p. 85 f.

³ See the inscriptions (*C.I.A.* I. 282, 322; IV. 1, p. 1, p. 74; I. 321, 324; IV. 1, p. 148, p. 38, 317^a, 331^b, 331^c) which deal with the Erechtheion.

which Plutarch used. It may have been appended to the debate from the fourth century on. Or did Plutarch simply observe how temples were erected in his own day, and thence infer the old-time methods?

This idea involves the conclusion that building remained practically unchanged during the interval of five hundred years or more. Is that true? In certain minor particulars alterations had taken place. Thus, whereas state officers (*ἐπιστάται*) had in the fifth century employed artisans at a daily wage, or given a small piece of work on contract, in Roman times the imperial or municipal officials made a contract with one or more contractors (*ἐργολάβοι*, *redemptores*), whom they held responsible under security for the money advanced them by the state and for the proper completion of the work.¹ It is difficult to say in what proportion citizens, freedmen, and slaves took part in the operations. It was no doubt different in different regions. It is clear, however, that all three classes performed industrial work under the Roman régime. They were organized in guilds (*collegia*), wherever they were present in sufficient numbers to make an organization worth while. The guilds, though made up of citizens, freedmen, and slaves, who worked individually at their trades, seem yet to have had a relatively large proportion of freedmen. The following list of the chief guilds engaged on the public buildings of Rome is given by M. Waltzing in his *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains*, vol. II., p. 115 ff.:—

Collegium fabrum = *Collegium fabrum tignariorum*. This included all concerned with building operations, and one existed in most of the chief towns of the empire. In Milan the guild had at one time twelve hundred members; in Rome as many as sixteen hundred. *Fabri* = *τέκτονες* in Plutarch.

Collegium dendrophorum — those who furnished and transported timber; lumber-dealers.

Collegium aerariorum fabrum = *χαλκοτύπτοι* in Plutarch — coppersmiths or bronzesmiths.

¹ See Professor Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung im römischen Kaiserreiche*, p. 382 ff.

Collegium fabrum ferrarium — workers of iron and other metals.

Collegae marmorarii = λιθουργοί in Plutarch — workers in marble.

Mensores aedificorum — architects.

Collegium pavimentariorum — *paveurs*.

Collegium subaedianorum = μαλακτῆρες ἐλέφαντος — *ébénistes*.

Conleg. sectorum serrarium — stone-sawyers.

Collegium structorum — masons.

A complete list of the industrial guilds of the Romans can be found in M. Waltzing's work, Vol. IV., p. 1 ff. It includes: *Lapidarii* = λιθουργοί, *Cisiarii* = ἡνίοχοι, *Lignarii plostrarii* = ἄμαξοπηγοί, *Linarii* = λινουργοί, *Metallarii* = μεταλλεῖς, *Navicularii marini* = ναύκληροι καὶ ἔμποροι, *Nautae* = ναῦται, *Sutores* = σκυτοτόμοι. These are not specifically connected with public buildings, but undoubtedly were interested in their construction. Many artisans remained outside the guilds.¹

Plutarch, speaking of the Periclean age, says: *ἐκάστη δὲ τέχνη, καθάπερ στρατηγὸς ἴδιον στράτευμα, τὸν θετικὸν ὄχλον καὶ ἰδιώτην συντεταγμένον εἶχεν*. Aurelius Victor, speaking of Plutarch's age, tells us of the emperor Hadrian that *ad specimen legionum militarium fabros, perpendicularatores, architectos, genusque cunctum extruendorum moenium seu decorandorum in cohortes centuriaverat*. One cannot help thinking that the two writers had something similar in mind. Plutarch, of course, lived to see Hadrian revive the old glories of Athens, though he had written his *Pericles* before the revival began in 125 A.D.

In summary, it may be said that the debate between Pericles and his adversaries contains no substantial inaccuracies. On the other hand, not only does it reveal close knowledge of the issues raised by Thucydides in his campaign against Pericles, but it attributes to Pericles motives which could hardly have suggested themselves to another than a contem-

¹ Few guilds in fact existed in Greece proper; see M. Francotte, *o.c.* VIII., p. 199 ff.

porary—motives unnatural even in the fourth century; for at that time it could hardly have been imputed as a virtue to a statesman that he sought to entice citizens into tasks which public opinion held to be unfit for them to perform, or that he aimed to give bread to poor citizens by offering them work without first having debarred metics and slave-owners from applying for it.¹ In the Greece of the fourth century the question seems to have been, not how carpenters, stone-masons, etc., could get work, but how cities could get enough artisans to construct their public buildings. The local supply did not suffice to complete insignificant edifices at Athens, to say nothing of small places like Delphi, Epidauros, Delos, Lebadea, etc. The explanatory note is different in character and origin. In part it betrays kinship with the dominant thought of the fourth century, in part it discloses careful observation of ancient building processes—nothing more.

¹ It is notorious that Athens welcomed metics; for the demand for foreign workmen, see M. Francotte, *o.c.* VII., p. 209 ff.

II. — *On the Distinction between Comitia and Concilium.*

By DR. GEORGE WILLIS BOTSFORD,

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

ALL inquiries into the relation between *comitia* and *concilium* have hitherto set out from the definition of Laelius Felix,¹ quoted by Gellius xv. 27 (Is qui non universum populum, sed partem aliquam adesse iubet, non comitia, sed concilium edicere debet); they have limited themselves to illustrating it, and to setting down as lax or inaccurate the many uses of the two words which cannot be forced into line with it. The object of this paper, on the contrary, is to consider all the occurrences of the two words in the principal extant prose writers of the Ciceronian and Augustan ages, — a period in which the assemblies were still living, — for the purpose of testing the definition of Laelius, and of establishing new definitions by induction in case that of Laelius should prove wrong.

All are aware that Livy pays little heed to the definition, if indeed he knows anything of it; but modern writers insist that his use of the two words is inaccurate, and that for the proper usage we should go back to the republican authors. In view of this general agreement as to Livy's frequent violation of the rule of Laelius, it will be enough to state here some conclusions I have drawn from complete statistics regarding his usage:

I. As to *Comitia*:

1. Livy frequently uses *comitia* to denote the tribal assembly of the *plebs*.
2. He always uses *comitia* to denote the assembly for the election of priests, consisting of but seventeen tribes, and hence of a minority of the people.

II. As to *Concilium*:

1. He frequently uses *concilia* (rarely *comitia*) to denote foreign assemblies of all the people.
2. Less frequently he uses *concilia* to denote Roman assemblies of all the people.

¹ Probably the jurist who lived under Hadrian, and who is mentioned by Paulus, *Dig.* v. 4. 3.

Turning to the republican period, we find that though Sallust has little occasion for using either word, he certainly makes *comitia* include the plebeian assembly in *Jug.* 37: P. Lucullus et L. Annius, tribuni plebis, resistentibus collegis continuare magistratum nitebantur, quae dissensio totius anni comitia impediēbat.

Cicero, however, is the author on whom scholars rely in support of the definition of Laelius. Following Berns, *de comitiarum tributorum et conciliorum plebis discrimine* (Wetzlar, 1875), p. 35, they say Cicero has violated the rule but once, *Att.* i. 1. 1, in which occurs the phrase *comitiis tribuniciis* (cf. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, iii. p. 149, n. 1). Berns' examination of Cicero must have been exceedingly hasty, as he has left a number of instances unnoticed. The following passage is especially to the point, *Q. fr.* ii. 14 (15 b). 4: Tribunicii candidati compromiserunt HS quingenis in singulos apud M. Catonem depositis petere eius arbitratu, ut, qui contra fecisset, ab eo condemnaretur. Quae quidem comitia si gratuita fuerint, ut putantur, plus unus Cato potuerit quam omnes leges omnesque iudices. The tribunician *comitia* are the only *comitia* concerned in Cato's transaction. Again in *Att.* ii. 23. 3 (Permagnum nostra interest te, si comitiis non potueris, at, declarato illo, esse Romae) Cicero is thinking of the election of Clodius to the tribuneship, and hence the *comitia* he refers to here are *comitia tribunicia*. In *Fam.* viii. 4. 3, *aedilium pl. comitiis* must refer to the plebeian assembly, in which the plebeian aediles were elected (cf. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, ii. p. 482).

Another important passage is *Sest.* 51. 109: Venio ad comitia, sive magistratum placet sive legum. Leges videmus saepe ferri multas. Omitto eas, quae feruntur ita, vix ut quini, et ii ex aliena tribu, qui suffragium ferant, reperiantur. De me, quem tyrannum atque ereptorem libertatis esse dicebat illa ruina rei publicae, dicit se legem tulisse. Quis est, qui se, cum contra me ferebatur, inisse suffragium confiteatur? cum autem de me eodem ex senatus consulto comitiis centuriatis ferebatur, quis est, qui non profiteatur se adfuisse et suffragium de salute mea tulisse? Utra igitur causa popu-

laris debet videri, in qua omnes honestates civitatis, omnes aetates, omnes ordines una mente consentiunt, an in qua furiae concitatae tamquam ad funus rei publicae convolant? The law which Cicero dwells on with such bitterness in the beginning of this passage, and recurs to at the end, is the tribunician law which pronounced on him the sentence of exile; in this connection, therefore, *comitia* distinctly includes the plebeian assembly in its legislative capacity.

Even more telling is *Leg. iii. 19. 44-45*: *Ferri de singulis nisi centuriatis comitiis noluerunt.* Descriptus enim populus censu, ordinibus, aetatibus plus adhibet ad suffragium concilii quam fuse in tribus convocatus. Quo verius in causa nostra vir magni ingenii summaque prudentia, L. Cotta, dicebat nihil omnino actum esse de nobis; praeter enim quam quod comitia illa essent armis gesta servilibus, praeterea neque tributa capitis comitia rata esse posse neque ulla privilegii: quocirca nihil nobis opus esse lege, de quibus nihil omnino actum esset legibus. Sed visum est et vobis et clarissimis viris melius, de quo servi et latrones scivisse se aliquid dicerent, de hoc eodem cunctam Italiam, quid sentiret, ostendere. Cicero is here contrasting the *comitia centuriata*, which recalled him, with the tribal assembly of the *plebs*, which pronounced the sentence of exile. Now as he was condemned by the plebeian assembly, it is clear that in this passage Cicero calls the plebeian assembly *comitia*. How Mommsen, *Römische Forschungen*, i. p. 161, n. 53, can make this citation refer to his "patricio-plebeian" *comitia tributa* no one can possibly explain.

In *Att. iii. 12. 1*, *comitia* expressly includes the tribunician elections. The same elections are twice called *comitia* in *Att. iii. 14*; and in *iii. 13. 1*, Cicero, again mentioning these *comitia*, says: *In tribunis pl. designatis reliqua spes est.* From all these passages it becomes evident that Cicero regards the plebeian assembly as *comitia*.

In many passages *comitia* seems to include all the elections of the year, of plebeian as well as of patrician magistrates; for the elections were usually held in the same season, and could not well be separated in thought (see list of citations

for elective assemblies, p. 28). In fact, according to Cicero's usage, *comitia* includes all kinds of national assemblies which do not come under the term *contiones*; cf. *Sest.* 50. 106: *Tribus locis significari maxime populi Romani iudicium ac voluntas potest, contione, comitiis, ludorum gladiatorumque consessu*; cf. also 54. 115; 59. 125.

The very expression *comitia populi* (*Rep.* ii. 32. 56; *Div.* ii. 18. 42) implies the existence of other *comitia*, for instance *comitia plebis*. It is not strange, therefore, that Cicero should use the following expression: *Qui (optimates) non populi concessu, sed suis comitiis hoc sibi nomen adrogaverunt*; *Rep.* i. 33. 50. Here he makes it evident that there may be *comitia* of the nobles in contrast with the *populi concessus*.

Furthermore, Cicero speaks of *comitiâ*, consisting of but seventeen tribes, for the election of *sacerdotes*; *Cael.* 8. 19; *Leg. Agr.* ii. 7. 18; *Brut.* i. 5. 3 f.; 14. 1; *Fam.* viii. 12. 4; 14. 1.

From his point of view, a tribal assembly of the whole people was one which consisted of all thirty-five tribes, irrespective of the number present in the several tribes, irrespective, too, of the rank of those who attended. An assembly *tributim* of a part of the people, on the other hand, was one in which some of the tribes were unrepresented. All this is clearly expressed in *Leg. Agr.* ii. 7. 16 f.: *Iubet enim tributum plebis, qui eam legem tulerit, creare decemviros per tribus septemdecim, ut, quem novem tribus fecerint, is decemvir sit. Hic quaero, quam ob causam initium rerum ac legum suarum hinc duxerit, ut populus Romanus suffragio privaretur . . . Etenim cum omnes potestates, imperia, curationes ab universo populo Romano proficisci convenit, tum eas profecto maxime, quae constituuntur ad populi fructum aliquem et commodum, in quo et universi deligant, quem populo Romano maxime consulturum putent, et unus quisque studio et suffragio suo viam sibi ad beneficium impetrandum munire possit. Hoc tribuno plebis potissimum venit in mentem, populum Romanum universum privare suffragiis, paucas tribus non certa condicione iuris, sed sortis beneficio fortuito ad usurpandam libertatem vocare.* Even if the tribes were repre-

sented by no more than five men each, and these men not voting in their own tribes, the assembly was nevertheless *comitia tributa populi* with full law-making power; *Sest.* 51. 109. The *comitia curiata*, too, which in Cicero's time was made up of thirty plebeian lictors, in which accordingly no patrician voters were present, was still an assembly of the whole people. This distinction, — recognized by Cicero and his contemporaries, — between an assembly of the whole people as represented by all the voting divisions and an assembly of a part of the people as represented by some of the voting divisions, is incompatible with the distinction formulated by Laelius. Though an antiquarian might make much of the presence or absence of a few patricians, a man who lived in the present, as did Cicero, probably never troubled himself about such unpractical matters.

From the evidence as to Cicero's usage given above, we must draw the following conclusions :

1. He often uses *comitia* to denote the plebeian tribal assembly, just as Livy does.
2. He regularly uses *comitia* to denote the assembly of seventeen tribes for the election of *sacerdotes*. In this respect his usage is the same as Livy's.
3. His distinction between an assembly of the whole people and an assembly of a part of the people is incompatible with the definition of Laelius.

Concilium is a comparatively rare word with Cicero. In a few cases he seems to make *concilia* include all kinds of organized national gatherings; cf. *Rep.* vi. 13 (3). 13: *Nihil est enim illi principi deo . . . acceptius quam concilia coetusque hominum iure sociati, quae civitates appellantur*; *Fin.* iii. 19. 63: *Natura sumus apti ad coetus, concilia, civitates*. In the first citation *concilium* must, and in the second it may, include all the citizens. Cicero could hardly mean that we are by nature adapted to assemblies of a part of the people, or that nothing could be more satisfactory to the Supreme Being than the *concilium plebis* which interdicted him from fire and water. In *Fin.* ii. 24. 77 (*Mihi quidem eae verae videntur opiniones, quae honestae, quae laudabiles, quae gloriosae, quae in senatu, quae ad populum, quae in omni coetu*

concilioque profitendae sint) he could not be thinking simply of the plebeian assembly, for he placed far greater value on the opinions expressed in and by the *comitia centuriata*.

From all that has been said it is evident that Cicero's usage does not differ materially from Livy's. It is thoroughly established, therefore, that in the late republic, as well as in the early empire, the distinction between *comitia* and *concilium* was not a distinction between the whole and a part; in fact, it becomes doubtful whether the definition of Laelius was known to the writers of this period.

The results thus far reached, though negative, are of great importance; the definition of *comitia* and *concilium* formulated by Laelius has been set aside, and the ground prepared for the establishment of new definitions by induction. From the material afforded by the authors under discussion, the following conclusions relative to the general uses of the two words may be drawn:

I. (a) The phrases *comitia curiata*, *comitia centuriata*, *comitia tributa* constantly occur; whereas (b) the phrases *concilium curiatum* (or *-tum*), *concilium centuriatum* (or *-tum*), *concilium tributum* (or *-tum*) cannot be found in the authors of the period under discussion.

(a) is too well known to need illustration; (b) may be sufficiently established by an examination of the references for *concilium* given in this paper.

II. (a) *Concilium* may apply to a non-political as well as to a political gathering; (b) *comitia* is wholly restricted to the political sphere.

(a) *Concilium* is non-political in Cicero, *Div.* i. 24. 49 (*deorum concilium*); *Tusc.* iv. 32. 69; *N. D.* i. 8. 18; *Off.* iii. 5. 25; 9. 38; *Sen.* 23. 84; *Fin.* ii. 4. 12 (*virtutum concilium*); *Rep.* i. 17. 28 (*doctissimorum hominum in concilio*); *Sest.* 14. 32 (applied to the meeting of a *collegium*); Livy i. 21. 3 (*Camemarum concilia*); ii. 38. 4; xxvii. 35. 4.

III. Within the political sphere, again, (a) *concilium* is the more general term,—it suggests neither organization nor lack of organization; whereas (b) *comitia* is restricted to the organized assembly.

(a) *Concilium* is the more general term in Cicero, *Fin.* iii. 19. 63; ii. 24. 77; *Rep.* vi. 13 (3). 13 (all three passages are quoted on p. 25). In all these citations *concilia*, denoting assemblies of the whole people, must certainly include organized meetings, probably without excluding the unorganized. In *Lcg.* iii. 19. 42 (*Invito eo qui cum populo ageret, seditionem non posse fieri, quippe cui liceat concilium, simul atque intercessum turbarique coeptum sit, dimittere*) *concilium* is probably the organized assembly. On the other hand, the *concilium* of all the people mentioned by Livy, i. 8. 1, may have been unorganized.

IV. Within the province of organized national gatherings, on the other hand, (a) *comitia* is the wider term, applying as it does to all assemblies of the kind, whatever their function; whereas (b) *concilium* as an organized national assembly is wholly restricted to legislative and judicial functions.¹

(a) *Comitia* is used in its most general sense in Cicero, *Div.* i. 45. 103; ii. 18. 42 f.; 35. 74 (quoted in footnote below); *Tusc.* iv. 1. 1. For separate lists of the elective and the legislative and judicial *comitia*, see VI, where will be found sufficient illustrations of (b).

V. (a) Applied to foreign institutions, *comitia* always designates electoral assemblies; (b) as at Rome, *concilia* are always legislative or judicial assemblies.

(a) *Comitia* is used of foreign states in:

Caesar, *B. G.* vii. 67; Cicero, *Verr.* II. ii. 52. 128 (three occurrences), 129. 130; 53. 133; 54. 136; *Fam.* viii. 1. 2; Livy v. 1. 1; xxiv. 23. 1; 26. 16; 27. 1; xxxii. 25. 2; xxxiii. 27. 8; xxxiv. 51. 5.

(b) Foreign *concilia* are mentioned by:

Caesar, *B. G.* i. 18, 19, 30, 31, 33; iii. 18; v. 2, 6, 24, 56 f.; vi. 3, 20; vii. 1, 14, 15, 63, 75, 89; viii. 20 (Hirtius); Sallust, *Frag.* ii. 22; Nepos,

¹ In classifying the functions of assemblies as elective, legislative, and judicial, I have followed Cicero, *Div.* ii. 35. 74: *Ut comitorum vel in iudiciis populi vel in iure legum vel in creandis magistratibus.* In this paper, accordingly, "legislative" refers not merely to law-making in the narrower sense, but also to the passing of resolutions on all affairs, domestic and foreign, including necessarily the *lex de bello indicendo*.

Tim. iv. 2; *Livy* i. 6. 1; 50-52; iii. 2. 3; 10. 8; v. 1. 8; 17. 6; 36. 1; vi. 10. 7; vii. 25. 5; viii. 3. 10; ix. 45. 8; x. 10. 11; 12. 2; 13. 3; 14. 3; xxi. 14. 1; 19. 9, 11; 20. 1; xxiv. 37. 11; xxvi. 24. 1; xxvii. 9. 2; 29. 10; 30. 6; xxix. 3. 1, 4; xxxi. 25. 2; 29. 1, 2, 8; 32. 3, 4; xxxii. 10. 2; 19. 4, 5, 9; 20. 1; 21. 2; 22. 3, 9, 12; xxxiii. 1. 7; 2. 1, 7; 3. 7; 12. 6; 16. 3, 5, 8; xxxiv. 41. 5; 51. 5; xxxv. 25. 4; 27. 11; 31. 3; 32. 3, 5; 33. 1, 4; 34. 2; 43. 7; 48. 1; xxxvi. 6. 3; 8. 2; 26. 1; 28. 7, 9; 31. 9, 10; 32. 9; 34. 1; 35. 7; xxxviii. 9. 11; 10. 2; 31. 1; 32. 3; 34. 5; 35. 1; xxxix. 33, 35, 36, 37, 48, 50; xli. 24; xlii. 6, 12, 38, 43, 44, 47; xliii. 17; xlv. 18.

Although most of these *concilia* are known to have been assemblies of the whole people, nobles and commons, very rarely, as in *Livy* x. 16. 3, the word denotes a council of a few men,—in this case, of the leading men of Etruria (cf. *Caesar, B. G.* i. 33; vii. 75; *Livy* xxxvi. 6. 6); and twice we hear of a *concilium plebis* at Capua; *Livy* xxiii. 4. 4; xxv. 16. 9.

VI. In the Roman state, in a great majority of cases *comitia* are electoral assemblies; in fact, the word may generally be understood to signify electoral assemblies, or simply elections, unless the context indicates a different meaning.

Comitia are electoral in :

Caesar, B. C. i. 9; iii. 1, 2, 82; *Sallust, Cat.* 24; *Jug.* 36, 37; *Cicero, Imp. Pomp.* 1. 2; *Leg. Agr.* ii. 7. 18; 8. 20; 10. 26; 11. 27; 12. 31; *Mil.* 9. 24, 25; 15. 41; 16. 42; *Mur.* 1. 1; 17. 35; 18. 38; 19. 38; 25. 51; 26. 53; *Phil.* ii. 32. 80, 81; 33. 82; 38. 99; viii. 9. 27; xi. 8. 19; *Planc.* 3. 7, 8; 4. 9, 10; 6. 15; 8. 21; 20. 49, 50; 22. 53, 54; *Verr.* I. 6. 17; 7. 19; 8. 22, 23; 9. 24, 25; 18. 54; II. i. 7. 19; *Frag. A.* vii. 48; *Rep.* ii. 13. 25; 17. 31; 31. 53; *Att.* i. 1. 1, 2; 4. 1; 10. 6; 11. 2; 16. 13; ii. 20. 6; 21. 5; 23. 3; iii. 12. 1; 13. 1; 18. 1; iv. 2. 6; 3. 3, 5; 13. 1; 17. 7; 19. 1; xii. 8; *Brut.* i. 5. 3; 14. 1; *Fam.* i. 4. 1; vii. 30. 1; viii. 2. 2; 4. 3; 14. 1; x. 26; *Q. fr.* ii. 1. 2; 2. 1; 11. 3; 15. 3; iii. 2. 3; 3. 2; *Varro, R. R.* iii. 2. 1; *Nepos, Att.* v. 4; *Livy* i. 32. 1; 35. 1; 60. 4; ii. 8. 3; 56. 1, 2; 58. 1; 60. 4, 5; iii. 6. 1; 19. 2; 20. 8; 24. 9; 30. 6; 34. 7; 35. 1, 7, 8; 37. 5, 6; 39. 8; 51. 8; 54. 9, 11; iv. 6. 9; 16. 6; 25. 14; 35. 6; 36. 4; 41. 2; 44. 1, 2, 5; 50. 8; 51. 1; 53. 13; 54. 8; 55. 4, 8; 56. 1; 57. 9; v. 9. 1, 8; 10. 10; 14. 1; 31. 1; vi. 1. 5; 22. 7; 35. 10; 36. 3, 9; 37. 4; 39. 5; 42. 9, 14; vii. 9. 4; 17. 10, 13; 19. 5; 21. 1; 22. 7, 11; viii. 3. 4; 13. 10; 16. 12; 20. 1; 23. 11, 14, 17; ix. 7. 12, 14; x. 5. 14; 11. 3; 15. 7; 16. 1; 21. 13; 22. 8; xxi. 53. 6; xxii. 33. 9, 10; 34. 1, 3, 9; 35. 2, 4; xxiii. 24. 3; 31. 7. 12; xxiv. 7. 11; 9. 5, 9; 10. 2; 11. 6; 43. 5, 9; xxv. 2. 3, 5; 5. 2; 7. 5; 41. 10; xxvi. 2. 2; 18. 4; 22. 2; 23. 1, 2; xxvii. 4. 1; 8. 1; xxviii. 10. 1, 4; 38. 11; xxix.

10. 1, 2; 11. 9, 10; xxx. 40. 5; xxxi. 49. 12; 50. 6; xxxii. 7. 8, 12; 27. 5, 6; xxxiii. 21. 9; xxxiv. 42. 3, 4; 44. 4; 53. 2; xxxv. 6. 2; 8. 1; 10. 1, 9; 20. 7; 24. 3; xxxvi. 45. 9; xxxvii. 47. 1, 6; xxxviii. 35. 1; 42. 1, 2, 4; xxxix. 6. 1; 23. 1; chs. 32, 39, 40, 41, 45; xl. 18, 37, 45, 59; xli. 6, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18, 28; xlii. 9, 28; xliii. 11, 14; xliv. 17.

Comitia are legislative or judicial in :

Cicero, *Dom.* 28. 75; 30. 79; 32. 86; 33. 87; *Har. Resp.* 6. 11; *Mil.* 3. 7; *Phil.* i. 8. 19; x. 8. 17; xiii. 15. 31; *Pis.* 15. 35, 36; *Red. in Sen.* 11. 27; *Sest.* 30. 65; 34. 73; 51. 109; *Leg.* iii. 19. 45; *Rep.* ii. 31. 53; 35. 60; 36. 61; *Att.* i. 14. 5; ii. 15. 2; iv. 1. 4; xiv. 12. 1; Livy iii. 13. 9; 17. 4; 20. 7; 24. 7; 29. 6; 55. 3; vi. 36. 9; viii. 12. 15; xxv. 4. 6; xxvi. 3. 9, 12; xxxi. 6. 3, 5; xxxiv. 2. 11; xlii. 30; xliii. 16; xlv. 35.

As these lists are nearly exhaustive, they represent substantially the relative frequency of the two uses of *comitia*.

VII. (a) Rarely is either the centuriate assembly or the so-called patricio-plebeian tribal assembly termed *concilium*; (b) the plebeian tribal assembly is rarely termed *comitia* except when elective.

The principal instances of the rare use of *concilium* under (a) are Livy i. 26. 5; 36. 6; iii. 71. 3; vi. 20. 11. (b) In its legislative or judicial capacity the plebeian tribal assembly is called *comitia* in Cicero, *Leg.* iii. 19. 45; *Sest.* 51. 109; Livy iii. 13. 9; 17. 4; vi. 36. 9; xxv. 4. 6; xxxiv. 2. 11; xlv. 35.

This classification covers without exception all the cases in the authors under discussion. An attempt may now be made to trace the development of these uses.

The first thing to be considered is that whereas *concilium* is singular, *comitia* is plural. Undoubtedly it is a plural of the parts of which the whole is composed; in other words, the *curiae*, or centuries, or tribes were thought of as little assemblies, whose sum total formed the *comitia*. *Comitia* therefore always has reference to the parts—the voting units—of which the assembly is composed, whereas *concilium* as a singular views the assembly without reference to its parts. For this reason, whenever it is advisable to add a modifier to indicate the kind of organization of the assembly, *comitia* is always used. We find, accordingly, *comitia curiata*, *comitia*

centuriata, and *comitia tributa* in common use, but never *concilium curiatum* (or *-tim*), *concilium centuriatum* (or *-tim*), or *concilium tributum* (or *-tim*). These last expressions, which are modern inventions, do not accord with the Roman way of viewing the assemblies. This consideration satisfactorily explains the first general use (p. 26).

As a non-political gathering is not made up of groups, — similar to the voting divisions of the national assemblies, — it cannot be called *comitia*. *Concilium* is the only term appropriate to it; hence we have the second general use of the two words (p. 26).

The same consideration makes *concilium* the more general term within the political sphere; the assembly it designates may be organized or unorganized, whereas *comitia* applies only to assemblies organized in voting divisions. This is the third general use (pp. 26–27).

For explaining the four remaining uses it is necessary to take into consideration a fact regarding the meaning of *concilium* not hitherto understood: to the Romans the word suggested deliberation, discussion; it connoted the idea which has passed to its English derivative, "council." Not without reason, therefore, is *concilium* connected with *cogitatio* by Varro, *L. L.* vi. 43: *A cogitatione Concilium, inde Consilium, quod ut vestimentum apud fullonem cum cogitur, Conciliari dictum.* When it refers to non-political gatherings, accordingly, *concilium* is always more than a mere crowd; it is at least a company, which converses, consults, discusses. The deliberative character of most non-political *concilia* is very evident, — cf. the citations under II (a), p. 26. With this meaning *concilium* could not designate an electoral assembly, which did not allow discussion;¹ it was restricted to legislative and judicial assemblies, in which the voting was preceded by deliberation. This is the fourth use (p. 27).

Rarely did a Roman writer have occasion to mention an election in a foreign state. Whenever he did so, however,

¹ For early times it is true that the historians refer to occasional speaking in the electoral assembly on the merits of candidates (cf. Livy, x. 13. 21), but in the age of Cicero such proceedings were no longer possible.

he always used *comitia*. Most of the business of foreign assemblies referred to by Roman writers was concerned with international affairs, — was legislative, — and hence foreign assemblies are generally termed *concilia*.¹ This consideration accounts for the fifth general use (pp. 27–28).

The sixth (pp. 28–29) may be easily explained. The tendency was to restrict *comitia* to electoral assemblies, just as *concilium* was restricted to legislative and judicial assemblies, though this tendency never became a rule.

The seventh (p. 29) may be accounted for by the fact that after the passing of the Hortensian Law, the centuriate assembly and the so-called patricio-plebeian tribal assembly came to be almost wholly elective, while the plebeian tribal assembly became the chief statute-making body in the state. Hence the centuriate assembly became *the* *comitia*, and the plebeian tribal assembly *the* *concilium*.

The cause of the error into which Laelius² fell is now apparent. Finding the plebeian tribal assembly frequently termed *concilium* and the centuriate assembly of the whole people generally termed *comitia*, he hastily concluded that *comitia* should apply only to assemblies of the whole people and *concilia* only to assemblies of a part of the people.

This paper has proved, on the contrary, that in the Ciceronian and Augustan ages the distinction between the two

¹ Mommsen imagined that foreign assemblies were usually so called because their resolutions were not binding on the Roman state. It would be strange, however, if in calling foreign institutions by Latin names (*senatus, populus, plebs*, etc.), Roman writers should attempt to show a connection between these institutions and Rome. Mommsen's proposed explanation of this use of *concilium* becomes actually absurd when it is extended to *comitia*; he certainly would not say that the resolutions of the Syracusan *comitia*, mentioned by Livy, were binding on Rome. It is only rational to conclude that the Romans gave to foreign institutions the names of corresponding institutions at home, with a view to representing these alien institutions in their real relation to the various states to which they belonged rather than in an imaginary relation, or lack of relation, to the Roman state.

² Cf. p. 1. Notwithstanding all the confidence reposed by the moderns in this utterance of Laelius, *debet* suggests that he is proposing a distinction to be made in the future rather than stating an actual usage; while recognizing that the distinction did not exist in practice, he thought that it should be made.

words is not a distinction between the whole and a part, and that all the uses of *comitia* and *concilium* in this period may be explained by two simple facts: (1) that whereas *concilium* is singular, *comitia* is plural; (2) that *concilium* suggests deliberation, discussion.

III. — *Studies in Latin Accent and Metric.*

By PROF. ROBERT S. RADFORD,
ELMIRA COLLEGE.

I. INTRODUCTION.

IN a former paper (*Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.*, 1903) I sought to show that in tribrach word-groups, the first word of which is a monosyllable, the accent receded upon the monosyllable, *e.g. sēd erus, sēd ego, hīc equos*, and I have since shown (*A.J.P.*, No. 98 ff.) that this is regularly the case also in many dactylic word-groups of the same kind, such as *hōc facis, sēd scio, ā patre*.

The question at once arises, — What is the explanation of this striking phenomenon? Why does the accent recede so constantly in these groups? Although monosyllables are usually connected closely in pronunciation with the following word, it is evident that this fact alone is insufficient as an explanation, unless it can also be shown that the great majority of these groups follow some usual arrangement of words, some usual and preferred word-order. This proof I have attempted to supply by pointing out (*A.J.P.* XXV, 256 ff.) that groups like *hīc homo, hīc dies* follow the I.-Eur. traditional word-order by which the demonstrative pronoun immediately precedes the substantive, groups like *quid agis, quod facis* the traditional order by which the object immediately precedes the verb, groups like *sēd erus, sēd ego* the traditional order by which the sentence-introducing conjunction immediately precedes the subject, and so on. The principle here involved is that, in every I.-Eur. word-order containing a monosyllable, so many frequent and usual phrases must arise like *quid agis, quod facis*, etc., that a general type is eventually established to which the accent even of rare combinations is made to conform. Finally, there is some evidence to show that even in the case of polysyllabic words a traditional order, such as that of object and

verb, sometimes admits in Plautus the recessive accent, *e.g.* *aquám velim*.

In the present paper I wish to show the influence of the traditional word-order still further by treating the accent of the conjunctions and pronouns in the Latin sentence. The numerous peculiarities of accent and metre which these parts of speech exhibit, have long been a cause of perplexity to Plautine scholars, and, with the notable exception of the treatment of the accentuations *illúm, istúm, ipsúm* by Skutsch, have usually been inadequately explained. I shall further discuss the accent in the traditional order adjective + noun, and finally, since recent accentual studies have considerably modified and, in some cases, seriously unsettled the views of Latin scholars in this field, I shall attempt to state concisely the general relation which appears to exist between word and verse-accent in Latin verse.

II. ACCENT OF CONJUNCTIONS.

The grammarians repeatedly assert that the conjunction *quando* is often accented *quandó* (Schöll, *De acc.*, p. 173 f.). In accordance with their favorite method they wish to make the difference of accent depend, it is true, upon a difference of meaning, and no two of them can agree just what this difference of meaning shall be. Nevertheless the original statement appears to be essentially correct, and is confirmed by the independent statement of Donatus (*Ter. Eun.* III, 1, 47) upon the accents *síquando, néquando*. Similar testimonies respecting the oxytonesis of other conjunctions (*igitur, quoniam, saltem, postquam*) are collected by Schöll, *l.l.*, 194 ff., 175. A monosyllabic sentence-introducing conjunction, as I have shown elsewhere (*A.J.P.* XXV, 259), regularly coalesces with the verb, *e.g.* *si-scio, si-volo*, and, by extension of this usage, sometimes with other parts of speech. We find three cases of a similar proclisis of *quando* in the critical feet of Plautine verse, viz. *Ba.* 224 *quandó* volt; *Cap.* 86 *quandó* res; *Men.* 664 *quando*⁴ quid.¹ In all these cases

¹ A numeral placed *in* the line denotes a foot of *trochaic* verse; *below* the line, a foot of *iambic* verse.

quando coalesces with a following monosyllable, just as the prepositions in the frequent combinations *proptér me*, *praetér spem*, and the like. When a preposition or conjunction coalesces with an iambic word, as in *proptér mare* (*Ru.* 34), *quandó sciet* (*Cap.* 406), *quandó lubet* (4 times¹), the resulting combination of spondee and iambus is regularly needed for making the verse-close, and this is the true explanation of its rare occurrence in the critical feet. Moreover, the proclisis of *quando* is not invariable; for we find *Am.* 1097 *quándó sátis* instead of *quandó satis*; cf. *Cap.* 886.²

With respect to the other polysyllabic conjunctions, an examination of the critical feet yields a similar result, viz. the proclisis of the conjunctions is admissible but not invariable.³ Thus we find in all fourteen examples of oxytone conjunctions, viz. two examples of *tamquam* (*Tri.* 913 *tamqua⁵m* me, where Ritschl writes unnecessarily *tam quam me*; *As.* 427 *tamquám si*); one of *etsi* (*Tri.* 527 *etsí sceléstus est*); one of *sicut* (*Syr. Sent.* 39 *sicut fax*, Ribb.; Meyer with one Ms.: *ita út fax*); three of *immo* (*Tri.* 427 *immó quas*; *Phor.* 644 *immó malum hércle*; *Poe.* 151 *immó mihi*); three of *etiam* (*Mer.* 728 *etiám vis*; *Ad.* 279 *etiám maneo ótiosus*; *Syr. Sent.* 557 *etiám querí*); two of *siquidem* (*Mi.* 624 *siquide⁴m* te; *St.* 616 *siquide⁴m* mea); one of *quidni* (*Mi.* 554 *quidní fateáre*); one of *quam obrem* (*Phor.* 715 *quam obrém dem*); one perhaps of *postquam* (*Am.* 806 *postqua⁶m* cenávimus); two perhaps of *quia* (*Phor.* 162 *tibi quia⁶ super est*, cf.

¹ Serviceable examples of *quando* are collected by Schubert, *Temporalconjunctionen bei Pl.*, p. 16 ff.

² *Quando* might equally well be classed with the pronouns and pronominal adverbs treated below, i.e. *olim*, *inde*, *unde*, etc.

³ For this study I have used chiefly the dissertations of O. Brugman, *De iambico senario*, Bonn, 1874; Mohr, *De iambico ap. Pl. septenario*, Leipzig, 1873; Köhler, *De trochaicis septenariis Plaut.*, Halle, 1877; Podiaski, *De tetrametris iambicis et trochaicis Terent.*, Berlin, 1882; W. Meyer, *Beobachtung des Wortaccentes in d. alllat. Poesie*, München, 1884; Schrader, *De partic. -ne prosodia*, Strassburg, 1885; Ahlberg, *De proceleusmaticis antiquae poesis Lat.*, Lund, 1900; Ritschl, *Proleg.* cap. xv; C. F. W. Müller, *Plaut. Prosodie*; Klotz, *Grundzüge*, etc.

Podiaski, *l.l.*, p. 12; *Ad.* 523 nísi quia⁸ propést; cf. *Tri.* 938 nísi quia² lubet).¹ Also, in the case of apparently broken dactyls with *atque* (*Tri.* 935 a⁴tque cuníla; *Men.* 508; *Mi.* 958; cf. *St.* 701 du¹mque se exórnat), the assumption of syncope is not necessary, but the proclisis of the conjunction is an alternative explanation; cf. the similar example with *sicut*, p. 45. From this survey I conclude that the oxytonesis of the conjunctions, which is asserted by the grammarians, is confirmed by the evidence of dramatic verse.²

III. ACCENT OF PRONOUNS.

As early as the time of Quintilian the ancient grammarians had noted the exceptional oxytonesis existing in the pronouns and derived adverbs (in adverbiiis fere solis ac pronominiibus, Quint. I, 5, 26), and similar statements are often made later, usually with an explanation drawn from the fatal *differentiae causa* method (Schöll, *l.l.*, 170 ff.). So far as concerns *illum*, *istum*, *ipsum*, a thoroughgoing oxytonesis of these pronouns is indicated by the derivative Romance forms, and has been justly vindicated for the Plautine period by Skutsch, *Forsch.*, p. 130 ff.³ Skutsch has also assumed that the oxytonesis first arose through the proclisis of the pronoun in such traditional orders as *illúm-patrem*, *illúm-videt*, and was subsequently extended beyond its original limits. This account is undoubtedly correct, so far as it goes, but the full logical consequences of the proclisis of *ille* are not developed by Skutsch. The phenomena to be discussed are curious enough, and if each one of them be studied separately, as

¹ Examples like quíd-igitu⁴r (*Mo.* 911; *Tri.* 333), with preceding monosyllable, are not included in the above. For the frequent accentuation of *igitur*, *edepol*, also *aliter*, *aliá* upon the ultima in proceleusmatici, v. Ahlberg, *Procel.* I, 33.

² Interesting also is the regular proclisis of the adverb in association with the adjective, e.g. *And.* 120 adeó-modésto, adeó-venústo, cf. the strict observance of Lachmann's law seen in *ám-citó* (*A.J.P.*, No. 100); *Ep.* 380 áliquantó₂ lubéntiúis.

³ A correct view was also taken by Conradt, *De vers. Terent. struct.*, Berlin, 1870, p. 20.

has hitherto been the case, they are of a kind to baffle the most practised investigator, but I hope to show that they form a simple and harmonious whole when studied together. Hence in order to exhibit the accentual and metrical peculiarities of the pronouns in full, I shall first take the pronoun cited by Quintilian, viz. *quâlis* or *qualis*, and illustrate its uses theoretically. A pronoun like *qualis* occurs as a proclitic chiefly in two traditional word-orders, viz. pronoun + noun, as *qualis homo, quales senes*, and object or subject + verb, as *quales videt, qualis erat*; more rarely in simple extensions or variations of the orders just named. By saying that *qualis* is a proclitic in such cases, I mean that it coalesces in pronunciation and in accentuation with the following word, and that the pause which falls after most words (and which may be termed the word-end), very largely vanishes in the case of the pronoun; in short, pronominal combinations like those just named are commonly treated in Latin as quadrisyllabic words, and accented *qualis-homo, qualés-senes, qualés-videt, qualis-erat*. The consequences that flow from this cardinal fact, that no full word-end falls after the Latin pronouns and pronominal adverbs, are fivefold.

A. Although the accentuation of a spondaic word upon the ultima is not permitted in the critical feet, pronominal combinations like *qualés senes, qualés videt* enter these feet freely.

B. Although the accentuation of a trochaic word upon the ultima is very strictly forbidden in the critical feet, pronominal combinations like *qualis homo, qualis erat, undé venis* are admitted freely.

C. Although it is forbidden in all feet, except the first foot of a colon,¹ to separate by a word-end the two shorts composing the thesis of a trochaic dactyl, yet dactyls like *quâlis hómó, quâlis érat, undé vénis* are admitted freely, since the division of the two shorts is for the most part only apparent; cf. the case of prepositions, as in *próptèr amórem, intérr éstás*.

D. The Lachmann-Ritschl law, which forbids a foot to be

¹ I shall use henceforth the term 'first foot' freely of the first foot of a colon, i.e. of either the first or the fifth foot.

filled by a dactylic word-form, is waived in favor of all the dactylic pronominal forms, viz. *haecine, istucine, sicine*, etc., *illius*, and largely also in favor of the similarly used adjectival forms, *omnia, omnibus, omniūm*.

E. The initial syllable of *ambó, omnis, ecquis, eius, huius*, etc., as well as of *illé, isté, ipsé* (cf. also *etsí, ergó*), being now unaccented, is freely shortened after a Brevis Brevians (for examples of this well-known use, cf. Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 46 f.; Ahlberg, *De corrept. Plaut.*, p. 69 ff.).

The evidence in support of these uses will be presented in order:

A. OXYTONESIS OF SPONDAIC PRONOUNS.—Exclusive of the very numerous cases of *illúm, istúm, ipsúm* (Skutsch, *Forsch.*, p. 132 ff.), also *olím* (*And.* 221), *huiús* (*Poe.* 389), etc., we find in the critical feet thirty-seven examples of the oxytonesis of the spondaic and anapestic pronouns *haecin* (1), *quantus* (4), *ecquis*¹ (4), *numquis* (3), *siquis* (4), *quisquam* (1), *aliquis* (3), *alius* (2), *ullus, nullus* (2), *ídem* (2), *noster, voster* (3), *omnis* (4), *ambo* (1), perhaps also *vobis* (2). To this number we should add eight examples of oxytone pronouns with *res*.

Haccin: *Ad.* 379 *haecin*[e] *flagítia*, cf. 408; cf. *Au.* 746 *ístaci*²ⁿ *te orátione*; *As.* 932 *ístosci*^{2ne} *patrém*; — *quantus*: *Hau.* 1013 *quantu*^{5m} *malí*; *Per.* 517 *quantu*^{4m} *tu*; *Cap.* 51 *quantí* *sunt*; *Ad.* 700 *quantu*^{5m} *potést* (a frequent phrase which Pl. always needs for the verse-close (eleven times), except once (*Am.* 971), but which Ter. places more freely); very exceptional is *Poe.* 534 *qua*^{5ntum} *ve*^{6lis}, corrected in ed. mai. to *quántum vis*; — *ecquis*: *Per.* 108 *ecquíd* *meminísti*; *Ps.* 482 *ecquám* *scis*; *Au.* 16 *ecquí* *maiórem*; *Phor.* 474 *ecquíd* *spēi* (iamb. oct.); — *numquis*: *Cur.* 516 *numquíd* *vis*; *Hec.* 272 *numquíd* *vis* (iamb. sep.); *And.* 235 *numquíd* *nam haec túrba*; — *siquis*: *And.* 258 *siqui*^{6s} *nunc mé roget*; *Ad.* 941 *siquíd* *te máius órét*; *Ci.* 111 *siqui*^{4d} *tibi ópus est*; *Ep.*

¹ I assume throughout that the first syllable of *ecquid, quidquid, nequid, numquid, siquid*, etc., is long; for precisely as the existence of *nēmp(e)* is disproved by the non-occurrence of *nēmp(e)* with elision, so the existence of *ēquid* is disproved by the non-occurrence of *ēqu(a), ēqu(em)*, etc.

449 siquíd vis, cf. *Am.* 453; Terentianus Maurus 2288 siquís velít (incomplete collection). Only in the first foot of a colon do we find *And.* 333 síquid po⁵tes; *Poe.* 1205 quícquid sípít; — *quisquam*: *Au.* 76 quicquám meliúst mihi; cf. *Mer.* 1021 neu quisqua²m posthac; cf. *Cap.* 346; — *aliquis*: *And.* 957 aliquís fors[itan] mé putét; *Hau.* 752 aliquót diés; cf. *Ad.* 509 in-aliquód magnúm malum, cf. *Ru.* 575 in-aliquo⁴ tibi, and, for examples of aliquíd boni (mali) in non-critical feet, v. Lodge, *Lex. Pl.*, p. 93; — *alius*: *Tri.* 458 aliú² vis; *And.* 189 aliám vitám áffert; — *nullus, ullus*: *Poe.* 991 nullús me est; cf. *Cap.* 91 nullúm periculúmst (quadrisyllabic word in verse-close); *Men.* 594 ullu⁶m tenéri vídi; cf. *Ep.* 497 ullá pecúnia; — *idem*: *Am.* 447 ide⁵m sum; cf. 808 in-eode⁴m lectó; — *noster, voster*: *Phor.* 609 nostér Chremés; cf. *Am.* 221 nós nostràs móre (cretic); *Eu.* 418 dí³ vestrá³m fidem: hóminem (a frequent phrase, which is elsewhere always utilized for the verse-close (sixteen times) in Pl. and Ter., cf. Brugman, *l.l.*, p. 30); cf. *Ci.* 550 filiám nostrám sustóllere (quadrisyllabic word); cf. *Cap.* 15; cf. also *Am.* 356 horu⁴nc servós sum; — *omnis*: *Eu.* 1092 omne⁵s amárent (subject); *Mo.* 192 dí deáequé omné²s me péssumis exémp¹lis ínterficiant (often corrected, cf. Mohr, *l.l.*, p. 19); *Hau.* 26 omnés vos óratós voló; cf. *Am.* 1013 ápud omni⁶s aedís sacrás; add *omnem rem, omnés res* (*Cas.* 506; *Hec.* 194; *Ad.* 364; Lucil. XXVIII, 10; *Hec.* 738; 483) and, in the case of other pronouns, *tantám rem* (*Tri.* 682), *aliás res* (*Hec.* 826), *ipsá re* (*And.* 359; *Hau.* 266), etc. A general or indefinite 'enclisis of *res*,' such as is sometimes assumed (Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 324, and *Bursian's Jahresb.*, 1883, p. 427), seems improbable; — *ambo*: *Ad.* 131 ambós curáre; cf. *Ru.* 1104 hasce amba²s ut; — perhaps *tibi* and *vobis*: *As.* 654 tibi³-dabó (double iamb. in colon-close); cf. *Per.* 847 vobís dabo (iamb. sep., acc. to Ritschl, cf. Mohr, *l.l.*, p. 18, but anap. oct., acc. to recent edd.); *Per.* 855 vobís do (iamb. dim. cat., cf. Mohr, *l.l.*, p. 24).

A similar oxytonesis may be proved for the iambic pronominal forms *eum*, *eo*, *meum*, *meo*, *tuom*, *utrum*, etc. Thus these forms are often (nine times) found in the third foot of the senarius (Brugman, *l.l.*, p. 10 ff.), as *Tri.* 794 eás resígnatás sibi; *Ci.* 568; *Tru.* 85; *Tri. arg.* 6; *Mi.* 484; ³*Turp. com. fr.* 130; *And.* 442 (eám rem); *Tru.* 656 (meó); *Ba.* 344 utrúm velím (an apparent double iamb., which Ritschl, *Prol.* ccxviii, would emend). Similarly we find eúm in apparent double iamb. verse-closes, as *Am.* 991 eúm-sequór; *Men.* 880 átque eám-meáe¹; perhaps also *Naev. trag. fr.* 13 meá-manú | moriáre, where R.³ needlessly corrects: mea móriaris manú.

B. OXYTONESIS OF TROCHAIC PRONOUNS. — We find in the critical feet thirty-five examples of the oxytonesis of the trochaic pronouns *ille*, *illā* (8), *illíc* (4), *iste* (1), *unde* (2), cf. *tute*, *haecin* (3), *ecquis*, *quisquis*, *siguis* (13), *nostrā* (1), *òmnis* (1?), *quisque* (3).

Examples, in the critical feet, of *illé quidem* (*Ba.* 103; *Mer.* 540; *Mo.* 375; *St.* 561; *Phor.* 754) and *illíc homo* (*Ep.* 666; *Men.* 992; *Mi.* 334; *Ru.* 1297) are cited by Luchs, *Comm. pros.* II, 4, and *Hermes*, VI, 279, respectively; *ístíc homo* (*Ep.* 488) and *nullús homo* (*Ba.* 808) occur in the extant literature only in the first foot. Further, the well-known Latin word-orders, by which the demonstrative pronouns and

¹ In connection with the last example, which is explained by the regular order of the pronouns (p. 41), I wish to deny emphatically that the preceding elision, as in *atqu(e)*, justifies or explains the double iamb., in the irrational manner assumed by Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 245 f. In such assumed cases the double iamb. is justified only when a monosyllable, which forms part of a word-group, is really not elided at all, even in thesis, as *Hec.* 495 quò-abis? adés; *Poe.* 290 sě-amét potést. These cases are then quite similar to the well-known *dēhórtari* (*Poe.* 674), *dē hórdeo* (*As.* 706), *cūm istac* (*Cas.* 612), on which v. Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 139 f., and Skutsch, *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1894, p. 139 f.; cf. also examples in Lucilius and the Augustan poets, as *Hor. S.* 1, 9, 38 sí mē-amás; 2, 2, 28 nūm adést, etc. (L. Müller, *R. M.*² 371 ff.). Other examples of the double iamb. in Klotz, *l.l.*, as *Poe.* 447 quando amór iubét, are probably to be referred to some form of the traditional order (subject + verb). — The view which I have here defended against Klotz is, as I have since noted, also the view of Luchs himself, who writes of just such cases (*Studem. Stud.* I, 18): In his enim versibus pes paenultimus non continetur iambo, sed anapaesto, quòd cum hiatu semper pronuntiandum est: sě àmēt, quí hābét.

adverbs immediately precede possessive pronouns and oblique cases of personal pronouns (Kämpf, *Pronom. Personal.*, pp. 27, 30 ff., 35), give rise to the accents *illé-mihi*, *undé-tibi*, etc.; e.g. *Ad.* 139 *isté tuos*; *Cas.* 631 *unde⁴ meae*; *Ep.* 179 *illá mihi* (cf. Skutsch, *Forsch.* 136), and cf. *Mer.* 451; *Ad.* 457 (first foot); cf. *St.* 133 *ille² meus* (cf. Skutsch, *l.l.*, 118); cf. also *Cap.* 461 *ipse³ sibi*.¹ In association with the verb, *ille³ reprehéndit*, *Tri.* 624, happens not to fall within the critical feet, but Commodianus, who observes the accent in the close of his hexameters, writes *Inst.* I, 35, 15: *unde⁵ licet ille* (Hanssen, *Dissert. Phil. Argent.* V, 24),² cf. the adverb *undélibet*. The developed oxytonesis is seen in *Tru.* 309 *ille⁶ meretrículis*; note further that no example of *únde* or *inde rédis* (disyllabic verb) occurs in the dramatists, but *únde rédeam* (trisyllabic verb) occurs repeatedly (*Tri.* 937; *Eu.* 11; *Mo.* 865; *Hec.* 377). Examples of oxytonesis in the first foot are very frequent, e.g. *Cas.* 432 *ut illé trepidábat*, *Poe.* 620 *et illé chlamydátus* (cf. Seyffert, *Bursian's Jahresb.*, 1894, p. 282), *St.* 24 *neque illé sibi méreat* (cf. Skutsch, *l.l.*, 118, n. 2), where the proceleusmatici, as usual, follow closely the grammatical accent³; very doubtful, however, is *St.* 175 *quia indé iam á pausflló* (*ed. min.*: *quia inde iam á*); *Ps.* 503 *illúd erat*; Lucil. XXIX, 43 *M. tum illúd ἐπιφώνεϊ*; doubtful is *As.* 123 *nam illúd ego* (so *ed. mai.*; *ego illud* Mss.); *Cas.* 932 *indé foras*; *Poe.* 1055 *indé sum oriúndus*; — *tuté tibi Cap.* 371, *Ci.* 563, *Cur.* 9, hence also *Per.* 573 *tute³ tibi*; — for still other examples, cf. Ahlberg, *De corrept. Pl.*, p. 50, n. 1, and Luchs, *l.l.*

Haecin and *haecine*: *Hec.* 771 *haecine east*; *ib.* 282 *haecine ego vítam* (resulting from the traditional word-order, which attaches other pronouns to the sentence-introducing pronouns,

¹ This accent is not, however, wholly invariable, e.g. *Eu.* 819 *ístuc míhi*, and in the first foot: *Poe.* 355; *ib.* 2; *Ci.* 561 *unde tibi*; v. other examples in Kämpf, *l.l.*, 29.

² This may possibly be the true explanation of the accents *déinde*, *périnde*, *éxinde* prescribed by the grammarians (Schöll, *l.l.*, p. 192), i.e. *déindé*, etc.; so perhaps *St.* 545 *dei¹ndé sénéx*, rather than *deinde sénéx*.

³ Hence I cannot accept the view of Ahlberg, *Procel.* I, 34, 110.

cf. Kämpf, *LL.*, pp. 31, 36); cf. *Phor.* 1013 haeci²ne erat éa. Hence it is apparently largely due to accident, or rather to the natural position of the sentence-introducing pronouns in the beginning of the verse, that examples of this kind occur chiefly in the first foot, viz. *And.* 186 hocíne agis; *Eu.* 99 and *Ad.* 128 sicíne agis (cf. ídagis, hóc-agis, síc-agis); *Hau.* 203 huncíne erat; *Eu.* 771 hancíne ego. Similarly it is apparently accidental that *hancíne ego* occurs in Pl. only in anap. verse (*Ru.* 188, 189). We may perhaps, if we wish, assume always for Pl. the syncopated forms *haecin*, etc., though this is going much beyond the available evidence (cf. Schrader, *LL.*, p. 10 ff., and the numerous examples there cited), but in any case there can be no serious objection, on the score of accentuation, to examples like *Mo.* 26 hocínemodó (cf. hócmodo); 27 hocíne-boni; *Tru.* 719 hīcī⁷ne tu erás; *Am.* 514 hoci⁷ne placet; *As.* 128 hòcine preti, etc. (cf. also Spengel on *Ad.* 183).

Ecquis, nunquis, quisquis, siquis: *Poc.* 364 ecqui⁶d ais; cf. *Cas.* 913 and 914 nisi quidqui²d erat;—always siquíd agis: *Ep.* 196; *Mi.* 215; *Per.* 659; *St.* 715; 717; *Tri.* 981;—cf. *Phor.* 553 siqui²d opis; *Au.* 193 siqui⁶d opust; *As.* 117 siquíd opus; *Ad.* 877 ecqui⁶d ego. Often in other feet, especially the first, as *Au.* 653 quicqui³d habes; *Poc.* 505 quicqui⁵d agit; *Cas.* 456 ecquíd amas; *Eu.* 475 numquíd habes;—quicqui⁵d erat, etc.: *Per.* 46; 47; *Ru.* 58; 1308, cf. nullús erat, *Ru.* 1253;—*Men.* 439 siqui⁵d ego; *Eu.* 523 ecquís eam; *As.* 559 and *Mo.* 416 sicút ego; cf. *Mi.* 1206 quo mo³do ego. In short, if we take a trisyllabic word (verb or pronoun) like *inerit* and a dissyllabic word like *erit*, we shall always find in the one case the accent quídquid ínerit (*Ru.* 1134), in the other the accent quídquíd erit (quídquid erít). This accentuation long continued in use, e.g. *Sen. Oed.* 263 quídquíd ego; *Rufinus* 341 G. quídquíd agis (quoted by Ribb., *Com. Frgm.*² cii).¹ In a former discussion (*Trans.*

¹ Ribb.³ accents quite needlessly quídquid pla³cet, *Caecil. fr.* 148; recomposition is perhaps first attested for the Christian poetry, e.g. *Et quídquid micat síderis* (Königsfeld, *Lat. Hymn.* I, 32).

Am. Phil. Assoc. XXXIV, 84) I assumed with Ritschl and other critics the divisibility of compounds like *ecquid* into their constituent parts, *i.e.* *ec quid ego*, but this is a desperate remedy, as Maurenbrecher, *Hiatus*, p. 31, n. 3, and Ahlberg, *Procl.* I, 81, have already observed, and is improbable for the period of Pl. or Sen. At the most, the pronunciation might be derived from an earlier formative period, when the two monosyllables were still independent, *i.e.* *ec-quid-ego*, hence *ecquidego*; but even this assumption is unnecessary, and no reason exists for separating the treatment of *ecquid* and *quidquid* from that of other pronouns.

Nostra, omnis (?), *quisque*: *St.* 741 *nostrā*⁴ placet; perhaps *Tri.* 329 *mĕūmst, omne*⁶ *meum autēm tuōmst*, — so Schöll in *ed. mai.*, but the *ed. min.* retains the reading of A, etc., and scans *mĕūmst, ómne mĕū*⁶*mst autēm tuom*; *Ep.* 214 *suís quaeque*⁶ | *amatóribus* (*ed. mai.* *quaeque íbi*); so the phrase *suo quique loco* (also *suo quicque loco*, *St.* 62; cf. Prehn, *Pronom. Indef.*, p. 11) is always accented *suó quiqué loco*, *viz. Mo.* 254 (troch.²), *St.* 62 (tr.³), *Poe.* 1178 (anap.⁶), *Titin. com. fr.* 130 (tr.⁴, acc. to Müller, *Pl. Pr.*, p. 61, but Ribb.³ scans as anap., *quíque locó*); cf. *St.* 693 *suóm quemque*² *deceť*, and also *Au.* 732 *quóí tanta*² *mala*.¹

C. APPARENT DIVISION OF TROCHAIC DACTYL. — Exclusive of the first foot, we find thirty-four examples of a divided dactyl, such as *quísquís homó*, with *illic, ille, unde, inde* (10), cf. *hasce* (2), *haecin, sicin, istūcin, tute* (4), *qualis, omnis, quisquis, ecquis, numquis, siquis, quisque* (18), and apparently many more with *huius, eius, quóius*.²

¹ In addition to the pronouns, the proclisis and oxytonesis of *esse* (cf. Skutsch, *Forsch.* 136, n. 1) and *hercle* have been established in certain word-orders; thus *Ba.* 83 *vóles esse*⁴ *tibi*; *St.* 716 *vídes esse*⁶ *tibi*, and, in *Ter.*, cf. *Hec.* 398 *esse*³: *scio*; *Au.* 40 *herclé tibi*; hence the frequent shortening seen in these words after a Brevis Brevians. Also in the case of pred. adj. + copulative verb proclisis has perhaps been known, *viz. Poe.* 1194 *pulcrá vidére*; *Ru.* 218 *servá forem*, or *servá forem* (so B). Some of the other cases of oxytone trochees quoted by Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 239 ff., may also be genuine.

² The admissibility of the broken dactyl in general has been discussed especially by Müller, *Pros. Nachtr.*, p. 12 ff.; Leo, *Forsch.*, p. 236 ff.; Ahlberg, *Procl.* I, 14 ff.; Maurenbrecher, *Hiatus*, p. 26 ff.

Examples of *ille quidém* (twice within the verse: *Ep.* 673; *Mo.* 1081) and *illic homó* (once within the verse: *Tru.* 593; sixteen times in first foot) are cited by Luchs, *Comm. Pros.* II, 4, and *Hermes*, VI, 278, respectively; cf. also Skutsch, *Forsch.* 115. Since the sentence-introducing pronouns are placed especially in the verse-beginning, it is probably due only to accident that we find examples of the similar combinations *iste quidém* (*Mer.* 945), *ille senéx* (*Mer.* 446; *St.* 559), *ípsus homó* (*Tri.* 1070), *écquis homó* (*Mo.* 354); cf. *sérvos homó* (*St.* 58; 442; for the combination v. Asmus, *De appositionis collocat.*, p. 18) only in the first foot. Again, while I accept with Skutsch the *weakening* of the final syllable of *ille*, *inde* (also of *hocin*, *quidquid*, etc.), in sequences where it is regularly unaccented, I do not admit any need of this explanation (Skutsch, *l.l.*, 110 f., 81) in cases like *Ba.* 281 ille mihi (cf. illá mihi, illé meus, etc., above); *Am.* 660 i⁶lle revórtitur; *Hau.* 197 immo illé fúit senex inportúnus (cf. also Ahlberg, *Procel.* I, 110); *Cas.* 903 índe voló; *St.* 67 i³nde vocátote; *Poe.* 902 i³nde surrúptus; *Per.* 150 únde surrúpta, not to mention the numerous cases occurring in the first foot, as únde lubét (*Ep.* 144), ille iubébit (*Mi.* 1192), or ille misérrumum (*Mi.* 713). Even háscce tabéllas (*Ba.* 787), háscce corónas (*Au.* 385) admit of some defence; for, although Pl. never allows the particle *-ce* in these pronouns to have the full value of a mora and so to form the whole thesis (Schmidt, *De pronom. demonstr. form. Plautinis*, p. 16 ff.), he may well have allowed this particle to form part of the swift thesis of the 'cyclic' dactyl; cf. *Tri.* 186 hascé mihi (acc. to A and *ed. min.*).

Haecin, sicin, istucin, tute: *And.* 236 hócinest ófficiúm; *Per.* 42 si³cine hoc té; *Eu.* 830 istúcline intérrminata; *Tri.* 386 tu³te concílies (unnecessary is tu³ with Skutsch, *Forsch.* 151); numerous examples for the first foot, as *Phor.* 1012 hae¹cine eránt; *Eu.* 804 si¹cine agís (cf. hae¹cine erat, etc., above, p. 42); *Poe.* 512 si¹cine opórtet,

are quoted by Müller, *Pros.*, p. 441 ff., and Schrader, *l.l.*, p. 17 f.¹

Qualis, omnis, quisquis, ecquis, siquis, quisque: *Hec.* 766 qua⁴lis sim amicus (the insertion, in accordance with Wackernagel's law, of an 'enclitic' in the second position does not affect the connection); *Cap.* 536 ómnis in incertó; *Am.* 309 qui²squis homo húc; *Ps.* 713 qui²dquid opú²t; *Men.* 772 sed quicquid id est (bacch.; needlessly corrected in *ed. min.*); *Mi.* 311 qui²cquid est; *Tri.* 218 quiddquid audítum; *Ps.* 740 e⁶cquid habét; —écquís hóc áperit óstium as verse-close: *Ba.* 582, *Am.* 1020, *Cap.* 830; —*Ba.* 581 ecquís [his] in aédibus; *Tru.* 839 si⁶quis eúm; *St.* 182 síquis me essúm; *And.* 258 si⁶quis nunc mé; *Au.* 340 síquid utí; *Ep.* 729 si³quid imprúdens; *As.* 326 qui³dque deró⁴gito. Often in the first foot, as *Tri.* 655 and *Ru.* 1100 ómnia ego ístaec; *Ru.* 1359 ómnia ut; *Hec.* 287 ómne quod; *Ru.* 1121 qui⁵dquid ibíst; *Ep.* 677 and *Hau.* 961 quiddquid egó; *Ep.* 293 númquid ego íbi; *Poe.* 506 sicut ego hós; *St.* 576 néquid ádvéniens; —écquid agís *Au.* 636, *Ep.* 688, *Ci.* 643; —écquid amás *Tru.* 542, *Poe.* 327; —*Ci.* 67 síquid est quód; *Ep.* 647 síquid erít; etc.² (cf. Ahlberg, *l.l.*, p. 80).

¹ I have purposely not quoted examples like *Mi.* 61 hícine Achíllés; *Phor.* 992 hícine ut tibi. The long quantity of the first syllable of *hicine* (pronoun) is very doubtful, and is not proved, as Müller, *l.l.*, thinks, by the iamb. sep. *Ad.* 709 hic nón amándus? hícine nón-gestándus, since no diaeresis necessarily falls after a monosyllable, as I shall show more fully elsewhere. On the other hand, the quantity in *hōcine, hācine, scine* is often attested.

² Among other cases of the broken dactyl which appear to be justified by the regular word-order, I would specify the following: 1) the phrases composed of a pred. adj. + *incedo*, like *Mi.* 897 ornátus incédit (also *As.* 405; *Ba.* 1069; *Mer.* 600; *Poe.* 577); cf. *Mer.* 887 amicus advénio. This combination has the same value as adv. or adj. + copula, as *Poe.* 922 intus-ero ódio; cf. also *Cap.* 321 únícús-súm. 2) Common alliterative phrases, or combinations of related words, viz. *Ps.* 704 trína triplicía; *Mer.* 385 amicus amícis, similarly *Mi.* 660; Pomponius *fr.* 145; cf. also *Ba.* 401 cómmódús incommodát. Cf. the not very different view which Leo takes of these combinations, *Forsch.*, p. 244, and observe that in etymological phrases like *amicus amícis* the order is fixed, i.e. 'nominativus casus obliquos praecedit' (Kellerhoff, *Studem. Stud.* II, 58 f.). 3) Perhaps adj. or gen. + noun, viz. *Men.* 268 mágnus amátor (P; A mag.); Accius *fr.* 501 hórrida honéstido;

Huius, eius, quonius: These forms, instead of being always taken as monosyllabic, ought probably often to receive their regular scansion as dissyllables in the very numerous cases like *Cap.* 887 quo³ius erát tunc; *St.* 545 quo⁵ius erát tibícina; *Ru.* 52 éius eránt; 1204 éius amátios^t; see the examples collected by Ahlberg (*De corrept. Pl.*, pp. 84-90), whose conclusions probably require some modification at this point.¹

D. ADMISSION OF DACTYLIC PRONOMINAL FORMS.— Exclusive of the first foot, we find about twenty-nine examples of a foot filled by the dactylic pronominal forms *haecine, istaecine, illaecine* (7), *illius* (20), *omnia, omnibus* (2).

Haecine, istaecine, illaecine: *Poe.* 1166 haécine meae⁴ sunt; *Ps.* 83 istócine pácto; 847 ista³cine caúsa; *Ru.* 110 ísticine vós; *Tru.* 537 ho²cine míhi; 606 ístúcline míhi; *Hau.* 751 illáncine mülíerem. The examples quoted above (p. 44) of *hocine*, etc., with elision, *i.e.* hócínest ófficium, show clearly that the problem presented by *hócíně* without elision is not solved by the assumption which is sometimes made (Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 308; Ahlberg, *Procel.* I, 20, 112), that the final syllable of this form was always syncopated in pronunciation; besides, this assumption of constant syncope after a *short* vowel appears to be unwarranted (Schrader, *l.l.*, 10, 14). For the frequent occurrence of *haécine* and similar forms in the first foot, see Schrader, *l.l.*, 10.

Illius: *Hau.* 367 íllius ánimum; *Ad.* 261 íllius ópera; 722 íllius ádulescentis; 572 í¹llius hómínis, and more generally

Enn. tr. fr. 40 virgínális modéstia; *And.* 857 trí¹stis sevérítas; *As.* 509 mal¹tris impérium; *St.* 432 frátris ancíllulam. In most of the common phrases so far quoted, the elision of final *s* before an initial vowel, which Leo advocates (*Forsch.* 229 ff.), may also afford an explanation. 4) Inf. + auxiliary verb, viz. *Ps.* 1182 íre lícēbit (cf. *ilicet*); *Ru.* 112 ésse decēt; *Ep.* 573 férre íubés. Cf. *esse-vult* used as equivalent of a trisyllabic word in verse-close not only often in Pl., but also in Syr. *Sent.* A 51, and *dare-vis* placed in the pentameter-close by so perfect a master of technique as Martial (7, 75, 2); cf. also *dare-nescit*, Syr. *Sent.* 46, the only divided anapest, according to Meyer, *l.l.*, p. 27, which Publilius admits in the third foot.

¹ The view that *huius, eius*, etc., may also be pyrrhics, advocated, so far as I know, only by Exon, *Hermathena*, XI, 208 ff., does not seem probable.

Ep. 717 ²illius invenisse; 447 illius illae; for other examples, see Leo, *l.l.*, 290 ff., Ritschl, *Opusc.* II, 678 ff., and Ahlberg, *De corrept. Pl.*, p. 91 ff. The proclisis of *ille* is, in fact, so far developed that there is no diaeresis in the iamb. sep., *Mi.* 1231 ³quámquam ⁴illúm-⁵multaé sibi éxpetéssunt, and this is the real explanation of this much-discussed verse. The scansion *illús* which I have here assumed has been successfully vindicated for Pl., in my judgment, by Ritschl and Leo,¹ although the scansion *illís* must also be admitted for a few examples like *Phor.* 648 ²míttam ³illius ⁴inéptiás. — *Omnia, omnibus, omnium*: *Tru.* 447 ⁴ómnia ³quí; *Am.* 55 ⁴ómnibus ⁴isdem. Often in the first foot, viz. *Mi.* 1148; *Poe.* 834; 905; *St.* 114; 336; 526; 684; *Tri.* 933; *Hec.* 380; *Ad.* 971. Several of these examples are of the type *ómnia génera* (*Poe.* 834); in the case of dissyllabic words, however, accents like *ómniá mea* (*Hau.* 575; *Phor.* 248), *ómniá bona* (*Hau.* 942) possibly correspond sometimes to the actual pronunciation.

While proclitic tendencies exist in all the pronouns, they have not necessarily been developed in all to the same extent. The proclisis is most nearly complete in *ille, iste, ipse*, and an accent *ille-sénex, istuc-ágo* is probably nearly as exceptional as *altrimsécus* (*Ps.* 357) or *amabilis* (*St.* 737); thus *illic hómo* occurs twice (*Ep.* 45 = troch.⁶; 671 = troch.²) against twenty-four cases of *illíc homo* and *illic homó*. Pl. and Ter. have only *istúc-agó*, — twice within the verse (*Tri.* 819; *Eu.* 349), four times in verse-close (*As.* 358; *Ba.* 708; *Hau.* 346; 558); *scið* is as frequent in the dramatists as *scið*, yet we find only once *tantúndem scið* (*Per.* 517) against eight cases of *illúm-scið, illíc-scið*, etc. (*Am.* 922; *Men.* 246; *Per.* 161; *Poe.* 1028; *As.* 869; *Mi.* 236; *Tru.* 811; *St.* 474). Many combinations, however, vary, cf. *Eu.* 536 ⁴ístuc ⁴íta, and while Pl. regularly accents *tuté tibi* (four times; on the order, cf. Seyffert, *Philol.* XXV, 459 f.), *túte tí²bi* seems the correct scansion in *Men.* 111^b.

We have seen in this investigation that the proclisis and

¹ Against Luchs, *Studem. Stud.* I, 319 ff.

oxytonesis of the pronouns as a class, which the ancient grammarians strongly attest, is confirmed in every possible way by the evidence of dramatic verse,¹ and we have found at the same time, as I hope, an explanation for several phenomena of the verse which have hitherto remained unexplained. Since the study of the pronouns is the main object of this paper, my treatment of the topics which remain will be brief.

IV. ACCENT OF ADJECTIVES.

Although the I.-Eur. word-order, adjective or genitive + substantive, is very imperfectly preserved in Latin, we might, perhaps, expect to find that it had exerted some influence upon the Latin accent. The critical feet offer, however, very few direct evidences of recession at this point, and we find hardly more than half-a-dozen certain examples of a recessive accent like *rectá via* in the critical feet. Yet the rare occurrence of such an accent may be explained as due in part to the structure of the verse. Thus, to take illustrations from the structure of the senarius, the combination of spondee and iambus which is found in *recta via*, needs, as a rule, to be utilized for the verse-close, and this fact of itself would largely prevent its occurrence in the critical feet. Again, the combination cannot be placed without elision in the second foot, since it would then produce an inadmissible conflict in the third, *i.e. rectá víá*, nor can it be placed without elision in the fourth, since it would then introduce an iambus into the fifth foot, *i.e. rectá víá*; it follows that it can, as a rule, be placed only in the third foot, and we find in fact

¹ The proclisis of the demonstrative and relative pronouns in Latin, Umbrian, and Oscan is also indicated at times by the orthography of the Inscr., viz. *eamrim*, *eare*, *eaires*, *hunciuverem* (Corssen, II, 879), *eaiveka* (Lat. eas iuvenas), *erer-nomneper* (pro eius nomine), *paeancesto* (quae incensa), cf. Corssen, II, 919; v. Planta, I, 599. For the conjunctions also proclisis is indicated in Umbrian by writing *ape* (= Lat. *ubi*, in meaning), and *pune*, I.at. *-cunde*, at times with the following word, as *apepesondro*, cf. Corssen, *ibid.* Especially often is the proclisis of the pronouns indicated in connection with *modus*, e.g. *huiusmodi*, *huiuscemodi*, *eiusmodi*, etc.; for *quodammodo*, *omnimodo*, (*nullomodo*), v. the lexicons, and for *ullomodo*, v. Cod. Bern. 83, Keil, *Suppl.* 180, 9.

several examples of its use in this place, viz. *Hec.* 177 primós diés; *Hau.* 61 pró deum átque hominúm fidém; cf. *Tri.* 425 millé dráchŭmárum (numeral). In addition: *Syr. Sent.* 388 non ést turpís cicátrix; *Am.* 481 decumó post mense; *Hec.* 198 pro deum átque hominúm fidém (oct.); *Ep.* 249 hominú⁴m me vis; cf. *Ba.* 968 unó mendáció (oct.); cf. *Phor.* 867 suspenso² gradu. Cases of adj. + quadrisyllabic noun in the verse-close, as *Hec.* 462 una⁶ senténtia; *Am.* 840 sedatu⁶m cupídinem; 841 cognatu⁶m concórdiam; *As.* 298, — are inconclusive.

That the non-occurrence of the type is partly due to the verse-structure seems confirmed by the notable fact that the accent *trigintá-minas*, etc. (numeral + noun), which is attested by nearly all the Romance languages, also does not occur a single time in the definitely critical feet,¹ and we find only one example in these feet of the quantitative type *frátrém-měum* (*And.* 540 gnatám tuam ét; cf. *Ru.* 1341), although the occasional existence of this accent seems indicated by verse-closes like *pátrém-měúm* (*Men.* 750; *Mer.* 972; *Titin. fr.* 65; *Asin.* 64). Very serious difficulties, however, still remain; for the combination of iambic or cretic adjective + noun, i.e. *malá-manu*, *dexterá-manu*, is always avoided in the verse-close, and we find instead *dexterá retinéns manu*, *Cap.* 442, and the like; the only exception is the phrase *bond(u) fidé Tru.* 586; *Mo.* 670 (v. Luchs, *Studem. Stud.* I, 21, and Köhler, *l.l.*, 31). We must conclude then upon the whole that, in the case of adjective combinations, there is no sufficient evidence for the existence of an accent *malá manu*, except in the case of a few special phrases.

V. RELATION OF WORD AND VERSE-ACCENT.

The results reached in the preceding study afford a fresh proof of the frequent agreement which exists between word and verse-accent in the verse of Plautus. It is important,

¹ All the examples cited by Skutsch, *Forsch.* 163, involve the second arsis of the septenarius.

however, not to exaggerate the extent of this agreement and not to misinterpret its meaning. Thus at the present day we sometimes hear the belief confidently expressed that a complete or almost complete agreement of word and verse-accent will eventually be proved for Latin dramatic verse, and further, that all those kinds of verse which, like the dactylic hexameter, show serious disagreement, are artificial verse-forms in Latin. Such extreme views have little or no basis in fact, for both the agreement between word and verse-accent in Plautus is far from being complete on any scientific hypothesis, and the quantitative poetry of the Romans is a thoroughly genuine and national product.

IMPORTANCE OF QUANTITY. PROBLEM OF ICTUS.—It is difficult for the modern student—who has rarely, if ever, heard an exact quantitative pronunciation—to understand the unique importance which attaches to quantity in the pronunciation of the classical languages; and this general difficulty is vastly increased, so far as concerns the pronunciation of Latin, by the numerous special problems which Latin here presents. Hence many scholars have sought an escape from this difficulty by supposing that a strict observance of quantity formed no part of the original Latin language, but was adopted later by the educated Romans in consequence of Greek influence. The actual predominance of quantity, however, in the genuine Roman pronunciation—or, at least, in some widely prevalent form of this pronunciation—is indisputable. Not only has Latin inherited its system of quantity from I.-Eur. in an essentially unchanged form (Bergaigne et Henry, *Manuel Védique*, p. 38), but under certain conditions Latin quantity is invariably accompanied by an important secondary product, viz. intensity; for any regular alternation of long and short syllables in Latin prose or verse, provided a careful enunciation of the quantities be employed, produces *naturally*¹ a rhythmic beat or ictus (*impressio*, Cic.

¹ The same view is taken by Vendryes, *L'intensité initiale*, Paris, 1902, p. 65, and, according to V., by Meillet, who writes "par suite de la prononciation naturelle des mots"; cf. also Uppgren, *Metrische Komposition d. Terenz*, Lund, 1901, 107 ff.

de Or. III, 48, 185; *percussio*, *ib.* III, 186; *quasi pulsus*, Quintil. IX, 4, 136), which approaches the value of a stress-accent,¹ or, to state the fact more briefly, variations in quantity

¹ In connection with Professor Bennett's attempt to show that 'ictus' was not identified with *elevatio vocis* 'before the fifth century' (*A.J.P.* XIX, 368 ff.; cf. also Vendryes, *l.l.*, 66), I cannot refrain from calling attention to a question of chronology involved in this claim. To obtain such a result, it is not only necessary to explain away many early testimonies, but also to assign a very late date to Terentianus Maurus, who says very clearly with respect to arsis and thesis, v. 1345: *parte nam attollit sonorem, parte reliqua deprimit*; v. 2249: (*necesse est*) *scandendo et illic (sc. in secundo loco) ponere adsuetam moram* (T. is discussing the principal ictuses of the trimeter). While T.'s date is not certainly known, according to the judgment of all the best recent authorities he is probably to be assigned to the close of the second century (Schultz, *Hermes*, XXII, 275 f.; Werth, *Jahrb. Sp.* XXIII, 235 ff., and preface to dissertation, Leipzig, 1896; Teuffel-Schwabe, *Röm. Lit.* II, 945; Schanz, *Ädm. Lit.* III, 26); in addition, his statements are usually drawn from good early sources. In Greek also, references to the existence of a metrical ictus are not so rare as Professor Goodell appears to think in his recent book (*Greek Metric*, 156 ff.). Thus, besides Christ's examples of *κρούειν* (*Metr.*, p. 50) and the frequent marking of the *στιγμαί* in musical schemes (Gleditsch³, p. 322), Plutarch, *Dem.* 20, describes Philip after the battle of Chaeronea reciting the tetrameter verse *Δημόσθηνός Δεμώσθένους, κτλ.*, dividing it into feet and beating time to it (*πρὸς πόδα διαίρων καὶ ὑποκρούων*); the author, *περὶ ἤψους*, c. 41, 2, states that the rhythmical clausulae of the orators often have the effect of dance-music upon their auditors, who sometimes cannot refrain from stamping their feet in time with the speaker (*ὑποκρούειν τοῖς λέγουσι καὶ . . . προαποδιδόναι τὴν βᾶειν*). Similarly an ictus in the oratorical cola and clausulae is constantly affirmed by the ancients (*Cic. de Or.* III, 47, 182; *Or.* 18, 59; cf. Quintil. IX, 4, 31), and is assumed by all modern writers in this field. To the ancient testimonies upon the verse-accent cited by Hendrickson, *A.J.P.* XX, 198, add the very late Vergilius Grammat. Exc., K., *Suppl.*, 190, 12, who mentions an accent *regis* 'secundum rationem metrorum.' At times the ancients do not appear to distinguish sharply between word and verse-accent, cf. Auson. *Ep.* XXII, 47; Cassiodor. *Var.* 9, 21, 3, and the striking use of *τόνος* in Greek to denote both word-accent and rhythmical cadence. Hence I am disposed to justify, against the objections of Crusius, *Litt. Centralbl.* 1891, 7, 213, the use which Klotz, *Grundz.* 269, 348, makes of Dionysius' *συλλαβῆ ὀξύτονος* (*de Comp. Verb.*, c. 11) in questions relating to the ictus, and even suggest for comparison in part Dionysius' other statement (*de Admir. Vi Dem.* c. 48), that Demosthenes has produced wonderful 'melody' through the arrangement of 'sharps' and 'graves' in his cola. Since the ictus, in all poetical recitation, largely takes the place of the tone, such a lack of distinction, though inexact, is not wholly unnatural. Similarly, in his discussion of *volūeres* (I, 5, 28), Quintilian perhaps employs *syllaba acuta* 'inexactly' of the ictus; such at least is the view of some metricians (*e.g.* Havet, *Métr.*⁴ § 491; Schöll, *De acc.*, p. 26), although the passage seems to me to admit of another interpretation (cf. Humphreys, *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* VII, 109).

naturally produce variations in intensity. Hence Latin possesses, in all carefully enunciated quantitative sequences, a natural series of stress accents, and this series assumes many

Cf. also Cassiodor. *Var.* 2, 40: naturalis rhythmus animatae voci cognoscitur attributus: qui tunc *melos* pulchre custodit, si apte taceat, congruenter loquatur et per *accentus* viam musicis pedibus composita voce gradiatur; where *taceat* and *loquatur* are doubtless to be explained from Arist. *Q. de Mus.*, p. 31, 17 M. ἀρσιν καὶ θέσιν, ψῆφον καὶ ἡρεμίαν. In addition to the passages usually quoted, a clear testimony upon the rhythmical accent in prose and verse is found in Sen., *de Brev. Vit.* 12: quid illi qui in componendis, audiendis, dicendis canticis operati sunt: dum vocem cuius rectum cursum natura et optimum et simplicissimum fecit inflexu modulationis inertissimae torquent? quorum digiti aliquod intra se carmen metientes semper sonant. quorum, cum ad res serias adhibiti sunt, exaudita tacita modulatio. That the interpretation of Dionysius given above is correct, and that he refers to the 'ictus' in the Demosthenic melodies, appears to be confirmed by the very similar passages in which Lucian speaks of 'the *beat* and *accent* and melody of the Demosthenic rhythms,' 'the *beat* of the Demosthenic periods,' viz. *Dem. Encom.* 32 οἱ δ' Ἀττικοὶ ῥήτορες παιδιὰ παραβάλλειν τῷ τούτου (sc. Δημοσθένους) κρότῳ καὶ τόνῳ καὶ λέξεων εὐρυθμίᾳ; *ib.* 15 Πυθέα δὲ ὁ κρότος τῶν Δημοσθενικῶν λόγων ἀπόδειξιν ἐφαίνετο τοῦ νυκτερικοῦ λύχνου. Cf. *Anthol. Planud.* 226, 5 ἀμφὶ δὲ σοὶ ῥυθμοῖο κατὰ κρότον ἐνθεον ἔχρος ῥησσεῖσθω (description of a song accompanied by the pipe); according to Passow's *Lex.* κρότος is here "der Klang einer Rede, eines Gesanges"; in oratory, τὸ ἐπικροτοῦν τῶν λόγων is very aptly described by Herodes Atticus in Philostr. 539 Boiss. Somewhat late is the use of *ιαμβόκροτος*, 'iambic-beaten,' in the meaning 'iambic,' 'in iambic rhythm,' viz. Niceph. in Walz, *Rhet.* I, 443 (*ιαμβοκρότοις λόγοις εἴρηκεν*, 'in iambic verses'); *Planud. ib.* 5, 450 (ὁ ῥυθμὸς ἐστὶν ὁ ποὺς ἡχος τοῦ λόγου, *ιαμβόκροτος* τυχὸν ἢ ἐλεγείῳ). So far as concerns the relation of word and verse-accent, this relation in Latin is undoubtedly largely one of similarity in kind; cf. Schöll, *De acc.*, 23. This fact is not only clear from the statement of Annius ap. Gellius VI, 7, 4, and other similar passages named above, but is made even more obvious by the frequent employment of precisely the same terms in reference to both, viz. *modulari*, *modulatio*, *moderare*, *flectere*, etc. Thus in the well-known passage Cic. *Or.* 18, 58 *modulari* is employed of the word-accent: ipsa natura, quasi *modularetur* hominum orationem, in omni verbo posuit acutum vocem; cf. Mart. Cap. III, p. 65, 19 Eyss. On the other hand Quintilian (I, 10, 22) employs *modulatio* of the 'beat' which accompanies rhythm: ῥυθμὸς . . . *modulatione* constat, and shortly afterwards (25) explains the meaning of *modulatio* more definitely by the terms *intentio vocis*, *remissio*, *flexus* (cf. Hendrickson, *A.J.P.* XX, 206). Both uses are found together in Victorinus VI, 206, 12 K.: metrum est ratio cum *modulatione*, rhythmus sine ratione metrica *modulatio*. plerumque tamen invenies rationem metricam in rhythmō, non artificii observatione servata, sed *tono* et *ipsa modulatione* ducente. Similarly Gellius (XIII, 6, 1) uses *moderamenta* of the word-accents, but Caesius Bassus (ap. Rufin. VI, 555 K.) *moderare* of the verse-accent: nisi percussione ita *moderaveris*. Again, *flectere*, *flexus*, etc., are constantly employed of the ictus (e.g. Quintil. I, 8, 1 quo flexu . . .

different forms corresponding with the various forms of metre employed. So much is perfectly clear, but since the Latin word-accent appears to have possessed from an early time an element of intensity (probably varying greatly in strength according to the quantitative relations, *i.e.* moderately strong in *cáll(ē)duſ*, weak in *ūrbānī*; cf. L. Müller, *R.M.*² 468), it is evident that, unless we are able to explain away the internal evidence which the language affords in favor of an accent of intensity, we must admit the existence in Latin of a second series of quasi-stress accents.

SONG-LIKE RECITATION OF ANCIENT POETRY. EFFECT UPON QUANTITY AND WORD-ACCENT. — The difficult problem presented by the conflict which often arises in Latin poetry between these two series of accents has given rise to many discussions. Instead of attempting in this place a general treatment of the subject in the usual way, I wish to limit my inquiry to several definite and special questions, *viz.* What was the form of delivery adopted by the ancients in the recitation of their poetry? What was the probable effect of this delivery both upon the quantities and upon the word-accents? Although the Greek word-accent was, down to the beginning of our era, primarily a musical accent, and although its relation to the rhythmic accent has often been discussed in a general way (*e.g.* Westphal³, III, 31 f.; Christ², 55; Gleditsch³, 81 f.), I shall, for obvious reasons, include the recitation of Greek poetry in the present discussion, and make free use of the statements of Greek writers. The whole subject may be treated under two principal heads:

1. *Character of Poetical Recitation.* — In that part of their poetry which was sung, the Greeks, according to the well-

dicendum), but Diomedes (I, 456, 18 K.) observes that whenever the inflections (*flexus*) of the voice come into play, the 'accents' come into play: *tenor in flexibus vocis servandus est; nam quaedam acuto tenore . . . desiderant enuntiarī.* With reference to Greek usage, one must speak with extreme caution, and there is no express identification of the oxytone syllable with ictus to be found earlier than the mediaeval fragments of Pletho (fifteenth century); yet, as we have seen, Lucian joins *κρότος* and *τόνος*, and a certain degree of similarity is indicated even for the classical period by the twofold use of *τόνος* already mentioned. See further, *A.J.P.* XXV, 420 (421), n. 5.

known statement of Dionysius Hal. (*de Comp. Verb.*, c. 11), subordinated the usual pronunciation to the melody, and entirely disregarded the word-accent.¹ This statement is commonly thought to apply exclusively to song, and to have no bearing upon the poetry which was spoken or declaimed; but such a view can scarcely be correct, since all poetry was, in a certain sense, sung among the ancients, and 'declamation' appears to have differed in degree, and not in kind, from 'song.' This fact is often overlooked, and has scarcely received from metricians the attention which it deserves; for while the technical employment of song, recitative and declamation in the delivery of ancient poetry has often been carefully discussed,² one will seek in vain in our standard metrical works for any account of the real character of ancient 'declamation'; valuable notices of the subject are to be found, however, in several works of a more general character, viz. Friedländer, *Sittengesch.* III⁶, 337 f.; Teuffel-Schwabe, *Roman Lit.* I, § 34, 3; Grasberger, *Erziehung u. Unterricht im*

¹ Cf. the description which Heliodorus (3, 3) gives of the rendering of a melody: τοσοῦτον δέ τι ἐμμελείας περιῆν τοῖς χοροῖς, καὶ οὕτω συμβαίνων ὁ κρότος τοῦ βήματος πρὸς τὸ μέλος ἔρρυθμίζετο, ὡς κτλ.; cf. 3, 2. There is evidently no retention of the word-accent here. On the other hand Schöll, *De acc.*, p. 18, wholly misapplies the *very late* scholiast on Dionys. Thrax., p. 830 Bk., in his attempt to prove that the Greek accent was sometimes observed in song. The scholiast belongs to a time when short syllables were lengthened by the word-accent (e.g. αἶδλον ἄφιν), and when, as he himself says, musical notes (κρούσματα) and word-accents were often made to agree. For the earliest examples of this tendency, v. Monro, *Modes of Greek Music*, p. 90.

² F.g. W. Christ, *Die Parakataloge im gr. u. röm. Drama*, Münch. 1875; *Metrik*², 676; Zieliński, *Gliederung d. att. Kôm.*, Lpz. 1885, 288-314. In general, Christ's views upon these questions seem to me much less correct than those of Zieliński; according to the latter, the Greek tragic trimeter was commonly rendered through recitative, the purely comic trimeter through the ψιλὴ λέξις. So far as concerns this last statement, its correctness depends upon the meaning given to ψιλὴ λ., which in itself is an ambiguous term. If the absence of musical accompaniment alone is meant, no exception can be taken to the use of this term; but if it be meant that the recitation of the comic trimeter is 'mere speech' or 'mere declamation' in the modern sense (cf. ψιλὴ φωνή, Dion. H. *de Comp.* 11), and that it is unsupported by the πλάσμα or πεπλασμένη ὑπόκρισις, such a conclusion appears to me to be quite false; cf. Quintil. II, 10, 13; XI, 3, 183, and see esp. Klotz, *Grundz.* 381. The Latin equivalent of ψιλὴ φωνή, in still another sense, is *assa vox*, Non. pp. 76-77 M.

klass. Alt. 279 ff., 384 ff.; Norden, *Kunstprosa*, I, 55 ff.; cf. Murray, "Connection between Greek Music and Poetry," in *Studies in Honor of Professor Gildersleeve*, p. 205 ff.; O. Jahn, *Hermes*, II, 418 ff. A few ancient testimonies, several of which are not quoted in any of the works just named, but are of the same general character as these quotations, may be mentioned here: Quintilian (I, 8, 2) shows at some length that the reading of poetry in the schools should be different from the reading of prose (*non quidem prosae similis*), and should bear some resemblance to song (*carmen*); cf. *id.* I, 10, 29; Plin. *Ep.* IX, 34, 2; this was the regular custom of the schools in the reading of Vergil, Euripides, and other poets, cf. Macrobi. *Sat.* I, 24, 6 (*canere*); Plut. *de Fort. Alex.* 5, p. 328 d (*ᾄδειν*); Cassiodor. *Var.* 9, 21, 3 (*decantare*); Auson. *Ep.* XXII, 47 P. (*flexu et acumine vocis*).¹ Aristides Quint., who belongs to the fifth century A.D., but who often draws from authoritative early sources, expressly names a movement of the voice intermediate between song and speech, which is to be used in the reading of the poets (*de Mus.*, p. 7, 23 M. μέση δὲ κλήσις), ἢ τὰς τῶν ποιημάτων ἀναγνώσεις ποιούμεθα)²; this statement of Aristides is discussed in the *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* XXX, 48, by Dr. C. W. L. Johnson, who, after referring to the fact that the points of pitch must have been more stationary in this movement than in conversational utterance, reaches the conclusion that "the metrical quantity of the syllables must have been made more evident than is possible in the case of the spoken sentence"; similarly Nicomachus states that if, in any form of utterance, the quantities of the several tones are distinctly rendered and also the intervals, the voice passes naturally from speech to song (*Enchirid.*, p. 4 M. εἰ

¹ Christ, *Parakat*, pp. 175, 222, cites still other passages as proof "für den Gebrauch des lateinischen *cantare* im Sinne eines bloß rhythmischen Vortrags, nicht vollständigen Gesanges"; he is quite mistaken, however, in wishing to limit the term 'sing' in this rhythmic sense to Roman usage.

² We find this statement of Arist. fully reproduced in Mart. Cap. IX, p. 353 Eyss. (quoted by Jahn, *l.l.*, 421): continuum (genus vocis) est velut iuge conloquium, divisum quod in modulatione servamus. est et medium, quod in utroque permixtum ac neque alterius continuum modum servat nec alterius frequenti divisione praeciditur, quo pronuntiandi modo carmina caecæta recitantur.

γάρ τις . . . ἀναγινώσκων γε ἔκδηλα μεταξὺ καθ' ἕκαστον φθόγγον ποιῶν τὰ μεγέθη, διστάνων καὶ μεταβάλλων τὴν φωνὴν ἀπ' ἄλλου εἰς ἄλλον, ὁ τοιοῦτος . . . μελεάζειν λέγεται).¹ Herodotus repeatedly describes the Pythia as giving her responses (λέγειν, χρᾶν) in the hexameter or trimeter 'tune' ('musical mode,' 'cadence': ἐν ἑξαμέτρῳ τόνῳ, I, 47, etc.; ἐν τριμέτρῳ τόνῳ, I, 174²; cf. the similar use of ἐντείνειν), and Plato expressly ascribes both rhythm and musical modulation (ἄρμονία = Lat. *concentus*) to 'spoken' poetry (*Rep.* 397 *b*; 398 *d*), which he classifies under μουσική (*Rep.* 376 *e* ff.; *Phaed.* 60 *e* ff.). I may quote also the definition of prose given by Donatus (on Ter. *Eun.* 2, 3, 14) as 'that form of speech which is not modulated by song' (*prorsa oratio, quam non inflexit cantilena*). Further, although the ordinary recitation of poetry is usually indicated by the expressions 'speak,' 'read,' 'declaim,' we find the terms 'modulate' and 'sing' also at times in use (Friedländer, *l.l.*; Christ², 681), which imply the μέση κίνησις or vox canora (Petron., c. 59; 68; Gell. XVIII, 5, 2). From these and similar notices we may fairly draw the conclusion that no part of the elevated poetry of the ancients was intended for 'mere declamation' in the modern sense, that is, intended for the simple συνεχῆς κίνησις or speaking voice. The case is altogether similar with the chanting of the oratorical rhythms; here also the rhetor's voice adopted a movement intermediate between speech and song, as is expressly stated by Longinus (*Rhet.* I, 312, 14 Sp.), and is well attested for all periods of antiquity (Norden, *l.l.*). Finally, the view of

¹ Just before Nicom. writes: τὸ δὲ ἕτερον (γένος) τὸ συνεχές, καθ' ὁμιλοῦμέν τε ἀλλήλοις καὶ ἀναγινώσκομεν, οὐδεμίαν ἔχοντες ἀνάγκην ἐμφανεῖς τὰς τῶν φθόγγων τάσεις ('quantities') καὶ διακεκριμένας ἀπ' ἀλλήλων ποιείσθαι.

² So also Joseph. *Anl.* II, 16, 4 (ἐν ἑξαμέτρῳ τόνῳ); Themist. *Or.* 2, p. 27 *c*. Suidas, *s.v.*, has the plural: Πυθικὸν ἦν προμάντευμα ἐν τόνοις ἑξαμέτροις. Passow's *Lex.* explains τόνος in this use as "die Hebung im Verse u. das dadurch entstehende *Versmass*"; thus the word appears to be used in the threefold sense of musical tone (Sext. *Emp.* 757, 29 Bekk.), word-tone, and verse-tone. In Latin also we should probably follow Bährens and the early editors in reading in Stat. *Silv.* V, 3, 99: quis . . . dulce vel heroos gressu truncare *tenores*, 'to combine the curtailed pentameter with the accents of the hexameter'; the Ms. reading, truncare *leones*, which is retained by Vollmer (1898), appears to be corrupt and to yield no satisfactory meaning.

Christ and Westphal, that, in cases of conflict, the Greek musical accents were fully preserved in recitation, seems improbable; more likely is Gleditsch's view (*Metr.*³ 86) that they were preserved only in part ('*in gewissem Grade*').

2. *Probable Effects.*—The ancient Greeks and Romans had not passed that stage of development in which a rigorously exact rhythm is viewed as the chief essential of poetry (Gummere, *Beginnings of Poetry*, pp. 82–115). Hence, as is well known, they required in poetical recitation such a scrupulous observance of the rhythm as can only be paralleled by the insistence of a modern audience upon correctness of tune in singing (Dion. H. *de Comp.* 11 *med.*; other references in Haigh, *Attic Theatre*², 309). To this end the long and short syllables which vary greatly in length in ordinary speech and do not exist, according to Westphal, in the form necessary for exact rhythm, must be measured more exactly in terms of the time-unit, the *χρόνος πρώτος*; especially must a long syllable be given approximately twice the value of a short one, the ratio which Aristoxenus (p. 18 W.) states existed in song, but which did not exist in speech according to Westphal (III³, 8 ff.). The careful enunciation which in this way becomes necessary for the rhythmizing of speech is often mentioned by the ancients. Thus Dionysius Thrax (first century B.C.) declares that 'prosody' must be observed in reading verse, and that the metrical art (*τέχνη*) of a poem is perceived through 'trained reading according to prosody' (*ἀνάγνωσις ἐντριβῆς κατὰ προσῳδίαν*¹), where by 'prosody' is evidently meant such a precise rendering of the quantities, *i.e.* such an enunciation of the syllables in terms of the *χρόνος πρώτος*, as will produce rhythm²; cf. also Dion. H. *de Comp.* 11: ἡ δὲ ῥυθμικὴ καὶ μουσικὴ μεταβάλλουσι (τὰς συλλαβὰς), μειοῦσαι καὶ αὔξουσai, κτλ. Similarly Dositheus, in his interesting account of the reading of verse in the schools, states that he was required to recite with *an observance of the rhythm* as well as of the pauses and clausulae (*Colloquia Scho-*

¹ *Ars*, § 1, Uhlig, p. 5.

² For the comprehensive meaning of *προσῳδία* in D., cf. *Supplem. vetust.*, Uhlig, p. 107, and also Jannaris, *A.J.P.* XXIII, 77.

last., Röder, p. 14: versus *ad numerum* et distinctum et clausulam . . . reddo ad praeceptorem); cf. Quintilian's remarks upon *observatio* ('precision'), IX, 4, 104 and 95, and the frequent references to poetry as 'moulding' the pronunciation of the young (e.g. Hor. *Ep.* II, 1, 126 os . . . *figuratur*). This 'moulded' pronunciation in its extreme form is the well-known *πλάσμα*, the use of which the ancients often¹ disapprove for the simpler metres (Quint. I, 8, 2; II, 6), but require in the rendering of the more difficult rhythms (Christ², 90, 682; cf. Westphal³, III, 8). It is evident that the effect of a carefully moulded *προσφδία* (cf. under I above) upon the word-accent must often have been very great, especially in the case of an accent which is partly expiratory like the Latin, and the variable quantity of many syllables in early Latin seems to result from this fact. Thus the final syllable of *dōmī*, under the influence of the word-accent, tended to shorten in popular speech, and is often so used by Pl. in the first foot, before the beating of the time was fully begun; but in those parts of the verse where the time was strictly observed this syllable has regularly the value of two *χρόνοι*, i.e. *domī*, and in this pronunciation the expiratory accent must have been practically wiped out (cf. V. Henry, *Comp. Gr.*², Eng. tr., p. 87; L. Müller, *R. M.*², 468)²; cf. *δμιττέβατ* (where the verse-accent also assists in the

¹ Yet by no means always; for we find in the commentary ascribed to Probus (Verg. *Ecl.* p. 6): Aeneida quoniam plasmate legi volebat, ait 'arma virumque cano.' This whole discussion of Probus upon the form of poetical delivery (*pronuntiatio*) is highly suggestive, in spite of the arbitrary dictum that the *plasma* or singing delivery (*cantare*) is to be employed in a poem (only) from the point where the words *canere* or *carmen* first occur. It is noteworthy that the general teaching of the commentary agrees perfectly with the well-known statement of Gellius (VI, 7, 4) that Valerius Probus and his pupils accented *exádvserum* in verse. For the meaning of *πλάσμα*, cf. Spalding on Quintil. I, 8, 2, who quotes some ancient authorities, and also the excellent modern definition of Salmasius: "voce mollem et eliquatam, quae per omnes sonos intentionesque varietur." For numerous references to the abuse of this singing delivery, see Jahn, *LL.*, 422, n. 1 and 2.

² At the same time the rhythmical tone falls upon the ultima. In a somewhat similar way Zieliński in his recent valuable work, *Das Clauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden*, Leipzig, 1904, reaches the conclusion that iambic words are oxytone in the oratorical rhythms, e.g. *forént*; cf. p. 239: "Immerhin ist zu betonen, dass für den rednerischen Accent die iambischen und anapästischen Wörter, im Gegensatz zur geläufigen Auffassung, Oxytona sind." This oxytonesis is of course not the

shortening) and *omittēbat*. In a similar way our ancient authorities recognize also for prose an easy and colloquial pronunciation, which is called *sermo*, or *oratio remissa* (Auct. ad Her. III, 13, 23), but they prescribe for elevated language an emphatic kind of utterance which involves a sustained effort of the voice and is called *contentio*, or *oratio acris* (Auct. ad Her. *ibid.*; Cic. *Off.* I, 37, 132; II, 14, 48, etc.); cf. *de Or.* III, 45, 177: non enim sunt alia sermonis, alia contentionis verba, . . . sed ea nos cum iacientia sustulimus e medio, sicut mollissimam ceram ad nostrum arbitrium formamus et fingimus. This *contentio vocis*, or tense voice, passes readily over into the singing or modulated voice; cf. Cic. *Off.* I, 37, 133: sine contentione vox nec languida nec canora.

It is probable, then, that the limits of variable pronunciation have been sufficiently great in Latin to admit the existence of two distinct forms of pronunciation: 1) A formal and dignified pronunciation which is strictly quantitative, and which in its extreme form — the μέση κίνησις — usually possesses no appreciable stress-accent.¹ 2) An easy and

normal accent (*i.e.* Zieliński's 'Vulgäaccent'); for the popular speech pronounces *dóm̄*, with 'half-long' ultima, and hence, as is well known, the Romans do not admit in their poetry two iambic words in succession in the rhythimized form *domī*. Consequently I greatly prefer the form of statement adopted by Zieliński, p. 242: "Die quantitativ bevorzugte Silbe hatte die Tendenz, im Redefluss zu einer tonisch bevorzugten zu werden. . . . Vollends in der *rhythmisch* bewegten Rede lag die Versuchung nahe, die accentuirte Kürze vor der Länge zurücktreten zu lassen." On the other hand, I am not prepared to accept Zieliński's conclusions upon *facērent* as the sole form of the oratorical accent for anapestic words, since he himself hesitates greatly (p. 231) between the accents *fācērent* and *fācērent*. Finally, Zieliński's conjecture (p. 241 f.) that the 'oratorisch-poetischer Accent' is identical with the archaic popular accent of the third century B.C., seems to me unnecessary; it is rather to be viewed as the accent which the rhythmizing process and a precise observance of quantity (*μέση κίνησις*) engender in the language of all periods. One very late ancient grammarian, Vergilius Maro (Keil, *Suppl.*, 190), actually professes to recognize in some form of Roman pronunciation the accents *rēgēs*, *amē*, etc., but we can of course give little credence to such a source.

¹ Uppgren, *Metrisch. Komp. d. Ter.*, who has a general discussion of this subject, does not go so far, yet he writes (p. 113, n. 1): "Bei den verschiedenen Bewegungen innerhalb der konstanten Versbewegung kann doch gar recht diese Stimmhöhe . . . wenig oder schwach herausgehört worden sein, . . . wie solche Nebenbewegungen beim musikalischen Dirigieren immer eingehalten werden";

colloquial pronunciation, in which a weak stress-accent is developed at the expense of quantity.¹ All Roman poetry, since it is at once quantitative and a form of the μέση κίνησης, is based (with the exception of the unusual quantities in early Latin) solely upon the strict quantitative pronunciation; it is to be noted, however, that, under certain favorable quantitative conditions, an accentual pronunciation has been developed in the Latin language as a whole, and has greatly weakened all *short* syllables immediately preceding or following the accent, e.g. *génére, péctōre, àpērire*, etc.

LAW OF THE RELATION BETWEEN WORD AND VERSE-ACCENT. — In any case, whether the Latin accent be wholly musical, or, as seems more probable, in part also expiratory, it is certain that Latin possesses a single colloquial 'cadence' or 'harmony,' viz. the accentual² (Aristotle's ἡ λεκτικὴ ἁρμονία, *Poet.* 6; Aristoxenus's λογῶδες τι μέλος, *Harm. Elem.* I, 17 W.); with the employment, however, of a stricter quantitative pronunciation and a special arrangement of the quantities, it acquires a score or more of metrical 'cadences' or 'harmonies,' such as the hexameter cadence (Hdt.'s ἐξάμετρος τόνος), pentameter cadence, Sapphic cadence, iambic trimeter cadence, etc. As is natural in different spheres of time and tone, the metrical cadences in general are entirely independent of the accentual cadence, but among them all there is one, the iambic, whose distinguishing characteristic in both Greek and Latin, as we know from many ancient testimonies,³

cf. above, p. 54 ff. Perhaps we can only say with certainty that the word-accents were very greatly weakened; for so good an authority as Hanssen writes (*Zur lat. u. roman. Metrik*, Valparaiso, 1901, p. 51): "Es können ohne die geringste Schwierigkeit in einem und demselben Verse zwei rhythmische Strömungen neben einander hergehen." Cf. also Christ,² 59, Schöll, *De acc.*, p. 25 ff., and Professor Hale, *Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc.* XXIV (1895), p. xxix. It is certain, however, that the verse-tone is the predominant tone in all cases where the words are properly rhythimized.

¹ These variant pronunciations explain the well-known fact that Greek loan-words often assume a double form in Latin, one form showing a retention of the Greek accent, as *Philippus* (Pl.), *tyrānnus* (Sergius, IV, 528 K.), cf. *Apóllinis* ('Ἀπόλλωνος), the other a retention of the Greek quantity, as *Philippus, tyrānnus*.

² Cf. Cic. *Or.* 17, 57: est etiam in dicendo quidam cantus obscurior.

³ Arist. *Poet.* 4 *fin.*; *Rhet.* 3, 8; Demetrius, π. ἐπιμ. 43; Hephaestion, p. 19

is to approach more closely than the rest to the tone of colloquial speech.¹ Hence it is not surprising that the poet or poets who arranged the Latin iambic and determined its *original form*, imposed upon it the law that it should agree with the accentual cadence in the pronunciation of *gènère*, *âpèrire*, etc.,² and doubtless also in the phenomena of the dipodic law; further, since the popular iambic cadence tends to be associated more or less closely in the Roman mind with the accentual cadence, it is possible that the popular poets, even *after* the determination of the original verse-form, tended, in some measure, to prefer agreement to disagreement in *neutral* cases, *i.e.* in those cases where disagreement was not the *usage* of the verse (in the manner explained below). Such a tendency as this last would, however, be contrary to the usual rule of Latin verse, and its existence must consequently be considered doubtful.³

Finally, we may state the general law which appears to have governed Latin verse in its relation to accent. The Latin metrical cadences or verse-forms were originally constituted entirely without reference to accent, and solely in accordance with metrical laws; no sooner, however, had they assumed a definite form in this way than they began to

W.; Aristid. Q., p. 38, 19 M.; Cic. *Or.* 55, 184; 56, 189; 57, 191; 58, 196, etc.; Hor. *A. P.* 81; Quintil. IX, 4, 75 f.—Some of these passages are cited by Christ², 315.

¹ Yet even here the *πλάσμα* was employed to some extent, as is expressly stated for the *comic iambic trimeter* by Quintilian, XI, 3, 183: *pronuntiatio gesticationibus molesta et vocis mutationibus resultans*; cf. also Klotz, *Grundz.* 381.

² See the really excellent discussion of the verse-accent *gènere, corpore*, in Klotz, *Grundz.* 268–280.

³ The most general principle that can be stated here is that, after the determination of the norm, *any* considerable deviation, whether favorable or unfavorable to the accent, was a departure from literary usage and, to that extent, a vulgar usage; see the striking examples cited by Munro. The literary language is especially careful to avoid too close an approach to the accentual cadence (the ordinary tone), as is clearly implied in Cicero's statement, *Or.* 55, 184; cf. Christ², p. 59. On the other hand, popular poetry must not be entirely removed from the spoken tone, and the iambic poets have perhaps sought to avoid a *succession* of disagreements (*continuatio oxytonarum vocum*) in the neutral parts of the verse; for the usage of Phaedrus, cf. Langen, *Rhein. Mus.* XIII, 198.

respond to the influence of the accent in accordance with a simple psychological law. In view of the uniformity of the Latin accentual system, the result of observing the metrical rules was to produce at certain points of almost every cadence 1) agreement of accent and ictus in the great majority of cases, 2) disagreement of accent and ictus in the great majority of cases. Wherever this result is brought about, the Roman ear is quick to note the relation which usually exists, and to require in the end, *i.e.* in the course of the historical development, that it shall *always* exist, that is, to require that the agreement or disagreement shall be made invariable; in other words, the Roman ear *remembers* the hexameter or the Sapphic or the trimeter cadence at certain points by the relation which it bears to the accentual cadence, which is its simplest and most familiar standard of measurement. In those more numerous parts of the verse, however, where no usual relation between accent and ictus was established, but the effect of observing the metrical rules was to produce sometimes agreement and sometimes disagreement, the metrical cadence remained wholly unchanged, wholly unaffected by the accent, so long as the Roman quantitative system endured.

What relation, it will be asked, does the explanation just given of the development of Latin verse bear to the views of Ritschl and his numerous followers? So far as concerns cases of agreement in caesurae and in verse-closes, this explanation agrees with Ritschl's in recognizing the fact that the agreement has been brought about through the influence of the accent, but differs from Ritschl's in holding that agreement is not sought *per se*, but in consequence of familiar association. So far as concerns cases of disagreement in caesurae and in verse-closes, the divergence from Ritschl's view is still greater. For Ritschl, as is well known, started from the assumption that the Roman poets found actual pleasure in the agreement of ictus and accent, and hence sought to produce this agreement as often as possible. So acute an observer did not, however, fail to recognize that the Romans had unmistakably sought to produce disagreement

also in many parts of their verse, *e.g.* while agreement is sought in the second half of the dactylic hexameter, disagreement is required in the first half of the same verse. Hence, in a well-known passage of his writings (*Opusc.* II, Leipzig, 1868, p. xii), Ritschl sought to explain this latter fact by his famous assertion that the special charm of ancient verse lay in the balancing of agreement and disagreement, in the production of an '*harmonische Disharmonie.*' According to this theory, after having sought agreement in one part of the verse for the pleasure which it gave, the Romans next sought with pleasure ('*suchten mit Wohlgefallen*') to produce disagreement, in order to contrast the two parts of the verse, and seemingly also (though this is not expressly stated) in order exactly to balance the two opposing forces, quantity and accent. Every one will recognize that Ritschl in this account has truly and graphically described an *effect* which has been actually produced in many kinds of Latin verse; at the same time the *process*, through which this effect has come about, is explained in a quite impossible manner, or rather is left in large measure wholly unexplained. For how could the Romans seek agreement with pleasure, and then for the sake of an abstraction, such as 'balance' or 'contrast,' seek with pleasure — disagreement? In point of fact, neither aesthetic pleasure nor aesthetic pain plays any part in this process, which is purely a psychological matter of association.

It remains to note that the general law of the accentual development of Latin verse, which I have given above in my own language, was first clearly stated by an eminent American metrician and a former student of Ritschl's, Professor M. W. Humphreys, in a careful study published in the *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* IX (1878), pp. 39-58.¹ The article in question deals chiefly with cases of agreement in the dactylic hexameter, but the same principle is expressly applied

¹ And still earlier in the dissertation, *Quaest. metr. de accentus momento in versu heroico.* Lips. 1874. See also the able paper of H. A. J. Munro, *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Vol. X (1864), pp. 374-402. Humphreys and Munro reach quite independently precisely the same conclusions respecting the influence of the accent upon Latin verse.

in one passage to the explanation of cases of disagreement (p. 40). Again, Professor Humphreys has limited his rule in its formal statement to the dactylic hexameter, but I cannot doubt that he regarded it as applicable to other Latin verse-forms also.¹ Since Professor Humphreys' solution of this difficult problem leaves none of the phenomena unexplained, and *is in accord*, as he has very fully shown, *with the historical development of Latin verse*, it seems probable that it needs only to be better known to supersede in this field the less complete and less carefully constructed theories of Ritschl and of Meyer.²

¹ Professor Humphreys does in fact state his conclusions in a more general form, *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* VII, 112.

² *Addenda* :

P. 53, n. — For supposed cases of the use of the *apex* in Latin Inscrr. to denote the ictus, v. Christiansen, *De apicibus*, p. 20.

P. 56, n. 2. — The interpretation which I place upon the phrase ὁ ἐξ. τόνος requires perhaps to be more distinctly stated. In my judgment ὁ ἐξ. τόνος is the hexameter *mode*, and is parallel to the Lydian *mode*, the Phrygian *mode*, and the like. The spoken tone also belongs, as the ancients often recognize in a general way, among the musical modes, but, in the chanting or intoning of verse, it is regularly made subordinate to the new mode which accompanies the verse. If this interpretation of τόνος is correct, there will be found no real inconsistency in the various references which I have made to the meaning of the term; cf. also *A.J.P.* XXV, 420 (421), n. 5.

P. 59 (60), n. 1. — Compare the somewhat similar views of Goodell, *Chapters in Greek Metric*, New York, 1901, p. 167 f. Several other topics mentioned in the preceding discussion are also very clearly treated by Professor Goodell, viz. the elasticity of syllabic quantity (pp. 100, 112), the strict observance of rhythm (p. 125), the use of πλάσμα (p. 129, etc.). Professor Goodell is quite right in rejecting (p. 125) Westphal's doctrine of "a sharp separation between the rhythm of song and that of spoken verse"; on the other hand he appears to rely too much in his exposition upon modern parallels (p. 128), and to take too little account of the very important change which has taken place within historical times in the usual method of poetical delivery, although, to be sure, we find πλάσμα aptly defined (p. 50) as "the more exact observance of rhythm that goes naturally with the singing voice."

IV. — *The Accentus of the Ancient Latin Grammarians.*

BY DR. CHARLES W. L. JOHNSON,

BALTIMORE, MD.

THE evidence from which we must derive our conception of the nature of the accentuation of the Latin language is very complex. There is no unanimity among scholars even upon the general character of the accents, although it may be claimed that a considerable majority hold the view that these are stress-accents. They base their conclusions chiefly upon a study of Indo-European accentuation in general, and upon the indications which the etymology of the language and that of the languages derived from Latin afford. The direct evidence of the ancients, however, is strongly in favor of a melodic or musical accent, similar to the Greek accent, if not actually identical with it. An explanation of this state of affairs is often given, to the effect that the ancient Latin grammarians were so completely under the influence of the Greek scholars to whom they owed their erudition that they imposed upon the Latin language a Greek doctrine for which there was little or no justification in the facts. But one can not long remain satisfied with this. Is it possible for such an imposition to hold its ground for centuries? Is it possible for men, whose judgement and whose statements upon other matters we accept as sound, to be so self-deceived or so unscrupulous? Perhaps so; but even then it is our duty to dispose of their evidence by showing clearly how their misapprehension arose, or why they conspired to spread falsehood. I do not know that this has been done. At any rate, here is one aspect of the subject of Latin accentuation which deserves consideration. An exhaustive review of the situation might result in a reconciliation of the two opposing views upon the nature of the Latin accent.

So far as the scope of the present paper is concerned, we shall put narrow limits upon it. We shall ask, not "What was

the Latin accent?" but "What did the ancient Latin grammarians mean to be understood by the term *accentus*?" It is almost as important to know what they meant, as to know what were the facts; to know what they thought they heard, as to know what they really heard.

In the first place it must be admitted by all that the changes in pitch which accompany speech received recognition at the hands of the ancients, no less when the Latin language was under consideration than when the Greek language underwent an analysis of its character. The musical theorists and the grammarians attacked the subject from slightly different points, and their evidence is clear that in Greek speech there ran through the sentences a sort of melody, and that in Latin also of the period when the language was brought within the purview of Greek scholarship there existed a melodic element which resembled that of the Greek sufficiently to be identified with it. When Cicero (*Orator*, 57) speaks of a *cantus obscurior*, he is referring to the Latin language, such, presumably, as it was in his own time. The existence, at any rate, of these pitch-changes was acknowledged. Indeed, we could expect little else with the example of the Greeks before them. But we must now ask, "How much further did the ancient students of the Latin language go in their adoption of the Greek terminology, and what were the facts upon which they based their work?"

The Greek term for the melodic element in the constitution of words and sentences was oftenest *προσῳδία*. Other terms are found, like the *λογῶδες τι μέλος* of Aristoxenus (*Harmonica Elementa*, I, § 42, p. 18 M, p. 17 W), like the *διαλέκτου μέλος* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*de Compositione Verborum*, XI) and his *τὸ τῆς φωνῆς μέλος, λέγω δ' οὐ τῆς ᾠδικῆς ἀλλὰ τῆς ψιλῆς* and *τὰ μέλη τῶν φθόγγων* (*ibid.* XI, *fin.*), but the most usual expression was *προσῳδία*, and the diacritical marks with which Aristophanes of Byzantium endowed the language, the written accent signs, were called *προσῳδαίαι*, as well as *τάσεις* and *τόνοι*.¹

¹ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *de Comp. Verb.* xix: *τάσεις φωνῆς αἱ καλουμέναι προσῳδαίαι.*

This term *προσῳδία* was taken over into the Latin language in the form *accentus*, and in those passages where the term *accentus* is explained it is asserted, as clearly as words can assert anything, that the Greek *προσῳδία* and the Latin *accentus* are one and the same thing.

Aulus Gellius, XIII, 6: quas Graeci *προσῳδίας* dicunt, eas veteres docti tum 'notas vocum,' tum 'moderamenta,' tum 'accentiunculas,' tum 'vocationes' appellabant.

Diomedes, Keil, I, p. 431, 1: *accentus est dictus ab accinendo, quod sit quasi quidam cuiusque syllabae cantus. apud Graecos quoque ideo προσῳδία dicitur, quia προσάδεται ταῖς συλλαβαῖς.*

Idem, K. I, p. 456, 18: tenor, quem Graeci dicunt tasin aut prosodian, in flexibus vocis servandus est.

Servius, *de Fin.* K. IV, p. 451, 10: *accentus autem est quasi adcantus dictus, quod ad cantilenam vocis nos facit agnoscere syllabas.*

Martianus Capella, III, p. 65, 19, Eyssenhardt: et est *accentus* ut quidam putaverunt anima vocis et seminarium musices, quod omnis modulatio ex fastigiis vocum gravitateque componitur, ideoque *accentus* quasi adcantus dictus est.

There is, so far, no suggestion that the imported Greek doctrine of the accents needed amendment to apply to the Latin language. The phenomenon is the same, even if the laws governing it turn out to be different in the two languages.

Proceeding with their analysis of the sounds of the Latin language, the grammarians report that the language possessed, like the Greek, three accents, — the acute, the grave, and the circumflex. These are musical terms and translate Greek words in which also the musical idea is obvious. Just as Dionysius of Halicarnassus speaks from the standpoint of a musician, when he uses the expressions *ἡ ὀξεῖα τάσις, ἡ βαρεῖα τάσις, ὁ ὀξύς τόνος*, etc., so do the Latin grammarians employ musical terms without the least reservation or warning, when in analysing the Latin *accentus* they make their classification of *accentus acutus, accentus gravis, and accentus circumflexus.*

Varro ap. Sergium, K. IV, p. 531: prosodiam ibi esse dicimus ubi aut sursum est aut deorsum. quae demissior est a pluribus βαρεία appellatur Graece, Latine vero gravis, ideo quod deorsum est in sede scilicet ponderum graviorum. at eam quae sursum est Glaucus ἐπιτεταμένην, item alius aliter, sed nemo adhuc levem vocavit, quamvis id erat gravi contrarium; verum ea nomen obtinet ὀξεΐαν, Latine acuta, ideo quod tenuis et omne acutum tenue. inter has est μέση, Latine media, quia limes est per quem duae supra dictae ultro citroque comitantur. quartae illi, quia ceteris perplexior est, plura sunt vocabula [*i.e.* ὀξύβαρυς, περίσπασις, δίτονος, σύμπλεκτος, κεκλασμένη]. verum ea nunc ab omnibus περισπωμένη Graece vocatur, apud nos flexa, quoniam prima erecta rursus in gravem flectitur.

Nigidius Figulus ap. Aul. Gell. XIII, 25: P. Nigidii verba sunt ex commentariorum grammaticorum vicesimo quarto, hominis in disciplinis doctrinarum omnium praecellentis: Deinde, inquit, voculatio qui poterit servari, si non sciemus in nominibus, ut Valeri, utrum interrogandi an vocandi sint? nam interrogandi secunda syllaba superiore tonost quam prima, deinde novissima deicitur; at in casu vocandi summo tonost prima, deinde gradatim descendunt. sic quidem Nigidius dici praecipit. sed si quis nunc, Valerium appellans, in casu vocandi secundum id praeceptum Nigidii acuerit primam, non aberit quin rideatur. ‘summum’ autem ‘tonum’ προσφδίαν acutam dicit et quem ‘accentum’ nos dicimus ‘vocalationem’ appellat et ‘casum interrogandi’ eum dicit quem nunc nos ‘genetivum’ dicimus.

Vitruvius, *de Archit.* V, 4, 2: vox enim mutationibus cum flectitur alias fit acuta, alias gravis, duobusque modis movetur, e quibus unus affectus habet continuatos, alter distantes. [Aristoxenus’s continuous and intervallar motions of the voice are then given.]¹

Donatus, K. IV, p. 371, 1: tonos alii accentus, alii tenores nominant. toni igitur tres sunt, acutus gravis circumflexus.

¹ See the writer, “The Motion of the Voice,” in *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* XXX, p. 45, and “Accent and Accentual Arsis and Thesis,” in *Studies in Honor of B. L. Gildersleeve*, p. 57.

Diomedes, K. I, p. 430, 29: accentus est acutus vel gravis vel inflexa elatio orationis vocisve intentio vel inclinatio acuto aut inflexo sono regens verba. nam ut nulla vox sine vocali est, ita sine accentu nulla est, et est accentus, ut quidam recte putaverunt, velut anima vocis.

Sergius, K. IV, p. 482, 14: his ita se habentibus sciendum est quod acutus et gravis et circumflexus soli sunt qui, ut superius diximus, naturalem unius cuiusque sermonis in voce nostra [Keil: vocem nostrae] elationis servent tenorem.

Priscian, K. II, p. 51, 21: accidit unicuique syllabae tenor, spiritus, tempus, numerus literarum. tenor acutus vel gravis vel circumflexus.

Ps.-Priscian, K. III, p. 519, 25: accentus namque est certa lex et regula ad elevandam et deprimendam syllabam uniuscuiusque particulae orationis, qui fit ad similitudinem elementorum, litterarum, syllabarumque, qui etiam tripertito dividitur, acuto gravi circumflexo. acutus namque accentus ideo inventus est, quod acuat sive elevet syllabam; gravis vero eo, quod deprimat aut deponat; circumflexus ideo, quod deprimat et acuat.

The next step is to determine the laws governing the disposition of the accents. It was found that every Latin word, with the exception of those we call enclitic and proclitic, had one point of acuteness and one only. As in the Greek theory of accentuation, so in the Latin, every syllable was regarded as having one of the three accents, but it was not considered important either to mark the grave accents or to refer in every case to their existence, provided the other accents were attended to. Both of these contained a high pitch, for the circumflex was but a combination of acute and grave, and one or the other was found to be always present in a word. Writers would then speak of *the* accent of a word when they meant the acute or the circumflex, that is, the acute element. With this understood they formulated the law of Latin accentuation, by which the accent was confined to the last three syllables of any word (in which particular it was like the rule for Greek), and, furthermore, had the restriction placed upon it that, except in the case of monosyllables, it could not occupy

the last place (in which particular it differed from the Greek). But it was not sufficient to find the position of the accent only; it was necessary also to determine its kind, and for this there were laws which stated the facts as observed. A long penultimate syllable bore a circumflex if it was long by nature and the last syllable was short, but an acute in any other circumstances, while a short penultimate threw an acute accent back upon the antepenultimate in words of more than two syllables.

This surely is the meaning of the following passages:

Cicero, *Orator*, 57-58: mira est enim quaedam natura vocis, cuius quidem e tribus omnino sonis, inflexo, acuto, gravi, tanta sit et tam suavis varietas perfecta in cantibus. . . . in quo illud etiam notandum mihi videtur ad studium persequendae suavitatis in vocibus: ipsa enim natura, quasi modularetur hominum orationem, in omni verbo posuit acutam vocem, nec una plus nec a postrema syllaba citra tertiam, quo magis naturam duces ad aurium voluptatem sequatur industria.

Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* I, 5, 30: namque in omni voce acuta intra numerum trium syllabarum continetur, sive hae sunt in verbo solae sive ultimae, et in his aut proxima extremae aut ab ea tertia. trium porro, de quibus loquor, media longa aut acuta aut flexa erit, eodem loco brevis utique gravem habebit sonum, ideoque positam ante se id est ab ultima tertiam acuet. est autem in omni voce utique acuta, sed numquam plus una nec umquam ultima, ideoque in disyllabis prior; praeterea numquam in eadem flexa et acuta, quia in omni flexa est acuta. itaque neutra cludet vocem latinam. ea vero quae sunt syllabae unius, erunt acuta aut flexa, ne sit aliqua vox sine acuta.

Cicero's *acuta vox* is the acute element which characterizes every word, whether marked as an acute or as a circumflex accent. Schöll¹ argues that Cicero was not acquainted with a circumflex like the Greek circumflex, or he would have referred to it in the passage quoted above, which seems to mention only an acute accent. But in the passage from

¹ Schöll, *De accentu linguae latinae*, *Acta Soc. Philol. Lips.* VI, p. 34.

Quintilian it is clear what is the point of view of both writers, for the latter explicitly states that an *acuta* is a part of every *flexa*. The doctrine hangs well together.

Other passages where the laws of accentuation are given are the following :

Donatus, K. IV, p. 371, 1-30; Diomedes, K. I, p. 431, 6 ff.; Servius, K. IV, p. 426, 6-16; Sergius, K. IV, p. 482, 19 ff.; Ps.-Serg. K. IV, p. 524, 21 ff.; Pompeius, K. V, p. 127, 12 ff.; Ps.-Priscian, K. III, p. 520, 17 ff.; p. 521, 5 ff.

In these passages words are given which show all possible combinations of quantities, and the proper accent for each is stated.

Let us now consider some of the difficulties which confront those who see in all these passages a perverse determination to force upon the stress-accents of the Latin tongue rules which were invented for the musical accents of another language.

If, under the term "grave accents," we are to understand unstressed syllables, it follows that stressed syllables are those which are called in the theory acute or circumflex. The question then arises, Was such an acute accent identical with the circumflex in everything but name? That is, was the difference purely imaginary? The assumption forces us into a curious attitude toward the writers quoted. We must believe that they went to the trouble to expound rather complicated rules for the fixing of these accents upon the proper syllables, when not only was this unnecessary from the point of view of the written language, but the distinction they drew could not even be detected by the ear. The statement that the circumflex is an acute followed by a grave becomes absolutely meaningless with the new definitions. In the case of monosyllables, the absurdity of the grammarians' conduct is even greater, for here the presence of a stress-accent hardly declares itself until the word is joined with other words to form a sentence or a phrase.

The following from Donatus is an example of the manner in which this subject is dealt with by the grammarians :

Donatus, K. IV, p. 371, 8: ergo monosyllaba, quae correptam vocalem habebunt, acuto accentu pronuntiabimus, ut fáx, píx, n úx; quae productam vocalem habebunt, circumflexo accentu pronuntiabimus, ut rês, d ôs, sp ês. in disyllabis quae priorem productam habuerint et posteriorem correptam, priorem syllabam circumflectemus, ut m êta, Crêta: ubi posterior syllaba producta fuerit, acuemus priorem, sive illa correpta fuerit sive producta, ut népos, léges: ubi ambae breves fuerint, acuemus priorem, ut b ónus, málus. In trisyllabis et tetrasyllabis et deinceps, si paenultima correpta fuerit, acuemus antepaenultimam, ut Túllius, Hostílius: si paenultima positione longa fuerit, ipsa acuetur et antepaenultima gravi accentu pronuntiabitur, ut Catúllus, Metéllus, ita tamen si positione longa non ex muta et liquida fuerit; nam mutabit accentum, ut látebrae, ténebrae: si ultima brevis fuerit, paenultima vero natura longa, paenultima circumflectetur, ut Cethêgus, perôsus: si ultima quoque natura longa fuerit, paenultima acuetur, ut Athénæ, Mýcénæ.

Here and in the other passages it is not a case of confusion between quantity and accent, although the latter depends upon the former.

A number of writers comment on the contrast presented by the two languages, Greek and Latin, in the matter of the laws governing their accentuation. Now, if the Latin accent was radically different from the Greek, what point is there in these comments? Quintilian complains that the Latin language is the poorer for the restriction which prevented an acute or circumflex from falling on a final syllable.

Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* XII, 10, 33: sed accentus quoque cum rigore quodam, tum similitudine ipsa minus suaves habemus, quia ultima syllaba nec acuta unquam excitatur, nec flexa circumducitur, sed in gravem vel duas graves cadit semper. itaque tanto est sermo Graecus Latino iucundior, ut nostri poetae, quotiens dulce carmen esse voluerunt, illorum id nominibus exornent.

Is it likely that Quintilian is here comparing two such dissimilar things as a Latin stress-accent and the Greek

melodic or musical accent and remained unconscious of the difference? And if so, how did the introduction of Greek words help the Latin poets?

Athenaeus (*Deipnosoph.* X, 425 a) says that the Romans imitate the Aeolians in all things, even in their accentuation. Both languages are barytone. It is easier to hold that the Aeolic dialect was stressed in the time of Athenaeus than that a faulty comparison was here drawn between essentially different things.

We are told that Greek words retain their Greek accents when they occur in Latin:

Donatus, K. IV, p. 371, 27; Servius, K. IV, p. 427, 10; Sergius, K. IV, p. 483, 33; Ps.-Sergius, K. IV, p. 525, 8; Diomedes, K. I, p. 433, 4.

Now, what is it that they really retained—a musical accent or a stress-accent occupying the place of the musical accent? Servius on Virgil, *Geor.* I, 59, remarks that we must pronounce *Epiros* with an acute on the first syllable, besides keeping the Greek termination *-os*. See Lindsay, *The Lat. Lang.*, p. 155. What is the real difference in the pronunciation? It can not be a matter of stress accentuation, for the penult is long in either case, and according to the prevailing doctrine in regard to *ictus*, we must suppose the accents to have become obliterated in verse. If, however, the accents are musical or melodic, this difficulty of a conflict between *ictus* and accent vanishes. Accent and *ictus* mingle harmlessly.

Interjections, moreover, are reported to have no definite accents. In the case of monosyllabic interjections this remark would seem to be quite superfluous, if their accents are stress-accents, of which neither definite nor indefinite sorts are readily conceived.

Donatus, K. IV, p. 371, 24: *accentus in integris dictionibus observantur, in interiectionibus et in peregrinis verbis et in barbaris nominibus nulli certi sunt.* Cf.:

Diomedes, K. I, p. 433, 31; Sergius, K. IV, p. 483, 29; Ps.-Priscian, K. III, p. 520, 23.

Certain light is also thrown on the belief of the ancient writers by their definition of the syllable. The syllable is a group of elementary sounds uttered in one breath and with one *accentus*. This definition contemplates the difference in the sound of a syllable according as it is spoken with an acute, a grave, or a circumflex, and the distinction between stressed and unstressed syllables does not seem to be tangible enough to call for mention when the syllable is considered, as it were, *in vacuo*.

Marius Victorinus, K. VI, p. 26: *syllaba est coniunctio litterarum cum vocali vel vocalibus sub uno accentu et spiritu continuata.*

Now the evidence given above is not presented as an exhaustive collection of the passages bearing on the subject. As already stated, the nature of the Latin accent is not to be derived solely from the *testimonia* of the ancients. I have not considered the evidence of the language itself, as revealed in its etymology, nor the evidence of verse-forms; but then the field of the inquiry was narrowed so as to exclude all these. The object was to ascertain what phenomenon in the Latin language was originally understood by the term *accentus*. I believe that it was a melodic or musical accent, but this does not preclude a belief in the simultaneous existence of a stress-accent. Such an accent may have existed from early times; it may have been present in the Saturnian metre and in the verse of Plautus and Terence; it may never have died out from the language, even that spoken at Rome; or it may have done so only to revive again when Latin was in its decline. We know that the Greek accents were converted from musical to stressed accents, and the corresponding phenomenon in Latin may have taken place at the same time or even earlier. At any rate it is curious that the direct evidence of ancient writers should contain so little in support of a stress-accent. It is not my wish to conceal such evidence if I could; it is all in Schöll's article. But we must handle all this grammatical lore of the ancients with constant recollection of the fact that, while most of the matter is traditional, some of it may always be original contribution,

or may be so modified as to become such. Many of the later grammarians lived at a time when there is no difficulty in admitting that the accent was stressed. The rules of accentuation were obsolete in their day, and it is not strange that they should have made positive errors in transcribing the doctrine which had come down to them, or should have attempted to make an adjustment to meet the existing situation. The following passages should be considered together. They seem to contain the doctrine of Donatus.

Servius, *in Don.* K. IV, p. 426, 16: *accentus in ea syllaba est quae plus sonat. quam rem deprehendimus, si fingamus nos aliquem longe positum clamare. . invenimus enim naturali ratione illam syllabam plus sonare quae retinet accentum, atque usque eodem nisum vocis adscendere.*

Pompeius, *Comm. Artis Don.* K. V, p. 126, 18: [The grave accent is superfluous. Every word has either an acute or a circumflex.] *ut puta malesanus; sa circumflexum habet, male nus istae tres syllabae gravem habent accentum. nam ideo dictus est gravis hac ratione, quod minus sonet, quam sonat ille legitimus. . . . sa plus sonat. ideo dictae sunt illae habere gravem accentum, quod et pigrum et minus sonent.*

Idem, K. V, p. 126, 32: *ergo illa syllaba quae accentum habet, plus sonat quasi ipsa habet maiorem potestatem. et quo modo invenimus ipsum accentum? et hoc traditum est. sunt plerique qui naturaliter non habent acutas aures ad capiendos hos accentus, et inducitur hac arte. finge tibi quasi vocem clamantis ad longe aliquem positum. [In the word *orator* it will be found that *ra plus sonat.*]*

Codex Bernensis 16, K. Suppl., p. xlv: *accentus est anima verborum sive vox syllabae, quae in sermone plus sonat de ceteris syllabis. accentus autem a cantu vocatus est, quia in ipso cantu producitur modulatio vocis.*

Here it is said that the accented syllable of any word sounds louder than the others. This may very well be true for the time of Donatus (fourth century), but it is curious that Servius and Pompeius consider it necessary to give a criterion for the accent, as if it were a difficult matter to discover it.

The most important question with us is, How much weight are we to attach to these statements in determining what was the nature of the Latin accent at the time when the laws governing it were first formulated? For that time the weight of the evidence is for the existence of what we may safely call, not an accent, but an *accentus* of a melodic or musical character.

V. — *The Āntikalpa of the Atharva-Veda.*

BY DR. GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING,

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA.

A. MATERIAL FOR THE CONSTITUTION OF THE TEXT.

THE text is based on Weber's transcript of No. 363 (Chambers 144) in the *Verzeichniss der Sanskrit Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin* (Vol. I, p. 89), the only Ms. of the *Āntikalpa* mentioned by Aufrecht. This Ms. bears the date, *saṃvat* 1658, and is written in *devanāgarī*. Weber distinguishes two hands, of which the second has generally but not invariably preserved the better reading. The Ms. is evidently a good one, its chief failure being a tendency to interchange long and short *i*; besides this occur interchanges of the sibilants with one another and of *kh* with *ṣ*, though in these and other respects it is far superior to the Mss. of the *Parīṣṭas*.

Weber's transcript is the property of the Library of Congress, having recently been purchased by it, together with the rest of his library. It is written in Latin letters, and with separation of the words. No attempt, however, at emendation is made beyond the correction of the most glaring errors. These are obviated in various ways: (1) by a selection between the readings of the two hands; (2) missing letters are supplied in parentheses; (3) the correct form is written with the Ms. reading above it, e.g. *ghṛtāktā*, with "*tkā* Cod." above; (4) much more frequently a dot is placed under an offending letter or a line under a syllable; exclamation points sometimes emphasize the absurdity of a variant. Upon *kandikās* 7-11 the readings of the Chambers codex of *Nakṣatrakalpa* 37-41 have been collated.

These matters I detail here because I have not considered it to be my duty to reproduce them in detail in the critical apparatus, in which it has been my purpose merely to record the readings of the codex. Any emendations which seem to

me of importance, I have discussed in the commentary or introduction. For these I am responsible except in so far as explicit statements to the contrary are made. Credit for all other corrections may be given to Weber, and I am of course solely responsible for any mistakes.

No other Ms. of this text is recorded by Aufrecht, but one apparently calling it, as Sāyaṇa does, the *Nakṣatralpa* was used by Shankar Paṇḍit for his edition of the Atharva-Veda. The library of His Highness the Mahārāja of Bikāner also contained two copies of an *Atharvavedīya-mahācānti* that must have corresponded (cf. Rājendralāla Mitra's catalogue, Nos. 299, 300) with the second part of our text. The same is probably true of the Atharvan *Āntikādhyāya* and *Ānti-vidhi*, belonging to the Mahārāja of Alwar (cf. Peterson, Detailed report of operations in search of Sanskrit Mss. in the Bombay Circle, 2. 182). A *Mahācāntipaddhati* in 260 *ślokas*, which is described by Rājendralāla Mitra in his *Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts*, No. 835, is connected with our text; but this is not the case with the *Āntikalpadīpikā*, *ib.* No. 904. I was informed at the British Museum in 1899 that it possessed a copy of an Atharvan *Mahācānti*, related to the Berlin Ms. of the *Āntikalpa*, but as I then had no intention of editing the text I made no collation of it. The short quotations from the Indian Mss. show a very corrupt text.

Kaṇḍikās 7-11 of the *Āntikalpa* are identical with *Nakṣatralpa* 37-41; for these I have employed also six manuscripts of the *Nakṣatralpa*. Five of these have been previously described (cf. Hatfield, *JAOS.* XV, 207); the sixth (St) is a copy of a Ms. which was sent to me from India by my friend, the late A. W. Stratton, Registrar of the Punjab University, and Principal of the Oriental College of Lahore. A complete collation of the variants of these Mss. is reserved for my edition of the *Nakṣatralpa*, but all the variants of importance are mentioned in the commentary.

A considerable portion of this text is quoted by Sāyaṇa, as the *Nakṣatralpa*; these quotations I have collected in the critical apparatus, and have added all variants of the Mss. of his commentary (S'Kd.), and also of the editor's Ms. of the

Çāntikalpa (P.) whenever reported, by Shankar Paṇḍit. Quotations occurring in portions of the commentary supplied by the editor are included as giving the testimony of P., but are distinguished by being enclosed in parentheses.

B. CONTENTS OF THE TEXT AND ITS POSITION IN THE ATHARVAN LITERATURE.

The text takes its name from the fact that it contains the ritual for the *adbhutamahāçānti* or "great ceremony for averting the evil effects of omens and portents" which is most frequently spoken of in the Atharvan ritual as simply the *mahāçānti* and even occasionally as the *çānti*, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*. With four other texts it constitutes the five *kalpas* mentioned in the *Caranavyūha*, AVPar. 49. 4. 3: *pañca kalpā bhavanti*.

nakṣatrakalpo vāitānakalpas tṛtīyaḥ saṃhitāvidhiḥ :
caturtha āṅgirasakalpaḥ çāntikalpas tu pañcamah.

This classification is so persistently maintained by the Hindu tradition that *pañcakalpin*, "one who possesses (*i.e.* operates with) the five kalpas," has become a designation of certain adherents of the Atharva-Veda (cf. Bloomfield, *The Atharva-Veda*, p. 16). Nevertheless, it is obvious that this classification has brought together, for unknown reasons,¹ works of very different value. Among them are found the *Kāuṣika* and *Vāitāna Sūtras* on the one hand, and on the other, three texts, which as far as we can see might properly have been included among the *Pariçiṣṭas*. The *Nakṣatra-kalpa* is, in fact, regularly counted as the first *Pariçiṣṭa*, but there is no evidence to show that either of the other two *kalpas* was ever included in that collection. Of these three minor *kalpas* the *Āṅgirasakalpa* is known only from a short abstract by Sāyaṇa, Introduction to his commentary on the

¹ Rhys-Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 168, considers the term Vedānta (except in its literal sense) an imitation of the Buddhistic term Suttanta. A similar relationship might be assumed between Pañcakalpin and Pañcanekāyika, and if the number five is thus explained, no better selection of texts could have been made to make up that number.

Atharva-Veda, p. 28. The other two texts are known from manuscripts, and it is my intention to publish shortly an edition of the *Nakṣatrakalpa* together with the other *Parīṣiṣṭas*.

The position of the text in the Atharvan literature may be summarized as follows: it presupposes a knowledge of the Atharvan *Samhitā* in the *Çāunaka* recension and also of the *Kāuṣika Sūtra*. Its dependence upon the latter text is evidenced, not only by the fact that it cites (15. 5; 18. 2) by *pratīka* the *mantras* of *Kāuṣika* 97. 8, but also by a very consistent maintenance of the *Kāuṣikan* tradition of the manipulation of the hymns that not infrequently extends even to verbal correspondences. This cannot fail to strengthen the credit of our text for the treatment of such hymns as are not rubricated in the *Kāuṣika*. Such hymns are found especially in the nineteenth book of the *Samhitā*, upon which our text draws freely in a way that shows its advance from the standpoint of the *Kāuṣika*, a fact that is evinced also in its greater elaboration of ceremonies common to both texts.

Of the *Parīṣiṣṭas* our text seems to have drawn upon the *Nakṣatrakalpa*, though perhaps the relations of the two texts may better be explained by the assumption of a common source. It also is acquainted with the ceremony of the *Tiladhenu*, which is the subject of the ninth *Parīṣiṣṭa*. On the other hand, the *Uktaparīṣiṣṭānām Kartavyakālāḥ*, AVPar. 18^a. 15. 1, speaks of the *daṣagaṇā mahāçāntiḥ*; the *Gaṇamālā*, AVPar. 32, arranges its first nineteen *gaṇas* in the order in which they are employed at the *Mahāçānti*; the *Caranavyūha* (cf. above) cites our text; and finally, most of the *Parīṣiṣṭas*, beginning with 31, prescribe a *Mahāçānti* (cf. in addition to passages cited below, 33^b. 4; 52. 1. 81; 58. 1. 13; 58^a. 3. 31; 59. 1. 19; 68. 5. 28). There is no reason to doubt that the ceremony meant is the one described in our text, with which there are not infrequently coincidences of detail.

The ceremony itself must be preceded by a series of preliminary ceremonies for the propitiation of various powers. The first of these in our text is a *nakṣatrāṇām upacārah*. This is probably the cause of Sāyaṇa's mistake of citing this text as the *Nakṣatrakalpa*, which he does consistently, cf.

Bloomfield, *SBE*. XLII, p. 233, except for a variant *çāntikalpe*, at AV 19. 13, p. 317. Two passages in the *Pariçīṣṭas* show a further elaboration in virtue of which a *grahayāgaḥ* is prefixed to this *nakṣatrayāgaḥ*. These are :

AVPar. 70. 9. 2 ff. :

devatānām tato yāgam yathāçruti samācaret.
Yāgam kṛtvā grahāṇām tu nakṣatrāṇām tataḥ param :
ṛtūn athā "rtavānṣ cāi 'va mahādevagaṇādhipān.
Dīçaṣ ca vidīçaṣ cāi 'va yamendravarunāns tathā :
viçveçvaram ca viṣṇum ca yajetā 'dbhutakarma ca.
Sūryācandramasāv agnīm sarvān grahagaṇāns tathā :
vāyūn tathā 'çvināu cāi 'va mahāçāntīvidhānataḥ.

AVPar. 18^a. 15. 1 :

pratidinam grahayāgaḥ. pratidinam nakṣatrayāgaḥ. pratidinam
daçaganā mahāçāntīḥ.

Now Sāyana's quotations from the text which he calls the *Çāntikalpa*, show that it was the ritual for a *grahayāga*, and we may with great probability assume that it is the one referred to in these passages. The *Nakṣatrakalpa*, as we know it, is never referred to by Sāyana.

The *nakṣatrāṇām upacārah* is performed as follows: the celebrant, clothed in a new garment, covers with a new cloth the seats for the *Nakṣatras*, which are situated to the east of the fire. To these he brings pictures, or images made of wood or metal, of the *Nakṣatras*, which are placed with their faces towards the west, *i.e.* to face the fire. The bringing in of each *Nakṣatra* is accompanied by a laudatory *çloka*, which are perhaps the *nakṣastrastutayah* of *Nakṣatrakalpa*, 42. 4. These verses are given in *sakalapāṭha*, and may be compared in general with those similarly employed at the bringing in of the image of Skanda in the *Skandayāga*, AVPar. 20. 2; ed. by Goodwin, *JAOS*. 1890, p. v. ff. The most interesting thing in them is the astrological classification of the *Nakṣatras* into the *dāruṇa*, *ugra*, *mṛdu*, *dhruva*, *cara*, *ksīpra*, and *sādhā-rana*. Compare Weber, *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Nakṣatra*, II, p. 385, who fails to note that this text applies

the term *sādhāraṇa* to the *Kṛttikās* and *Viçākhā*. This correction reduces to a minimum the discrepancy with Mādhava. The classification in Bṛh. Saṁ. 98. 6–11 is also identical, except for the omission of *Abhijit*; its employment may be seen besides in Bṛh. Saṁ. 32. 19; 55. 31; 60. 21.

The color for each Nakṣatra is prescribed, and flowers, garments, and ointment of corresponding colors must be given to them with AV 9. 3. 23–28, and the words, “May their worships the Nakṣatras receive these.” Then at the end of the *ājyabhāgāu* he offers *ājya* with AV 19. 7 and 8;¹ *havis*, with the *nakṣatradāivātā mantrāḥ*; *ājya* again with AV 19. 7 and 8. He then puts fuel on the fire, worships with the *abhaya* hymn (according to Sāyaṇa AV 6. 40, but more probably with the *abhayagaṇa*, for which, cf. Kāuṣ. 16. 8; 104. 3 notes), and brings the *tantra* to its close. The verses with which the offering of the *havis* is accompanied are twenty-eight in number, and recur also in *sakalapāṭha* in *Nakṣatrankalpa*, 37–41. In *Nakṣatrankalpa*, 42. 5, they are rubricated under the designation *nakṣatradāivātā mantrāḥ* at the *nakṣatrasnānavidhi*. As to the origin of these verses — the Vedic Concordance, as far as printed, shows no parallels. In language and metre they are more archaic than either of these *kalpas*. The text is practically identical in both *kalpas*, even where it is manifestly corrupt, and consequently was probably stereotyped in a corrupt form before the composition of either *kalpa*. Accordingly, I conceive my duty to be to reproduce this text, reserving all emendations for the commentary. The verses may have come originally from the latest portion of some other *çākhā* of the Atharva, in which case we may compare the perpetuation of the corruptions of AV 19. 7 and 8 in the *Nakṣatrankalpa*. The fact that these verses are given in *sakalapāṭha* and not cited by *pratīka*, makes it improbable that our text was drawing directly upon the *Nakṣatrankalpa*.

The *havīṁsi* for each *Nakṣatra* are listed in a separate section; occasionally the same substance and *Nakṣatra* are

¹ These hymns are here cited by *pratīka*, whereas in NK they are given in *sakalapāṭha*.

brought into correlation in the *Nakṣatralpa*, either by prescribing it to be eaten under the *Nakṣatra*, or its use in the *Nakṣatrasnāna*.

A similar list of *dakṣiṇās* is given, evidently drawn from a metrical source which (or a reproduction of which) is found in the *Nakṣatralpa*, 47-50.

This ceremony must have had other applications than serving as an introduction to the *Mahāçānti*, and its independence is recognized by the marked transition with which our text turns to the *Mahāçānti* itself. The name of this ceremony occurs in the *Kāuṣika*, 39. 7, 27; 43. 5; 44. 6; 46. 7; 69. 7 (cf. also 9. 5 note), but in all these passages it seems to refer to a *caturgaṇī çāntiḥ*, a ceremony so much simpler that it has in common with our text little except the name. Furthermore the *Kāuṣika* does not employ the *Mahāçānti* in its thirteenth *adhyāya*, which deals with the subject of omens and portents, while this is the very purpose for which the *Mahāçānti* of the *Çāntikalpa* and *Pariçiṣṭas* is intended.

First the celebrant worships with the *mantras* specified — the *Dīças*, *Vidīças*, *Yama*, *Indra*, *Varuṇa*, *Viṣveçvara*, *Viṣṇu*, the sun and moon; or according to others *Agni*, the *Grahas*, *Vāyu*, and the *Açvins*. These alternative series are combined in the passage AVPar. 70. 9. 2 ff., quoted above. Sāyaṇa ignores the use of the *mantras* of the second series, and perhaps P omits them as its reading: *çivās te saṁtv oṣadhaya iti sūryācandramasāv (!) iti*, looks like the end of the *kaṇḍikā*. The author's adherence to tradition may be seen from the following: Kāuṣ. 127. 4-8 furnishes the *mantras* for *Varuṇa*, *Vāyu*, the *Dīças*, and *Agni*; Kāuṣ. 81. 34, 35 that of *Yama*; the *ādityādayo grahāḥ* are provided for by employing a hymn used at the worship of the rising sun, Kāuṣ. 58. 22, and in case the sun is eclipsed, Kāuṣ. 99. 3; for *Indra's mantra* cf. Vāit 2. 14; 3. 3; the *Açvins'*, Vāit 19. 4; *Viṣṇu's*, Vāit 10. 1, the *mantra* being AV 7. 26. 3° (Sāyaṇa), not VS 5. 38, etc. (Garbe). In two cases the author has made his own selection, both times judiciously, viz. AV 8. 2. 15 for *Sūryācandramasāu*, and AV 11. 4. 23 for *Viṣveçvara*, as it begins *yo asya viçvajanmana iḥe*.

The mention of the *ādityādayo grahāḥ* would fix, according to Jacobi, *ZDMG.* XXX, 306, the time of composition of the text as later than 200 A.D.; on the other hand it is older than the *Pariçiṣṭas*, which precede by some interval the *Bṛhat Saṃhitā*, the author of which is said to have died 587 A.D.

The next step in the preparations is the propitiation of *Nirṛti*, the goddess Destruction. This indeed seems to be requisite at all ceremonies to secure prosperity (cf. Kāuṣ. 18. 6) *proṣya tām uttarasyām sâmpadam kurute*, Caland following Dārila's: *brahmacārisâmpadam* limits it to the ceremonies of Kāuṣ. 11. 1-13. 12, but Keçava takes a broader view: *tataḥ karmāṇi kuryât pāuṣṭikāni sâmpadāni ca*, which is borne out by the arrangement of the *Kāuṣika*, in which the ceremonies to propitiate *Nirṛti* are placed immediately before the *pāuṣṭikāni*. The *Çāntikalpa* contains two ceremonies for this purpose, that were doubtless originally intended as alternatives. The employment of both, however, is required at the *Mahāçānti* as the omission of the latter part is mentioned 24. 3, as one of the characteristics of the *Daçaganā Çāntiḥ*. That they are an essential part of the ceremony is recognized by the *Koṭihoma*, AVPar. 31. 5. 6 :

Mahāçāntīvidhānena nirmathyā 'gnīm samāhitāḥ :
tāvāt kuryād budhaḥ sarvaṃ yāvan no nairṛtaṃ kṛtam.

The celebrant clad in a black garment kindles by night in *vīraṇa*-grass (*andropogon muricatus*) a fire at a cross-roads to the southwest of his village, taking the light from a funeral fire. To the south of this fire he erects a clay image representing *Nirṛti* in a black garment — the image is placed with its face towards the north. He adorns it with black flowers, burns incense, and makes a *balī*-offering of split(?) and bearded grains, certain cakes, ground sesame, liquor, meal, sour gruel of fruits, meat, honey, edible bulbs of the *dioscorea alata*, fruits, flowers, a porridge of rice and sesame, fish and cakes. Then with his face towards the statue (consequently with his back to the fire?), he offers with the *mantras* specified raw flesh, *iṅgiḍa* oil instead of *ājya*, chaff, the points and panicles of reeds, thorns of a plant called "dogstooth," and

grains, each separately but mixed with pebbles, then reed points without such mixture, then an oblation of pebbles. He makes an oblation of chaff in a saucer that has been in contact with the fire, and breaks the saucer over the back of an ass with the words, "Slain are the haters of the Brahmans."

Or he may offer a kettle of rice to *Nirṛti*. He goes down to the water (after both of these ceremonies?) muttering AV 6. 26. 1, fastens to the bank of a navigable river, where it makes a bend to the south, a mat of drift reeds, sprinkles it while reciting the *apām sūktāni*, throws the black garment in the water, puts on a new garment, utters a benediction, puts on sandals, turns round while reciting AV 10. 1. 32 (7. 13. 1, according to Sāyaṇa), and returns home.

The last part of the ceremony is the clearest; its kernel is composed of the *paribhāṣās* for *nirṛtikarmāṇi*, Kāuṣ. 18. 2-5; to this is added a prescription from Kāuṣ. 39. 26, where there is also question of getting rid of dangerous substances; and finally the author has prefixed, apparently of his own accord, the direction for the muttering of AV 6. 26. 1.

The first part is alluded to in the *Ghṛtakambala* AVPar. 33^a. 1. 3 f.:

niçākāle bahirgrāme kuryād agniveçanam.

Yajeta nirṛtiṃ tatra kṛṣṇavāsā(ç) catuspathe :

yathoktair nāirṛtair mantrāi(r) havirbhiç ca yathākramam.

Its offerings of flowers, incense, and the multiplicity of gifts are characteristics of the later ritual, that have abundant parallels in the *Parīçiṣṭas*. The time, place, black garments, and *vīraṇa*-grass are familiar elements in the *nirṛtikarmāṇi* and other uncanny practices. The *kravyāda agniḥ* seems most naturally to mean a fire kindled from a funeral fire, though that it may have a wider meaning may be seen from Caland, p. 149, Anm. 6; comparable is the *Koṭihoma*, AVPar. 31. 9. 2, with its use of uncanny fires :

cāṇḍālāgnāu citāgnāu vā sūtikāgnāv athā 'pi vā

hāvayed (cf. the fuller text ap. Caland, p. 183).

For the offering of split (?) grains, cf. Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 176; the beard of grains evidently has the

same evil symbolism as the thorns of trees (cf. Kāuṣ. 83. 11, where the direction is given to select a place on which grow thornless trees and plants). Raw flesh is the food of demons, AV 8. 6. 23, and employed accordingly in witchcraft, AV 4. 17. 4; 5. 31. 1. For *īṅgiḍa* oil, cf. the witchcraft *paribhāṣā*, Kāuṣ. 47. 3; for chaff, cf. Bloomfield, 557, 617; for reeds, Kāuṣ. 47. 1, and the use of *ṣarabhṛṣṭi* at the sinister performances of 36. 14; 47. 43. Pebbles are mixed with the offerings in a *nirṛtikarman*, Kāuṣ. 18. 13, and in the exorcism of the storm, ib. 38. 5.

Of the *mantras*, AV 8. 2. 12, 13 and *ape 'ta etu nirṛtiḥ* are employed in Kāuṣ. 97, in case of quarrelling in the family, when it is considered *nirṛtigṛhītam*; AV 6. 63 and 84 are rubricated in Kāuṣ. 52. 3 at a ceremony for freeing one from fetters. The hymns show that the fetters meant are those of *Nirṛti*, and if in the *Kāuṣika* more material bonds are meant, our text has returned to a conception more in accord with the primary purpose of the hymns. AV 4. 36 is an imprecation against *Piṣācas*, evil-disposed demons; in the last stanza they are delivered over to *Nirṛti*. The celebrant of our ceremony desires this to be done with all malevolent powers, and accordingly employs this hymn while the other *mantras* are to secure his own liberation.

Of the *Mahācānti* thirty variations are named, partly from their divinities, partly from the objects to be secured. None of these names occurs in the earlier ritual, but about half of them in the *Pariṣiṣṭas*. These, with the number of their occurrences, are: *Amṛtā* (11); *Rāudrī* (10); *Māhendrī* (5); *Vāiṣṇadevī*, *Abhayā* (3); *Āindrī*, *Aparājitā*, *Vāruṇī* (2); *Brāhmī Prājāpatyā*, *Gāyatrī*(?), *Kāuberī*, *Ādityā Yāmyā* (1). *Vāyavī* is employed at 70^a. 4. 1 instead of *Vāyavyā*; a *Sāuryī cāntiḥ* is mentioned at 70^a. 6. 5, which is not identical with the *Ādityā* of our text, and at 70^b. 29. 1 a *Kāpotā cāntiḥ*. But apart from these no *cānti*, except those of this list, is prescribed in the *Pariṣiṣṭas*.

The occasions on which each variety is to be used are next specified. The scope of many, however, is so badly defined that it is impossible to justify each prescription of a certain

form in the *Pariçīṣṭas*; the following passages, however, may be quoted: AVPar. 72. 5. 1 f.: *yatra yac chayanc vā 'tha vastre vā jāyate hutācanaḥ | etad atyadbhutaṁ nāma sarvakṣayakaraṁ nṛṇāṁ || atra brāhmīṁ mahāçāntiṁ kārāyed*; 72. 5. 2: *rājya-kāmo 'rthakāmo vā pūjayet tu brhaspatim*; 70. 13. 2: *prājā-patyāṁ tataḥ çāntiṁ praçārthi kārāyen nṛpaḥ*; 31. 8. 1: *paracakrāgame tv āindri*, and at 65. 3. 6 it is: *avrṣṭes tu vināçāni*; for the *Rāudri* cf. 64. 10. 10: *sarvarogapraçamanīm*, 31. 8. 2: *rāudri sarvādbhutotpattāu*, 70^a. 10. 1: *vṛkṣādbhutavināçīni*; 65. 3. 6 the *Vāruṇi* is *avrṣṭes tu vinaçīni*; at 70^a. 4. 1, the *Vāyavyā* is prescribed in case of *vāyavyeṣu (utpāteṣu)*, which include an *akālika vāyuh*; at 60. 1. 6 the *Abhayā* is prescribed in case of danger, *bhaye*.

The ceremonial differences between these varieties of the *Mahāçānti* consist in the employment of different *mantras* at the *āvāpas* (for which cf. Hillebrandt, *op. cit.*, p. 72) and of different amulets. These are next specified.

For the *āvāpikā mantrāḥ*, whenever a *gaṇa* of the same name exists, it is employed — thus the *rudra-*, *aparājita-*, *vāstospatya-*, and *abhayagaṇas* — except that the *ādityagaṇa*, AVPar. 32. 19^b, is not employed.¹

Similarly the *nirṛtimantrāḥ* (the term is new) are employed at the *Nāirṛti*; sometimes the connection is etymological; so the *bhāuma anuvāka* at the *Pārthivī* and the *citrāgaṇa* at the *Bhārgavī*. Sometimes the hymns are similarly employed in the *Kāuçika*, either in the worship of the same god (cf. *Prājāpatyā* and Kāuç. 127. 9; *Bārhaspatyā* and Kāuç. 59. 19) or to obtain a similar object at the *kāmyāni karmāṇi* — cf. *Vaiçvadevī* and Kāuç. 59. 1; *Āgneyī* and Kāuç. 59. 15; *Āindri* and Kāuç. 59. 5. The *vyāhṛti-* and *chando-gaṇas* do not occur elsewhere. In harmony with our text, AVPar. 70^a. 4. 1: *vāyavyām eva çāntāu ca vāyoh savitur. āvapet*.

Setting aside the hymns from the nineteenth book, all the hymns except three are rubricated in the *Kāuçika* for the

¹ The *Gaṇamālā*, AVPar. 32, contains thirty-two *gaṇas*; the first nineteen of these are those employed at the *Mahāçānti* in the order in which they are there rubricated. With 19^b begins a change in form which suggests that the remainder of the text is a later addition.

tying on of amulets of the same substance as are here prescribed. In one of these cases, the same substance is used in Kāuṣ. 28. 9, but not as an amulet. Noteworthy is the fact that our text substitutes for *mantruktam* of Kāuṣ. 26. 35, *sahasrakāṇḍam* found in the third stanza of the hymn, while the commentators explain it as *yavamāṇi* for reasons given by Bloomfield, p. 285.

The *Amṛtā* is then explained as the *tantra* of all the forms; that is, their performance differs only in the substitution of the proper *āvāpikā mantrāḥ* and of another amulet with its corresponding *mantra*. The celebrant, who must know AV 19. 1. 1, takes pure water from rivers or pools and recites over it that *mantra*. He then performs the Full Moon Sacrifice to the end of the *ājyabhāgāu* (note that this may be done on any day (cf. above *pratidināni daṣaḡaṇā cāntih*), a fact that bears on the discussion; Caland, p. vi f., and Bloomfield, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1902, p. 495 f.); he then consecrates the holy water, afterwards reciting AV 19. 2. 1; 8. 7. 26 [close parallels are Kāuṣ. 44. 3, 4; 53. 6, 7; 136. 9; cf. the commentators to the first two passages]; he thrice sprinkles the fire with the water, places part in a jar for washing (certain unspecified objects), and retains part for the rest of the ceremony. He then makes an oblation of fibres of the *aṣvattha* tree (?), rice, barley, horseradish, water, bdellium, and poison (!).

Another oblation of pepper, *abrus precatorius*, *lagenaria vulgaris*, reed panicles and points, accompanied by the *cātanagana*; another oblation of *iṅgiḍa* oil with the same *gaṇa*; then various kinds of wood are placed on the fire, and he worships with the same *gaṇa*. Then without a *mantra* he makes an oblation of various plants.

At this point is intercalated a ceremony which is an elaboration of that described in Kāuṣ. 51. 14, for the protection of a house. Its requisites are a staff of *tumbara*-wood, a *sadam-puṣpā*-plant, yellow mustard plants with ten leaves, ten stones, and sand. These are covered with the leavings of an oblation (of *ājya*) made with AV 5. 10, some of which is also placed in the holy water. He draws circles in all parts of

the house (one in each corner, in the middle of each side, in the centre, and on the roof, *i.e.* one for each of the *diças*), pours the sand into them, sprinkles them with holy water, and puts a stone in each one. Above the door he draws another circle, proceeds as before, and places the staff, etc., in it. He makes separate oblations to the *diças* with AV 3. 26, and worships them with AV 3. 27. The leavings are placed in a jar while oblations are made with the subsequent *mantras*.

Then he recites ten *gaṇas* and the *Apratiratha* hymn (AV 19. 13); this must be muttered a second time, and he must recite AV 4. 13. 1; 5. 30. 1; 8. 1. 1; 2. 1, and 11. 4. 1-12; then AV 11. 4. 13; then the *āvāpikā mantrāḥ* and the rest of AV 11. 4; then the *Rudra-* and *Rāudra-gaṇas* (this seems an interpolation, as it is inconsistent with the arithmetic of 24. 3, 4).

Then eight other *gaṇas* are recited; the omission of these and the "lower part" of the *nāirṛtaṃ karma* constitutes the difference between the *Mahāçānti* and the *Daçagaṇā çāntiḥ*. At the end of all the *gaṇas* he must have the Brahmins pronounce benedictions (cf. AVPar. 33^a 3. 3: *gaṇānteṣu yathāçakti brāhmaṇān svastivācayet*).

Then follows an oblation of bdellium in silence, the bestowal of a gift upon the *Rakṣas*, oblations with the *āyuṣya-* and *patnīvanta-gaṇas*, the leavings of which are placed respectively upon the *yajamāna* and his wife. The washing (*āplavanam*; cf. Caland, p. 12, Anm. 9) of the person for whom the rite is performed follows.

The amulet of rice and barley is next fastened on, after it has been anointed with the leavings of an oblation made with AV 11. 4. A pot of rice is cooked according to the *pākajajña* ritual, offered with the *Āvāpikā mantrāḥ*, and then the Full Moon Sacrifice is brought to a close. Feasts to the Brahmins are given and fees, the specifications for which are in concord with Kāuṣ. 94. 16, 17 (cf. Weber, *Omina und Portenta*, p. 354).

The ceremony is characterized by such a heaping up both of *mantras* and ceremonies as to preclude the hope of finding much clear symbolism underlying either.

C. LANGUAGE AND METRE.

Three strata are to be distinguished: the text proper, the twenty-eight *çlokas* of the *āvāhana*, and the *Nakṣatradāivatā mantrāḥ*, the last two being quotations.

The *Nakṣatradāivatā mantrāḥ*: on account of the condition of the text it is profitless to attempt a detailed account of their peculiarities. The metre is *jagatī* mingled with *triṣ-ṭubh*; unlike the *jagatī* verses of the *Pariçiṣṭas*, they do not conform to the classic requirements, but show the freedom of the older period and the imperfections that are characteristic of Atharvan metres (cf. Bloomfield, *The Atharva-Veda*, p. 41). Hiatus, resolution of semivowels, and protraction of long vowels occur; a clear case of double *saṁdhi*, *nòragāiḥ* for *na uragāiḥ*, is warranted by the metre in 8. 2, but this test fails in 10. 3, where the Mss. are divided. The weight of Ms. authority is in favor of the omission of *visarga* before *st-*. Noteworthy are the following grammatical peculiarities, all of which are, however, textually uncertain. In noun inflection: *āpaḥ*, acc. plur. in 10. 3; *rohiniṭ*, instr. sing. in 7. 2; in verbal inflection: *vinīyoja*, unreduplicated perf. in 7. 2; *ceti*, form of stem attested only for Rig-Veda, in 8. 4; *prasarjata*[*ḥ*], unaugmented impf. and rare stem in 10. 1; *pātave*, a dative infinitive in 11. 1.

The *çlokas* of the *āvāhana* are constructed with greater freedom than those of the text itself. The following deviations from the classic standard occur: hypermetric *pāda* in 5. 2; hiatus within *pāda*, 2. 2; between *pādas*, 2. 3, 5; 3. 5; 4. 3. 4 (*bis*); 5. 4, 8; only twice (4. 3; 5. 4) is it written; in odd *pādas* closing cadence — ∪ ∪ ∪, 1. 2; 4. 3; ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪, 1. 3; 5. 3, 8. Double *saṁdhi* occurs but once, 2. 4, and as it is between two *pādas* must certainly be removed. Metrical shortening is found in 2. 4; 4. 4; 5. 7 and 8. No grammatical peculiarity occurs, unless *punarvaso* in 1. 6 be treated as *pragrhya*, which involves less departure from the manuscript; cf. *manyo iti* in 18. 7 and Bloomfield, *Kāuç.*, p. xxxviii. Lexically noteworthy is the fact that the feminine *sādhakī* is found

in 4. 4 instead of *sādhikā*; and that *pūrvapūrvaka* in 4. 3 is an unrecorded extension of *pūrvapūrvā*.

The text proper consists of about one thousand words of prose and forty-two *ślokas*. In *kaṇḍikās* 13 and 17 the prose betrays the fact that it was drawn from a metrical source. The metre of the *ślokas* is practically in conformity with the classic standard. The only deviations are: a hypermetric *pāda*, in 22. 1; hiatus within *pāda* is found in 6. 6, -a r-; cf. Wackernagel, *AIG.*, p. 314, but the case in 24. 8 is a Vedic quotation; between *pādas*, 6. 2; 21. 4; in odd *pādas* a closing cadence — ∪ — ∪ occurs in 6. 1, 5; and — — — ∪ in 6. 4. Noteworthy is the shortening in 24. 1, *tathā 'bhayā-parājītāu*; metrical lengthening is perhaps to be assumed in 15. 2: *śhāpayen nirṛtibhāgīm*. There is but one clear case of double *saṁdhi*: *ahatavāsāgneḥ*, 1. 1, as *dhruvāsthānopasādinām*, 6. 6, and *sarvāuśadhoyah*, 12. 2, may be compounds, while *khalāśṭakāḥ*, 13. 2, is an emendation. Grammatical irregularities: *çaṣkulyah*, acc. plur., 15. 3; *juhvan* in 22. 2 is best emended.

A number of new or rare words may be noted:

saṁpātayati, 22. 2, denom. from *saṁpāta* (cf. Bloomfield, *Kāuṣ.*, p. lvi). *sarpi* for *sarpis*, 12. 5; 13. 1; probably to be emended.

āvalekhanī, "image," 15. 2 (cf. Bloomfield, *Kāuṣ.*, p. xlvii).

bhāgī, "image," 15. 2. Such a word must be assumed to defend the Ms. reading: *nāirṛtīm bhāgīm*, and may have originated from a substantive use of e.g. *nirṛtibhāgī*, "representing Nirṛti" (sc. *pratīkṛtiḥ*), but it seems simpler to assume lengthening in the compound (cf. Wackernagel, *AIG.*, § 264 b.), and emend to *nirṛtibhāgīm*.

lomaka, "hairy," 15. 3, of grains "bearded," hitherto quotable only in compounds.

Various botanical names:

çvadantī, 15. 5 (M: *svadantī*) is not in PWW.; its formation is similar to that of *vyāghradantī* AVPar, 5. 1. 5, which is also new. Synonymous are *çvadañṣṭraka* (*tribulus lanuginosus*), *vyāghradāñṣṭra-* (same), and *çvadañṣṭrū* (*asteracantha longifolia*).

krodā, 15. 4; PW. *s.v.* *krodācūḍā* mentions *krodā* as = *mahāçravaṇikā* on the authority of the *Rājanighaṇṭu*. But as *krodā* = the edible

bulb of the *vārāhikanda* (*dioscorea alata*) and *kroḍī* according to the same authority also has this sense, we may either equate *kroḍā* and *kroḍī* or emend: *madhu-kroḍī-phalāni ca*, or better *madhu kroḍān phalāni ca*.

pūtadāru, 19. 1: *pūtudru*, *pūtadru*, *pītudāru* are the forms hitherto known.

kṛṣṇalī, 21. 1: this fem. has not been hitherto attested. The form given by the lexicographers, but not quotable, is *kṛṣṇalā*.

tārṣṭāgha, 21. 3: cf. Bloomfield, *Kāuṣ.*, p. xlv.

cat.mga, 21. 4: probably corrupt.

çālmala, *ibid.*: in sense of "cotton" = *çālmali*; quotable only in compounds; given by lexicographers but not quotable in sense of "rosin of the cotton plant." The first meaning is more probable here.

malā, *ibid.*: *flacourtia cataphracta*, hitherto not quotable.

Technical designations of Gaṇas and Hymns:

kṛtyādūṣana, 23. 1 = *kṛtyāpratiharāṇa*.

yakṣmopaghāta, 23. 2 = *takmanāçana*.

svapnāntika, *ibid.* = *duḥsvapnanāçana*.

çāntīya, 23. 4 = *çantāṭīya*.

In conclusion I wish to express to Mr. Herbert Putnam my gratitude for the courtesy and kindness with which he, as librarian, has extended to me all possible facilities for utilizing the resources of the Library of Congress.

D. TEXT OF THE ÇĀNTIKALPA.

- I. 1. Atha nakṣatrāṇām upacāraṁ vakṣyāmo ᵂ hatavāsā-
gneḥ purastād ᵂ ahatena vastreṇo 'dagdaçenā''sanāny
avaçhādyā kṛttikādīny ṛkṣāny āvāhayed ᵂ āvāhayiṣyāmi
çubhāṁ kṛttikāṁ ity aṣṭāviṅçatyā ||
2. Āvāhayiṣyāmi çubhāṁ kṛttikāṁ devapūjītāṁ |
ehi sādharāṇe devi jyeṣṭhe dakṣa-sute çubhe ||

Double saṁdhi is marked by the sign for crasis in Greek. In prose passages, where punctuation seemed necessary, I have employed a wedge (ᵂ) to avoid disturbing the saṁdhi as presented by the manuscript.

I. 1. Sāyana, at AV 19. 7, p. 283: atha . . . vakṣyāmaḥ. M upacāraṁ. M kṛttikādīny. M kṛkṛkām. M aṣṭāviṅçatyām.

3. Āvāhayāmi varadām rohiṇīm candra-vallabhām |
ehi rohiṇi dharmajñe dhruvakarmasu çobhane ||
4. Āvāhayāmi varadām andhakām çaçi-vallabhām |
ehi me andhake devi mṛdukarmasu çobhane ||
5. Ārdram āvāhayiṣyāmi nakṣatram bāhu-samjñakam |
ehy ārdre cāru-sarvāṅge dāruṇe rudra-sammite ||
6. Ṛkṣum āvāhayiṣyāmi dharmajñam tu punarvasum |
punarvasa ihā "gaccha carakarma-prasādhaka || 1 ||
- II. 1. Puṣyam āvāhayiṣyāmi nakṣatram kṣipra-samjñakam |
ehi puṣya mahābhāga poṣam vardhaya sarvataḥ ||
2. Āvāhayāmy açleṣām bhaktānām çri-vivardhanīm |
açlese tvam ihā 'bhyehi dāruṇe vijaya-prade ||
3. Maghām āvāhayiṣyāmy ugram nakṣatram ojasā |
ehi me subhage devi sarvāgha-ṽiniṣūdani ||
4. Ṛkṣam āvāhayiṣyāmi pūrvaphālguni-samjñakam |
ehi bhāgya-mahābhāga ugrakarma-prasādhaki ||
5. Ṛkṣam āvāhayiṣyāmy uttarām phālgunīm çubhām |
ehi tvam subhage devi dhruve sarvāṅga-sundari || 2 ||
- III. 1. Hastam āvāhayiṣyāmi sāvitram kṣipram añjasā |
ehi sāviṭra dharmajña bhaktānām pāpa-nāçana ||
2. Citrām āvāhayiṣyāmi citra-rūpām manoharām |
ehi me varade citre mṛdukarmasu çobhane ||
3. Svātim āvāhayiṣyāmi nityam uttaramārga-gām |
devi svāti tvam abhyehi carakarmasu çobhane ||
4. Ṛkṣam āvāhayiṣyāmi viçākhām ugra-tejasām |
viçākhe tvam ihā 'bhyehi devi sādharmaṇe çubhe ||
5. Ṛkṣam āvāhayiṣyāmy anurādhām varapradām |
anurādhe tvam abhyehi mṛdukarmasu çobhane || 3 ||
- IV. 1. Jyeṣṭhām āvāhayiṣyāmi nakṣatram çakra-dāivatam
jyeṣṭhe devi tvam abhyehi dāruṇe cāru-locane ||

I. 3. M candravalabhām. — 4. M āhi. M devī. — 6. Ma punarvasor; b punarvasvor. II. 3. Ma āvāhayiṣyāmy. M ojatā. M āhi. M devī. — 4. M °mahābhāgograkarma°. — 5. Ma °sundari. III. 1. M āhi. Ma pāpabhāçanaḥ; b pāpanāçanaḥ. — 2. Ma āvāhayiṣyāmi. — 3. Ma uttaramārgakām; gām in marg. — 4. M devī. IV. 1. Ma dāru.

2. Mūlam āvāhayiṣyāmi nakṣatram dāruṇam mahat |
ehi mūla mahābhāga bhaktānām abhaya-prada ||
3. Rkṣam āvāhayiṣyāmi pūrvāśāḍhe 'ti-samjñakam |
ehi tvam ugre varade āśāḍhe pūrvapūrvike ||
4. Rkṣam āvāhayiṣyāmy uttarāśāḍha-samjñakam |
uttare tvam samabhyehi āśāḍhe dhruva-sādhaki ||
5. Rkṣam āvāhayiṣyāmi yat tad abhijid ucyate |
ehi dhiṣṇya variṣṭhā 'dya kṣiprakarma-prasādhaka || 4 ||
- V. 1. Rkṣam āvāhayiṣyāmi çravaṇam sarvakāmadam |
açvattha tvam ihā 'bhyehi carakarma-prasādhaka ||
2. Dhaniṣṭhām āvāhayiṣyāmi nakṣatram çaçi-vallabham |
dhaniṣṭhe tvam ihā 'bhyehi carakarma-prasādhaki ||
3. Rkṣam āvāhayiṣyāmi nāmnā çatabhiṣām çubhām |
āgaccha tvam çatabhiṣe carakarmasu çobhane ||
4. Rkṣam āvāhayiṣyāmi pūrvabhadrapadām mahat |
ehi bhadrápade pūrve ugrakarma-prasādhaki ||
5. Dhruvam āvāhayiṣyāmi deçe bhadrápaddottarām |
ehi tvam sumahābhāge mama bhadrápaddottare ||
6. Rkṣam āvāhayiṣyāmi revatīm cārudarçanām |
ehi revati dharmajñe nṛdukarmasu çobhane |
7. Rkṣam āvāhayiṣyāmi kṣipram açvini-samjñakam |
ehy açvini mahābhāge varade kāmādāyini ||
8. Rkṣam āvāhayiṣyāmy ugram bharaṇi-samjñakam |
ehi tvam devi bharaṇi subhage cāru-da(r)ça(na)
ity āvāhya varṇakamayīr vṛkṣamayīr dhātumayīr vā nakṣatra-
pratimāḥ pratyañ-mukhīr āsaneṣū 'paveçayati || 5 ||

- VI. 1. Raktam varṇam kṛttikānām phalgunī-dvitayasya tu |
hastasya cāi 'va pāuṣṇasya maitrasya ca tathāi 'va ca ||
2. Pītam ke-çasya puṣyasya çākra-vāsavayos tathā |
çvetam sāumyasya rāudrasyā 'pya-vāruṇayos tathā ||
3. Āditya-sārpa-pāitryānām brāhmya-vāyavyayos tathā |
proṣṭhapadā-dvayasyā 'tha çvetam eva vidhīyate ||

IV. 3. Ma pūrvapūrvike. — 5. M āihi. Ma variṣṭā; b variṣṭā. Ma kṣiprakarmaprasādhake. V. 1. Ma çravaṇām. Ma carakarmaprasādhakām. — 2. M dhaniṣṭām, or dhaniṣṭā. — 3. M çitabhiṣe. — 4. M pūrvabhadrapadam. Ma āidi. — 6. M āidi revati. — 7. M āihy. — 8. Ma āvāhyam varṇakamayīr. VI. 1. M kṛttikānām. Ma phalgunīdvitayasya. — 3. Ma °dvayasya pya.

4. Vicitrarūpaṁ tvāṣṭrasya vāiçvadevasya cā 'py atha |
āçvīnasya tathā kāryaṁ nityaṁ eva vijānatā ||
5. Kṛṣṇaṁ yāmyasya mūlasya pālāçaṁ çravaṇasya tu |
viçākhaḥ pītarakte kartavye hi phala-prade ||
6. Eteṣāṁ cāi 'va ṛkṣāṇāṁ dhruvasthāno-'paśā.linām |
yathāvarṇāni puṣpāni vāsāṁsy evā 'nulepanam ||
7. Imā āpa ity etāiḥ ṣaḍbhiḥ pratigr̥hṇantu bhagavanti na-
kṣatrāṇi 'ty etāir yathoktaṁ kṛtvā Ḍ 'thā 'jyabhāgānte citrāṇi
sākāṁ divi rocanāni yāni nakṣatrāṇi 'ty ājyaṁ hutvā Ḍ 'gnir
devo yajvana iti haviṣo hutvā 'jyaṁ juhuyāt Ḍ samidha ādhāyo
'patiṣṭhate || 6 ||

- VII. 1. Agnir devo yajvanaḥ kṛṣṇavartmā vāiçvānaro
jātavedā rasāgrabhuk |
sa nakṣatrāṇāṁ prathamena pāvakaḥ kṛttikābhir
jvalano no 'nuçāmyatām ||
2. Prajāpatir yaḥ sasṛje prajā imā devānt sa sṛṣṭvā viniyoja
karmasu |
sa sarvabhuk sarvayogeṣu rohiṇi çivāḥ kriyāḥ kṛṇutām
karmasiddhaye ||
 3. Vidyāvīdo ye abhiçocamānavā arcanti çakraṁ saha
devatāgaṇāi(h) |
sa no yoge mrgaçiraḥ çivāḥ kriyāḥ çrestharājāḥ
kṛṇutām karmasiddhaye ||
 4. Devaṁ bhavaṁ paçupatiṁ haraṁ kṛçāṁ mahādevaṁ
çarvam ugraṁ çikhaṇḍinam |
sahasrākṣum asitaṁ yaṁ gr̥ṇanti sa no rudraḥ paripātu
na ārdrayā ||
 5. . . . yā viprāiḥ kavibhir namasyate dākṣāyaṇi devapu-
rādibhir ṛbhiḥ |
sā na stutā prathamajāḥ punarvasuḥ çivāḥ kriyāḥ
kṛṇutām karmasiddhaye || 7 ||

VI. 4. Ma vā py. M āçvīnasya. — 6. Quoted by Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 7. p. 283. — 7. Sāyaṇa, *l.c.*, quotes imā . . . hutvā. (S' pratigr̥hṇanti; tantrāiḥ for ity etāiḥ; nakṣatrāṇi abhayenopaty ājyaṁ.) Ma nakṣatrāṇi, bis. M samidādhāyo. VII. 1. M nuçāmyatām. — 2. Mb sasṛjet. Ma çivā kriyāḥ. — 3. Of abhiçocamānavā, nav seems to have been read by Weber on authority of NK. M çakraṁ? — 4. Ma sarvam. M asinaṁ. M no 'rdrayā. — 5. Ma viprāi. Mb stutāḥ. Ma prathamajā. Ma çivā.

- VIII. 1. Yasya devā brahmacaryeṇa karmaṇā mahāsuraṇ
 tigmatayā 'bhicakrire |
 tam subudhaṁ devaguruṁ bṛhaspatim arcāmi
 puṣyeṇa sahā 'bhipātu mā ||
2. Yā na[h] stutaḥ parihiṇomi medhayā tapyamānam ṛṣibhiḥ
 kāmaçocibhiḥ |
 jaratkāra-sūnor ṛṣibhir manīṣibhis tā açleṣā abhirak-
 ṣantu nōragāih ||
3. Ye devatvaṁ puṇyākṛto 'bhicakrire ye cā 'pare ye ca
 pare maharṣayaḥ |
 arcāmi sūnur yamarājagān pitṛn chivāḥ kriyāḥ kṛnu-
 tān ca no maghā ||
4. Yo yojayan karmaṇā carṣaṇīdhṛto bhūmiṁ ceti bhaga
 (h prajāḥ) prasādayan |
 taddevatye çivatamām alamkṛte phalgunyor ide bha-
 jataṁ ca pūrvayoḥ ||
5. Stutam pūrvāir aryamaṇaṁ manīṣibhiḥ stāumi devaṁ
 jagativācam āirayan |
 taddevatye çivatamām alamkṛte phalgunyāu na uttare
 devatātaye || 8 ||
- IX. 1. Çivāir yuktaḥ çitipād dhiranyayo yasya rathaḥ
 pathibhir vartate sukhāih |
 sa no hastena savitā hiraṇyabhug ghiranyapāñih
 savitā no 'bhirakṣatu ||
2. Tvaṣṭre namaḥ kṣitisrje manīṣiṇe bhūtagoptre parama-
 karmakāriṇe |
 sā na stutā kṛṇutān karmasiddhaye citrā[m] devi[m] |
 saha yogena rūpabhṛt ||
3. Yaḥ prāñinān jīvayan khāni sevate çivo bhūtvā mātā-
 riçvā rasāgrabhuk |
 dhvajo 'ntarikṣasya sa sarvabhūtabhṛd vāyur devah
 svātinā no 'bhirakṣatu ||

VIII. 2. Ma kāmaçocibhiḥ. Ma açlekhā. — 3. Ma devatvaṁ. M sunur. M yamarājagān. Ma omits pitṛn. Ma chivāḥ. Mb maghāḥ. — 4. M yo yo japan. Ma phalgunyo. — 5. Ma manīṣibhiḥ. M jagativācam. M phalgunyo. IX. 1. M hiraṇyabhuk hiraṇyapāñih. — 2. Ma manīṣiṇe. M bhūtagoptṛṇe. Mb naḥ.

4. Yāv iditāv ātmaividbhir manīṣibhiḥ sahitāu [yāu] trīṇi
savanāni sāmāgāu |
indrāgni varadāu namaskṛtau viçākhayoḥ kurvatām
āyuse çriḥ ||
5. Viçve devā yam ṛṣim āhur mitraṁ bharadvājam ṛṣitaḥ
prasāmavit |
tam jagatyā gāthayā stāumy ugrāiḥ sa mām anurā-
dhābhir [bhṛtakaṇvo] 'bhirakṣatu || 9 ||
- X. 1. Çatakratur yo nijaghāna çambaram vṛtram ca hatvā
saritaḥ prasarjata[h] |
sa na stutaḥ prītamanāḥ purāmdaro marutsakhā
jyeṣṭhayā no 'bhirakṣatu ||
2. Yā dhārayati ojasā 'tideva-padaṁ mātā pṛthivī ca sa
sarvabhūtabhṛt |
sā na stutā kṛṇutām karmasiddhaye mūlam devī
nirṛtiḥ sarvakarmasu ||
3. Parjanyaṣṛṣṭās tīṣṇibhir āvṛtam yās tarpayanty abhitaḥ
pravṛddhaye |
tā stāumy āpo vāruṇī (ḥ . . .) pūrvā 'śādhā svadhayā
'stu yojane ||
4. Yās triṇçatām trīṇç ca madanti devā devanāmno
nirmitāç ca bhūyasaḥ |
tā no 'śādhā uttarā vaso viçve (çivāḥ) kriyāḥ kṛṇutām
suramatāḥ ||
5. Yaḥ sarvajñāḥ sarvakṛt sarvabhūtabhṛd yasmād anyan
nā 'param kiṁ canā 'sti |
nirmitaḥ satyajitaḥ puruṣtutaḥ sa no brahmā 'bhijitā
no 'bhirakṣatu || 10 ||
- XI. 1. Sthānācyute sthānam indrāya pātave devebhyaç ca
ya irayaṁs trīṣ vicakrame |
tam svid dhi svargaṁ nākapṛṣṭhām svarvid viṣṇur
devaḥ çravaṇenā 'bhirakṣatu ||

IX. 4. Ma idatāv. Ma sahitāu. Ma indrāgni. Ma çroḥ. — 5. Ma jatyā. Ma bhūtakaṇvo. X. 1. M çambaram. — 2. Ma omits sa; b has for it ca in marg. M naḥ. — 3. Ma aṁbhitaḥ. M pravardhaye. Ma stā stāumy. — 4. Ma traç ca. — 5. M nirmitāḥ. M brāhmā. XI. 1. Mb tam. Ma omits svid dhi; Mb sighiḥ. Ma nākapṛṣṭhām svarvid; Mb nākapṛṣṭhasthavid, with çvavi in marg.

2. Aṣṭāu çatāni çvetaketūnām yāni tvaṁcasatvam nijaghāna
bhūyasaḥ |
anādeçeno 'bhayaç ca vīditāḥ çraviṣṭhābhir no 'bhi-
rakṣa(n)tu vājinaḥ ||
3. Vājā devī devamṛṇānikākubhāv ubhāvājasya natakar-
maṇā çivā
tava vrājāni stāumasi devabhojanāu pratyagbhiṣak
çatabhiṣak çivāu naḥ ||
4. Çunāsirāu na(h) pramumota jihmasāu tāu tāu pitṛbhyo
dadatu stanāu çivāu |
tāu pūrvajāu kṛṇutām ekapād ajo pratiṣṭhānāu sarva-
kāmā-'bhayāya ca ||
5. Sarvārthāya kṛṇomi karmasiddhaye gaviṣṭutāyā 'nekakā-
riṇe namaḥ |
so 'hir budhnyāḥ kṛṇutām uttarāu çivāu pratiṣṭhānāu
sarvakāmā-'bhayāya ca ||
6. Yam mahāhemamṛṣitaḥ prasāmavid bharadvājaç candra-
masāu divākaram |
sajuṣṭānām açvayujāu bhayāya ca sa naḥ pūṣā kṛṇutām
revatīm çivām ||
7. Jirṇāni santāni yāu yuvānaḥ hi cakratu(r) ṛṣim dhiyā
cyavanaḥ somapāu kṛtāu |
tāu naç cittibhir bhiṣajām asya satkarāu (. . .)
prajām açvinyām açvināu çivāu ||
8. Yasya çyāma-çabalāu rakṣataḥ svadhā duḥkṛt-sukṛd-
vididhā carṣaṇīdhṛtāu
tāu savitṛṇç ca savitur dha(r)macāribhir yamo rājā
bharaṇībhir no ('bhi)rakṣatu || 11 ||

XII. 1. Atha nakṣatra-haviṇṣi A ghṛtaṁ kṛttikābhyāḥ
A sarvabījāni rohiṇyāi A pāyaso mṛgaçirase A madhv ārdṛāyāi
A taṇḍulāḥ punarvasubhyām A ghṛta-pāyasaḥ puṣyāya A

XI. 3. M natakarmanā. M chatabhiṣak. — 4. Ma daddatu. M ajāu.
— 5. Ma sarvārthā. M karmasiddhaye. — 6. M yamaḥ hñāhe hamṛṣitaḥ,
with interrogation point above hñā. — 7. Ma cakratuṁ. M açvibhyām
(n? is written over bh). — 8. M çāmaçabalāu. Mb vamacāribhir.
XII. 1. Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 7, p. 283: atha . . . rohiṇyāi. M °-haviṇṣi. M
kṛttikābhya. M taṇḍulā.

2. sarvāuśadhayo 'çleśābhyaḥ ᵕ tilataṇḍulā maghābhya(h) ᵕ priyaṅgavaḥ pūrvābhyām phalgunibhyām ᵕ akṣatā uttarābhyām ᵕ dadhi hastāya ᵕ gṛtapaīyasaç citrāyāi ᵕ gṛtāktā yavāḥ svātaye ᵕ

3. yavāu-'danāu viçākhābhyām ᵕ masurā anurādhabhya(h) ᵕ kanakam jyeṣṭhāyāi ᵕ ośadhimūlāni mūlāya ᵕ çālayaḥ pūrvābhya āśādhābhyaḥ ᵕ paya uttarābhyaḥ ᵕ sarvaratnāny abhijite ᵕ

4. taṇḍulā(h) çravaṇāyāu ᵕ 'dumbara-vaṭa-çuṅgāḥ çra-
viṣṭhābhyo ᵕ 'bjāni puṣpāni çatabhiṣaje ᵕ çālayaḥ pūrvābhyām
proṣṭhapadābhyām ᵕ vrihiyavā uttarābhyām ᵕ gṛtākṣatā
revatyāi ᵕ

5. kṣīravṛkṣā-'ñkurā açvayugbhyām ᵕ kṣṣṇatilāḥ sarpir-
madhumiçrā bharaṇibhyaḥ ᵕ citrāni sākam (divi rocanāni
yāni nakṣatrāni) ity ājyam hutvā 'bhayeno 'pasthāya tantraṁ
parisamāpayet ᵕ

6. kṛttikābhiḥ pāyasam sarpiṣā sahe 'ty uktā nakṣatra-
dakṣiṇā ᵕ brāhmaṇān bhakteno 'pepsanti || 12 ||

XIII. 1. Kṛttikābhiḥ pāyasam sarpiṣā saha brāhmaṇebhyo
dadāti ᵕ rohiṇyām akṣatāir māśāiḥ sarpirmiçraṁ sahāu
'danam ᵕ mṛgaçirasy ajām payasvinim ᵕ ā(r)drāyām kṣaram
dadyāt tāilamiçram upoṣito ᵕ madhu-sahitān apūpān punar-
vasvoḥ ᵕ

2. suvarṇam puṣye ᵕ 'çleśāsu rukmam ᵕ maghāsu madhu-
miçratilāiḥ çrā(d)dham kuryāt ᵕ pūrvayoḥ phalgunyor maṇ-
ḍakāiḥ phānitam khalāiṣṭakā ᵕ evam cen madhunā saho
'ttarayor ᵕ haste hastiratham yuktam ᵕ citrāyām vṛṣalim
alamkṛtām gandhāir anuliptām ᵕ svātāv ekadhanam dadyād
(yad yad) asya gṛhe priyam ᵕ

XII. 2. M açleśābhyaḥ. Ma phalgunibhyām. M akṣitā. M gṛtāktā.
— 3. M viçākhābhyo. Mb abhijitaye. — 4. M °vaṭaçuṅgāḥ. M puṣyāni.
M çālayaḥ ||. Ma vriha; b vrihiyava. M gṛtākṣitā. — 5. Sāyaṇa, *l.c.*,
kṣīrivṛkṣāñkurā açvinibhyām kṣṣṇatilāḥ sarpirmadhumiçrā (S' omits
sarpiḥ°) . . . iti hutvā . . . parisamāpayet. 'M sarpimadhu-°. M omits
words in (). M parisamāpayeta. — 6. M. kratikābhyaḥ. Ma brāh-
maṇā; b brāhmaṇām. XIII. 1. M kratikābhyaḥ. M akṣitāir māśāi
sarpimiçra. M ajām. M kṣaram. M madhusahitān yūpāna. — 2. Ma
pūrvayoḥ phalātunyor maṇḍakāi. M svalāiṣṭakā. Ma gṛhe ṣyam.

3. dhenum rūpasampannām anaḍvāhāu voḍhārāu madhuma-
manthēna saha viçākhayor Δ anurādhāsu prāvaraṇam Δ annaiḥ
ca çuci jyeṣṭhāyām Δ surā(m) mūlena maṇhetā 'nnēna saha
strībhyo na brāhmaṇibhyaḥ Δ pūrvāsv āśādhāsu saktuman-
tha(m) Δ uttarāsu madhumaṇtham Δ abhijiti duhitaram vivāho-
'ktena vidhinā Δ veṇu-sahitam kambalam çravaṇe Δ dhaniṣṭhāsu
vastra-yugam Δ

4. sarvagandhāḥ chatabhiṣajy Δ ajamānsenāu 'danam pūr-
vayor Δ urabhramānsenāu 'danam uttarayo(ḥ) proṣṭhapa-
dayo(r) Δ dhenum rūpasampannām vatsatarīm prasūtām
kāṅsyadohana-pūraṇīm revatyām Δ

5. vastreṇā 'chāditāv anaḍvāhāv aḥvayujī Δ bharaṇīsu
tiladhenum vidhānenā Δ 'nēna vidhinā nakṣatradakṣiṇā yo
dadāti sa nakṣatrāṇām yathā somo jyotiṣām iva bhāskaro
bhāti sarveṣu lokeṣv iti || 13 ||

XIV. 1. Athāto 'dbhutamahāçāntāu diço yajate vidiço
yamam indram varuṇam viçveçvaram viṣṇum sūryācandra-
masāv agni(m) grahān vāyum aḥvināv ity eke Δ 'tha mantrāḥ ||

2. āçānām iti diçām Δ vidigbhyaḥ svahe 'ti vidiçām Δ yamo
no gātum iti yamasye Δ 'ndre 'mam prataram kṛdhi 'ti
'ndrasyā Δ 'psu te rājann iti varuṇasya Δ yo asya viçvajanmana
iti viçveçvarasyo Δ 'ru viṣṇo vikramasve 'ti viṣṇoḥ Δ çivās te
santv oṣadhaya iti sūryācandramasor Δ apām agnir ity agner Δ
viṣāsahim ity ādityādinām grahāṇām uktā Δ vāyav ā run(d)dhi
na iti vāyor Δ aḥvinā brahmaṇā 'yātam ity ardharcam aḥvinor
iti || 14 ||

XIII. 3. M dhenur upasampannāv. Ma anūrādhāsu prāvaṇam.
M mehitā. Ma ākhādhāsu; b aṣādhāsu. Ma sakturmantha. M ma-
dhumantho 'bhijiti. M çravaṇāya. — 5. Ma jyotiṣām ikmāsvāreti; b cor-
rects adding bhā in marg. M ita. XIV. 1. Sāyaṇa, AV 1. 31, p. 162:
athāto . . . diço yajate vidiço yajate; AV 6. 5, p. 12: athāto . . . diço
yajate. M atho. — 2. Sāyaṇa, AV 1. 31, p. 162: āçānām iti. Ma tyaçā-
nām. Sāyaṇa, AV 6. 5, p. 12: indre 'mam . . . 'ndrasya; 7. 87, p. 485:
indre 'mam . . . varuṇasya. M pratamaḥ. M psu re, with psu also in
marg. Sāyaṇa, AV 8. 2, p. 575: uru viṣṇo . . . sūryācandramasoḥ (so
S'; P°candramasāv iti) and 7. 26, p. 354, uru viṣṇo . . . viṣṇoḥ. Ma
ādityādayo; b ādityādayo.

- XV. 1. Athāto nāirṛtaṁ karma catvare dakṣiṇe 'pare |
 kravyādāṁ viraṇe rātrāu kṛṣṇavāsāḥ pradīpayet ||
 2. Sthāpaye(n) nirṛti-bhāgīm kāraved vā "valekhanīm |
 kravyādād dakṣiṇe deçe kṛṣṇavastīṁ udañimukhīm ||
 3. Arcitvā kṛṣṇapuspāis tāñ dagdhvā dhūpañ bali(ñ)
 haret |
 balimāñl lomikā dhānāḥ ṣaṣkulyaḥ palalañ suiām ||
 4. Piṣṭa-kulmāṣa-māñsāñi madhu-kroḍā-phalāñi ca |
 puṣpāñi kṛṣarañ matsyāñ apūpāñ upahārayet ||
 5. Atha nirṛty-a(bhi)mukho 'bhi tañ nirṛtir dhattāñ yat
 te devī nirṛtir yasyās ta āsani ghore juhomy ārād aīātim
 iti dve ape 'ta etu nirṛtir ity etāñḥ savapāmāñsam Ḷ iñgīdam
 ājyañ Ḷ kambūkāḥ ṣarabhṛṣṭayaḥ ṣaratūlāñi ṣvadantī-kañṭakā
 dhānā ity etāñi pratyekañ ṣarkarā-miçrāñi hutvā 'miçrāḥ
 ṣarabhṛṣṭīr atha ṣarkarā-hutiñ juliuyāt Ḷ sāgnāu kapāle
 kambūkā-hutiñ hutvā Ḷ hatā brahmadviṣa iti kapalañ
 rāsabhasya pṛṣṭhe bhinatti Ḷ nāirṛtañ vā caruñ juhuyād Ḷ
 6. ava mā pāpmanñ iti japann udakam abhigacchen Ḷ nadyā
 nāvyañḥ pradakṣiñāvarte ṣape-'tañ mikhaned Ḷ apāñ sūktāir
 avasiñcaty Ḷ apsu kṛṣṇañ jahāty Ḷ ahatavasāḥ puñyāhañ
 vācayitvo 'pāñahāv upamueya Ḷ yathā sūrya ity āvrṛtyā
 "vrajati || 15 ||

XVI. 1. Athāto mahāçāntīr vyākhyāsyāmo Ḷ 'mṛtā vai-
 çvadevy āgneyī bhārgavī brāhmī bārhaspatyā piñjāpatyā
 sāvitrī gāyatri āñgīrasy āñdrī māhendrī kāubery ādityā
 vāiṣṇavī vāstoṣpatyā iaudry aparājitā yāmyā vāruñi vāyavyā
 sañtatis tvāṣṭrī kāmārī nāirṛtī mārudgañi gāñdharvy āirā-
 vatī pārlhivy abhaye 'ti || 16 ||

XV. 1. Sāyaṇa, AV 8. 2, p. 575 athāto nāirṛtaṁ karma. — 2. M nāir-
 rṭiñ bhāgīm. — 3. M ṣaṣkulyaḥ. — 4. Ma markukroḍā°. M kṛṣarañ.
 — 5. Sāyaṇa, l.c., ārād . . . etāñḥ samamāñsam (so S'; P svavapur-
 māñsam) iñgīdam ājyam. M svadantikañtakā. M pṛaṣṭhe. —
 6. Sāyaṇa, AV 6. 26, p. 51, ava mā . . . abhigacchen. With rest cf.
 Kāuç. 18. 2-5. Ma pāpmanñ. Ma pradikṣiñamāvartañte; b pradakṣiñā-
 māvartañte. M kṛṣṇāñ. Sāyaṇa, AV 7. 11, p. 329: upāñahāv upa-
 mueya (P avamueya) yathā . . . "vrajati. Ma apamueya; b avamueya.
 M āvrṛtyā. Ma bujati; b brjati. XVI. 1. Ma mahāçāntīr. Ma mṛtyā.
 M kāuvery. M vāyavyāñ M sañtatis. Ma mārudañi; b mārudgañi.

XVII. 1. Amṛtām divyā-ntarikṣa-bhāumeṣu prayuñjīta Ḍ vaiçvadevīm gatā-yuṣām Ḍ āgneyīm agnibhaye sarvakāmasya ca Ḍ bhārgavīm naksatragrahopasrṣṭabhayārta-rogaḡrhitānām Ḍ brāhmīm brahmavarcasa-kāmasya vastraçayanā-ḡnirjvalane ca Ḍ bārhaspatyām rājyārtha-çrī-brahmavarcasa-kāmasyā Ḍ bhicarato Ḍ bhicaryamāṇasya ca Ḍ

2. prājāpatyām prajā-paçv-anna-kāmasya prajākṣaye ca Ḍ sāvitrīm çuddhikāmasya Ḍ gāyatrīm chandobrahmavarcasa-kāmasyā Ḍ āḡgirasīm sampatkāmasyā Ḍ bhicarato Ḍ bhicaryamāṇasya cāi Ḍ āndrīm vijaya-bala-vṛṣṭi-paçu-kāmasya para-cakrāgame ca Ḍ

3. māhendrīm rājyakāmasyā Ḍ dbhutotpatti-vikāreṣu ca Ḍ kāuberīm dhanakāmasya dhanakṣaye cā Ḍ ādityām çrītejo-dhanāyuhkāmasya Ḍ vaiṣṇavīm annakāmasyā Ḍ inakṣaye ca Ḍ vāstospatyām vāstusaṃskārakarmaṇi bhūtikāmasya ca Ḍ rāudrīm rogārtasyā Ḍ nāmnāteṣu ca kāmēṣv āpatsu vividhāsu cā Ḍ

4. aparājītām vijayakāmasya Ḍ yāmyām yamabhaye Ḍ vāru-

XVII. 1. Sāyaṇa, AV 11. 6, p. 86: amṛtām . . . prayuñjīta. Sāyaṇa, AV 8. 2, p. 568: vaiçvadevīm gatāyuṣām. Sāyaṇa, AV 2. 6, p. 220; 7. 87, p. 481: āgneyīm . . . ca. Sāyaṇa, AV 2. 7, p. 225: bhārgavīm . . . ḡrhitānām. Sāyaṇa, AV 3. 22, p. 466; 4. 1, p. 512 brāhmīm (S' Kd brāhmī, once) . . . ca. M brañhma-°, and repeatedly hereafter. Mb ḡnirjvalane. Sāyaṇa, 1. 9, p. 59; 7. 52, p. 394; 7. 54, p. 402: bārhaspatyām rājyaçribrahmavarcasakāmasya; 2. 11, p. 244: same plus Ḍ bhicarato . . . ca. (P with Ma rājyārtham çribrahmavarcasa-°.) —2. Sāyaṇa, AV 4. 15, p. 590: prājāpatyām . . . ca; 19. 27, p. 373: same omitting ḡanna°. M °kāmasyā. Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 21, p. 355: gāyatrīm (S' gāyatri) . . . °kāmasya prayuñjīta. Ma °brañhmavarcasyasṛkāmasya. Sāyaṇa, AV 3. 5, p. 360: āḡgirasīm sampatkāmasya; 3. 6, p. 366, abhicarato Ḍ bhicaryamāṇasya ca. Ma ḡgirasīm. Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 28, p. 383: āndrīm . . . ca; 2. 4, p. 213: same with ḡpuṣṭi° for ḡvṛṣṭi°. M ḡndrī. —3. Sāyaṇa, AV 1. 29, p. 148: māhendrīm (S' Kd māhendri) . . . ca. M dbhutotyabhikāreṣu. Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 31, p. 394; kāuberīm . . . dhanakṣaye (S' omits) ca; cf. (5. 3, p. 734). M kāuberīm. Sāyaṇa, AV 1. 35, p. 179; 17. 1, p. 2: ādityām çrutatejo-°; 1. 5, p. 38: ādityām çrītejo-° (so P: S' Kd. çrutatejo-°). M °dhanāyuhkāmasya. Sāyaṇa, AV 7. 25, p. 353: vaiṣṇavīm . . . °nnakṣaye (S' annajaye) ca; cf. (5. 28, p. 786). Sāyaṇa, AV 8. 5, p. 622: rāudrīm rogārtasya. M nāpnāteṣu; nāpnāteṣu? —4. Sāyaṇa, AV 1. 2, p. 16; 2. 27, p. 291: aparājītām vijaya-°. Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 32, p. 401: yāmyām yamabhaye. Sāyaṇa, AV 4. 10, p. 560: vāruṇīm jalabhaye; 18. 4, p. 243: vāruṇīm jalabhaye jalasaṃkṣaye (ca).

nīm jalabhaya-jalasaṅkṣayayor ᳚ vāyavyām vāta-vātyāyām ᳚
saṁtatīm kulakṣaye ᳚

5. tvāstrīm vastrakṣaye ᳚ kāumārīm vyādhitasya bālasya ᳚
nāirṛtīm nirṛti-grhītasya ᳚ mārudgaṇīm balakāmasya ᳚ gān-
dharvīm açvakṣaya ᳚ āirāvatiṁ gajakṣaye ᳚ pārthivīm bhūmi-
kāmasyā ᳚ 'bhayām bhayārtasye 'ti || 17 ||

XVIII. 1. Athā "vāpikāḥ çāntaya ity ᳚ amṛtāyām çāntaye
çāntir asi mahāçāntir asi bhūyasi vaśiyasī çreyasī namo 'stu
paramāyu(r) dīrgham āyuh kṛnotu ma iti ᳚ viçve devā iti
vāiçvadevyām ᳚ samās tvā 'gne 'bhyarcate 'ty āgneyyām ᳚

2. citrāgaṇo bhārgavyām ᳚ brahma jajñānām brahma bhrā-
jad iti brāhmyām ᳚ bṛhaspatir naḥ paripātu paçcād amutra-
bhūyād iti bāṛhaspatyāyām ᳚

3. prajāpatiḥ salilā l iti prājāpatyāyām ᳚ vyāhrtigaṇa(ḥ)
sāvitrīyām ᳚ saptasu chandaḥsv ṛcaḥ kalpayitvā gāyatrīyādi
gāyatrīyāi svāhe 'ty evam yathāchandaç chandogaṇo gāya-
tryām ᳚ samās tve 'ty āngirasyām ᳚

Ma jalabhakṣayayor; b jalabhaye jalasaṅkṣapayor, the addition in
margin. Sāyaṇa, AV 4. 25, p. 644; 19. 34, p. 415: vāyavyām vātavātyāyām.
M vātavātyāyām. Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 36, p. 425: saṁtatīm kulakṣaye
prayuñjita. M saṁtati. — 5. Sāyaṇa, AV 7. 26, p. 354: tvāstrīm va-
strakṣaye; 19. 24, p. 361: adds prayuñjita. Sāyaṇa, AV 3. 7, p. 371:
kāumārīm . . . bālasya. Ma balaça; b balasya. Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 44, p.
451: nāirṛtam nirṛti°. Sāyaṇa, AV 4. 27, p. 654; 7. 84, p. 475: mārud-
gaṇīm balakāmasya; 19. 46, p. 463: adds prayuñjita. Sāyaṇa, AV 4. 37,
p. 705: gāndharvīm açva°; 19. 25, p. 367, adds prayuñjita. Ma gān-
dharvīm. M açvakṣaye. Sāyaṇa, AV 1. 9, p. 59; 1. 30, p. 154; 4. 9, p. 554:
āirāvatiṁ gajakṣaye. (Sāyaṇa, AV 10. 6, p. 762; 12. 1, p. 202): pārthi-
vīm bhūmikāmasya. (Sāyaṇa, AV 10. 3, p. 743): abhayām bhayārtasya.
XVIII. 1. Sāyaṇa, AV 2. 5, p. 214: athā "vāpikāḥ çāntayaḥ; 19. 24, p.
361 athā "vāpikāḥ (S' atha vāpikāḥ) çāntaya ity amṛtāyām. Ma atha
vāpikā syātaya; b atha vāpikāḥ çāntaya. Sāyaṇa, AV 2. 6, p. 220: samās
. . . āgneyyām; 7. 87, p. 484: abhyarcate 'ty āgneyyām. — 2. M bhyar-
gavyām. Sāyaṇa, AV 4. 1, p. 512: brahma . . . bhrājad. Sāyaṇa, AV
7. 51, p. 394; 7. 54, p. 402: bṛhaspatir . . . bāṛhaspatyāyām. — 3. Sāyaṇa,
AV 4. 15, p. 590: prajāpatiḥ . . . prājāpatyāyām. Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 22,
p. 356: saptasu . . . yathāchandaḥ . . . gāyatrīyām samāsaḥ (22, 23)
(S samāsam) āngirasyām. M chandast ṛcaḥ. M gāyatrīyādhi. Myathā-
chandaḥ chandagaṇo; the visarga in margin.

4. indra juṣasve 'tyāindryām ᵂ tvam indras tvam mahendro mahāñ indro ya ojase 'ti māhendryām ᵂ mamā 'gne varca iti kāuberyām ᵂ

5. Salila-gaṇa ādityāyām ᵂ viṣṇor nu kam iti vāiṣṇavyām ᵂ vāstospatyagaṇo vāstospatyāyām ᵂ rudragāṇo rāndryām ᵂ aparājitagāṇo 'parājītāyām ᵂ

6. yad devā devahedanam iti yāmyāyām ᵂ candramā apsv antar iti vāruṇyām ᵂ vāyoh savitur iti vāyavyāyām ᵂ prāṇāya nama iti samtatyām ᵂ yena devam savitāram iti tvāṣṭryām ᵂ

7. tvāṣṭrā manyo yas te manyo iti kāumāryām ᵂ nirṛtimantrā nairṛtyām ᵂ marutām manve prajāpate na tvad etāny anya iti mārudganyām ᵂ aṅrāntasya tvā manasā yunajmī 'ti gāndharvyām ᵂ

8. āyuṣyaḥ ṣāntiḥ svastigaṇa āirāvatyām ᵂ satyam bṛhad iti anuvākāḥ pārthivyām ᵂ abhayagaṇo 'bhayāyām iti || 18 ||

XIX. 1. Prāṇāya nama iti vrīhiyavam amṛtāyām badhniyād ᵂ ārabhasve 'ti pūtadāruṁ vāiṣvadevyām ᵂ agneḥ prajātam pari yad dhiranyam iti karṇe hiraṇyam āgneyyām ᵂ aghadviṣṭā devajāte 'ti sahasrakāṇḍam bhārgavyām ᵂ

XVIII. 4. Sāyaṇa, AV 2. 5, p. 214: indra . . . āindryām. (Sāyaṇa, AV 5. 3, p. 734): mamā . . . kāuberyām. Ma mamā gñi vardha. M kāuveryām. — 5. Sāyaṇa, AV 1. 5, p. 38; 17. 1, p. 2: salilagaṇa ādityāyām. Sāyaṇa, AV 7. 26, p. 353: viṣṇor . . . vāiṣṇavyām. Sāyaṇa, AV 6. 93, p. 190: vāstospatyagaṇo vāstospatyāyām. Sāyaṇa, AV 1. 2, p. 16; 6. 97, p. 198: aparājitagāṇo 'parājītāyām. — 6. Sāyaṇa, AV 6. 114, p. 233: yad . . . yāmyāyām, 18. 4, p. 243: yad devā devahedanam iti yāmyāyā(m) candramā apsv antar e 'ti vāruṇyām. Sāyaṇa, AV 4. 25, p. 644: vāyoh . . . vāyavyāyām. Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 24, p. 361: prāṇāya . . . tvāṣṭryām. — 7. Sāyaṇa, AV 4. 27, p. 654; 7. 84, p. 475: marutām . . . mārudganyām. Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 25, p. 368: aṅrāntasya . . . gāndharvyām. Ma nuyunaṣmī; b nuyunajmī. M gāndharvyām. — 8. Sāyaṇa, AV 1. 9, p. 59; 1. 30, p. 154: āyuṣyaḥ (so S' Kd; P: āyuṣya) ṣāntisvastigaṇa āirāvatyām; 3. 8, p. 375; 19. 10, p. 304; 19. 25, p. 368: āyuṣyaḥ ṣāntiḥ svastigaṇa āirāvatyām; 19. 9, p. 293: same, omitting āirāvatyām. (Sāyaṇa, AV 12. 1, p. 202): satyam . . . pārthivyām. Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 15, p. 328: abhayagaṇo 'bhayāyām. XIX. 1. Sāyaṇa, AV 11. 6, p. 86: prāṇāya . . . badhniyāt. Sāyaṇa, AV 8. 2, p. 568: ārabhasve 'ti pūtadāruṁ (so S'; P: pūtadāruṁ) vāiṣvadevyām. Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 26, p. 369: agneḥ . . . iti (S' inserts karṇam; P: omits it) hiraṇyam āgneyyām. Sāyaṇa, AV 2. 7, p. 225: aghadviṣṭā . . . bhārgavyām. M aghadviṣṭhā.

2. hastivarcasam iti hastidantaṁ brāhmyām ᵅ asmin vasv
iti yugma-kṛṣṇalaṁ bārhaspatyāyām ᵅ dūṣyā dūṣir asī 'ti
srāktyam abhicarato 'bhicaryamāṇasya ca ᵅ gobhiṣ ṭvā pātṽ
ṛṣabha iti trivṛtaṁ prājāpatyāyām ᵅ

3. akṣitās ta iti yavamaṇiṁ sāvitrīyām ᵅ uttamo 'si' ti man-
troktaṁ gāyatrīyām ᵅ ā 'yam agann iti mantroktam āṅgira-
syām ᵅ pumān pum̄sa iti mantroktam abhicarato 'bhicarya-
māṇasya ce ᵅ

4. 'maṁ badhnāmi te maṇiṁ dīrghāyutvāya tejasa iti
darbhamaṇiṁ āindryām ᵅ abhivartene 'ti rathanemimaṇiṁ
māhendryām ᵅ āudumbareṇa maṇinā puṣṭikāmāya vedhase
'ty āudumbaraṁ kāuberyām ᵅ

5. yad ābadhnann iti yugmakṛṣṇalam ādityāyām ᵅ nava
prāṇān iti trivṛtaṁ vāiṣṇavyām ᵅ abhy arcate 'ty āudumbaraṁ
vāstospatyāyām ᵅ ayaṁ pratisara iti mantroktam rūdryām ᵅ

6. nec chatrur iti pāṭā-mūlam aparājītāyām ᵅ ṣatakāṇḍo
duḥcyavana iti darbhamaṇiṁ yāmyāyām ᵅ vātāj jāta iti ṣaṅ-
kham vāruṇyām ᵅ jaṅgiḍo 'si (jaṅgiḍo rakṣitā 'sī) 'ti jaṅgiḍam
vāyavyāyām ᵅ ṣatavāro anīnaṣad iti ṣatavāraṁ samtatyām ᵅ

7. agniḥ sūrya idaṁ varca iti trivṛtaṁ tvāṣṭryām ᵅ hari-

XIX. 2. Sāyaṇa, AV 3. 22, p. 466: hastivarcam . . . brāhmyām
(P: some variant for hastidantaṁ). Sāyaṇa, AV 1. 9, p. 59: asmin . . .
bārhaspatyāyām. M vāsv. Sāyaṇa, AV 2. 11, p. 244: bārhaspatyāyām
. . . ca (S'Kd: sraktyam). M asi. Ma srāktyām. Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 27,
p. 373: gobhiṣ . . . sāvitrīyām (in 3; S' yomaṇiṁ for yava°). — 3. Sāyaṇa,
AV 3. 5, p. 360: ā 'yam . . . āṅgirasīyām; 3. 6, p. 366: āṅgirasīyām. . .
'bhicaryamāṇasya ca. — 4. Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 28, p. 383: imaṁ . . . māhen-
dryām; 1. 29, p. 149: abhivartene . . . māhendryām. M rathanemimaṇi.
Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 31, p. 394: āudumbareṇa . . . kāuberyām. M kāuveryām.
— 5. Sāyaṇa, AV 1. 35, p. 179: yad . . . ādityāyām. M ābradhnam.
(Sāyaṇa, AV 5. 28, p. 786): nava . . . vāiṣṇavyām. M trivṛtaṁ. Sāyaṇa,
AV 7. 87, p. 484: abhy . . . āudumbaraṁ. Sāyaṇa, AV 8. 5, p. 623:
ayaṁ . . . rūdryām. — 6. Sāyaṇa, AV 2. 27, p. 291: nec chatrur iti
pāṭhāmūlam aparājītāyām; 19. 32, p. 404: nec . . . pāṭhāmūlam . . .
yāmyām (P: yāmyāyām). M ne chatrūr. M duḥcyavana. Sāyaṇa, AV
4. 10, p. 560: vātāj . . . vāruṇyām; 19. 34, p. 415: vātāj . . . vāyavyāyām
M omits words in (). Ma jaṅgiḍam. Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 36, p. 425: ṣata-
vāro . . . ṣatavāraṁ (so S'; P: ṣatāvāri) samtatyām. M traninaṣad or
aninaṣad. M ṣatāvāraṁ. — 7. Sāyaṇa, AV 7. 26, p. 354: agniḥ sūrya
idaṁ viṣṇur iti . . . tvāṣṭryām. Sāyaṇa, AV 3. 7, p. 371: hariṇasye
. . . kāumāryām; 19. 44, p. 451: hariṇasye . . . nairṭryām; 19. 46, p. 463:

ṅasye 'ti viṣṇānāgram kāmāryām Ḍ āyuso 'si prataraṇam ity
āñjanam nāirṛtyām Ḍ prajāpatiṣ tvā 'badhnād ity astṛtaim
mārudgaṇyām Ḍ

8. tvayā pūrvam ity ājaçṛṅgam gāndharvyām Ḍ ehi jīvam
ity āñjanamaṇim āirāvatyām Ḍ arātīyor iti phālam pārthi-
vyām Ḍ ayaṁ me varaṇo maṇir iti vāraṇam abhayāyām Ḍ
pratisaram vā sarvatra || 19 ||

XX. 1. Tantrabhūtām mahāçāntīm pravakṣyāmo yathāvi-
dhi |

anyāsām viçvaçāntinām amṛtām viçvabheṣajīm ||

2. Nadībhyo vā hradebhyo vā jalam puṇyam samāharet |
sam sam sravantu tad-vidvān abhimantrayate tataḥ ||

3. Çam ta āpo hāimavatīr yāvatiṣu maṇyā itī |
pāurṇamāsam atas tantram ājyabhāgāu yadā hutāu ||

4. Tadā çāntyudakam kuryā(t) tanmantram anuyojayet |
triḥ prokṣyā 'gnim tataḥ kumbhe snapanā-rthā ni-
secayet ||

5. Paçyann anyāni kāryāṇi na sarvā nikṣiped apaḥ |
açvatthas tasya lomāni vṛihūṅç cāi 'va yavāns tathā
çigrum hutvā jalam cāi 'va guggulum viṣam eva ca || 20 ||

XXI. 1. Pippalīm kṣṇalīm cāi 'va sahām cāi 'va tv alābunā
çaratūlāni bhṛṣṭiṅç ca juhuyāç cātanena tu ||

2. Etenāi 've 'ṅiçam hutvā samidho 'bhyādadhāti ca |
ātāsir jātuṣiç cāi 'va trāpusir māuṣalis tathā ||

āyuso 'si (S' hi) prataraṇam . . . 'badhnād iti trivṛtaim (S' tam) mārud-
gaṇyām. M kāmāryāmāyumāryām āyuso. Mb atastṛtaim. — 8. Sāyaṇa,
AV 4. 9, p. 554: ehi . . . āirāvatyām. (Sāyaṇa, AV 10. 6, p. 762):
arātīyor . . . pārthivyām. M phālam. (Sāyaṇa, AV 10. 3, p. 743):
ayaṁ . . . abhayāyām. Sāyaṇa, AV 2. 11, p. 245: pratisaram vā sarvatra.
XX. Sāyaṇa, AV 19. 1, p. 249, quotes 1. 2; p. 250, quotes 1^c; 19. 2, p. 252,
quotes 2, 3^a; and 4. 37, p. 705, quotes 5^{ef}. — 1. M mahāçānti. Ma prava-
kṣyāmi. M yathāvidhim. S'P sarvaçāntinām. M viçvabheṣajam. —
2. M sasamsravantu. S' once, abhimantrayeta. — 3. M pāurṇamāsa-
maghas tantram. — 4. Ma snapanārtham; b snapanārtham. — 5. M sar-
vāṇi kṣaped. M çigrum. M guggulam; S'P galgulum. M caḥ. XXI, Sāyaṇa,
AV 4. 37, p. 705, quotes as if in succession: 1^{ad}, and 5. — 1. M piṣyaliṁ.
Ma kṣṇalīm. Ma saha. — 2. M bhyādadhiti. Ma ātūsir; b ātūsir.
M māuṣalis.

3. Khādirir atha pā'āçis tārṣṭāghih samidhas tathā |
apāmārgir athā 'çvatthir etenāi vo 'patiṣṭhate ||
4. Oṣadhīm khadiram cāi 'vā 'pāmārga(m) mahāuṣadham |
baja-piṅgāu çatiṅgam ca çālmalam malayā saha ||
5. Oṣadhīm sahamānām tu pṛṇiparṇīm tathā parām |
ajaçṅgīm samasyāi 'tām amantram juhuyāt sakṛt || 21 ||

XXII. 1. Tumbara-daṇḍa(h) sadampuşpā tathā 'nye
gāurasarṣapāh |
daçapatrā daçā 'çmānah sikatā pratisarasya
vāi ||

2. Açmavarme 'ti sūktena juhvat sampātayed imān |
ānayed apsu çāntāsu sampātān uttarān budhaḥ ||
3. Sarvāsu veçmano dikṣu maṇḍalāny anulepayet |
nikīrya sikatās teṣu çāntādbhiḥ prokṣayet tataḥ ||
4. Nidadhyād açmanas tatra dvārasyo 'pari lepayet |
nidadhyāt tatra daṇḍādi nikīrya sikatā iti ||
5. Ye 'syām pratidiçam hutvā prāci dig upatiṣṭhate |
sampātān ānayet kumbhe juhvan mantrair atho 'tta-
rāih || 22 ||

XXIII. 1. Prayojyaḥ çānti-samjūo 'taḥ kṛtyādūṣaṇa eva
ca |
cātano matṛnāmā ca vāstoṣpatyo 'tha pāp-
mahā ||

2. Tato yakṣmo-'paghātas tu tata(h) svapnā-'ntikaḥ paraḥ |
gaṇāv āyusya-varcasyāu tathā 'pratiratham smṛtam ||
3. Punas tad eva japyam tu çantātiyam athā 'vataḥ |
antakāyā 'rabhasve 'ti prāṇādyā dvādaça tv ṛcaḥ ||

XXI. 3. Ma apāmārgir. — 4. Ma amārga; b amārga, with pā in marg. M bajainpigāu. Ma çatiṅgam. Mb balayā. — 5. M auṣadhīm. XXII. Sāyaṇa, AV 3. 26, p. 482, quotes, 5^{ab}; 2. 2, p. 199, quotes, 5^{cd}. — 1. M sadampuşyā. M daçaputrā. — 2. Ma çūktrena. M juhvan. Ma budha. — 3. Ma daṇḍadina nikīrya. — 5. M prāci di. Ma upatiṣṭhati. M juhvana. Ma ttarāṇ. XXIII. Sāyaṇa, AV 2. 2, p. 199, quotes, 1^{cd}; 2. 11, p. 243; 8. 5, p. 622, quotes, 1^b; 2. 14, p. 259, quotes, 1^c; 19. 13, p. 317, quotes, 2^{cd}; 8. 1, p. 553; 8. 2, p. 568, quotes, 3^{abc}. — 1. M kṛtyādūṣaṇa aiva. M pāsmahā. — 2. Ma svapnāntika. Ma gaṇāvāyusya varcasyā; b gaṇāvāyusya varcasyā; P gaṇa āyusya varcasya. S' smṛti. — 3. Ma punas tud. M dvādaça ṛcaḥ; cf. comm.

4. Vyatiṣaktās tu tā sarvāḥ cāntīyena saha smṛtāḥ |
vyatiṣakte tu cāntīye prāṇāpānāv iti smṛtāḥ ||
5. Atha mantrān yathākāmam āvapet pūrvacoditān |
prāṇasūktasya ya(c) cheṣam kevalam tat samāpayet |
rudrarāudragaṇāv atra nityam cāntāu prayoja-
yet || 23 ||

XXIV. 1. Atha svastyayanaḥ cāi 'va tathā 'bhayā-'parā-
jitāu |

- çarmavarmā tataḥ proktas tathā devapurā smṛtaḥ ||
2. Rudrarāudragaṇāu cai 'va tataḥ citrāgaṇaḥ paraḥ |
cānt(y)ādayo daçā 'mnātā aṣṭāu svastyayanādayaḥ ||
3. aṣṭādaçagaṇāiḥ sarvāi(r) mahācāntiḥ smṛtā budhāiḥ |
parān aṣṭāu gaṇā.1 muktivā yac cā 'dho nāirṛtasya vāi ||
4. Eṣā daçagaṇā proktā cāntir nityā maṇiṣibhiḥ |
etām arvānāyānādāu snapanārthaṁ niṣecayet ||
5. Pratiṣṭhāpya tathāi 'va reām etām eva prayojayet |
gaṇānteṣu ca sarveṣu brāhmaṇān svastivācayet ||
6. Tūṣṇīm gugguluhomaç ca rakṣobhyo dānam āpnuyāt |
namo rakṣobhyo namo mahārakṣobhyo namo rakṣo-
'dhipatibhyaḥ | namo gaṇebhyo namo mahāgaṇebhyo
namo mahāgaṇādhipatibhyaḥ | āyuṣyam gaṇam hutvā
'tmani sampātān ānayati | patuīva(n)taṁ hutvā
patnyām sampātān ānayati ||
7. Dadhimanthaṁ surāmanthaṁ saktumanthaṁ prayacchati |
rakṣobhyo dakṣiṇeṇā 'tha mantrāir āplāvayet tataḥ ||
8. Ye purastāt tathā 'cānām samam jyotir uto asi |
punantu mā tathā vāyoh pūto vaiçvānaraḥ tataḥ || 24 ||

XXV. 1. Prāṇa-sūktena sampātya bandhyo vrihiyavāu
maṇiḥ |

alamkr̥tya tathā 'bhyareya tato dvāu paridhāpayet ||

XXIII. 4. Ma vyatiṣiktās. Ma sarvā?. Ma cāntīyena. Ma vyatisrikte.
In marg. tha for tu. Ma cāntīye prāṇāpānāvvyatismr̥tāḥ; b cāntīye
prāṇāpānāvvyatismr̥tāḥ. XXIV. 1. Ma adhā.—2. Ma citrāgaṇa.—
3. Ma aṣṭādaçagaṇāi. M mahācāntiḥ. M parān.—4. Mb ekādaçagaṇā.
Ma maṇiṣibhiḥ. Ma āitām. Mb arvanāyānādāu.—5. Ma brāhmaṇoṇi;
b brāhmaṇām.—6. M gugguluhomaç. M rakṣādhipatibhyaḥ.—8. M
tathāi. Ma vaiçvānaraḥ smṛtaḥ. XXV. 1. M vrihiyavāu. M dvo;
taṁ Bikāner 299 in midst of corruptions.

2. Pākayajña-vidhānena çrapayitvā caruim budhaḥ |
āvāpikena taṁ hutvā tantraim saṁsthāpayet tataḥ ||
3. Tad anvāhārya çeṣaṁ tu brāhmaṇāu bhojayet tataḥ |
bhojayet peçalam cā 'nnaṁ tuṣyeyur yena vā dvijāḥ ||
4. Brāhmaṇo daça gā dadyād anaḍvāhaṁ tato 'dhikam |
sīrādhikam tato vāiçyas tathā prādeçiko hayam ||
5. Rājā dadyād varam grāmaṁ samūho rājavat tathā |
yathoktāim dakṣiṇāim dadyāt sakalam phalam açnute ||
sakalam phalam açnuta iti || 25 || iti çrī atharvavede
çāntikalpa(ḥ) samāptaḥ ||

XXV. 3. Ma pāçalam. Ma jena. — 4. M gāim. Ma çirādhikam.
M vāiçyas. — 5. Ma samuho rājavart. M çrāu atharvavede.

E. TRANSLATION OF THE ÇĀNTIKALPA.

I. 1. Then we shall tell the service of the Nakṣatras. Clad in a new garment, to the east of the fire, after covering the seats with a new cloth, its fringe to the north, he must bring hither the asterisms, Kṛttikā, etc., with the twenty-eight verses. "I shall have brought hither the beautiful Kṛttikā."

2. I shall have brought hither the beautiful Kṛttikā, honored by the gods: come hither, O neutral goddess, the eldest daughter of Dakṣa, the beautiful.

3. I am having brought hither the granter of wishes, Rohiṇī, the beloved of the moon: come hither, O Rohiṇī, thou knower of the right, thou who art propitious to "constant" works.

4. I am having brought hither the granter of wishes, Andhakā, the beloved of the moon: come hither, O goddess Andhakā, thou who art propitious to "kind" works.

5. Ārdrā, I shall have brought hither, the nakṣatra that is termed Bāhu: come hither, O Ārdrā, beauteous in every limb, cruel, devoted to Rudra.

6. The asterism that knows the right, Punarvasu, I shall have brought hither: O Punarvasu, come hither, thou who art favorable to "mobile" deeds.

II. 1. Puṣya, I shall have brought hither, the nakṣatra that is termed "swift": come hither, O prosperous Puṣya, increase prosperity (poṣa) on every side.

2. I am having brought hither Açleşā, she who increases the

welfare of her worshippers: O Aṅṅeṣā, do thou come hither, thou cruel giver of victory.

3. Maghā, I shall have brought hither, a nakṣatra harsh in its might: come hither to me, O lovely goddess, thou destroyer of all sin.

4. The asterism, I shall have brought hither, that is termed Pūrvaphālgunī: come hither, thou who art distinguished for thy fortune, thou helper of "harsh" deeds.

5. I shall have brought hither the asterism Uttarā Phālgunī, the beautiful: do thou come hither, O lovely goddess, constant, beautiful in every limb.

III. 1. Hasta, I shall have brought hither, the asterism of Savitar, swift in its speed: come hither, thou asterism of Savitar, thou that knowest the right, that destroyest evil for thy worshippers.

2. I shall have brought hither the captivating Citrā of various (citra) forms: come hither to me, thou granter of wishes, O Citrā, thou who art propitious to "kind" works.

3. I shall have brought hither Svāti that always travels on the northern road: O goddess Svāti, do thou come hither, thou who art propitious to "mobile" works.

4. I shall have brought hither the asterism Viçākhā whose brilliancy is harsh: O Viçākhā, do thou come hither, O goddess, neutral, beautiful.

5. I shall have brought hither the asterism Anurādhā, the granter of wishes: O Anurādhā, do thou come hither, thou who art propitious to "kind" works.

IV. 1. Jyeṣṭhā, I shall have brought hither, the nakṣatra whose divinity is Çakra: O Jyeṣṭhā, thou cruel, fair-eyed goddess, do thou come hither.

2. Mūla, I shall have brought hither, the great, cruel nakṣatra: come hither, O Mūla, the distinguished, thou granter of safety to thy worshippers.

3. The asterism, I shall have brought hither, that is termed "Pūrvāṣādhā": come hither, thou harsh granter of wishes, O Āṣādhā Pūrvapūrvikā.

4. The asterism, I shall have brought hither, that is termed Uttarāṣādhā: O Uttarā Āṣādhā, effecter of "constant" (works), do thou come hither.

5. The asterism, I shall have brought hither, which is called Abhijit: come hither, O best asterism, to-day, thou helper of "swift" works.

V. 1. I shall have brought hither the asterism Çravaṇa, the granter of all desires: O Aḡvattha, do thou come hither, thou helper of "mobile" works.

2. Dhaniṣṭhā, I shall have brought hither, the nakṣatra beloved of the moon: O Dhaniṣṭhā, do thou come hither, thou helper of "mobile" works.

3. I shall have brought hither the asterism by name Çatabhiṣā, the beautiful: do thou come hither, O Çatabhiṣā, thou who art propitious to "mobile" works.

4. I shall have brought hither the great asterism Pūrvabhadrapadā: come hither, O Bhadrapadā Pūrvā, thou helper of "harsh" works.

5. I shall have brought hither to its place the constant asterism Bhadrapadottarā do thou come hither for me, O glorious Bhadrapadottarā.

6. I shall have brought hither the asterism Revatī, of lovely appearance: come hither, O Revatī, thou who knowest the right, and art propitious to "kind" works.

7. I shall have brought hither the "swift" asterism that is termed Aḡvinī: come hither, O Aḡvinī, the distinguished, the giver of wishes; the granter of desires.

8. I shall have brought hither the harsh asterism that is termed Bharanī: come hither, O lovely goddess Bharanī, of lovely appearance.

9. After having had brought in with these verses images of the nakṣatras made out of colors, wood, or metal, he must place them in the seats with their faces towards the west (*i.e.* so as to face the fire).

VI. 1. (He must make) red the color of the Kṛttikās, of both Phalgunīs, of Hasta, and of the asterisms of Pūṣan and Mitra.

2. Yellow of that which has Ka for regent, of Puṣya and those of Çakra and the Vasus: white of those of Soma, Rudra, the Waters, and Varuṇa.

3. White is also prescribed for the asterisms of Aditi, the Serpents, the Manes, Brahman, and Vāyu, and for the two Proṣṭhapadā.

4. A form of diverse colors will always be made by a wise man for the asterisms of Tvaṣṭar, the Viṣve Devās, and the Agvins.

5. Black for the asterism of Yama and for Mūla; palāṅga-color for Çravaṇa; yellow and red must be made (the colors) of the Viçākhe, bringers of reward (they will prove to be).

6. To these asterisms seated in a firm place (he must give) flowers, garments, and ointment of corresponding colors.

7. Having done as stated with the six verses AV 9. 3. 23 ff. and (the words) "May their worships the nakṣatras receive these"; then at the end of the ājyabhāgāu after offering ājya with (the two hymns) AV 19. 7 and 8; after offering from the havis with the verses of sections 7-11 (= Nakṣatrakalpa 37-41), he must offer ājya. After putting fagots on the fire, he worships.

VII. 1. Agni, the god of the pious, whose track is black, Vāiṣvānara, Jātavedas, the eater of the best essences, may he the fire, flaming with the first of the Nakṣatras, the Kṛttikās, prove propitious for us.

2. Prajāpati who created these creatures (prajā), he after creating the gods made them dependent upon the (sacrificial) works; may he the devourer of all together with Rohiṇī, make our rites propitious, in all our undertakings, that (our sacrificial) work may succeed.

3. Çakra, whom the knowers of knowledge, the brilliant men, praise together with the troops of deities; may he, the best of kings, O Mṛgaçiras, in our undertaking make our rites propitious, that our work may succeed.

4. May he, Rudra, whom they praise as the god, Bhava, the lord of cattle, the robber, the lean one, the great god, Çarva, the terrible, Çikhaṇḍin, the thousand-eyed, the black, protect us together with Ārdrā.

5. (The goddess Aditi) who is revered by seers and poets, by gods and then by men, the daughter of Dakṣa, may she the first-born, O Punarvasū, being praised by us make our rites propitious that our work may succeed.

VIII. 1. By whose piety, (sacrificial) work, and acuteness, the gods practised witchcraft (abhicāra) upon the great Asura, him the wise guru of the gods, Bṛhaspati, I praise; may he together with Puṣya protect me.

2. Those whom, praised by us, I impel by my wisdom, who

were inflamed by the Rishis whose desires were as flames, the wise Rishis of the son of Jaratkāra; may they, the Aḥleśās, together with the Serpents, protect us.

3. The meritorious great Rishis both of later and former times, who wrought out godliness; I, the son, praise the fathers who belong to King Yama; and may Maghā make our rites propitious.

4. Bhaga who brings into union with the (sacrificial) work the supporters of mankind, and observes the earth, bringing joy to creatures; O ye two who have him for divinity, most propitious, (well) adorned, I choose the worship of (ye) the Pūrve Phalgunyāu.

5. Raising my voice in the jagatī I praise the god Aryaman who was praised by the wise men of former times; may the Uttare Phalgunyāu, who have him for divinity, the most propitious, (well) adorned, (be propitious) to our worship of the gods.

IX. 1. Whose golden chariot yoked with brown, white-footed steeds moves on the pleasant paths; he, Savitar, whose food is gold, Savitar, whose hand is gold, may he protect us together with Hasta.

2. Obeisance to Tvaṣṭar, to the creator of the world, to the wise, to the protector of the world, to the performer of the greatest deeds; may she, the goddess Citrā, the bringer of beauty, praised by us, together with our undertaking, make for the success of our (sacrificial) work.

3. Mātariḡvan, the eater of the best essences, who having become propitious, giving life frequents the mouths of them that breathe; may he, the flag of the air, the support of all creatures, the god Vāyu together with Svāti protect us.

4. The two who are chosen by the wise, the knowers of the Ātman, the two singers of sāmans who together (come to) the three pressings (of the Soma); may they, Indra and Agni, the revered granters of wishes, under the Viçakhe make good fortune for long life.

5. Bharadvāja the Rishi, whom all the gods called friend (mitra) . . . ; him I praise with the jagatī song; may he together with the harsh (asterisms) the Anurādhās protect me.

X. 1. He of a hundred powers who smote down Çambara, and after slaying Vṛtra let loose the streams; may he, the breaker of fortresses, whose friends are the Maruts, may he, praised by us, with gladdened spirit, protect us together with Jyeṣṭhā.

2. Mother Earth who with her might supports the place of the great gods, she is also the supporter of all creatures; may she, praised by us, the goddess Nirṛti, at all our works, make Mūla (propitious) to the success of our (sacrificial) work.

3. Those who let loose by Parjanya, gladden on all sides for its increment that which is enclosed by the three sickles; them I praise, the Waters, sacred to Varuṇa. . . . May Pūrvā Āśādhā be with svadhā at our yojana.

4. Those who delight the thirty-three gods, and the more numerous, infinite ones whose names are gods; may they, the Uttarā Āśādhās, O all ye Vasus, being well-pleased, make our rites propitious.

5. He who is the knower of all, the creator of all, the supporter of all creatures, apart from whom there is nothing else; may he, the infinite, truthful, much praised Brahmā, together with Abhijit, protect us.

XI. 1. He who made three strides bringing forth an abode for Indra, who shakes not in his abode, that he might drink (the Soma) and for the gods; may he that knoweth all upon the back of the firmament with Çravaṇa protect heaven for us.

2. . . . may the heroes being strengthened together with the Çraviṣṭhās protect us.

3. . . . thy host we praise, may the two who serve as food for the gods, Pratyagbhiṣaj and Çatabhiṣaj, be propitious to us.

4. He has set in motion for us the slow-moving Çunāsīrāu; they have given to the Fathers their kindly breasts; may Ekapād Aja make the first-born Pratiṣṭhānāu (propitious) to all our desires and our freedom from danger.

5. For all purposes and for the success of my (sacrificial) work I make obeisance to the worker of many deeds that was praised by the seers; may he, Ahi Budhnya, make the Uttarāu Pratiṣṭhānāu propitious for all my desires and freedom from danger.

6. . . . may he, Pūṣan, make Revatī propitious for us.

7. The two who having been made drinkers of the Soma by their wisdom made the Rishi Cyavana young when he was old; may they, the two physicians, his benefactors, the kindly Aḡvins, by their knowledge . . . our offspring under Aḡvinī.

8. He whose (dogs) Çyāma and Çabala keep guard over the svadhā, the friends of men (but) not alike to the doer of evil and of good; . . . may he King Yama together with the Bharanīs pro-

fect for us them and the Fathers(?) together with them that follow the laws of Savitar.

XII. 1. Then the gifts offered to the nakṣatras: ghee to the Kṛttikās; all seeds to Rohiṇī; milk-rice for Mṛgaçiras; honey to Ārdṛā; (rice) grains for the Punarvasū; milk-rice with ghee for Puṣya; 2. all plants to the Aḷeṣās; sesame and (rice) grains to the Maghās; panicum italicum to the first Phalgunyāu; unhusked (grains) to the second; curds to Hasta; milk-rice with ghee to Citṛā; barley smeared with ghee to Svāti; 3. two porridges of barley to the Viçākhe; lentils to the Anurādhās; gold to Jyeṣṭhā; the roots of plants to Mūla; rice to the first Āṣādhās; milk to the second; all jewels to Abhijit; 4. (rice) grains to Çravaṇa; bud-sheaths of the udumbara and the ficus indica to the Çraviṣṭhās; water-growing flowers to Çatabhiṣaj; rice to the first Proṣṭhapa-dāu; rice and barley to the second; ghee and unhusked grains to Revatī; 5. sprouts of milky trees to the Aḷvayujāu; black sesame mixed with clarified butter (sarpis) and honey to the Bharaniṣ. After offering the ājya with the hymns AV 19. 7 and 8, after worshipping with the abhaya (gaṇa or hymn?) he must bring the tantra to a close. 6. The nakṣatra-fees are stated in the following section. They propitiate the Brahmans with food.

XIII. 1. Under the Kṛttikās he gives to the Brahmans milk-rice with clarified butter; under Rohiṇī a porridge mixed with clarified butter along with unhusked grains and beans; under Mṛgaçiras a milch goat; under Ārdṛā, fasting himself, he must give a dish of rice and sesame mixed with sesame oil; cakes with honey under the Punarvasū; 2. gold under Puṣya; under the Aḷeṣās gold; under the Maghās he must perform a çrāddha (offering to the Manes) with sesame mixed with honey; under the first Phalgunyāu along with certain cakes (maṇḍaka) thickened sugar-caue-juice and oil cake bricks (?); the same with honey under the second; under Hasta an elephant-chariot harnessed; under Citṛā a female of the Çūdra caste (vṛṣālī) adorned and anointed with perfumes; under Svāti he must give as a gift of honor (whatever) in the house is dear to him; 3. a beautiful cow, a pair of draught oxen with a beverage of honey under the Viçākhe; under the Anurādhās a mantle; and pure food under Jyeṣṭhā; under Mūla let him bestow spirituous liquor together with food for non-brahmanical women; under the first Āṣādhās a beverage made of barley;

under the second one of honey; under Abhijit his daughter with the wedding ritual; a woollen cloth and a flute under Çra-vaṇa; under the Dhaniṣṭhās a pair of garments; 4. all perfumes under Çatabhiṣaj; a porridge with goat's flesh under the first, a porridge with ram's flesh under the second, Proṣṭhapadāu; a beautiful cow, a heifer, one that has had a calf and can fill a brass milkpail, under Revatī; 5. a pair of oxen covered with a cloth under Aḡvayuj; under the Bharanīs a sesame cow according to ritual. He who according to this rule gives the nakṣatra fees, shines in all the worlds like the moon among the nakṣatras, like the sun among the heavenly bodies.

XIV. 1. Next at the great ceremony for averting (the evil effects) of portents he sacrifices to the cardinal points, the intermediate points, Yama, Indra, Varuṇa, the lord of the universe (Çiva), Viṣṇu, the sun and moon, Agni, the planets, Vāyu, and the Aḡvins according to some. Then the mantras.

2. AV 1. 31. 1, for the cardinal points; "To the intermediate points. Svāhā." for the intermediate points; AV 18. 1. 50, for Yama; AV 6. 5. 2, for Indra; AV 7. 83. 1, for Varuṇa; AV 11. 4. 23, for the lord of the universe; AV 7. 26 3°, for Viṣṇu; AV 8. 2. 15, for the sun and moon; AV 4. 15. 10, for Agni; AV 17. 1. 1 ff., are said (to be the mantras) for the planets, the sun, etc.; Kāuḡ. 127. 5, for Vāyu; the half of AV 5. 26. 12, for the Aḡvins.

XV. 1. Next the ceremony of Nirṛti: at a cross roads to the southwest, clad in a black garment he kindles in the night a funeral fire in vīraṇa grass.

2. He must erect or have made to the south of the funeral fire, a clay image representing Nirṛti clad in a black garment, with her face to the north.

3. Having honored her with black flowers, having burned incense, he must make a bali-offering: he must give split (?) and bearded grains of corn, certain cakes, ground sesame, liquor, (4) meal, sour gruel of fruits, meat, honey, kroḡḡ, fruits, flowers, a porridge of rice and sesame, fish, and cakes.

5. Then with his face turned towards (the image of) Nirṛti, with AV 4. 36. 10; 6. 63. 1; 84. 1; 8. 2. 12, 13; Kāuḡ. 97. 8, after offering separately the following substances mixed with gravel, raw meat, iṅgida-oil as ājya, chaff, reed points, and panicles, "dogstooth" thorns and grains of corn, reed points unmixed

(with gravel); then he must offer an oblation of gravel, (and) an oblation of chaff on a heated saucer; with the words "Slain are the haters of the Brahmans" he breaks the saucer over the back of an ass. Or he must sacrifice a kettle of rice to Nirṛti.

6. Muttering AV 6. 26. 1, he must go to the water. In a place on the bank of a navigable river where it makes a bend to the south he must fasten a mat of drift grass. With the hymns of the Waters he sprinkles (the mat). He leaves the black (garment) in the water. Clad in a new garment, after uttering a benediction, he puts on his shoes, turns round with AV 10. 1. 32 (or 7. 13. 1), and comes back.

XVI. 1. Next we will tell the Mahāçāntis (the great ceremonies for averting the evil effects of prodigies). (They are) the Amṛtā (immortal), those of the Viçve Devās, of Agni, of Bhṛgu, of Brahmā, of Bṛhaspati, of Prajāpati, of Savitar, of the Gāyatrī, of Aṅgiras, of Indra, of Mahendra, of Kubera, of Aditi (or Āditya), of Viṣṇu, of Vāstospati, of Rudra, the Aparājitā (unconquerable), those of Yama, of Varuṇa, of Vāyu, (the one called) Continuance, those of Tvaṣṭar, of Kumāra (Skanda), of Nirṛti, of the troops of the Maruts, of the Gandharvas, of Āirāvata (Indra's elephant), of the Earth, and (the one called) Abhayā (the one that produces immunity from danger).

XVII. 1. One should employ the Amṛtā in case of portents of sky, air, or earth; that of the Viçve Devās for the dead; that of Agni in case of danger of fire, or for one who wishes everything; that of Bhṛgu for those who are tormented by danger produced by the nakṣatras or planets, or seized by disease; that of Brahmā for one who wishes preëminence in theology or virtue (brahmanavarcas), or in case of fire blazing out in one's garment or bed; that of Bṛhaspati for one who wishes a kingdom, wealth, good fortune, or brahmanavarcas, or is practising witchcraft, or is its victim;

2. That of Prajāpati for one who wishes offspring (prajā), cattle, or food, or in the case of the death of offspring; that of Savitar for one who wishes purity; that of the Gāyatrī for one who desires to be a preëminent theologian in the department of metre; that of Aṅgiras for one who desires success, or is practising witchcraft, or is its victim; that of Indra for one who desires victory, strength (or troops), rain (v.l. prosperity), and cattle, or in case of the coming of a hostile army;

3. That of Mahendra for one who desires a kingdom, or in the case of the occurrence of portents or monstrosities; that of Kubera for one who wishes wealth or in case of the destruction of wealth; that of Aditi (or Āditya) for one who desires good luck, brilliance, wealth, or life; that of Viṣṇu for one who desires food or in case of the destruction of food; that of Vāstoṣpati at the performance of the consecration of a house, or for one who desires welfare; that of Rudra for one tormented by disease or in the case of desires not specified, or in case of various misfortunes;

4. The Aparājītā for one who desires victory; that of Yama in danger of death (yama); that of Varuṇa in danger of water or in case of the destruction of water; that of Vāyu in the case of a wind or whirlwind; Continuance in case of the destruction of the family;

5. That of Tvaṣṭar in the case of the destruction of a garment; that of Kumāra (the boy) for a sick child; that of Nirṛti for one in the grasp of misfortune (Nirṛti); that of the troops of the Maruts for one who desires strength (or troops); that of the Gandharvas in case of the death of a horse; that of Āirāvata (Indra's elephant) in case of the death of an elephant; that of the Earth for one who desires the earth; the Abhayā for one tormented by danger (bhaya).

XVIII. 1. Next the Āvāpikāḥ Ḷāntayaḥ: at the Amṛtā, "For the Ḷānti thou art the Ḷānti, thou art the great Ḷānti, the greater, the better, the more excellent. Obeisance be to thee. May it make for me long life that reaches old age." AV 8. 8. 13, at that of the Viṣve Devās. AV 2. 6. 1; 7. 82. 1, at that of Agni.

2. The Citrāgaṇa at that of Bhṛgu. AV 4. 1. 1, and Kāuḥ. 97. 8, at that of Brahmā. AV 7. 51. 1, and 53. 1, at that of Bṛhaspati.

3. AV 4. 15. 11, at that of Prajāpati. The Vyāhṛtigaṇa at that of Savitar. After arranging verses in seven metres with the gāyatrī first, "To the gāyatrī. Svāhā," and so forth according to the metres (he uses) the Chandogagaṇa at that of the Gāyatrī. AV 2. 6. 1 at that of Aṅgiras.

4. AV 2. 5. 1 at that of Indra. AV 17. 1. 18, and 20. 138. 1 at that of Mahendra. AV 5. 3. 1 at that of Kubera.

5. The Salilagaṇa at that of Aditi (or Āditya). AV 7. 26. 1 at that of Viṣṇu. The Vāstoṣpatyagaṇa at that of Vāstoṣpati. The Rudragaṇa at that of Rudra. The Aparājitagagaṇa at the Aparājītā.

6. AV 6. 114. 1 at that of Yama. AV 18. 4. 89 at that of Varuṇa. AV 4. 25. 1 at that of Vāyu. AV 11. 4. 1 at the Continuance. AV 19. 24. 1 at that of Tvaṣṭar.

7. AV 4. 31. 1, and 32. 1 at that of Kumāra. The mantras of Nirṛti at that of Nirṛti. AV 4. 27. 1, and 7. 80. 3 at that of the troops of the Maruts. AV 19. 25. 1 at that of the Gandharvas.

8. The Āyusya, Çānti and Svasti gaṇas at that of Āirāvata. The (bhāuma) anuvāka beginning AV 12. 1. 1 at that of the Earth. The Abhayagaṇa at the Abhayā.

XIX. 1. With AV 11. 4. 1 let him bind on as an amulet rice and barley at the Amṛtā. With AV 8. 2. 1 an amulet of the pinus deodora at the çānti of the Viṣve Devās. With AV 19. 26. 1 (let him fasten) a piece of gold in his ear at that of Agni. With AV 2. 7. 1 an amulet of a thousand stalks at that of Bhr̥gu.

2. With AV 3. 22. 1 an amulet made of ivory at that of Brahmā. With AV 1. 9. 1 a pair of kṛṣṇala-berries at that of Bṛhaspati, with 2. 11. 1 an amulet made of the sraکتya-tree (clerodendrum phlomoides) for one who is practising witchcraft or is its victim. With 19. 27. 1 a triple amulet at that of Prajāpati.

3. With AV 6. 142. 3 an amulet of barley at that of Savitar. With AV 6. 15. 1 (*et al.*) an amulet of the substance mentioned in the mantra, at that of the Gāyatrī. With AV 3. 5. 1 (*et al.*) an amulet of the substance mentioned in the mantra at that of Aṅgiras; with 3. 6. 1 (*et al.*) an amulet of the substance mentioned in the mantra, for one who is practising witchcraft or is its victim.

4. With AV 19. 28. 1 an amulet of darbha grass at that of Indra. With AV 1. 29. 1 an amulet made of the felloe of a wheel at that of Mahendra. With AV 19. 31. 1 an amulet of udumbara wood at that of Kubera.

5. With AV 1. 35. 1 a pair of kṛṣṇala berries at that of Aditi (or Āditya). With AV 5. 28. 1 a triple amulet at that of Viṣṇu. With AV 7. 82. 1 an amulet of udumbara wood at that of Vāstoṣpati. With AV 8. 5. 1 an amulet of the substance mentioned in the mantra at that of Rudra.

6. With AV 2. 27. 1 an amulet made from the root of the pātā-plant (clypea hernandifolia) at the Aparājitā. With AV 19. 32. 1 an amulet of darbha grass at that of Yama. With AV 4. 10. 1 a shell as an amulet at that of Varuṇa. With AV 19. 34. 1 an amulet of the jaṅgiḍa-tree at that of Vāyu. With 19. 36. 1 an amulet of a hundred hairs at the Continuance.

7. With AV 5. 28. 2, and 19. 37. 1 a triple amulet at that of Tvaṣṭar. With AV 3. 7. 1 the tip of a horn at that of Kumāra. With AV 19. 44. 1 an amulet of ointment at that of Nirṛti. With AV 19. 46. 1 an invincible (v.l. triple) amulet at that of the troops of the Maruts.

8. With AV 4. 37. 1 an amulet of odina pinnata at that of the Gandharvas. With AV 4. 9. 1 an amulet made of ointment at that of Āirāvata. With AV 10. 6. 1 an amulet made of a ploughshare at that of the Earth. With AV 10. 3. 1 an amulet made from the varaṇa-tree (crataeva roxburghii) at the Abhayā. Or (he may tie on) a pratisara-amulet on all occasions.

XX. 1. We will duly describe the Mahāçānti, the Amṛtā, the cure of all (ills), that has become the scheme for all the other Çāntis.

2. Let him who knows AV 19. 1. 1 fetch pure water from rivers or ponds. Then he recites over it (AV 19. 1. 1).

3. AV 19. 2. 1 and 8. 7. 26. The scheme (of the sacrifice) is that of the full moon sacrifice. When the ājyabhāgāu are offered, (4) then he must make the çāntyudaka and follow it with the mantra (AV 19. 2. 1; 8. 7. 26). After thrice sprinkling the fire he must pour (the water) into a jar in order to wash with it.

5. With a view to the other ceremonies he must not pour all the water (into the jar). After sacrificing fibres of the aṣvattha tree, rice and barley, (leaves of) the horseradish-tree and water, bdellium and poison.

XXI. 1. He must make an oblation of pepper, the kṛṣṇala-plant (abrus precatorius), sahā-plant, together with lagenaria vulgaris, reed panicles, and points with the Cātanaḡaṇa.

2. After making an oblation of iṅgiḡa oil with this same ḡaṇa, he puts on the fire additional fagots of atasī, and others smeared with lac, others from the trapusī-plant, and others in the shape of a club.

3. Likewise fagots coming from khadira, palāça, and tārṣṭāgha trees, from the apāmārga-plant and the aṣvattha tree. With this same ḡaṇa he worships.

4, 5. Once without a mantra, he makes an oblation of the plant khadira, the great plant apāmārga, the plants baja, piṅga, and çatiṅga, (the rosin of?) the cotton-plant and the malā-plant (flacourtia cataphracta), the sahamānā-plant, the pṛeṇiparṇī-plant

(hemionitis cordifolia), and the ajaçṅgī-plant (odina pinnata), having thrown this in with (the rest).

XXII. 1. (There are needed) for the pratisara a staff from a tumbara-tree, a sadaiṃpuṣpā-plant (calotropis gigantea), also yellow mustard plants with ten leaves, ten stones, and sand.

2. He must sacrifice with the hymn AV 5. 10 and cover these with the remainder of the oblation. The wise man must afterwards put the leavings in the consecrated water.

3. In all the diças of the dwelling he must smear circles, pour the sand into them, and then sprinkle them with the consecrated water.

4. He must place the stones in them. Above the door he must smear a circle, there he must put the staff, etc., after pouring sand, etc.

5. With AV 3. 26. 1 he must make oblations separately to the diças and worship with AV 3. 27. 1. He must put the leavings in a jar, offering oblations with the subsequent mantras.

XXIII. 1. (These gaṇas) must be uttered, the Çānti, Kṛtyādū-ṣaṇa, Cātana, Mātṛnāman, Vāstoṣpatya, Pāpinahan (2), Yakṣmopa-gḥāta, Svapnāntika, Āyuṣya, Varcasya, also the Apratiratha hymn (AV 19. 13).

3. This must be muttered a second time (and there must be employed), AV 4. 13. 1; 5. 30. 1; 8. 1. 1; 2. 1 (*et al.*), and the first twelve verses of the Prāna-hymn (AV 11. 4).

4. It is taught that all these are involved with the Çāntiya-hymn (AV 4. 13. 1); and since the Çāntiya-hymn is involved it is taught that the verses AV 11. 4. 13 ff. (must be employed).

5. Then according to his wish he must insert the mantras given before (in kaṇḍikā 18), and bring to a close all the rest of the Prāna-hymn. At this point in the Çānti he must always recite the Rudra and Rāudra gaṇas.

XXIV. 1, 2. (These gaṇas) are prescribed next, the Svastyayana, Abhaya, Aparājita, Çarmavarman, Devapurā, Rudra, Rāudra, and Citrā. Ten beginning with the Çāntigaṇa are cited, eight beginning with the Svastyayana.

3. It is taught by the wise that the Mahāçānti (must be performed) with all eighteen gaṇas. If the last eight gaṇas are omitted and the lower part of the ceremony of Nirṛti, (4.) it is always termed by the wise the ten-gaṇa Çānti. This (!) he

shall pour (into a jar) for the purpose of washing his horses, carts (?), wagons, etc.

5. He shall use it after setting aside half. At the end of all the gaṇas he shall have the Brahmans pronounce benedictions.

6. (There must be) an oblation of bdellium in silence, and he must get a gift for the Rakṣas (saying), "Obeisance to the Rakṣas; obeisance to the great Rakṣas; obeisance to the lords of the Rakṣas. Obeisance to the Gaṇas; obeisance to the great Gaṇas; obeisance to the lords of the Gaṇas." After making an oblation with the Āyuṣya gaṇa he puts the leavings on himself. After making an oblation with the Patnīvanta gaṇa he puts the leavings on the wife (of the yajamāna).

7. He gives a beverage of curds, one of spirituous liquor, and one of barley with his right hand to the Rakṣas. Then with the mantras he washes (the person to be benefited by the rite).

8. AV 4. 40. 1; 1. 31. 1; 4. 18. 1; 19. 1; 6. 19. 1; 51. 1; 35. 1 (*et al.*) (are the mantras).

XXV. 1. With the Prāṇa-hymn he must put the leavings of the oblation on rice and barley and tie it on as an amulet. After adorning and praising them he must make him wear the two.

2. The wise man, after cooking a pot of rice with the ritual for a pākayajña, and offering it with the Āvāpika mantra, must bring the tantra to its close.

3. After completing the rest, he must give a feast to the Brāhmans. He must feast them on excellent food or on whatever the twiceborn like.

4. A Brāhman must give ten cows and an ox besides; a Vāiṣya a plough-ox besides; and a dealer with foreign countries a horse.

5. A king must give a good village; and a group of men the same as a king. If one gives the fee as stated, he obtains the whole fruit (of the ceremony).

With the words "he obtains the whole fruit of the ceremony," the Çāntikalpa in the revered Atharva-Veda is ended.

F. COMMENTARY.

Kaṇḍikā 5.

4. Pūrvabhadrapadām: I have introduced the feminine on account of the following bhadrapade pūrve, taking mahat to agree with ṛkṣam, cf. 5. 5; 9. 5. Weber, *Nakṣ.* ii. p. 375 makes no change.

Kaṇḍikā 7.

2. ABDE sasrjet; St saṁsrjet.

ABCDESt viniyoja. An unreduplicated perfect seems unlikely; to change to niniyoja, an abnormal form found AB 7. 16, is palaeographically easier, but otherwise less satisfactory than to read niyuyoja. The decision of this and most of the following difficulties hinges on the date to be assigned for the composition of these verses.

Sarvayogeṣu: an astronomical meaning, "at all thy conjunctions, O Rohiṇī," is also possible.

Rohiṇī: possibly a Vedic instrumental, or nominative for vocative, or rohiṇi may be read.

3. ABCDESt ye: smoother syntax may be obtained by reading yam.

4. ADESt sarvam; C tsarvam; B çarmam.

ABCDESt asinam.

ABCDESt no rdayā: corrected by Weber.

5. Lacuna in all manuscripts.

ABCDESt prathamajā: less archaic than the reading of Mb.

ABCDE punarvasuḥ; St punarvasu: nominative for vocative; or emend to vocative either singular or dual.

Kaṇḍikā 8.

1. ACDE tigmatayā cakrire.

2. ABCDESt na, also stutaḥ and tapyamānam. Read stutāḥ and either tapyamānā or tapyamāna, preferably the former. The son of Jaratkāra is mentioned on account of his relation to Vāsuki, king of the serpents.

3. ABCSt sūnur; D sūnu; E mūnu.

ADE yamarājagān; A corrected to yamarājayān, which is read by BSt. C is blotted.

ABCDESt pitṛṇ çivāḥ.

4. ABCDESt yo yojayan.

ABCESt bhaga prasādhayan; D bhaga prajā dadhat. According to Weber a second hand in C has added a visarga to bhaga.

AD yaddevate; BCE taddevate; St taddevatye.

ABCESt çivatamām alaṅkrṭe; D çivatamālaṅkrṭe: read çivatame.

ACDESt bhajatam; B bhajanam: the latter is correct.

5. ADE jagativācam; BC jagatiṁ vācam, in C the anusvāra is deleted; St jagantivācam. Jagatiṁ vācam would be the most

natural, cf. 9. 5, and the versifier was not above such metrical imperfections: but jagativācam can be retained as a metrical shortening for jagativācam.

ABCDESt āirayan: read erayan.

ACDE taddevatya; St taddāivatye.

ABDESt phalgunyo.

ABCDESt devadātaye.

Kaṇḍikā 9.

1. ABCDESt cāvāir and çitipād dhiranyayo: read cāvāir and çitipadbhir hiranyayo, cf. RV 1. 35. 5.

ABCDESt hiranyabhuk hiranyapāñih. There appears to be no warrant for making the first = hiranyabāhu.

The second no is metrically superfluous.

The verse recurs with the same variants and hiraṇmayo besides in AVPar. 14. 1. 11.

2. ADE bhūtagoptriṇe; C bhūtagauptriṇe; St pūtagodhrīṇe; B bhūtagomaparapṛṇekarma°—i.e. bhūtagopriṇe paramakarma° transposed. Corrected by Weber.

ADE devī; BCSt devīm.

ADE rūpabhṛk; CSt rūpakṛt.

It is also possible to read: sa na stutaḥ . . . citrām devīm . . . rūpakṛt, cf. 10. 2.

4. All manuscripts contain yāu, and lack two syllables before or after indrāgnī.

A dual would be expected instead of kurvatām.

5. We expect a verse to the god Mitra.

Pāda e: only variants are: St bharadvājaḥ mṛṣitaḥ; B prasānavit. Comparison of 11. 6 yields no solution.

ADE jatyā; B jatityā; CSt jagatyā.

ACDESt bhṛtakanvo; B bhūtakanvo.

Kaṇḍikā 10.

1. ABCDESt prasarjataḥ.

ABDE na; CSt naḥ.

2. ABCDESt ca sa: read sā ca (suggestion of Bloomfield). Apparently mātā pṛthivī and nirṛti are identified; cf. Henry, *La Magie dans l'Inde antique*, p. 161.

ABCDE na; St naḥ.

3. ADE trisṛñibhir; B trisṛnebhir; St trisṛñibhir; C trisṛñibhir: read trisṛñibhir with metrical lengthening. The mythology is

hard to unravel; āvṛtam may be neuter or masculine. If the latter, Agni is perhaps meant; for his three tongues, cf. RV 3. 20. 2; for the comparison of his tongues with sickles, *ib.* 1. 58. 4, and inasmuch as he is latent in plants, the waters might be said to gladden him for his increment.

ADE yā devīs tarpayanty; B yāsas tarpayanty: the metre permits no addition, but the variant may point to a devīs in the following defective pāda.

ABCDE pravṛddhaye; St pravarddhayet.

B alone vāruṇīḥ.

ABCDE pūrvā āṣādhā.

4. ABDE vasu; CSt vaso.

Read: devān . . . anirmitāṅ . . . vasavo . . . çivāḥ kriyāḥ kṛṇvatām surāmītāḥ.

5. Anyam in all manuscripts is a defective writing for anyan.

B kim cid asti.

Read: anirmitaḥ.

Kaṇḍikā 11.

1. ADE taṁ svivi svargam; B taṁ svid dhi svargam; C ti svid dhi svargam; C (corrected) St taṁ svargam. ADE nākapṛsthāsthaviçcad; C nākapṛsthāmsthaviçcad; B nākapṛsthāsthaviçcid; St nākapṛsthāsthaviçvad. This seems the result of the fusion of two readings, that of the text and taṁ svargam nākapṛsthasthaviçavid.

ABCE çravane no.

3. ABCDESt çatabhiçak.

4. AD pramubhūtu; BCESt pramumūtu; read perhaps pramumoca.

With pāda b cf. RV 4. 57. 5.

ABDESt jihmasāu: read jihmagāu.

ABDESt ajāu; C ajo, the correctness of which Weber indicated.

5. ABCDESt gaviṣṭutāyā: read kaviṣṭutāyā.

6. ADE yammahāhemamṛṣitaḥ; BCSt yamanhāhehamṛṣitaḥ.

St candramaso.

E divākarāu.

7. ABCDESt bhiçajām: read bhiçajāv (Bloomfield).

ABCDESt açvibhyām: cf. Weber, *Nakṣ.* ii. p. 376 for its correction to açvinyām.

8. AE sarvatṛṣṅ; D sarvatryaṅ; B savihṛ; C savitrṛ; St savitrāṅ: perhaps sa pitṛṅ.

Kaṇḍikā 12.

4. Read perhaps: *çravanāyo 'dumbara-*°.

6. *Kṛttikābhiḥ*, demanded by the syntax, I have restored from NK 47. 1.

Upepsanti: the sudden shift to the plural and indicative is due to the fact that this is a quotation of *Kāuç.* 68. 40; 140. 21. So AVPar. 72. 4. 7

Kaṇḍikā 13.

1. NK *akṣatāir māṣāiḥ*.

Madhusahitān apūpān is Weber's correction. It is confirmed by NK *madhv apūpāns tv anuttamān*.

2. NK *açleṣā rajatām dadyāt*.

The addition of *yad yad* is from NK.

3. *Saktumantham*: NK *udamantham*.

Kaṇḍikā 14.

2. *Ādityādayo grahāṇām uktā*: probably *uktā* should be omitted, in addition to the change to *ādityādīnām*.

Kaṇḍikā 15.

3. *Balimant* is quotable only as meaning "having received a gift"—a sense evidently impossible here. A slight change *valinā* would mean "wrinkled," a possible designation for split grains.

5. Cf. *Keçava* to *Kāuç.* 18. 16, *nirṛtyabhimukho bhūtvā*.

Read: *ity etāir āmanāṁsam*, which is a very slight change from *Sāyaṇa's* reading.

Kaṇḍikā 19.

2. *Hastidantam*: *Kāuç.* 13. 2 has *hastidantām*. Probably this is the unrecorded variant of P, and it might be introduced into the text.

Kaṇḍikā 19.

6. *Çatavāram*: I have followed *Sāyaṇa* in so reading. For the use of hairs as amulets, cf. Bloomfield, p. 477. Other possibilities are to read *çatavarīm*. This plant (*asparagus racemosus*) is used in the *Pariçištas*, and its name puns with *çatavārah* of the hymn. Or *çātāvaram* "made from this plant." The last two readings involve but slight changes from P and M respectively; *Sāyaṇa's* reading is liable to have been secondarily assimilated to the text of the hymn.

Kaṇḍikā 20.

3. Weber placed a dot under the a of kṣaped, but made no further change.

Perhaps read: aḥvatthasya tu lomāni.

Kaṇḍikā 22.

1. Daḥa putrā is unintelligible: I have changed it to daḥa-patrā.

3. Weber wrote prāṇādyādvāvaḥas treaḥ, with a query as to whether da should not be substituted for va, and a note that seems to mean that Mb omits the s.

Kaṇḍikā 24.

4. Four pādas beginning with e seem misplaced here. I suspect an original association with 20. 4, 5. The text is also unsatisfactory, but there can be little hope of improving it as long as it is out of its original connection. Weber places a dot under the a of reām; I would rather read: tathāi 'vā 'rdhām.

6. The Gaṇamālā twice has the form patnīvanta.

VI. — *Notes on Ovid.*

BY DR. EDWARD KENNARD RAND,

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

I. A MANUSCRIPT OF OVID'S *Heroides*, XXI. 1-144.

THE final edition of Ovid's *Heroides* has not yet appeared. In spite of the achievements of Dilthey, Palmer, Sedlmayer, Peters, Ehwald, and others, much remains to be done for the text, since, despite Sedlmayer's conviction, the classification of the manuscripts does not yet rest on a sure foundation.¹ A problem which must be settled before a genealogy of the manuscripts can be constructed is furnished by the interpolations, or possible interpolations, large and small, with which the text abounds. The most important portions which come under this category are the *Epistula Sapphus*, *Epist.* xvi. 39-142, *Epist.* xxi. 13-248, and the prefatory distichs to some of the letters; but these are not all.²

Yet matters have been simplified, first of all, by the acceptance of the last two passages as genuine by the majority of the best authorities;³ this matter, I am convinced, needs no further discussion. The double letters may now be considered all of a piece, whether Ovid is their author or not. Perhaps, too, the tide of opinion regarding the authorship of the double letters may ultimately turn, as in the case of the letters which Lachmann doubted and, more recently, the *Epistula Sapphus*. Schanz doubtless expresses the current opinion in deciding for the genuineness of this latter work, and though he does not accept the double letters, a voice is heard here and there in their defence; indeed, it would not be surprising if the entire collection were restored to its author before long.

¹ See Sedlmayer, *Prolegomena critica ad Heroides Ovidianas*, 1878, p. 86. On the defects of Sedlmayer's treatment, cf. Peters, *Observationes ad P. Ovid. Nas. Heroid. Epist.* 1882, p. 8, and Dilthey, *Observationum in Epist. Heroid. Ovid. Part. I*, 1884, p. 10.

² See Sedlmayer, *op. cit.* p. 65; Peters, *op. cit.* p. 16.

³ See the summary of this discussion in Schanz, *Gesch. d. röm. Litt.* § 296.

Internal evidence on this question shows us poems which bear the marks of carelessness, yet which only a very clever imitator could have written. The pseudo-Ovid, Dilthey declares,¹ is a poet "qui hoc in genere facultatem Ovidii fere aequiparaverit." External evidence requires us to assume a second edition of the *Heroides* if the double letters are Ovid's. We have no notice of such an edition, but also no proof that it could not have existed. It doubtless was not a product of the days of exile, but there was plenty of time for its achievement before 8 A.D. It is sheer assumption — almost impertinence — to imagine that the facile Ovid was too busy with his other poems to dash off half-a-dozen epistles. It has been suggested that the story of Byblis, *Met.* 9, 529, is evidence that no second edition of *Heroides* had appeared at that time, since otherwise the letter of Byblis would have appeared rather in this edition than in Ovid's longer poem. But the supposition is belittling to Ovid's genius. On the contrary, he is apparently introducing here an intentional novelty — an *epistula Heroidis* in a narrative setting. He welcomes the chance to describe the events leading up to the heroine's act — her passion, her vacillation, the arguments whereby she nerves herself to the act, her succeeding irresolution at the moment of writing, her faltering attempts to start, the resistless rush of words when the letter once begins. This is a situation which the poet could not connote in the letter itself, after the fashion followed in some of the *Heroides*. It may well be that the Byblis story turned Ovid to the old path once more, this time to take up a conceit that his friend Sabinus had suggested in providing his first *Heroides* with answers.²

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 9.

² This possibility is admitted by Bürger, *De Ovid. carminum amatoriorum inventione*, 1901, p. 45, who, however, does not incline to it; it is maintained vigorously by I. de Louter, *De tribus Ovid. Heroid. codicibus Leidensibus*, 1899, p. 24. The latter explains the irregularities in the double letters by the fact that Ovid had not put the finishing touches on these poems at the time of his banishment. Other recent advocates of their genuineness are Pieri, *Quaest. ad Ov. Epist. Heroid. . . pertinentes*, 1895, p. 71 ff., and Purser, who completed Palmer's edition of the *Heroides*, 1898, p. xxxii.

But to return to the consideration of the text of the *Heroides*, since the double letters are surely of one piece, whatever their authorship, manuscripts containing the omitted parts are at once important as representing a new tradition. The Cydippe letter was discovered probably about the middle of the fifteenth century in a *codex antiquissimus*, and the new text was at once copied into other manuscripts or editions. Obviously a fifteenth-century manuscript, of which *Epist.* xxi is an integral part, is a great desideratum.¹ Moreover, if further investigation should pronounce the double letters genuine works of Ovid, the interpolations in them would naturally rest on the same footing as in the other poems, and not require a different treatment, as at present.² Finally, as to the minor interpolations, von Winterfeld in his review of Traube, *Regula Sancti Benedicti*,³ makes it clear that more is to be expected from the later manuscripts in case, like the Codex Etonensis, they are connected with the tradition from Monte Cassino. It would be presumptuous to attempt new stemmata illustrating possibilities of descent; we need first a more careful study of manuscripts of the mixed class. But several promising clues are already at hand for any investigator who would attempt the maze. The purpose of the present article is merely to publish a collation of a Harvard manuscript which contains the text of *Epist.* xxi. 1-144.

The manuscript in question (I will refer to it as H) bears the number L 25: it is of the fifteenth century, written on parchment, in what seems Italic script. It was acquired by Harvard College in 1902 from the bookseller Quaritch, being formerly the property of Sir Thomas Phillips. A fuller description of the manuscript will appear elsewhere. For the present it is enough to state that the volume consists of three distinct parts. (1) A manuscript (I) containing a letter of the humanist Rinucci da Castiglione written to

¹ Most promising of the manuscripts hitherto examined seem to be Gudianus, 297, s. XV (see below, p. 134), and Parisinus, 7997, s. XV. Neither of these manuscripts has been adequately studied.

² See Peters, *op. cit.* p. 40.

³ *Gött. Gelehrt. Anzeig.*, 1899, p. 897.

Poggio, and including translations from the Greek. (2) A manuscript (II) containing various humanistic works—among them translations by Bruni (Leonardo Aretino)—as well as important classical texts. These latter are the *Germania* of Tacitus, Book xiv (the metrical *de Arte Inquisitionis*) of Palladius, and the above-mentioned passage from Ovid's *Heroides*. Collations of the Tacitus and Palladius texts will be published shortly elsewhere. (3) A few leaves added at the beginning by some scholar of the fifteenth century, who combined manuscripts I and II, and on one of these initial leaves wrote in capital letters a table of contents for the entire volume.

IN · HOC · VOLVMINE · CONTINETVR · | . . . CORN ·
TACIT · DE · ORIGINE · ET · SITV · GĒMANIE · | . . . PAL-
LADIVS · DE · ARTE · INSITIONIS · | OVIDII · EPISTOLA · NO-
VITER · REPERTA · | . . .

The whole was then encased in a fifteenth-century binding of wood covered with leather.

One may make further surmises as to the exact date of the manuscript. The presence of Tacitus's *Germania* in manuscript II shows that this part of the volume was written after 1455, since the *Germania* was not discovered till about that year.¹ This date may be taken as a *terminus post quem*, since the humanistic works here included—the translations of Bruni and the *Liber Augustalis* of Rambaldi—are all earlier. The letter of Rinucci in manuscript I was written certainly before 1459, when Poggio died, probably before 1453, when he left Rome, and may have been much earlier still, as he came to Rinucci for instruction in Greek as early as 1425.² The present copy might well have been made about the middle of the century. The two manuscripts were put together by a scholar of the fifteenth century, as is evident from the style of the capitals in which the table of contents is given, and from the style of the cover. That the manuscripts were

¹ See Sabbadini in *Rivista di Filologia*, XXIX (1901), p. 262.

² See Voigt, *Wiederbelebung des klass. Alterthums*, 1893, II, pp. 45, 84.

combined early rather than late in the second half of the century seems probable from the title which Ovid's work is given in this list, OVIDII · EPISTOLA · NOVITER · REPERTA. The exact date of the discovery of *Heroides* xxi is not known, but may safely be assumed as about the middle of the century. Certainly it was before 1471, when verses 1-144 of this letter appeared in the Roman editio princeps. The binding of our book, it would seem, preceded this date, since one would not be apt to refer to the letter as a novelty after the printing press had introduced it to the reading public. Still, this reasoning needs further examination, for it is conceivable that a tradition started from some manuscript which called attention to the discovery, and that such a notice was copied mechanically in other manuscripts, although the printed edition had appeared. There are, in fact, manuscripts extant containing precisely such a notice. Two codices mentioned by Sedlmayer,¹ Cremifanensis 329 and Vindobonensis 3198, show the superscription (I quote the form given in the latter manuscript) CIDIPPE · ACONTIO · HEROIDVM · OVIDII · VLTIMA · EPISTOLA · RECENS · REPERTA, and this appeared likewise in the manuscript from which the editio princeps was prepared.² Now the Cremifanensis contains several works copied from printed editions, one copy being made as late as 1479. The title given for Ovid's letter: *Cydippe Aconcio heroidum Ouidii ultia recens reperta*, is exactly the same in the editio princeps (except *Acontio*), and this is the case also with the superscription to the *Epistula Sapphus*. The titles of *Heroid.* i differ, yet from the above indications it would not be surprising if the manuscripts were copied directly from the editio princeps. Or does it present, after all, an independent, though closely related text? As for the Vindobonensis, if all the pieces it contains were part of the original volume, it could be dated later than the Roman edition, 1471, the Venice edition of 1474, and the Parma edition of 1477; for the volume contains several works written after 1478.³ But I cannot be sure on this point, since Sedlmayer states that the

¹ *Op. cit.* pp. 12, 22.

² *Ibid.* p. 26.

³ See the *Tabulae Codicum* of the Vienna Library, and Endlicher cviii.

manuscript is the product of several hands. Both of these codices, then, *may* have been written before the appearance of the Roman edition, yet may equally well have followed it by several years. Now the superscription in the Harvard manuscript agrees with the titles in the above-mentioned codices, except that the words *recens reperta* do not appear. The text, moreover, bears a close relation to the Roman edition, though not a copy of it, and to the Vindobonensis,¹ so that the title in the manuscript from which H was copied may well have contained the additional words. But the owner of the volume who combined the two manuscripts did not borrow from some other copy the notice which he inserted in the table of contents, for he has it *noviter* (not *recens*) *reperta*. He is probably describing a fact which was true when he made up the volume; he is not mechanically reproducing a title from a manuscript, as he might perhaps do even after the printed edition had appeared. Now if the table of contents was written prior to the editio princeps, manuscript II must be placed earlier still. Its date would be, then, somewhere between 1455 and 1471; the year assigned in Quaritch's *Catalogue*²—1460—may not be far from correct.

Three classes of manuscripts for the text of *Epist.* xxi define themselves readily by external marks.³ One consists of manuscripts which contain the entire epistle. Here we may reckon with certainty only on the archetype of the Parma edition of 1477. It was for some time supposed that a fifteenth-century leaf, added to Laurentianus, xxxvi 27, offered an independent text, but according to Sedlmayer⁴ and Peters⁵ this is a copy from the edition. So, too, the Harleianus 2565,

¹ In the Vindobonensis, as in H, *Epist.* xxi is immediately preceded by the *de Arte Institutionis* of Palladius. The texts in the two manuscripts are very closely related, though neither is copied from the other.

² No. 211, p. 59.

³ Another we might expect, perhaps, to deduce from the Italian translations of the *Heroides* made in the fifteenth century, but these do not contain *Epist.* xxi. 13-248. See E. Bellorini, *Note sulle tradizioni italiane delle "Eroidi" d'Ovidio anteriori al Rinascimento*, 1900.

⁴ *Wiener Studien*, 1881, p. 158.

⁵ *Op. cit.* p. 54.

s. XV, to which Palmer¹ first called attention, believing it to be the basis of the Parma edition, seems to Ehwald² to have been copied from that edition. A detailed comparison of the manuscript and the edition, neither of which is at my disposal, would readily settle this question. Sedlmayer mentions also³ an apparently important source in Codex Lipsiensis 47, s. XV, of which Goetz had furnished him a description. But the volume has since disappeared.⁴ The entire letter is found in various Venice editions, of the years 1486, 1489, and 1492-1498; the latter bears a close resemblance to the Vicenza edition of 1480.⁵

A second class of manuscripts, recognized already, of course, by Sedlmayer,⁶ is made up of those which contain only verses 1-144. This we may now, aided by the information given by our new codex, subdivide into two groups: a) Manuscripts containing the title CYDIPPE . . . VLTIMA EPISTOLA · RECENS · REPERTA. Here belong Cremanensis 329, if this should be assigned the value of an independent manuscript; Vindobonensis 3198; doubtless also H; and the manuscript from which the Roman edition was taken. b) Manuscripts without this notice. The following perhaps represent the earlier tradition, before the title was altered: Gudianus 297, s. XV, and Parisinus (formerly Mazarinus), s. XV (XV-XVI, Palmer).⁷ In these manuscripts, it would seem, *Epist.* xxi forms an integral part of the text. They also, like the Venice edition of 1492,⁸ which follows a *codex antiquissimus*, give the division of the *Heroides* into books. As Sedlmayer uses for the Gudianus a collation made in 1774, while the Mazarinus has been examined only for *Epist.* xxi, a careful study of both these manuscripts might lead to valuable results for the text of the *Heroides*.

It would be fruitless to tabulate the distinctive readings of these apparent classes until all available information has been

¹ In his edition, 1898, pp. xxxvi and 157.

² *Jahresbericht über d. Fortsch. d. class. Altertumsst.* CIX (1901), pp. 211, 290.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 24.

⁴ Peters, *op. cit.* p. 54.

⁵ Sedlmayer, *op. cit.* pp. 28-31.

⁶ *Kritischer Kommentar*, p. 75 f.

⁷ On them see Sedlmayer, *Prolegomena*, pp. 4, 16.

⁸ Sedlmayer, *Proleg.* p. 30.

collected. Meanwhile we may note the additional evidence presented by H for the truth of Birt's statement¹ that nearly all the existing manuscripts are not copied from the editions, nor, probably, the editions from these manuscripts, and that thus the text, as we have it, has experienced a complicated history. Further, the new codex contributes something toward the solution of this complexity in suggesting an external criterion for subdividing the second class of manuscripts, and in supplying new material for determining the characteristics of that group to which the Roman edition belongs. Various noteworthy readings will be noticed in the following collation, and while there are flagrant errors, these very errors are proof that the manuscript was not copied from an edition. I have collated the manuscript with the edition of Merkel as revised by Ehwald, 1888, p. 166.

CYDIPPE ACONTIO] CEDIPPE · ACONTIO HEROIDVM |
OVIDII · VLTIMA · EPISTOLA · (*minio*).

[Littera . . . meis] <i>om.</i>	40 obstas] optas
6 Saevae] seue; e <i>pro ae ubique</i>	41 uelut] ueluit; <i>corr. man. prim.</i>
7 tura] thura	44 Inmodicus] Immodicus
8 favet] fouet	adest] inest
10 Hippolyto] hypolito	45 Ei] Nunc
14 Adjuvor] Adiuuor	47 sim] sum
15 vix] uī (x <i>supra adscripsit man. prim.</i>)	49 at] et
16 putas] puta	51 nihil] m
19 agamque] agam q̄	54 submota] summota
25 imperfecta] imperfecta	55 dic mihi] dicam
26 tegitur] cogitur	ne decipe] me despice
cauta] clausa	58 uelis] nolis
27 meos digitos] meus digitus	59 Aut tibi iam nullast] Aut iam
28 ipse] iste	nulla tibi est
29 Quo] Que	62 Qua] Quid
30 quamque mereris ego] quanque	nulla tuast] tua nulla est
moreris ero	63 quid] quod
32 poenas] penas; e <i>pro oe ubique</i>	61 difficili] difficilis
36 ope] operi	64 tuist] tui est <i>ubique</i>
38 Perditis] Proditis	70 Picta citae] Pictatite
	72 a] ah

¹ *Gött. Gelehrt. Anzeig.* 1882, p. 831 ff.

74 inpediebat] impediēbat	115 Inprobe] Improbe
77 Delon] delum	118 Penthesilea] pantasilea
79 convicia] conuitia	119 balteus] baltheus
81 Myconon] alicon	120 Hippolyte] hypolite
iam Tenon] antennon	123 Cydippen] Cydippem
82 Delos] bosphor	Schoeneida] ceneйда
84 numquid] nunquid	124 Hippomenes] hyppomenes
ut ante mari] <i>om.</i>	126 vices] faces
90 vestes] uestem	127 bonis] boni
umeris] humeris	129 Cur me cum] Cur cum me
91 sacrast] grata est	ea] <i>om.</i>
92 tura] thura	profitenda] proficienda
96 Erramusque] Enamusque	132 condicione] conditione
102 Quidquid] Quicquid	134 Linguaque] Lignaue
106 ecquis] et equis	140 tori] thori
108 Ei] Hei	

II. IMITATION OF OVID IN HORACE.

It has not been imagined that the poet Horace felt any particular admiration for Ovid. "There is no indication in the works of either the reigning or the rising poet of any intimacy between them," says Sellar, in his brief but admirable essay on Ovid's life and works.¹ There is evidence that the two were acquainted, and crossed each other in the social round. When Ovid tells us that "tuneful Horace charmed his ears,"² he means not merely that he found the *Odes* agreeable reading, but, as Sellar implies,³ that Horace gave recitals now and then — by exception — and invited Ovid to them. In this same passage Ovid says gracefully of his

¹ *Encyc. Brit.* 9th ed. XVIII, 78.

² *Trist.* iv. 10, 49: Et tenuit nostras numerosus Horatius aures | dum ferit Ausonia carmina culta lyra.

³ *Ibid.* "Even the fastidious Horace sometimes delighted his ears with the music of his verse." Ovid, speaking of Macer, says explicitly *legit* (v. 43), of Propertius, *recitare* (v. 45). The word would weary if expressed again, so for Ponticus and Bassus (vv. 47-48) the idea is implied. With the mention of Horace, the point, for clearness' sake, is made again, but more allusively than at first. This is but the technique of successful description, an art in which Ovid was not amiss. Then, in contrast with the preceding poets, Virgil is at once named (v. 51), whom Ovid "merely saw." So with Tibullus — *nec avara Tibullo | tempus amicitiae fata dedere meae*. Strict logic prompts the deduction that relations of *amicitia* did exist between Ovid and the poets first mentioned — Horace included.

illustrious predecessor that he smote an Ausonian harp—the *lyra Romana* which the poet imagined he used,¹ not the pseudo-Hellenic instrument with which some modern critics would equip him. A fine compliment this, and one finer still, at least as obvious, is the frequent imitation of Horace evident in the younger poet's work.² There is no question as to Ovid's feeling for Horace,³ but nobody has imagined that his homage awakened any enthusiastic response—other than an invitation to a recital. What, then, if it can be shown that Horace, in one of his most significant odes, imitates a characteristic verse of Ovid's with the intent of paying his young admirer a palpable compliment?

¹ c. iv. 3, 23, *Romanae fidicen lyrae*.

² See A. Zingerle, *Ovidius und sein Verhältniss zu den Vorgängern und gleichzeitigen römischen Dichtern*, Heft III, Innsbruck, 1871. The only review I have been able to find of this part of Zingerle's important work is by Gross, *Blätter f. d. Bay. Gym.* VIII (1872), p. 127. He adds a few imitations not mentioned by Zingerle.

³ Except by Teuffel, *Gesch. der röm. Lit.* § 219 (4th ed., p. 431, n. 4), who detects a coolness on Ovid's side because he fails to mention Horace with the other poets in *A. A.* iii. 329, and "erteilt ihm erst nach seinem Tode das ziemlich magere Lob: *tenuit nostras numerosus Horatius aures*." But the praise assumes plumper dimensions with the line which Teuffel does not quote. His opinions have been refuted by M. Hertz, *Analect. ad carm. Horat. hist.*, Breslau, 1876, II, p. 1, and O. Hennig, *De P. Ovidii Nasonis poetae sodalibus*, Breslau, 1886, p. 52. One might consider further whether the inclusion of Horace in the demi-monde's Parnassus—which is as paedagogically special as Quintilian's prescription—would be in place. Callimachus, Philetas, Anacreon, Sappho (quid enim lascivius illa?), and the poet who sings of the fond father "by cunning Geta's art beguiled"—this is fast company for Horace, taking him all in all. To the above number are now appropriately added Propertius, Callus, Tibullus, then Varro, with his poem on the golden fleece. This last work is cited doubtless for the tale of Medea, erotically significant, and also, possibly, because gay ladies should at least make a feint of familiarity with high epic as well. This explains the introduction of the *Aeneid*, which follows now; for though one might think of Dido and—*nec legitur pars ulla magis de corpore toto | quam non legitimo foedere iunctus amor* (*Trist.* ii. 535), still, the emphasis is laid here on *profugum Aenean* and *altae primordia Romae*—light-o'-loves must talk Shakespere on occasion. But the mention of Virgil—*quo nullum Latio clarius extat opus*—is enough; more seriousness would spoil the point. Horace falls between two stools: he is not frolicsome enough for a place with the amatory, and Virgil is the natural type of great and royal poetry. Ovid ends the tale, then, with his own works. It is not contempt, but the sense of the appropriate, that excludes Horace here and in the somewhat similar list in the second book of the *Tristia*.

In the opening ode of his fourth book, Horace tells his readers that since he now is out of the lists, Venus should betake her to his young friend Paullus Fabius Maximus, "a youth of an hundred arts, who will carry far afield the standards of thy war,"

Late signa feret militiae tuae.

This verse has been tentatively rearranged by various editors from Meineke down in a form which appeals at once as more consonant with Horace's usual manner —

Late militiae signa feret tuae.

It is strange that a line of Ovid's has not been adduced in support of this transposition. In the twelfth poem of the second book of *Amores* the poet describes triumphantly his conquest of Corinna, and after magnifying his own bloodless victory above other conflicts — such as the fight for Helen of Troy — in which much damage had been done to gain a similar prize, concludes that Cupid has given him uncommon privileges, and with them the behest "to carry far afield the standards of his war."

Me quoque, qui multos, sed me sine caede Cupido
Iussit militiae signa movere suae.

We should naturally reckon this coincidence merely as one more Horatian echo in the poetry of Ovid — with incidental gratitude for the support here given to the proposed rearrangement of Horace's verse¹ — if a simple proposition in chronology did not stare us in the face. A moment's consideration makes it most probable that Horace is the imitator. The fourth book of the *Odes*, it is commonly argued, appeared in or about the year 13.² The first poem in this new collection bears, it seems to me, like most dedications, the earmarks of a date near that of publication. The poet has filled his ten lustræ — more or less, as *circa* implies. Some editors place the poem, therefore, somewhat before, others, somewhat after 15 B.C. On the strength of a consideration to be suggested

¹ See below, p. 142.

² Schanz, *Gesch. der röm. Lit.* § 260.

later,¹ I am inclined to the latest possible date.² More difficult it is to determine when Ovid's *Amores* appeared, and what was the relation between the first edition in five books and the second in three. The earliest date fixed by external evidence for the collection in its present form is given by iii. 9, an elegy on Tibullus, who died 19 B.C.; the latest date externally determined is marked by the mention in i. 14, 45, of Augustus' conquest of the Sigambri in 15 B.C. Internal evidence, despite various appeals to it, has so far yielded no certain clew.³ Still, our present question requires only the proof that *Amores*, ii. 12, one of the poems on Corinna, was already in circulation when Horace published the fourth book of his *Odes*. Such proof, I believe, is furnished us by Ovid himself. The Corinna poems, he tells us, were the product of his earliest youth—but once or twice had the barber clipped his beard—and they took the town by storm.

Carmina cum primum populo iuvenalia legi,
Barba resecta mihi bisve semelve fuit.
Moverat ingenium totam cantata per Urbem
Nomine non vero dicta Corinna mihi.⁴

On the strength of this passage it is generally agreed that the poems on Corinna, Ovid's earliest work, were written and known about 22 B.C.⁵ Now it is most likely that in the extant collection of fifty odd poems the scant dozen in which Corinna is sun and centre⁶ constitute the poet's choice from

¹ See below, p. 143, N. 1.

² O. Tüselmann, *Quaest. chron. Horat.* 1885, p. 6, states various opinions, himself declining to assign a date more positive than *circa* 15 B.C. Of very recent editors of Horace, L. Mueller, *Oden u. Epoden*, 1900, p. 259, argues that *circa* must imply *before* 15 B.C. C. H. Moore, 1902, sets the date at 14/13.

³ See Ehwald's reviews of J. Heuwers, *De tempore quo Ovidii Amores Heroides Ars Amatoria conscripta atque edita sint*, 1883 (in *Jahresbericht*, XLIII, p. 125), and of P. Martinon: *Les Amours d'Ovide*, Paris, 1897 (*ibid.* 110, p. 168).

⁴ *Tr.* iv. 10, 57 f.

⁵ Schanz, *op. cit.* § 293.

⁶ Némethy, *De libris Amorum Ovidianis*, 1898, p. 18, makes out a list of sixteen, but Ehwald in his review of this publication (*Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1899, 556) and in that of Martinon, *op. cit.* (*Deutsche Literaturztg.*, 1898, 629), shows how subjective any treatment becomes which would class with the Corinna cycle poems that do not refer to her by name. We may include at least the following

the many effusions of his earliest muse. Further, the poem ii. 12 holds a significant place in the imaginary history; it gives the very moment of his first success — not an idea, one would think, that the poet elaborated in some later addition.¹ There is one internal test that may be profitably applied to this poem, and the others in which Corinna is definitely the theme. Leaving out of account for the moment the verse under discussion (ii. 12, 28), if we find in these poems indubitable imitations of later works, like Horace's fourth book of *Odes* or Virgil's *Aeneid*, the verse from ii. 12 must be considered an imitation, too, and the assumption of an early date for the Corinna poems must fall; but so far as I am able to discover, such imitations do not exist.² Since, then, we may reasonably

poems: i. 5, 11, 12; ii. 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 17. Corinna is not mentioned in i. 12, or ii. 7, but these are inseparable from neighboring poems in which she appears. In ii. 19, she has become a reminiscence, as in the poems of the third book, i. 7, 12. In the last-mentioned article, Ehwald further declares: "Sehr charakteristisch für die Beurtheilung der Corinnagedichte scheint mir, ii. 12. 3 (quam vir, quam custos, quam ianua firma, tot hostes | servabant) wo die vorher in anonymen Gedichten behandelten Züge, i. 4 (on the deception of the *vir*), ii. 3 (on the *custos*), i. 6 (to the *ianitor*), auf Corinna übertragen werden." This remark need not imply that ii. 12 is necessarily late, for one may as logically conceive the poems in question as developments from the suggestions offered in ii. 12, 3. Ehwald may mean merely to emphasize the fact that Corinna is an imagination, a lay figure for familiar erotic costumes.

¹ This aspect of ii. 12 so impresses Martinon, who thinks the Corinna poems narrate sober history in chronological order, that he concludes Ovid "forgot" to include it in Book I.

² Ehwald, *Jahresbericht*, XLIII, p. 126, declares, without specifying, that there are traces of the influence of *Carm.* iv on the *Amores*; perhaps these may pertain to other than the Corinna poems. The following coincidences with the *Aeneid* are noted by Zingerle, none of which is sure proof of an imitation: (p. 86) *Am.* ii. 11, 27 exasperet undas; *Aen.* iii. 285 asperat undas — the situations are quite different; (p. 78) *Am.* ii. 12, 1 tempora laurus; *Aen.* v. 246, 539 tempora lauro; *Am.* ii. 12, 21 nova bella movere and *Aen.* vi. 820 nova bella moventes; but Ovid might have developed this from Ennius' satis bella moveri, through his own fera bella movebas, *Am.* ii. 6, 25 (p. 4). There is at least one coincidence, also, with Horace's first book of *Epistles*. *Am.* i. 11, 13 (to Corinna's maid, Nape) si (Corinna) quaeret quid agam spe noctis vivere dices, *Epist.* i. 8. 3 (to the Muse, who is to inform young Celsus of the poet's unphilosophical discontent) si (Celsus) quaeret quid agam, dic (Musa) multa et pulchra minantem | vivere nec recte nec suaviter. The connection between the two passages cannot, I think, be denied, yet again, I believe it is Horace who adapts. The simpler message of Ovid's

place ii. 12 among the Corinna poems, which constitute Ovid's earliest work, the date of either of the editions of the *Amores* is of no consequence for our present consideration. The poem ii. 12 may be safely regarded as antedating the first ode of Book iv, even though this were written and published as early as 17 B.C.

Granting that we have to deal with a palpable imitation, and that Horace is the imitator, the purpose of this tribute is not difficult to discern. At the beginning of the ode, in telling us that he has bidden Love's service a final adieu, Horace quotes one of his own verses.¹

Desine, dulcium
Mater saeva Cupidinum —

The line is laden with reminiscence. It is a symbol of what his lighter poetry of the earlier time had meant to him; and it had meant much. For are not Horace's loves real? We may not know their street and number; yes, even the honest endeavor to distinguish good Cinara from the imaginary throng is, I suspect, something like the consoling faith that Plato wrote *one* authentic letter. This endeavor we may forego, but not the conviction that the love-poems of Horace are real: in them he has created the imaginary reminiscence, sympathetic, chivalrous, pleasantly illumined with wit and genial self-ridicule—as real emotions, these, as others which find expression in Venus' liturgy. So it is a reminiscence of a reminiscence that we have here—*mater saeva Cupidinum*. But these days are over, Horace declares—*splendide mendax*, for he was just in the prime of them. Hot youth has sped, so Venus may speed too—to the court of young Paullus Fabius Maximus, “noble and comely, a lad of an hundred arts, who shall carry far afield the standards of thy war.”

impassioned lover is expanded into a witty parody, quite in Horace's manner; the Muse plays the part of a go-between, a Nape. The whole gains point when we reflect that Celsus, like Paullus Fabius Maximus, was one of Ovid's intimates; see below, p. 146. Of course there are, in the Corinna poems, various imitations of Horace's earlier verse: cf. *Am.* ii. 8, 9 ff. and C. ii. 4; *Am.* ii. 13, 19, and C. iii. 22, 2; *Am.* i. 12, 13, and *Sat.* i. 8, 1.

¹ C. i. 19. 1: *Mater saeva Cupidinum*.

Now Paullus Fabius Maximus was a most intimate friend of Ovid. Already conspicuous as an advocate, already climbing the rounds of political distinction, he had also the interests of literature at heart. Juvenal mentions him among typical patrons of poetry in the Augustan age.¹ Horace doubtless saw in him the promise of a new Maecenas. With this direct mention of Fabius and no less pointed, because allusive, citation of Ovid, he takes off his cap to the rising generation, to Ovid, who heads the coming school. Why not pay a decent courtesy to a youngster who writes clever poetry and shows his sense by copying some of the good things in one's own verse?

The line that Horace adapts makes a good symbol. What more characteristic of Ovid's elegies than the idea — *militat omnis amans*? We cannot point surely to *Amores* i. 2, 7, 9, ii. 9 as specimens of his earliest work, but the conceit appears in one of the Corinna poems (i. 11, 12) as well, phrased in the same words, which fall into similar positions in the verse —

In me militiae signa tuere tuae.

Horace seized intuitively on a most typical bit in Ovid's verse and — a point that adds new support to Meineke's suggestion — he doubtless reproduced the metrical effect of the line, as well as the phrase, to make his meaning unmistakable. Book iv has sometimes been thought to suffer from lack of a dedication: both Maecenas and Augustus are absent in the

¹ *Sat.* vii. 95. An excellent account of Paullus Fabius Maximus is given by G. Graeber, *Quaestionum Ovidianarum, Pars Prior*, Elberfeld, 1881, p. x ff. I cannot follow him, however, in his attempt to show that Fabius was not a patron of poetry (p. xi). Starting with Juvenal's statement that a Fabius — mentioned in the same breath with Ovid's friend Cotta — played this rôle, we may complete the picture with the lines which Ovid addresses to the present Fabius, *Epist. ex Ponto*, i. 2, 131: *Ille ego sum qui te colui, quem festa solebat | inter convivas mensa videre tuos: | ille ego qui duxi vestros Hymenaeon ad ignes | et cecini fausto carmina digna toro: | cuius te solitum memini laudare libellos . . . | cui tua nonnunquam miranti scripta legebas: | ille ego de vestra cui data nupta domo est.* Although so intimate with Fabius, and connected with him by marriage, his attitude to him, as Graeber (p. xii) and others have pointed out, is one of deference — like that of a poet to his patron.

opening ode. This is because Horace is devoted to an ideal still higher than attachment to a friend and patron or loyalty to the saviour of the state. The Muse claims his first homage — *si spiro et placeo, tuum est*. The prospects of poetry are uppermost in his mind.¹ Old Horace, modern of the moderns, turns with enthusiasm to greet his young compeer. *Mater saeva Cupidinum* — that is his own past. *Late militiae signa feret tuae* — that is the future, big with hope. There is something of the true ring in the *Amores*.

In what way does Ovid show his gratitude for this striking commendation? To his outspoken admiration for Horace in the previously quoted passage from the *Tristia*² should be added the steady stream of imitation running through all his works — no subsequent poet, an eminent critic declared,³ can show so many reminiscences of Horace's verse. This is in itself acknowledgment enough; yet, looking farther, the reader, I think, will discover a peculiar significance in some of Ovid's borrowings. He does not simply appropriate thoughts or "beauties"; he imitates *mit einem Tone*, intentionally brings before us the whole context from which he

¹ *Carm.* iv. 2 is mainly a panegyric on the Emperor. Thus the opening of the second series of odes corresponds substantially to that of the first. In *Carm.* i. 1 Horace declares his allegiance to the Muse, in *Carm.* i. 2 he pays his homage to the Emperor. The difference between the two openings is that in the latter the initial ode is not addressed to Maecenas. This, as has often been remarked, is not an intentional slight; Horace's good sense prevents him from dedicating to Maecenas a work which the Emperor had asked him to compose. But the fact that a panegyric on Augustus is not plumped in at the start is no sign that Horace feels coolly towards his royal patron; he simply does not care to spoil by overemphasis the fine series of eulogies which form the backbone of the book (*Odes* 4, 5, 6, 14, 15). This consideration tends, I believe, to show that the first ode of this book was written last. If Horace had not reckon with the five odes just mentioned, he might well have made the initial piece a dedication to the Emperor, even as *Carm.* i. 1 is addressed to Maecenas. But supposing them already completed, we can see why the first ode was given its present character. If, then, it followed the panegyric odes, its date is 13 B.C. Another reason why the ode is not addressed to Augustus or any other mortal, is that Fabius Maximus and Ovid furnish personality enough.

² See above, p. 136 f., and for Ovid's reason for omitting mention of Horace where some critics would expect it, p. 137, N. 3.

³ M. Hertz, *op. cit.* ii, p. 7: *cum inter omnes poetas nemo fere tam constanter Horatium referat.*

selects, incorporating that, reminiscentially, in his own description. Thus when we read the verse (*Met.* 3. 353)

Multi illum iuvenes, multae cupiere puellae,

followed (v. 355) by

nulli illum iuvenes, nullae tetigere puellae,

we not only note a clever adaptation which dispenses with a harsh elision,¹ but can image something of the splendor of Catullus' wedding-hymn, skilfully put into a new setting. This quality appears often in Ovid's imitations,² and is very marked in his reminiscences of Horace. Reminiscence is the exact word—not mere imitation of an idea or phrase, but the suggestion of a situation, and of the poet who created it. One may turn for further illustration to Ovid's reminiscences of his own verse. The ending of *Trist.* iv. 10, for instance, with the repetition of the last line from the epilogue to the *Metamorphoses*, shows that the poet is thinking of his greatest work in connection with his coming immortality; or again, the imagery in the opening verses of *Trist.* iii. 8 takes us back at once, with something of the pain of contrast, to the light-hearted days when *Amores* iii. 6, 13 ff. was written. This last is a reminiscence strikingly akin in spirit to Horace's mater saeva Cupidinum. An instance of similar imitation of Horace meets us at the very start in *Amores* i. 15. This poem, in character an epilogue,³ may possibly have appeared in the first edition of the *Amores*, serving as an *envoy*. If this is so, and if the first edition preceded *Carm.* iv, then the passage in question should be ranked with the imitations of *Carm.* i–iii already noted.⁴ If, however, it appeared after the publication of *Carm.* iv—Zingerle⁵ notes the possible influence of

¹ See *Met.* ed. Haupt-Ehwald *ad loc.*

² For excellent remarks on this matter, see Zingerle, *op. cit.* p. 35, who points to the same characteristic in Horace's reproductions. A marked change of situation, as he shows, may be employed for humorous effect, thus resulting in parody. An instance of this last we may now recognize, if I am right, in Horace's *Epistles*, i. 8; see above, p. 140, N. 2.

³ Martinon, *op. cit.* p. xiv, imagines it a *prologue* to Book iv of the first edition.

⁴ See above, p. 140, N. 2.

⁵ *Op. cit.* p. 14 f.

Carm. iv. 9 — it is the poet's first distinct acknowledgment of Horace's favor. The poem strikes the chord which sounds so clearly in Horace's later odes — the thought of the poet's immortality. Ovid looks forward to a choir invisible in which Homer, Hesiod, Callimachus, have their place. Sophocles is there, Aratus, Menander. Of his countrymen, he names Ennius, Accius, Varro Atacinus, and Lucretius, in whose eulogy he gracefully interweaves one of the poet's own verses —

Carmina sublimis tunc sunt peritura Lucreti
Exitio terras cum dabit una dies.¹

But the list is becoming long. The next immortal, then, is introduced by allusion, —

Tityrus et segetes Aeneiaque arma legentur
Roma triumphati dum caput orbis erit.

But something there is, the poet continues, as permanent even as eternal Rome ;

Donec erunt ignes arcuque Cupidinis arma
Discentur numeri, culte Tibulle tui.

The mention of Tibullus is capped by that of Gallus. Is Propertius omitted because he was still living, or because there was not room? Catullus, too, had not figured. The closing lines sound again the praises of poetry and end with the words,

Ergo etiam cum me supremus adederit ignis
Vivam parsque mei multa superstes erit.

We picture at once the monument imperishable that Horace's fancy had reared.² Non omnis morior multaue pars mei, — Ovid's meaning is as clear as though he had inserted the poet's name, as he had just done in the similar quotation from Lucretius; he prophesies for himself the renown that his great friend had attained. The whole poem illustrates the same quality of description that we have observed before;³

¹ Cf. Lucretius, v. 95: una dies dabit exitio multosque per annos | sustentata ruit moles et machina mundi.

² *Carm.* iii. 30.

³ See above, p. 136, N. 3.

Ovid is not averse to the catalogue, but when the catalogue begins to pall, it shades into connotation. And the most important thought may not be the most directly expressed.

Other instances of this allusive imitation might be cited. In close connection with the above is the epilogue to the *Metamorphoses*, which may be briefly described as a summary of Horace *Carm.* iii. 30 in a different metre. An interesting case to which Zingerle¹ does justice is *Tristia* iv. 8, 19, where Ovid describes his retirement from letters in the manner of Horace's first epistle. In particular, Ovid's references to his work and fame will be found to have some touch of Horace about them. Without dwelling further on these passages, I would call attention, in concluding, to one of the latest of Ovid's poems, *Epist. ex Ponto* i. 9. This is a letter to Maximus, on the death of their common friend Celsus; it is in essence a threnody. Celsus, I believe, is the youthful poet whom Horace mentions in his epistles,² and Maximus is Paullus Fabius once more. Some scholars think differently, assuming "some other" Celsus,³ and for Maximus, Ovid's friend Cotta Maximus, son of Messalla.⁴ Truth to tell, there is no absolute evidence on either side. But is not the situation crystallized with the following lines? Ovid is speaking of the esteem in which Maximus was held by his departed friend (v. 35) —

Nam tua non alio coluit penetralia ritu
Terrarum dominos quam colis ipse deos.

Terrarum dominos evehit ad deos,⁵ — the verse is transplanted from Horace, rendering its original effect despite the new metrical setting, even as Horace refashioned

Iussit militiae signa movere suae.

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 17.

² i. 3, 8. Compare above, p. 140, n. 2.

³ So Klebs, *Prosop. Imp. Rom.* 1897, I. 334. For the other view, see e.g. O. Hennig, *op. cit.* p. 14 f.; Pauly-Wissowa, VI. 1882.

⁴ So Riese, and Graeber, *op. cit.* p. x f., against Merkel, Nipperdey, Teuffel. Klebs, *loc. cit.*, leaves the question undecided; Celsus, he states, is amicus Ovidii et (Paulli Fabii?) Maximi. Cf. Dessau, *ibid.* II. 49; so Pauly-Wissowa, VI. 1882.

⁵ *Carm.* i. 1, 6.

Does not the poet, once more, call up a definite picture? These friends of his must be the young Celsus and Fabius whom Horace had fathered; and in this mention of their intercourse, the reminiscential verse brings to mind their relations with him. It is the same scene that we know from the *Epistles* — Horace in years, surrounded by young devotees, receiving homage and dispensing advice.¹ If this interpretation is correct, Ovid was thinking both of Horace and of the first ode of Book iv when he wrote this letter to Maximus on the death of their common friend. Am I reading too much into Ovid? Not if one grants, what I think we may safely accept, namely, that Horace in *Carm.* iv. 1 imitates a verse of the younger poet. Bearing in mind the importance of this compliment and the nature of Ovid's imitations in general, we need not be surprised if some of his reminiscences of Horace are symbols of a further meaning.

¹ In what I feel must be a later poem, Ovid applies the same line with a new effect: *Epist.* ii. 2, 1, *Nec nos Enceladi dementia castra secuti | in rerum dominos movimus arma deos.* It seems more probable that he should first embody the line completely, and then change it in a second reproduction than *vice versa.* In this case a flavor of his first meaning still hangs about the present passage. However, if Wartenberg, *Quaest. Ovid.* Berlin, 1884, pp. 74, 88, is right in placing i. 9 among the the latest of the letters from Pontus, we may conceive that ii. 2 gives the ordinary sort of imitation, while in i. 9 the poet reverts to the same verse for a new significance. *Epist.* ii. 2 followed soon after Tiberius' triumph in A.D. 13: see Wartenberg, p. 77. For i. 9 Wartenberg's argument is that the letter shows Ovid to have been a resident at Tomi for some time. But supposing the date were 12, a year before ii. 2 was written, that would allow him four years of banishment; and with Ovid one day was as a thousand, at Tomi.

VII. — *The Etymology of Mephistopheles.*

BY PROF. JULIUS GOEBEL,

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

OF all the pet-names and titles which have been conferred upon the devil in the course of his long career none has troubled the philologists more than the name Mephistopheles. The first to express an opinion concerning the origin of this name was probably Georg Rudolph Widmann, who says in his *Faustbook* (1599), I, cap. 11: "Letzlich wird auch allhier in dieser Erzählung angezeigt, dass sich D. Fausti Geist Mephostophiles nennen lasse, welches sonsten ein *Persianischer Name* seyn soll." It is interesting to compare with this opinion of one of the early compilers of the Faust story the view of the poet. November 20, 1829, Goethe writes to his friend Zelter: "Woher der Name Mephistopheles entstanden sei, wüsste ich direct nicht zu beantworten; beyliegende Blätter jedoch mögen die Vermuthung des Freundes bestätigen, welche demselben gleichzeitig-phantastischen Ursprung mit der Faustischen Legende giebt; nur dürfen wir sie nicht wohl ins Mittelalter setzen: der Ursprung scheint ins sechzehnte und die Ausbildung ins siebzehnte Jahrhundert zu gehören." Goethe makes no attempt at an etymology of the name, but quotes, for the sake of showing the highly dignified position of Mephistopheles, a chapter from Faust's *Höllenzwang*, a magic book printed in 1612, in which the various dignitaries of the demonocracy are described according to their rank and position.

The etymologies which have since been given by commentators on Goethe's Faust and others may be divided into two classes: those which explain the name from the Greek, and those which interpret it from the Hebrew.

The interpreters who derive the name from the Greek start from the supposition that the last part of the word Mephistopheles is the ending *-φιλης* or *-φιλος* as in Theophiles or Theophilos. Thus Professor Dürr of Altdorf writes as early

as July 18, 1676, in a letter to Georg Sigismund Führer that in his opinion Mephistopheles originated from μέγας and φίλος, "ut intelligatur se magnum et prae aliis eminere velle." W. Ernst Weber in his commentary on Goethe's Faust derives the name from *mefitis* or *mephitis*, "Schwefeldampf," and φίλος (or ὠφελεῖν), and interprets Mephistopheles as "homo quem mephites juvant." Düntzer's explanation Μῆ-φωτο-φίλης, "der das Licht nicht liebende," and Hagemann's Μῆ-φαιστο-φίλης, "Nicht-Faustlieb," I need only mention as curiosities born of philological despair.

A recent etymology by W. H. Roscher in the appendix to his treatise on "Ephialtes, Eine Abhandlung über die Alpträume und Alpdämonem des klassischen Altertums" (*Abhandlungen der phil. hist. Klasse der königl. sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Vol. XX), deserves more serious consideration. Starting from the theory that Mephistopheles had originally been a *spiritus familiaris*, a Germanic *Hausgeist* or *Kobold*, he derives the name from the Greek Ὠφέλης, by which name Ephialtes was known also, and sees in Mephistopheles a corrupted form of Megistopheles, "der höchst Nützliche." While it must be admitted that Mephistopheles acts for a time as Faust's servant, thus showing certain features of the Germanic Kobold, his character as a whole will scarcely appeal to any one but our etymologist as "highly useful."

Nein, nein! der Teufel ist ein Egoist
Und tut nicht leicht um Gottes willen
Was einem andern nützlich ist.

Although the Hebrew etymologies at first sight seem to promise better results, they do not explain the character of Mephistopheles. According to Krenkel, *Jahrbuch für deutsche Theologie*, XXII, 474 ff., our name is composed of *mephiz*, "Zerstreuer," "Vernichter," and *tophel*, "Lügner." But the compound *mephiz-tophel*, according to the rules of Hebrew noun-composition, would mean "destroyer of liars," a name far more fitting to Jehovah than to Mephistopheles. The same is true of the etymology proposed in Brockhaus's *Conversations-Lexicon*, which explains the first part of the name as the

Hebrew *mephir*, "Zerbrecher," and the second as *tophel*, "Lügner."

Before I give the etymology of the name which suggested itself to me recently, it is necessary to enumerate the principal forms of the word which have been handed down to us.

1. Mephostophiles (Faustbook of Spies, 1587; Versified Faustbook, 1587; Widmann's Faustbook, 1599; Pfitzer's Faustbook, 1674).

2. Mephostophilis (Marlowe's *Faust*. Shakespeare has Mephostophilus).

3. Mephistophiles (*Dr. Fausti dreyfacher Höllenzwang*, Rom, 1501; *Dr. Fausti vierfacher Höllenzwang*, Rom. 1580; *Faust's (dreifacher) . . . Höllenzwang, Romae in vaticano unter Papst Alexander VI, Anno 1520*). The places and dates of publication in these and other magic-books are, of course, purposely given incorrectly by the publishers, who desired to escape detection, and at the same time wished to have their productions appear old and rare.

4. Mephistopheles (*Dr. Joh. Fausti Nigromantia et Cabala alba, Mephistopheles et Auerhahn; Faustbuch des Christlich-Meynenden*, 1728; Goethe's *Faust*).

5. Mephis-Dopholus (old parchment scroll, dated 1509; old German manuscript entitled: *Doctor Faustens geheime Manuscripta*. Both documents are in possession of K. Engel).

6. Mephistophiel (*Praxis Cabulae nigrae Doctoris Johannis Fausti*, Passau, 1612).

The peculiar diversity of the form of our name in books, which appeared almost contemporaneously, indicates that the authors themselves were not sure of its etymology. This could not have been the case had the name been originally an epithet or a nickname of Satan, whose many surnames were generally known and understood. That Mephistopheles is, however, *not* originally identical with Satan, as most commentators of Faust assume, is clearly shown by Chapter XXIII of Spies' Faustbook, in which the various devils are described. These form a regular state or kingdom under the leadership of Satan — Lucifer. When the belief in this kingdom originated cannot be ascertained, but it is evident that it was fully

developed in the sixteenth century, as is shown by several magic-books.

According to *Doctor Johann Faustens Miracel- Kunst- und Wunderbuch oder die (!) schwarze Rabe*, Lion, 1469, the demonocracy consists of: 1, Lucifer, "König"; 2, Belial, "Vice Roi"; 3, "Vier Gubernatores" (Satan, Beelzebub, Astaroth, Pluto); 4, "Sieben Grossfürsten" (Aziel, *Mephistophiles*, Marbuel, Ariel, Ariguel, Anisel, Barfael); 5, "Fünf Geheimde höllische Räthe"; 6, "Ein Geh. Reichs-Secretarius"; and finally, 7, twelve "spiritus familiares." While it seems at first sight that the constitution of Lucifer's kingdom was patterned after that of the Holy Roman Empire, we may learn from several magic-books whence the seven *Grossfürsten* really originated. According to the Wagnerbook they are identical with the spirits of the seven planets: "Und sind erstlich der fürnemesten Fürsten *sieben*, nach den sieben Planeten, die regieren fürnemlich auch in ihren besonderen tagen und stunden, und heissen: 1, Aratron (Saturn); 2, Bethor (Jupiter); 3, Phaleg (Mars); 4, Och (Sonne); 5, Hagith (Venus); 6, *Ophiel* (Mercur); 7, Phul (Mond)." A similar account is given in the magic-book *Arbatel*, a Latin version of which is contained in the works of Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim, printed at Lyons about 1550: "Spiritus Olympici dicuntur illi, qui in Firmamento et in Astris Firmamenti habitant. . . . Septem sunt gubernationes seu officiorum differentiae Olympi, quibus Deus voluit universam hanc mundi machinam administrari. Visibilia autem eorum astra sunt: Aratron (Saturn), Bethor (Jupiter), Phaleg (Mars), Och (Sol), Hagith (Venus), *Ophiel* (Mercurius), Phul (Luna)." According to the *Praxis Cabulae nigrae Doctoris Johannis Fausti magi celeberrimi* (1612) the names of the seven planetary spirits ("Unter Lucifer gehören die sieben Churfürsten der Teufel, welche mit ihren Namen nach Ordnung der Planeten heissen") are: 1, Lucifer; 2, Marbuel; 3, Ariel; 4, Aciel; 5, Barbiel; 6, *Mephistophiel*; 7, Agadiel.

The fact that the names of the spirits given by the last book differ from those given in the preceding books may be explained by the following passage in the magic-book

Arbatel: "Olympicorum spirituum nomina ab aliis alia traduntur, sed tantum illa sunt efficacia, quae unicuique traduntur per revelatorem Spiritum visibilem vel invisibilem." It will be noticed, however, that in the list of names of the *Praxis Cabulae nigrae* Mephistophiel takes the place of Ophiel in the lists of *Arbatel* and the Wagnerbook, and that both names stand for Mercury. It is, therefore, in the astrological demonology, which we find fully developed as early as Jamblichus, that we must look for the origin of the name Mephistopheles, and there is no question in my mind that the etymological explanation must start with the form Ophiel, contained in Mephistophiel, the forms in *-les* and *-lus* being of later origin.

The word Ophiel is evidently composed of the Greek *ὄφις*, serpent, and the Hebrew ending *-el*, which frequently appears not only in old Hebrew names of demons, but also in the demon-names that were manufactured after the Hebrew pattern, owing to the influence of the Cabala, by writers of magic-books during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. From the long list of such names I quote for the sake of illustration the following: Kyriel (*κύριος*), Kyniel (*κύνων*), Leoniel (*leo*), Cancriel (*cancer*), Tauriel (*taurus*), Ariel (*aries*).

That the spirit of the planet Mercury, or rather the demon Mercury, should be called Ophiel = serpent-god, is explained by the fact that Mercury-Hermes was represented during the later Hellenistic period with the *κηρύκειον* or the caduceus. This *κηρύκειον* is above all the symbol of Hermes Trismegistos or Maximus Mercurius, the guardian-god of the magicians, alchemists, and astrologers. I do not doubt for a moment that Mephistophiel is a corrupted form of Megist-Ophiel, and that Mephistopheles is originally identical with Hermes Trismegistos.¹

The expressions "Hermetic art," "hermetically sealed," etc., still point to the great rôle which Hermes Trismegistos played in the science of the ancients and of the middle ages. Originally the Egyptian god Toth (cf. R. Pietschmann, *Hermes Tris-*

¹ In early astrological writings of the Arabians Hermes Trismegistos also appears as the spirit of Mercury. See Pietschmann, *Hermes Trism.*, p. 46.

megistos, Leipzig, 1875), he was identified with the Greek Hermes when the family of the Ptolemies took possession of the Egyptian throne. Thus Toth is called in the inscription on the famous Rosetta stone: 'Ερμῆς ὁ μέγας καὶ μέγας. The epithet *τριμέγιστος* appears, however, for the first time in Tertullian († ca. 220), who speaks of him as: "Mercurius ille Trismegistus, magister omnium physicorum." A century later Lactantius says concerning him: "Mercurius, qui tametsi homo fuerit antiquissimus tamen et instructissimus omni genere doctrinae, adeo ut ei multarum rerum et artium scientia Trismegisto cognomen imponeret. Hic scripsit libros et quidem multos ad cognitionem divinarum rerum pertinentes, in quibus majestatem summi ac singularis Dei asserit."

The truth, however, is that the writings of Hermes mentioned here by Lactantius were attributed originally to Toth, and consisted of forty-two sacred papyrus scrolls. These scrolls were first called 'Ερμού βιβλία by Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* vi, 4, § 35. When Jamblichus, a century after Lactantius, wrote his work *de Mysteriis*, he could mention as many as twenty thousand books of Hermes, in which the principles of all our knowledge had been revealed by this god (*de Myst.* viii, 1). The belief that Hermes Trismegistos, θεὸς ὁ τῶν λόγων ἡγεμῶν, as Jamblichus calls him, had written these books or had inspired holy men to write them as his teachings, was handed down through the middle ages not only by St. Augustine, who gives long extracts from these writings in the eighth book of *de Civitate Dei*, but also by the alchemists, astrologers, and magicians. For these claimed Hermes Trismegistos as their special god, and to him they ascribed numerous books on magic and astrology. "Fertur," says Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, I, 74, "scripsisse imaginum sive praestigiorum (an praesagiorum) libros: De annulis, Liber i; De caractere, Lib. i; De sigillis, Lib. i; De imaginibus Martis, Lib. i; De imag. Jovis, Lib. i; De imag. Saturni, Lib. i; De septem annulis planetarum, Lib. i; De medicinis et conjunctionibus planetarum, Lib. i; De confectionibus ad capiendum animalia silvestria, Lib. i; De verbo perfecto, Lib. i; Ad Asclepium, Lib. i; De mathesi, Lib. ii." How

numerous the astrologers were during the early middle ages may be learned from the fact that the *Codex Justinianus* has the following: "Ars mathematica [astrology] damnabilis est et interdicta omnino" (IX, 18). With the alchemists of the middle ages the most famous of the writings of Hermes Trismegistos was the so-called *Tabula smaragdina*. According to the legend this emerald table, which had a most valuable inscription, was found by Sarah, the wife of Abraham, in the grave of Hermes, in the valley of Hebron, and taken by her from the hands of the corpse. "Meminit tabulam smaragdinam," says Fabricius, *l.c.*, "Aristoteles junior, Chemicus, De perfecto Magisterio, meminit Senior Zadith, Magister Ortholanus sive Hortulanus, nescio quis; Avicenna, Arnoldus de Villa Nuova, Isaacus Hollandus, Albertus Magnus, Bernhardus Trevisanus et anno 1330 Petrus Bonus Lombardus."

It is evident from the list of authors here quoted that the memory of Hermes Trismegistos was still alive when the revival of alchemy, astrology, and magic took place during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. That he was considered also the greatest of all magicians may be seen from the following passage in the fourth book of Agrippa von Nettesheim's *De occulta philosophia*: "Omnium siquidem, qui de nominibus spirituum eliciendis tractarunt, primus ille [Trismegistus] extitit."

It is my opinion that Hermes Trismegistos, who was worshipped during the first centuries of the Christian era in many parts of the Roman empire, and who was the special god of the alchemists, astrologers, and magicians, was considered by later Christian writers a demon, and appears as such under the name Ophiel and Mephist-ophiel (= Megistophiel) in the demonological literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The mediæval belief that the devil was the inventor of the game of dice ("der tiuvel shuof daz wüfelspil") seems to show that Satan and Mercury were identified quite early. Thus Hincmar von Reims (†882) says: "sicut isti qui de denariis quasi jocari dicuntur, quod omnino diabolicum est, et, sicut legimus, primum diabolus hoc per Mercurium prodidit, unde et Mercurius inventor illius dicitur." The Mercury

mentioned here is without question Maximus Mercurius, for according to a passage in Plato's *Phaedrus* it was the Egyptian god Teuth = Toth (or Hermes Trismegistos), who invented the game of dice. Cf. *Phaedrus*, 274 D: τούτων δὲ πρῶτον ἀριθμὸν τε καὶ λογισμὸν εὐρεῖν . . . ἔτι δὲ πεττείας τε καὶ κυβείας.

It is, moreover, significant that several of the teachings of Hermes Trismegistos were condemned as heresies by the early church. Thus Philastrius in his *Liber de Haeresibus* (fourth century) says: "Hermes ille vanus paganus Trismegistus docuit, post Dominum omnipotentem non alium nisi Solem debere ipsum et homines adorare, qui cum ad Celta- rum provinciam perrexisset, ipse eos dignoscitur docuisse, atque huic errori ut succumberent eisdem suasisse."

That Hermes Trismegistos played an important rôle in magic as early as the thirteenth century may be guessed from the following passage from Albertus Magnus (cf. Pietschmann, *l.c.*, 58): "Quales sunt imagines Belini [*i.e.* Apollonius or Asklepios] et Hermetis quae exorcitantur per liv nomina angelorum, qui subservire dicuntur imaginibus lunae et circulo ejus et forte potius sunt nomina daemonum."

We may, therefore, easily understand why Mephistopheles should appear in close connection with Faust, the greatest of all magicians, astrologers, and alchemists. When the latter conjures up the devil, it is not Satan, or Lucifer, who makes his appearance, but the very demon who had been the god of the magicians. While it is possible that, owing to the identity of Mercury and Wodan, certain characteristics of the latter were transferred to Mephistopheles, there are, nevertheless, certain features in Faust's conjuration of Mephistopheles which still remind us of Hermes, the old wind-god and inventor of music. Thus we are told in the Faustbook of Spies (p. 14) how wind and music precede the apparition of Mephistopheles: "Denn als D. Faustus den Teuffel beschwur, da liess sich der an, als wann er nicht gern an das Ziel und an den Reyen käme, wie dann der Teuffel im Wald einen solchen Tumult anhub, als wollte Alles zu Grunde gehen, *dass sich die Bäum biss zur Erden bogen*. . . . Und sind im Wald viel löblicher Instrument, Music und Gesäng gehört worden."

Moreover, in several places Mephistopheles is called "der fliegende Geist" (pp. 17, 27); he appears as "Diener des Hellschen Printzen im Orient" (p. 20), and he tells us that he is well-informed in astrology (p. 42).¹

In conclusion, a word concerning the transition of Megist-Ophiel into Mephist-Ophiel is necessary. The fact that the phrase $\theta\epsilon\hat{\omega}\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omega\ \text{Ἑρμῆ}$ occurs several times in inscriptions (cf. *Corp. Inscr. Gr.* III, 5703, 5100, etc.) proves that $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ was perhaps as frequent an epithet of Hermes as $\tau\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$. The change of *megist-* to *mephist-* will not astonish any one familiar with the treatment of Greek words in magic literature. A striking example of this is furnished by the word $\acute{\iota}\sigma\chi\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ occurring in the *Trisagion* of the ancient church: $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\iota}\sigma\chi\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\theta\sigma\omicron\nu\ \acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$. As these words were considered especially effective, we find them frequently used, though mostly in a distorted shape, in the incantations of magic-books. Thus the word $\acute{\iota}\sigma\chi\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ appears in one of the incantations of the *Praxis Cabulae nigrae D. Joh. Fausti* as a noun: *Hischacos*. According to Frauenlob (*Leiche und Sprüche*, No. 409: 'Ōschiros, got gewaltec') there existed also a form $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\chi\iota\rho\omicron\varsigma$ of $\acute{\iota}\sigma\chi\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$. This form seems to be at the basis of Osphadiel (from Oschra in incantations), the name of a demon, showing transition of $\chi = \phi h$.

Another example of how such words and names in magic literature boldly defy strict phonetic laws may be found in the history of the words *Zabulon*, *Sabilon*, *Sabulon*, *Savilon*, *Savelon*, all of which must be traced back to *diabolus*.

The final reason for changing *megist-* to *mephist-* may, however, be attributed to the desire of concealing the identity of Hermes Trismegistos, which the attribute $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ would easily have disclosed. For Ficinus in the introduction to his translation of the *Poemander* of Hermes tells us: "Nomen ejus proprium ob reverentiam quandam pronunciare vulgo ac temere non licebat."

¹ In a future paper I hope to show that certain chapters of the first part of Spies's Faustbook, the sources of which have not been ascertained, may be traced to the influence of Hermetic writings.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRTY-SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

HELD AT ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, SEPTEMBER, 1904

ALSO OF THE FIFTH AND SIXTH ANNUAL MEETINGS OF THE

Philological Association of the Pacific Coast

HELD AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

DECEMBER, 1903

AND

DECEMBER, 1904

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE AT THE THIRTY-SIXTH
ANNUAL MEETING (ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI).

Louis F. Anderson, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash.
R. Arrowsmith, New York, N. Y.
Sidney G. Ashmore, Union University, Schenectady, N. Y.
Francis M. Austin, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Ill.
C. P. Bill, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.
M. Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
George M. Bolling, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.
George Willis Botsford, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
Demarchus C. Brown, Butler College, Irvington, Ind.
Carl D. Buck, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Charles Nelson Cole, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O.
Martin L. D'Ooge, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Herman L. Ebeling, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
William S. Ebersole, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Ia.
Herbert C. Elmer, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Herbert B. Foster, University of South Dakota, Vermilion, S. D.
Frank H. Fowler, Lombard College, Galesburg, Ill.
George Depue Hadzsits, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.
Walter David Depue Hadzsits, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
William Gardner Hale, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
F. A. Hall, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
Karl P. Harrington, University of Maine, Orono, Me.
J. E. Harry, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.
W. A. Heidel, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia.
George Hempl, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Walter Hullihen, Grant University, Chattanooga, Tenn.
J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Emory B. Lease, College of the City of New York, N. Y.
F. A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Walter Miller, Tulane University, New Orleans, La.
Frank G. Moore, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Daniel A. Penick, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.
Edward D. Perry, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
John Pickard, University of the State of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
Rufus B. Richardson, New York, N. Y.
W. S. Scarborough, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O.
J. J. Schlicher, State Normal School, Terre Haute, Ind.

John Adams Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
T. D. Seymour, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
F. W. Shipley, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
Paul Shorey, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
M. S. Slaughter, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Herbert Weir Smyth, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Arthur T. Walker, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.
Andrew C. White, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Alexander M. Wilcox, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.
John Henry Wright, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

[Total, 48.]

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

ST. LOUIS, MO., September 16, 1904.

The Thirty-sixth Annual Meeting was called to order at 3.10 P.M. in a recitation-room in the new buildings of Washington University, by the President, Professor George Hempl, of the University of Michigan.

The Secretary of the Association, Professor Herbert Weir Smyth, of Harvard University, read the following list of persons who had been nominated for membership in the Association. At a later meeting they were declared elected by the Executive Committee :

Prof. George Henry Allen, University of Cincinnati.
Edmund C. Cook, Esq., New York, N. Y.
Prof. Eli Dunkle, Ohio University, Athens, O.
Miss Susan Fowler, Columbia University.
Prof. George D. Hadzsits, University of Cincinnati.
Dr. Walter D. D. Hadzsits, Smith College.
Prof. Archer Wilmot Hendrick, Whitman College.
Adam Fremont Hendrix, Esq., University of Kansas.
Prof. Walter Hulihan, Grant University, Chattanooga, Tenn.
Dr. Samuel A. Jeffers, State Normal School, California, Pa.
Dr. Elizabeth Mary Perkins, Washington, D. C.
G. E. Scoggin, Esq., Cambridge, Mass.
Dr. Andrew Shedd, University of Florida.
Eric Arthur Starbuck, Esq., Worcester, Mass.
Prof. William F. Swahlen, De Pauw University.
Prof. Frank Vogel, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Dr. Arletta L. Warren, State Normal School, Madison, S. D.

The Secretary also reported that the annual volume had been published in April, and that the Bibliographical Record was still incomplete at the time of this meeting.

Professor Smyth then presented his report as Treasurer for the year 1903-1904 :—

RECEIPTS.

Balance from 1902-1903		\$658.65
Sales of Transactions	\$139.46	
Membership dues	1401.00	
Initiation fees	90.00	
Dividends Central New England and Western R. R.	6.00	
Offprints	6.00	
Interest	8.00	
Philological Association of the Pacific Coast	214.97	
Total receipts for the year		<u>1865.43</u>
		\$2524.08

EXPENDITURES.

Transactions and Proceedings (Vol. XXXIV)	\$1074.43	
Salary of Secretary	300.00	
Postage	33.93	
Printing	16.00	
Expressage	3.78	
Incidentals	7.83	
Total expenditures for the year		<u>\$1435.97</u>
Balance, July 6, 1903.		1088.11
		\$2524.08

It was further reported that the Executive Committee had voted to continue for three years more its annual contribution of £40 towards the expense of preparing the Platonic Lexicon under the direction of Professor Lewis Campbell.

The reading of papers was then begun.

1. A Misinterpreted Greek Optative, by Professor J. E. Harry, of the University of Cincinnati.

The one hundred and eighty-sixth verse of the *Ajax* of Sophocles (*ἦκοι γὰρ ἂν θελα νόσος*) has been frequently misinterpreted. Jebb translates: "When heaven sends madness, it must come." This is incorrect; *ἦκοι ἂν* is not equivalent to *ἀνάγκη ἐλθεῖν*, *ἀνάγκη ἀφικέσθαι*. A proper conception of the tenor of the whole passage depends upon a correct understanding of *ἦκοι ἂν*. The Greek optative varies in significance from "may" to "must"; sometimes means "can" and "will." Cf. Soph. *Phil.* 1302, *οὐκ ἂν μεθελην*; Eur. *Heracl.* 344, *οὐκ ἂν λιποίμι βωμόν*; *I.A.* 310, *οὐκ ἂν μεθελμην*; *Ion.* 418, *στελχοίμ' ἂν εἰσω*; Aesch. *Cho.* 1050, 1062, *οὐκέτ' ἂν μείναιμ' ἐγώ*. It may be "permissive," or "jussive," e.g. *λέγοις ἂν*, *εἰ τι τῶνδ' ἔχεις ὑπέρτερον* (Aesch. *Cho.* 105), to which the chorus replies, *αἰδομένη σοι βωμόν ὡς τύμβον πατρός | λέξω, κελεύεις γάρ*. The polite request (*veuillez parler*) is answered by *λέξω*. Cf. *Enni.* 94, *εὐδοίτ' ἂν*; 117, *μύθοιτ' ἂν*; Soph. *Phil.* 674, *El.* 1491, *χωροῖς ἂν εἰσω*; *Ant.* 1339, *ἀγοιτ' ἂν*. But

when Meno speaks to his slave he says *δεῦρο πρόσελθε* (82 A). The modals in the dialogue between Isabella and Angelo in *Measure for Measure* are the despair of the foreigner. But "must" is particularly difficult for the novice. Our "must have" is reserved to express an idea which is generally rendered in modern European languages by the future perfect indicative: "Il lettore sarà certamente meravigliato" (Fanfani, *Cecco d'Ascoli*, ch. 45). Cf. George Sand, *Lélia*, ch. 64: "Ils auront voulu pêcher les truites du lac; le plus hardi des deux se sera risqué trop avant; il aura crié au secours, mais l'autre aura eu peur et la force lui aura manqué." In like manner the Salaminian sailors have come to the conclusion that their chieftain lies stricken by frenzy sent from heaven. The perfect optative middle and passive (with *ἄν*) must have been a favorite method with the Greeks, of expressing subjective conviction with reference to the past. But the verb which would have been naturally most employed happens to be without a perfect, hence was unable to form an optative with *ἄν* in the perfect to express the idea which is usually rendered in modern European languages by a future perfect (*wird gewesen sein, aura été, sarà stato, habrá sido*). Hence the Greek was content to use the present for the perfect: Herodotus I, 2, *εἴησαν δ' ἄν οὔτοι Κρήτες, these must have been Cretans*. The pure perfect optative active in any verb is exceedingly rare. In Xen. *An.* 5, 7, 26, is found one of the few examples without *ἄν* (*ἔδεισαν δὲ μὴ λῦτα τις ὡσπερ κυσὶν ἡμῶν ἐμπεπτῶκοι*). This sentence almost paraphrases the passage in the *Ajax*. The mariners, who constitute the chorus, fear that madness has seized their leader. But the optative in this sentence is doubly disguised, is really a perfect masquerading as a present and a passive as an active (*ventum sit*). The chorus means: *ἀφίγμένη ἄν εἴη θεία νόσος*. If we read on a hundred verses we get all the light we need from the mariners themselves. In responding to Tecmessa in 278 f., they repeat what they say here — only the sentence is given a different cast, *δέδοικα μὴ 'κ θεοῦ | πληγὴ τις ἦκη*. If verse 186 had been correctly interpreted by the commentators, there would have been no controversy as to the correct reading in 279 (*ἦκει or ἦκη*). Mekler reads the indicative, Jebb the subjunctive. Cp. Soph. *O. T.* 1011, *ταρβῶν γε μὴ μοι Φοῖβος ἐξέλθη σαφής*; 1182, *τὰ πάντ' ἄν ἐξήκοι σαφῆ*. Even Tecmessa sees in Ajax's behavior evidence of a *διαφορὰ φρενῶν*, a *θεία νόσος* (243). It is the subjective conviction of the chorus that a *θεοβλάβεια* or *νόσος φρενῶν* has visited their chief. Consequently, *ἦκοι ἄν θεία νόσος* is equivalent to *θεία νόσος αὐτῷ ἐμπεπτῶκυῖα ἄν εἴη, er wird von einem Gott getroffen sein, quelque dieu l'aura atteint de folie, la pazzia gli sarà venuta dal cielo*.

This paper is published in full in the *Classical Review*, April, 1905.

2. Horace as a Nature Poet, by Professor Karl P. Harrington, of the University of Maine.

If, judged on grounds of antecedent probability and environment, Tibullus and Propertius, as we have previously shown, exhibit but a disappointing amount of appreciation of nature in its simplicity and its most palpable relations, and it is evident that nature exerted but a meagre influence on the subject-matter, the illustrations, or the general tone of their writings, our surprise is rather in the

opposite direction, as we discover that Horace, the most carefully polished, the most laboriously concise, the most artfully naive of all Roman poets, who taught Rome to appreciate Greek models of lyric verse in abounding variety, who could lay away his unfinished beginnings for an indefinite period till the best *callida iunctura* should be worked out, who could carve out a poem on any subject, from Lalage's rippling laughter to the analysis of those qualities that should inhere in the ideal Roman citizenship, — that this Horace is so permeated with affection for, and appreciation of, the simple beauty of the fields and flocks, the groves, the babbling brooks, the wind in the tree-tops, and the moon-lit heavens, that we can ever see the humble rustic lad from the back-country village of Venusia, underneath all the external niceties of Roman society in the metropolis, and amid the folly and frippery of the Augustan court.

For it is mostly the pictures that Horace knew when a boy in Apulia, or those other ones which he loved so well among the Sabine mountains, which he presents to us in his poetry, with more or less directness and definiteness. Not that Horace omits the conventional references to Erymanthus and Tempe, to the Cyclades, and to the dust of Troy, to Proteus lording it over his seals, and to Enceladus prone beneath the roaring fires of Aetna. But, to our infinite satisfaction, he prefers to draw his parallels, and no small amount of his inspiration, from the dearest scenes of his childhood, or from those amid which his ripening years were so well at ease.

Even if we admit that sometimes he poses a little for effect, we cannot doubt that he is a true lover of the country. His picture of the delights that Alfius enjoyed in the country are really but a snapshot of himself upon his Sabine estate.

It must have been on that poor little Venusian farm of his father's that Horace had grown so close to nature. When in childhood he wandered off on the slopes of the Mons Voltur, the experience left only a fond reminiscent longing (*Carm.* iii. 4, 6-24). We may well believe it is this same dominating height which he has in mind when speaking of the life of the hills, or of the streams that sweep down so suddenly from their slopes, as in *Carm.* i. 23, 1-8; 15, 29-32; iv. 2, 5-6.

The stream that naturally impressed Horace most in his boyhood days was the Aufidus. To this he refers again and again, either by name or by implication; so in *Serm.* i. 1, 58, *et passim*; *Carm.* iv. 14, 25-28. And even the simile in *Carm.* iii. 29, 33-41 probably includes *Etruscum* for merely conventional considerations of politeness towards Maecenas, while really picturing the stream that Horace knew best. Peace and gladness at other times and places are suggested by the same river. It is still the Aufidus that we may see in such a passage as *Carm.* ii. 5, 5-9. Similar scenes of rustic life are found in *Carm.* iii. 11, 9-10; iv. 2, 27-31, where perhaps both the Calabrian and the Sabine country are really in the mind of the poet.

Something, too, of wild life Horace surely knew in his early days, as we may judge from *Carm.* iii. 12, 10-12. Nor did he forget the fierce storms of southern Italy (*Carm.* i. 28, 25-27). And though he was no sailor, he knew by experience something of the dangers off the eastern horizon of his boyhood home, as is indicated, *e.g.*, by *Carm.* iii. 27, 17-24; i. 33, 15-16. To Apulia also it seems natural to refer such other scenes as are described in *Carm.* iii. 27, 5-7, 9-12, and elsewhere.

Once, however, away for all time from his childhood surroundings, he turns

for rural joys to the Sabine mountains near Rome, where so many of his new associates could afford summer homes. Beautiful Tibur especially inspires him, as in *Carm.* i. 7, 10-17; iv. 3, 10-11; i. 18, 1-2; ii. 6, 5-8.

But when Horace was at length possessed of his darling estate on the slopes of the valley of the Digentia, all other spots on earth were to him of secondary beauty and importance. Here he was supremely content, as poem after poem clearly shows, e.g. *Carm.* i. 17; ii. 18, 11-16; iii. 18; 16, 29-32. Here is most probably to be located the Bandusian spring (*Carm.* iii. 13); and here from time to time he describes his life in communion with the rustic world about him (*Carm.* iv. 5, 29-30; 12, 3-12; 7, 1-4; iii. 1; 29-32).

More minute analysis of his preferences in describing nature phenomena shows unusual interest in the sea and the winds, less appreciation of day and night. Fire, the stars, rain, and the seasons have impressed him less than we should have expected.

3. On the Distinction between *Comitia* and *Concilium*, by Dr. George Willis Botsford, of Columbia University.

This paper appears in the TRANSACTIONS.

4. Notes on Ovid, by Dr. Edward Kennard Rand, of Harvard University (read by Professor Frank G. Moore).

This paper also will be found in the TRANSACTIONS.

5. A Critical Note on Catullus, *Carm.* lxxviii, 93, by Professor F. W. Shipley, of Washington University, St. Louis.

Of the numerous difficulties which the text of Catullus still presents, none is more baffling than the corruption in lxxviii, 93: *Quae uetet id*. The whole context is as follows: —

90 Nam tum Helenae raptu primores Argivorum
 Coepert ad sese Troia ciere uiros,
 Troia (nefas) commune sepulchrum Asiae Europaeque,
 Troia uirum et uirtutum omnium acerba cinis,
 Quae uetet id nostro letum miserabile fratri
 Attulit. Ei misero frater adempte mihi,
 95 Ei misero fratri iucundum lumen ademptum,
 Tecum una tota est nostra sepulta domus,
 Omnia tecum una perierunt gaudia nostra
 Quae tuus in uita dulcis alebat amor.

The unintelligible *Quae uetet id* is substantially the reading of all the manuscripts.¹ Many emendations have been offered by scholars. I quote from Ellis: "nuper *Passeratius* nunc et *Marcilius Ungerus* uitai nostrae *Ribbeckius* in

¹ The app. crit. of the edition of Ellis gives the readings as follows: *Quae uetet id* A C D G H L La² O V *Quae uetet id* B La¹, *sed in B ultima littera uocabuli uetet ita producta est, ut uetet esse potuerit. Quae uetat id a d. Quae uetet b P.*

Jahn. Ann. lxxxv, 378 uelut id *Coningto* uelut his uel eis *Eduinus Palmer* (Queis ueluti id iam antea *Froelichius*) ueterum id *Heysius* ueter id *ed. Parm.* 1473, quod in *ed. 1* retinui Quae ne etiam *Heinsius G. Hermannus* in *Jahn. Ann.* xxxiii, 245." Ellis, after retaining in his first edition the *Quae ueter id* of the *ed. Parm.* 1473, has, in his second edition, adopted an emendation of his own, *Qualiter id*. He cites, in support of the use of the somewhat rare word *Qualiter*, its occurrence in *Ov. Am.* 1. 7. 58, *Martial*, and *Valerius Flaccus*.

While I can agree with Ellis in rejecting the other conjectures, I cannot feel that his own emendation is at all satisfying, even if it does involve but a slight change in the text from *Quae ueter id* of B. After all, the examples which he cites of the use of *qualiter* simply help to confirm the rarity of the word. It is not found elsewhere in *Catullus*, or indeed in any writer until *Ovid*. But, aside from the rarity of *qualiter*, and the fact that it does not occur elsewhere in *Catullus*, and granting for the moment that *as* is the sense needed, there is still a difficulty in *id*. Whether it is used in the sense of *idem* or in that of *illud*, its force in either case is much weaker than that of either word. It could, in fact, be omitted altogether without serious loss of emphasis. So far as the *id* is concerned, it results in producing a weak line, where a strong one is evidently intended.

To return now to *Qualiter*. The passage in which *Catullus* speaks of his brother's death is no mere incidental comparison, such as would be introduced by this word. It contains the strongest vein of lyric feeling in a poem otherwise constructed in a somewhat mechanical way upon an Alexandrian plan. The exclamation *nefas* is evoked, not so much by the thought of the Trojan war, as by the sense of his own bereavement which the name of Troy calls back to his mind. The same is also true of the words *acerba cinis*. *Acerba* has the double sense of "bitter" and "untimely," and is much more pregnant with meaning in connection with the death of his brother than it would be if it applied merely to the legendary heroes of Troy whose promising careers were cut short. The bitterness of his brother's untimely end is again the keynote of his plaint in *Carm. ci*, *Heu miser indigne frater adempte mihi*. The two expressions, *nefas* and *acerba cinis*, form then the point of departure from the conventionally treated story of *Protesilaus* and *Laodamia* to the deeper personal feelings of the poet in the clause which follows containing the corruption. The clause should therefore present, not a mere incidental comparison, such as *Qualiter* might introduce, but a reason for the intensity of the feeling expressed in *nefas* and *acerba cinis*: "Troy — a curse upon her — the common burial ground of Europe and of Asia, of brave men and brave deeds untimely grave, since she has brought sorrowful death even to my own brother, alas my brother!" etc.

It is with diffidence that I attempt to add to the list of suggested emendations, already abnormally large. I believe, however, that the emendation which I propose: *Quandoquidem et*, which makes the lines read, *Quandoquidem et nostro letum miserabile fratri | attulit. Ei misero frater adempte mihi*, has much to recommend it, not only in giving the necessary force to the line, but also in accounting for the corruption.

Nostro is clearly the emphatic word in the line — my own brother — and needs an *et* or some other word with the sense of "even" to bring this emphasis out. *Quandoquidem* gives the reason for the expression of feeling in *nefas*, "a

curse upon her," and *acerba cinis*, "untimely grave." *Quandoquidem* is a word in frequent use by Lucretius in this position in a hexameter line, and is not only used by Catullus himself in this way, but is actually used in another passage (*Carm.* ci, 5) which also treats of his brother's death. The passage in question contains, in addition to similarity of sentiment, a repetition of several words which occur in the couplet lxxviii, ll. 93-4: *Quae uetet id* nostro letum miserabile fratri | attulit. Ei misero frater adempte mihi. The passage in *Carm.* ci reads as follows:—

Multas per gentes et multa per aequora uectus
 Aduenio has miseras, frater, ad inferias,
 Ut te postremo donarem munere mortis
 Et mutam nequicquam alloquerer cinerem,
 5 *Quandoquidem fortuna mihi tete abstulit ipsam,*
Heu miser indigne frater adempte mihi.
 Nunc tamen interea, etc.

Comparing now the couplets lxxviii, 93-4, and ci, 5-6, it will be seen that the second half of the one couplet is almost identical with that of the other. It would, therefore, not be surprising if the first word of the couplet ci, 5-6, echoed unconsciously the first word in the couplet lxxviii, 93-4. When *Quandoquidem et* occurred to me as the probable reading for *Quae uetet id*, I had not thought of the presence of *Quandoquidem* in the corresponding passage in *Carm.* ci. Its presence there came, accordingly, as a fairly strong piece of corroborative evidence.

There still remains the task of explaining how *Quandoquidem et* can be deduced from the manuscript reading *Quae uetet id*, or *Quae uetet id* from *Quandoquidem et*. To begin with, it is no ordinary corruption which has caused scholars for centuries to puzzle over four syllables in a passage in which the sense is as clear as it is here. I believe that the corruption, which was already in the lost Verona manuscript, began with the abbreviated forms of *quando* and *quidem*, e.g. qñ qið. The passage may have been written in some such way as qñ qiðet. Out of the first letter of the abbreviation of *quando* the *quae* might easily have grown, and out of the *quidem et*, with a partial abbreviation of the former, may have arisen a corruption which contained as an intelligible residuum *id et*. I believe that some scribe or corrector, attempting to make sense of the passage, now corrupt, suggested as a variant *et id*, thus: *uel et id*; and that out of this variant grew the reading *uetet id*, the remainder of the corruption.

SECOND SESSION.

Friday evening, September 16.

The Association met in the hall of the Library at 8 P.M. to hear the address of the President.

6. America and the English Language, by Professor George Hempl, of the University of Michigan.

This address will appear elsewhere, and the author has preferred to omit the customary abstract in this place.

THIRD SESSION.

Saturday morning, September 17.

The Association convened at 10.15 A.M., and proceeded at once to the reading of papers.

7. Accent and Ictus in Late Latin Hexameters, by Professor Frank G. Moore, of Dartmouth College.

The discussion was limited to the last two feet of the hexameter, with special attention to the admission of pyrrhic words in the fifth foot. It was shown that the general statement of an agreement between word-accent and verse-ictus in the *clausula* of the verse¹ is subject to considerable modification, in view of the wide differences of practice among the later Latin poets, especially in the treatment of pyrrhic words in the fifth foot. For while one poet will admit such unaccented words only where they are excused by some form of enclisis, another goes any length in accepting the pyrrhic word, even though emphasis makes it difficult to dispense with accent, — and that with such frequency as to strain even the most elastic theory of enclisis or proclisis. In the former case there is an evident effort to secure coincidence of ictus with *phrase*-accent, — a more important kind of stress, it was argued, than *word*-accent. On the other hand, in the second case one must feel that the poet in question allowed any pyrrhic word, being indifferent to the loss of accent in a single word, so long as the general movement of the *clausula* was maintained.

The poets examined ranged from the end of the third century to the beginning of the sixth, *i.e.*, from the *Catonis disticha* to Priscian, with a total of above thirty thousand hexameters. Commodian was excluded, as belonging to a class by himself. From a statistical table covering the poets mentioned it was proved that Claudian and Prudentius differ in their treatment of pyrrhic words in the fifth foot to an extent which would at first appear almost incredible, Claudian having but *six* examples in 9326 hexameters, while Prudentius admitted no less than 221 in a total of 5149 verses (neglecting *sine* and *super*). An analysis of Claudian's instances showed that all are easy of explanation, three being clear cases of enclisis or proclisis (*ac simul* and *et vice mira* and *haec mihi* [pers. pron. enclitic to the demonstr.]; *Gigant.* 111, *VI Cons. Honor.* 533, *in Rufin.* i. 204). In the three remaining cases, also, the same principle sufficiently covers the ground. Two of these follow *et* (and in each instance a tetrasyllabic Greek word precedes), the pyrrhic itself being an unemphatic word of rather indefinite meaning, immediately defined by a following phrase upon which the emphasis falls (*et freta*, *in Rufin.* i. 173, *et nova*, *Bell. Poll.* 9). Finally, an example of a predicate noun enclitic to its subject, with verb omitted (*telae labor*, *R.P.* iii. 204).

That Claudian so very rarely allowed a pyrrhic word in the fifth foot is all the more remarkable because so many instances can be found in Vergil (162 cases may be obtained from Professor Humphreys's table, *TAPA.*, 1878, p. 43). The only possible inference is that Claudian, with a more definite aim to secure

¹ Cf. the references given by Edmiston, *PAPA.* xxxiv (1903), xxvi f.

coincidence of accent and ictus in the cadence of the verse, declined the Vergilian liberty of inserting an unaccented dissyllable, as disturbing to the desired harmony, and not to be defended as merely a trifling discord, especially in the case of unemphatic words. Thus Claudian attempts to go much further than his master in this direction, and in isolated instances only does he admit the principle of phrase-accent, which in Vergil appears to cover a large number of the examples.

In contrast with Claudian's excessive strictness is the freedom of Prudentius, who saw no violation of any metrical canon in the frequent admission of words which in the nature of the case must lose their accent. And in a great many of these instances it is quite absurd to apply the theory of enclisis, or attempt otherwise to deny the very mechanical methods of composition. While he evidently desired coincidence of accent and ictus in this part of the verse, he was quite ready to insert even an emphatic word with neither an accent of its own, nor a substitute in the form of phrase-accent. Of the other poets examined Avienus and Ausonius are found on the side of Prudentius, with 117 instances in 3331 hexameters and 61 in a total of 3427, respectively. The others are rather to be classed with Claudian. Priscian has but three cases in 1399 verses, all fully covered by enclisis, in spite of the difficulty of placing the proper names in a geographical poem.

The paper also included statistics of monosyllabic endings for the same list of poets, showing Claudian and Prudentius again at opposite poles. The former was found to have but nine monosyllabic endings (omitting *si quis*, and the like, as practically dissyllables; also *ille est* (for the same reason)), while the latter has 116 examples, Ausonius 61 (neglecting the *Technop.*), and Avienus 27. Claudian's examples are (1) prepositional phrases, *in te, ex quo, per te*; (2) a stereotyped expression, *fas est (bis)*; (3) a monosyllable following a quadrisyllable, as *occiduis sol (bis)*, etc., — reminiscences of Ennius and Vergil. Here also Claudian endeavored to follow a stricter canon than Vergil.

8. On the Meaning of *προμαντεία*, by Professor M. L. D'Ooge, of the University of Michigan.

The traditional definition of this word is *precedence in consulting the oracle*. So e.g. Photius, τὸ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων χρῆσθαι τῷ ἐν Δέλφοις μαντεῖω· ἦν δὲ προεδρία τὸ αὐτό. The word occurs frequently in inscriptions recording the decrees of the Delphic priesthood and of the Amphictyons, and is coupled in such decrees with *προξενία, προεδρία, προδικία, ἀσυλία* (cf. *Bull. Corr. Hellen.* XXI, 104 ff.).

Since these decrees are so numerous, the question arises how can *προμαντεία* mean this and this only, and how could this right be exercised when so many clients could lay claim to it at the same time? The object of this present discussion is to show that *προμαντεία* may also mean *the consulting of the oracle on behalf of or for another*, and probably does mean that generally. When, therefore, a state or a person had decreed to it or to him the *προμαντεία* by the Delphic priesthood a privilege was bestowed to which such a state or person had no natural right. The traditional meaning, on the other hand, implies that any one had the right to consult the oracle who chose, and that the *προμαντεία* simply conferred the first chance or priority.

The first scholar to throw doubt on the correctness of the traditional meaning of *προμαντεία* is Homolle in a discussion of an inscription found at Delphi (cf. *Bull. Corr. Hellen.* XIX, 1), which belongs to the end of the fifth century B.C. and deals with the regulations concerning the phratry of the Labyadae.

The pertinent part of the inscription is this (p. 12): πάντων καὶ φιδίων καὶ δαμοσίων τὸμ προθύοντα καὶ προμαντευόμενον παρέχεν τὰ γεγραμμένα Λαβυάδαις. Homolle points out that the meaning of *προθύειν* here is determined by another inscription from Delphi which runs thus (Dittenberger, *Syll.*² 484): καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἀξιοὶ Ματροφάνης ἀποδείξαι τὸν προθύσοντα διὰ τὸ μὴ ὑπάρχειν πρόξενον Σαρδιανοῖς, οὐ δυνατῶν ὄντων πλείονος χρόνον παραγενέσθαι εἰς τὸ μαντεῖον διὰ τὰς αἰτίας ἃς ἀπελογίσαστο Ματροφάνης προθύειν αὐτῷ τὰν πόλιν. From this inscription it appears that Matrophanes was charged with the duty of consulting the oracle (this is stated in line 2 of the inscription not quoted here), and to do this he must first sacrifice. For this purpose he needs the services of a *πρόξενος*. But Sardis had at that time no *πρόξενος* at Delphi. Matrophanes, therefore, asked the city of Delphi ἀποδείξαι τὸν προθύσοντα, and it voted: προθύειν αὐτῷ τὰν πόλιν, i.e. to offer a sacrifice for him. This interpretation of *προθύειν* is confirmed by two inscriptions cited by Dittenberger (*op. cit.* 565, 627) of which what follows is particularly pertinent: μὴ ἐξείναι κατάρχεσθαι εἰς τὸ Ἑραίων ξένω, and ἦν ξένος ἱεροποιῆ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι προιεῖσθαι τῶν ἀστῶν [i.e. of the Milesians] ὃν ἂν θέλῃ ὁ ξένος. According to these inscriptions a stranger must obtain an intermediary to offer sacrifice for him. *προθύειν* then means *to sacrifice on behalf of or for*.

This is, however, not always its sense. E.g. in Plato *Crat.* 401 D, τὸ γὰρ πρὸ πάντων θεῶν τῇ Ἑστία πρώτη προθύειν, the temporal sense of *πρὸ* is clear. Since this paper was presented, an article on *προθύειν* has appeared in the *Rheinisches Museum*, N.F., LXIX, 391 ff., by Ziehen, in which the writer tries to show that in the classical period *προθύειν* can only mean *to offer before* (*vorher opfern*). This view does violence, *me judice*, to the use of *προθύειν* in several passages, as e.g. Eur. *Ion* 805, παιδὸς προθύσων ξένια καὶ γένεθλα, where *παιδὸς* is naturally connected with *προθύσων*, and in the alleged letter of Olympias to Alexander (*Athen.* xiv, p. 659): ὅσα τε Ὀλυμπιάς προθύεται, where Ziehen suspects the genuineness of the word *προθύεται*. The effort to show that the *πρὸ* in *προθύειν* always must have the temporal sense of *before* overshoots the mark.

I hold with Homolle that *προμαντεία* stands on the same footing as *προθυσία*, *προδικία*, and that in these compounds the sense of *πρὸ* oscillates between a temporal and a local sense out of which grows the derived meaning of *for, in behalf of*. In *προεδρία* the local sense is of necessity fixed. The view that *πρὸ* in *προμαντεία* does not indicate priority or precedence receives support from the word *πρόμαντις* which is applied to the Pythia, where the *πρὸ* certainly does not refer to priority, but may be equivalent to our *forth* in such a word as *to speak forth*, or *pro in proclaim*. The meaning of *προμαντεία* for which I contend seems further to be confirmed by the regulation according to which priority in consulting the oracle was determined by lot, except in the case of Sparta and possibly a few other states which seem to have possessed this privilege as an ancient right.

That such a right of priority in consulting the oracle was sometimes granted is not denied, and is shown, e.g., by a Thessalian inscription (cf. *Athen. Mitt.* VII, 72): καὶ εἰσαγέτω κατὰ τὸ ἐξῆς ἐκάστης ἀναγραφῆς ἀνακαλούμενος, εἰ μὴ τιςιν

συγκεχώρηται πρώτοις εσιέναι. That such priority may be indicated by *προμαντεία* is not denied, as, e.g., probably in Dem. ix, 32; xix, 327; our only contention is that *προμαντεία* may also mean *the consulting of the oracle for or in behalf of another*, or through an intermediary, and then for oneself. The *πρὸ* thus in one case = *before*, in another *for*, just as it does, e.g., in *προθνήσκω* = *to die before*, or *to die for*.¹

Remarks were made by Professors Seymour and Smyth.

9. The Homeric Hades and the Dead, by Professor Thomas D. Seymour, of Yale University.

In the discussion of no question pertaining to the life and thought of the Greeks of the Homeric Age, is common sense more needed than in the attempt to determine what was the belief of the Homeric poet with regard to the existence of the soul on its departure from the body, but in no discussion have the reins of fancy been left so free, and in none has the element of common sense been more frequently and conspicuously lacking. Sentimental motives for honorable treatment of dead bodies have often been disregarded, yet in this matter sentiment is almost supreme. Many old Greek customs find parallels in modern usages from which no one dares to infer even the beliefs of preceding generations. Another frequent error of writers on this subject is the demand for consistency. The Funeral Games in honor of Patroclus are thought to be so inconsistent with the belief that the soul of Patroclus was as incorporeal as smoke, that some scholars would attribute the one view to an Aeolic and the other to an Ionic poet, requiring of the epic poet greater consistency than is found in Pindar, or even in Plato or in Dante. That many customs in the burial of the dead and in the honors paid at their tombs were based originally on beliefs with regard to the connexion of the soul with the body, is not disputed. The analogy of modern usages, however, warns the scholar that the belief may have ceased long before the practice which is based upon it, and great caution should be exercised in making inferences from usages.

The paper closed with two theses, briefly sustained: 1. The Homeric Tartarus does not differ from Hades as the mediæval Hell differed from Purgatory. The punishment of the gods who were sent thither consists, not in their physical discomfort, but in their separation from their kindred. 2. The belief that Homeric perjurers are punished in Hades rests only on *Iliad*, iii. 278, where the peculiar use and position of *καμόντας* indicate that the text is not in good condition. The office of the Erinyes was not to punish after death, but during life; and nothing elsewhere indicates that Hades and Persephone ever punished any one,—this was not their function.

Remarks upon the paper were made by Professor Shorey and the author.

¹ My attention has been called to a discussion of the meaning of *προμαντεία* by Legrand, *Rev. des Études Grecques*, XIII, pp. 290 ff., which I have not yet seen.

10. The Problem of ἀλλοίωσις in Pre-Socratic Philosophy, by Professor W. A. Heidel, of Iowa College.

Historians of Greek philosophy have much to say of ἀλλοίωσις, or qualitative change, and assume, even when they do not state in express terms, that the Aristotelian conception, essentially unchanged, may be found in the pre-Socratics. Nobody seems to have considered the question critically to ascertain whether this view is tenable. The truth or falsity of the view is however of the greatest interest, as the conception is all but fundamental to a knowledge of the development of Greek thought.

It is impossible to epitomize the study which the writer has made of the pre-Socratic philosophies in his desire to determine the mode of change which we have come to call "qualitative." But it may be said that the traditional view rests entirely upon the Aristotelian reports, whereas the original documents, wherever available, strongly support the theory that the pre-Socratics one and all regarded this kind of change as mechanically conditioned and as essentially identical with μίξις. Even where μίξις and ἀλλοίωσις appear to differ, the latter rests upon the primitive conception of "quality," as constituted by the ingredients of a substance, change of quality being nothing but change of ingredients.

The greatest difficulty is met in determining the nature of the changes wrought by condensation and rarefaction. This process itself suggests a mode of transformation wholly mechanical; and in its historic application it is constantly associated with the segregation of like unto like from a mass only nominally unified or homogeneous. The typical process of segregation of like unto like is found in the scheme of evaporation and precipitation, which is in turn equated with rise and fall in temperature. These associated changes are all mechanical, and, in the pre-Socratics, reveal no connection with occult processes such as are implied in the Aristotelian theory of ἀλλοίωσις.

The paper signalizes numerous instances in which Aristotle and the doxographic tradition import into the thought of the pre-Socratics notions which were of later origin. It is hoped that the study will serve to clarify the history of Greek thought in a most important direction.

This paper was requested for the TRANSACTIONS, but will appear in the *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*. It was discussed by Professors Shorey and J. H. Wright.

11. On the Principle and Terminology of Motion in the Pre-Socratic Cosmogonies, by Professor Paul Shorey, of the University of Chicago (read by title, with a brief *résumé*).

This paper is reserved for the next volume of the TRANSACTIONS.

12. Supplementary Note on the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum, by Professor Elmer Truesdell Merrill, of Wesleyan University (read by title).

Three years ago I had the honor of reading before the Association a paper on the historical interpretation of the sculptures of the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum,

which paper was published in full in the *TRANSACTIONS*. Since that time I have had opportunity to review thoroughly in the presence of the Arch itself the views therein expressed, and to weigh against them on the spot the published articles referred to in my former paper, as well as certain later suggestions and criticisms with which various friends have kindly favored me. I cannot take space in this short note in the *PROCEEDINGS* to enter upon extended argument, but must content myself here with the brief and crude statement that the added two-days' study of the sculptures under favorable conditions has not led to any change in my earlier views on matters concerned with interpretation. Nor could I convince myself that the eyes of the friends who have differed with me on points of actual fact in the mutilated stone have not been in error. For example, in the relief that depicts the mustering in of recruits (the upper relief on the left pier of the outer face) I was unable to make out that the measuring rod was of any other than the Γ -shape. The rod held in the left hand of the 'centurion' appears not to run in the right direction to make it a part of the measuring-rod (which would then be of the \sqcap -shape). Furthermore, it is not of the right section to be a part of the measuring-rod. It seems, to be sure, to be cut somewhat angularly on the left side, so as to throw it into clear relief against the folds of the recruit's tunic, in the approximate plane of which it lies; but its general roundness otherwise does not appear to be due to accident or to the wear of time. It quite surely never had the strictly rectangular section of the measuring-rod as depicted in the lowest plane of the relief.

May I venture to go one step farther, and this time outside of the determination of actual fact into the realm of probability? If there is no direct evidence that the military stature-gauge was of the \sqcap -shape (and if there be any, I must plead guilty to ignorance of it), it would not seem impertinent to suggest that the Roman mind might see very good reason for avoiding that especial shape. It was precisely that of the ill-famed 'yoke.' Is it likely — is it readily conceivable — that a people who attached so much importance to omens would usher a recruit into the service from 'under the yoke'?

A careful inspection of the curious and mutilated object held in the left hand of Jupiter, in the lowest relief on the outer face of the arch, to the left of the arcade, revealed nothing more satisfactory to my puzzled conception. It still does not appear to me to be the remains of a thunderbolt, nor yet does it suggest precisely enough the usual form of a neolithic celt, — if the progress of palaeo-ethnology still allows us to use that antiquated term. But I must stand by my former interpretation.

To the evidence that the inner face of the arch was considered and treated as its principal face I may add two points omitted in my former paper. The conventional representation of Victory crowning the emperor that fills the centre of the crown of the arch-vault is placed with the heads of the figures toward the city; that is, a person passing out of the city through the arch on looking up sees the figures in their natural position. The architect had the choice of two orientations for his group. Does it seem likely that, if he had considered the outer face of the arch to be its principal face, he would deliberately have chosen to place this group so that an observer approaching the arch from the direction of its principal face would see Victory and the emperor standing on their heads?

The other point I may preface with the reminder that Professor Petersen,

I think, was the first to point out that in every scene on the faces of the arch in which Trajan appears, his figure is turned toward the centre of the arch. Such a uniformity of orientation was of course not mere chance. Now I desire to remark that in each of the two reliefs (of the *congiarium* and the imperial sacrifice) that flank the arcade on either side, the figure of the emperor is so placed that it faces the spectator approaching from the city, and turns its back upon him if he enters from without. It does not appear reasonable to believe that, if the architect thought of the outer face of the arch as its principal face, he would plant the emperor's back toward the spectator approaching from that direction. Here, then, are two additional reasons for believing that the inner, and not the outer, face of the arch was meant to be viewed as its initial and principal face.

This paper was requested for the TRANSACTIONS, but the author has preferred that it should appear in the form of an abstract.

13. The Oxyrhynchus Epitome of Livy, Julius Obsequens, and Cassiodorus, by Professor Clifford H. Moore, of Harvard University (read by Professor Slaughter).

That the Oxyrhynchus Epitome and the list of consuls drawn up by Cassiodorus come from a common source is proved (1) by their agreement in the names of the consuls for 149 B.C.: O l. 88, L. Marcio Censorino M. *Manlio* cos.; Cass., L. Marcus et M. *Manlius*; but the correct form of the name is given by all other authorities — *Manlius*; (2) by the notice under the year 186 B.C.: O ll. 42 f., at[hletarum cer]tamina primum a Ful[vio Nobilior]e edita; Cass., His consulibus athletarum certamina primum a Fulvio edita. Livy's words (39, 22, 2) are, athletarum certamen tum primo *Romanis spectaculo fuit*. Mommsen (*Die Chronik des Cassiodorus*, 1861, p. 552) showed that Julius Obsequens and Cassiodorus drew from a common source, so that logically we can postulate the same relation between O and Obsequens as between O and Cassiodorus. Specific proof is given by the general style of Obsequens, agreement with O in phraseology, and by a comparison of the notice of the *sacrarium* and sacred laurel, Obs. 19, with O ll. 127-129. Furthermore, a comparison of these three authors with others who drew directly or indirectly from Livy shows that the source of O, Obsequens, and Cassiodorus was not used by the majority, at least.

This paper has appeared in full in No. 99 of the *American Journal of Philology*.

14. Notes on the Influence of Lucretius on Vitruvius, by Professor W. A. Merrill, of the University of California (read by Professor Bill).

So far as I know, attention has not been called to the influence of Lucretius on Vitruvius, and it has seemed worth while to note their similarity in diction, and their mutual relation in other respects. Vitruvius names Lucretius once indeed (ix. 3, 17 = p. 218, 5, ed. Rose-Müller-Strübing), but he not only discusses from time to time matters that had been previously touched upon by Lucretius, but also in many parts of his work he has employed parallelisms of ex-

pression. At the very beginning of the treatise Vitruvius has one of his laborious proemia that seems to have much in common with the *laudes Epicuri* in the 1st, 5th, and particularly the 3d book of Lucretius, as may be seen from the following parallel columns:—

VITRUVIUS I. <i>Proem.</i>	LUCRETIUS.
Cum divina tua mens et numen . . .	3, 15 divina mente. 3, 18 divum numen.
imperio potiretur orbis terrarum invictaque virtute . . .	2, 13 rerumque potiri. 1, 68 quem neque fama deum nec ful- mina nec minitanti murmure com- pressit caelum, sed eo magis acrem inritat animi virtutem.
victoriaque tua cives gloriarentur	1, 79 nos exaequat victoria caelo. 5, 3 qui fingere laudes pro meritis eius possit.
et gentes omnes subactae . . . liberatus timore . . . gubernaretur magnis cogitationibus edere . . .	5, 49 qui cuncta subegerit. 3, 16 diffugiunt animi terrores. 5, 77 natura gubernans. 1, 72 vivida vis animi. 1, 21 Ennius edens.
maiestas imperii . . . in sedibus immortalibus . . .	5, 7 maiestas . . . rerum. 3, 18 apparet divom numen sedesque quietae.
fui praesto . . . et commoda accepi. quae . . . tribuisti . . . eo beneficio essem obligatus . . .	2, 1068 locus est praesto. 3, 2 commoda vitae. 3, 10 suppeditas praecepta. 5, 50 nonne decebit hunc hominem numero divum dignariet esse.
non haberem inopiae timorem . . .	3, 65 acris egestas semota ab dulci stabilique videtur.
praescriptiones terminatas . . . aperui . . .	1, 77 alte terminus haerens. 2, 182 faciemus aperta.
disciplinae rationes.	1, 105 vitae rationes.

Probably Vitruvius had read and admired the proemia of Lucretius, and in composing his dedication to *Imperator Caesar* he was influenced by the Lucretian praise of Epicurus. Somewhat farther on he gives one of Epicurus's definitions: praeterea de rerum natura quae graece *φυσιολογια* dicitur philosophia explicat (p. 5, 20). On p. 16 sq. there seems to be another localization of Lucretian influence:—

VITRUVIUS I, 4, 3.	LUCRETIUS.
calor cum excoquit . . .	calor, <i>passim</i> .— 6, 962 terram sol ex- coquit.
vaporibus fervidis (<i>Vapor</i> is frequent elsewhere in V.)	vapor, <i>passim</i> .— 1, 491 ferventia vapore.
ferrum . . . tinctum frigida redurescit . . .	6, 968 umor aquae porro ferrum con- durat ab igni.

VITRUVIUS I, 4, 3.

non possunt durare sed
dissolvuntur . . .
non laborant . . .
namque e principiis quae Graeci *στοι-
χεία* appellant . . .

figurantur . . .
generatim . . .
fervidum . . . caelum . . .

apertas venas.

The sketch of the beginnings of society given in the second chapter of the second book (p. 33, 14 sq.) has much in common with Lucretius: —

VITRUVIUS II, 1, 1.

Homines veteri more ut ferae in silvis
et speluncis et nemoribus nascebantur
ciboque agresti vescendo

vitam exigebant.
interea quodam in loco ab tempestati-
bus et ventis densae crebritatibus
arbores agitatae et inter se terentes
ramos ignem excitaverunt . . .

nutu monstrantes . . .
cotidiana consuetudine vocabula ut ob-
tigerant constituerunt . . .
ergo cum propter ignis inventionem
conventus initio apud homines et
concilium et convictus esset natus,

et in unum locum plures convenirent . . .

coeperunt . . . alii de fronde facere tecta,
alii speluncas fodere sub montibus, . . .

LUCRETIVS.

6, 969 mollit durata calore.
6, 963 glaciem dissolvit.
3, 730 quareve laborent; cf. 6, 395, etc.
1, 198 sine principiis. (*Principiis* is the
Lucretian dative and ablative form
of *primordia*.)
2, 412 organici quae figurant.
1, 20 generatim.
5, 282 inrigat caelum candore.
5, 659 caelum . . . accendere . . .
5, 812 venis . . . apertis.

LUCRETIVS.

5, 955 sed nemora atque cavos montis
silvasque colebant.
5, 939 glandiferas inter curabant cor-
pora quercus.
5, 932 vitam tractabant more ferarum.
5, 1096 et ramosa tamen cum ventis
pulsa vacillans | aestuat in ramos
incumbens arboris arbor, | exprimi-
tur validis extritus viribus ignis | et
micat interdum flammai fervidus ar-
dor, | mutua dum inter se rami stir-
pesque teruntur . . .
5, 1022 gestu cum halbe significarent.
5, 1029 utilitas expressit nomina rerum.

5, 1105 inque dies magis hi victum vi-
tamque priorem | commutare novis
monstrabant rebus et igni | ingenio
qui praestabant. [Thus *et igni*
should be retained, and 1091-1160
should not be bracketed.]
5, 1108 condere coeperunt urbis arcem-
que locare . . .
5, 1011 casas . . . pararunt.
5, 954 cavos montis silvasque colebant.
5, 984 fugiebant saxea tecta.

Probably both followed a common authority, yet I cannot but believe that Vitruvius has some Lucretian reminiscences here.

In § 6 (p. 35, 26) sollertia ingenia exercendo per consuetudinem ad artes pervenissent may be compared with Lucretius 5, 1452 usus et impigrae simul experientia mentis | paulatim docuit pedetentim progredientis | . . . namque alid ex

alio clarescere corde videbant, | artibus ad summum donec venire cacumen. And p. 36, 4 natura . . . subiecisset cetera animalia sub potestate agrees in thought with Lucretius, 5, 860 sq. On p. 50, l. 22, Vitruvius's humanitatis dulcedine mollitis animis reminds one of Lucretius, 5, 1014 genus humanum primum mollescere coepit.

In Book vi, prooem. 2, there is another series of reminiscences :—

VITRUVIUS (p. 132, 5).

difficilesque fortunae sine timore posse
despicere casus, at qui non doctrinarum
sed felicitatis praesidiis putaret se esse
vallatum . . .
Epicurus . . . ait pauca sapientibus
fortunam tribuere, quae autem maxima
et necessaria sunt,
animi mentisque
cogitationibus gubernari.

LUCRETIUS.

2, 7 sed nil dulcius est, bene quam munita tenere | edita doctrina sapientum
templa serena, | despiciere unde queas alios.
2, 20 pauca videmus | esse opus . . .
5, 1118 divitiae grandes homini sunt vivere parce.
3, 139 animum mentemque.
5, 1117 si quis vera vitam ratione gubernet.

In treating one of the stock illustrations of the physicists Vitruvius also agrees with Lucretius :—

VITRUVIUS VI, 2, 2 (p. 139, 13).

in navibus remi cum sint sub aqua directi,
tamen oculis infracti videntur,

et quatenus eorum partes tangunt summam
planitiem liquoris, apparent uti sunt
directi, . . .
fluentes imagines . . .

sive simulacrorum impulsu

falsa iudicia oculorum habeat aspectus . . .

vera falsa.

LUCRETIUS.

4, 438 nam quaecumque supra rorem salis edita pars est | remorum, recta est, . . . quae . . . liquorem obeunt, refracta videntur.
4, 294 planitiem ad speculi veniens.

4, 63 debet imago | ab rebus mitti.
4, 156 apparet imago ; | perpetuo fluere ut noscas e corpore summo.
4, 164 simulacra ferantur.
4, 191 simulacra . . . transcurrere . . . quod . . . causa . . . propellat.
4, 464 pars horum maxima fallit | propter opinatus animi.
4, 520 ratio tibi rerum prava . . . falsis . . . sensibus.
4, 519 iudiciis fallacibus.
4, 481 veris . . . falsa.

In the prooemium of Book vii he again seems to remember the praises of Epicurus, but I have noted no special imitation unless possibly unde nos uti fontibus haurientes aquam—Lucr. 1, 928—may be one. In vii, 5, 4 (p. 173, 9) haec autem nec sunt nec fieri possunt nec fuerunt reminds one of Lucr. 5, 878 neque Centauri fuerunt, nec tempore in ullo | esse queunt duplici natura.

The prooemium of Book viii has also a Lucretian coloring. I note, however, sine quibus mortalium vita non potest esse tuta, ea fudit ad manum parata

per omnem mundum,—Lucr. 6, 9 nam cum vidit hic ad victum quae flagitat usus | omnia iam ferme mortalibus esse parata | et, proquam posset, vitam consistere tutam. And in the prooemium to Book ix there is a reminiscence—perpetua vita (p. 212, 10)=Lucr. 3, 13. His account of Berosus's theory of the moon (p. 224, 22) is similar to Lucretius's discussion in 5, 720 sq.

Simulacra natura divinaque mente designata, ut Democrito physico placuit, exposui (p. 231, 18) might be regarded as Lucretian prose.

I add a list of Lucretian words and phrases that occur in Vitruvius's vocabulary:—

ab rerum natura procreata, 172, 22	Lucr. 2, 880.
adaugebitur, 95, 5	2, 296.
aeris raritas, 56, 10	6, 1024, etc.
breviter percipere, 103, 26	Cf. 4, 115.
candens, 108, 25	6, 148.
capita fluminum, 190, 10	6, 636.
coaluerint (coluerint), 181, 4	2, 1061.
confervescendo, 181, 4	6, 353.
confervefaciunt, 182, 20	6, 353.
conglomeretur, 180, 30	3, 210.
corporum figuris, 138, 14	1, 685.
dilabantur, 186, 10	5, 311.
doneque, 129, 22, etc.	donique, 2, 1116, etc.
excoquit, 108, 26	6, 962.
flatus, 27, 16	5, 689.
impetum caeli, 188, 12	5, 200.
inminuit, 108, 26	5, 626.
intactus, 104, 7	6, 1060.
iactari, 133, 26	3, 47.
liquescant, 186, 10	4, 1114.
montium radices, 188, 4	6, 695.
mundi (= caeli), 198, 3	4, 134.
mundi versatione, 232, 5	mundi versatile templum, 5, 1436.
notities, 133, 9	5, 1047.
offensa, 103, 12	3, 941 ?
planitia, 130, 2	planitiem, 4, 294.
potestatibus, 56, 5	2, 587.
recidere, 183, 22	1, 857.
summatim exponam, 148, 29	s. attingere, 3, 261.
tacta pruina, 53, 17	6, 903.
umores, 108, 26	6, 1176.
vehemens aquae vis, 284, 7	vemens imber, 6, 517.
	aquai vim, 1, 285.
versatile, 263, 21	5, 1436.
viduatus, 119, 9	5, 840.

The conclusion that I would draw from this examination is that Vitruvius in his prooemia was influenced by the Lucretian *laudes Epicuri*, and that owing to a similarity in subject-matter he sometimes used Lucretian words of a some-

what technical nature. He had read and studied the *de Rerum Natura*, particularly the 4th, 5th, and 6th books.

The paper was discussed by Professors Shorey, Heidel, Lanman, and Slaughter.

As members of the Committee to audit the Treasurer's Report, the President appointed Professors Lanman and Heidel.

The following Committee on the Time and Place of Meeting in 1905 was also appointed: Professors Elmer and F. G. Moore, and Dr. Bolling.

Adjourned at 12.15 P.M.

FOURTH SESSION.

Saturday afternoon, September 17, 1904.

The Association was called to order at 3.15 P.M.

15. The Çântikalpa of the Atharva-Veda, by Dr. George Melville Bolling, of the Catholic University of America.

This text has been printed in the TRANSACTIONS, with introduction, critical notes, translation, and commentary.

16. The Criticism of the Atharva-Veda, by Professor Charles R. Lanman, of Harvard University.

Professor Lanman presented to the Association a brief account of the contents of his Critical Introduction to the Atharva-Veda, which he had recently finished, and which is to precede the translation of that Veda made by the late Professor Whitney of Yale. Whitney's translation is accompanied by an elaborate critical and exegetical commentary. The Critical Introduction takes up, one after another, the various sources of traditional information which may serve to guide us in forming a critical opinion respecting the original form of the text of the Atharva-Veda. Since the whole system of oral tradition by memory in India is so entirely different from the system which has obtained in the handing down of the great literary monuments of classical antiquity, it was thought that an explanation of the peculiar situation in India might be not without its peculiar interest for the students of classical text-criticism. In particular, the value of what we may call the living manuscripts, that is to say, the oral reciters of the text, was explained, and it was shown how their testimony was often of use to check errors which might very easily be made by the eye, but could not possibly be made through the medium of the ear. Attention was also called to the famous phonetic treatises called Prâtiçākhyas, which the Hindus produced with a special view to the conservation of the purity of the sacred texts, and the prevention of any, even the slightest, errors of orthography and accent. Since the Critical Introduction itself is already printed in full in the seventh volume of the Harvard Oriental Series, it is unnecessary to go into further detail here.

17. Plato's Simile of the Cave, by Professor John H. Wright, of Harvard University.

The use of the figure of a cave to illustrate human life and knowledge (in Book VII of the *Republic*) may have been suggested to Plato by the words of Empedocles, or by Orphic lore, if it was not inevitable in the development of the illustration, used in the preceding book, of the sun as a symbol of the Form of Good. But many of the peculiar features of the cave that are described in detail by Plato seem to point to a more specific source of influence. The speaker hazarded the conjecture that in elaborating the picture of the cave, Plato was influenced by recollections of the cave at Vari, which in many respects is unlike other Greek caves, and in several particulars very remarkably meets the requirements of Plato's description. The cave at Vari — a seat of the worship of Pan and the Nymphs — was, at the time Plato might have visited it, richly supplied with images and votive offerings. Near the end of its broad, but very deep slope, was a long platform, upon which worshippers evidently performed dances in honor of Pan and the Nymphs, the platform being roughly parallel with the wall of the cave in front of it. The reflection of these dancing figures, possibly carrying their offerings, in the firelight upon the interior of the wall of the cave may well have suggested to Plato the figure of a made roadway, upon which, according to him, images were carried, the reflections of which appeared as realities to the prisoners who are conceived as chained at the broad base of the slope, along the front of the wall, and facing it. (It may be noted that in the *Phaedrus*, which appears to have been composed at about the same time as the seventh book of the *Republic*, Pan and the Nymphs, with their votive offerings, figure conspicuously.) Such an association of Plato with this cave is justified by the familiar legend of his babyhood, according to which he was carried by his parents to a spot on Hymettus, sacred to Pan and the Nymphs (Aelian, *V.H.* 10, 21; Olympiodorus, *Vita Platonis*, p. 1; cf. Weller, *A.J.A.* VII (1903), p. 28). What is more probable than that Plato revisited this cave in later life? He mentions no other caves in his works, and the grottos of Syracuse, with which he was familiar, are so unlike the cave that is described in the *Republic* as to rule out the idea that they could have been suggestive.

The paper was discussed by Professors Perry, Seymour, Smyth, D'Ooge, Shorey, and the author.

18. Alphabetic Notation of Variant Sounds, by Professor F. A. March, of Lafayette College.

19. A Proposed Supplement to the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, by Dr. Walter Hullihen, of Grant University, Chattanooga.

The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, perhaps the most colossal undertaking in the history of modern scholarship, is an object of deep interest to every student of the classics, more particularly to Latinists. So small a fraction of the whole, however, has up to this time appeared that scholars generally have not yet had an opportunity to test its completeness or lack thereof; and it is with this, viz. completeness of citation, that this paper is concerned.

No one questions that a lexicon giving every occurrence of every word in the Latin language, between certain fixed points in its literature, would be an incalculable benefit to Latin scholarship. Other things being equal, the value of a lexicon to scholars varies as the number of examples quoted; but the lexicon which gives all examples leaps at once to a place by itself, so far does it transcend in usefulness any which are incomplete. All other considerations must, it seems to me, give precedence to this one of *completeness*. If the investigator have before him all examples of a certain word, which he is examining, he is unhampered by the disquieting fear that somewhere in the literature there may be examples that would impair or falsify his conclusions; he has the complete premises; if his conclusions are erroneous, the fault lies with himself. The difference in the degree of confidence inspired by a treatise based upon the consideration of all that bears upon its subject, as compared with one based upon only part, is very great; the truth of which is so obvious that it needs no argument to support it.

The assertion, therefore, may be made that the value and usefulness of the *Thesaurus* would be tremendously increased, if it cited every example of every word. The material has been collected and arranged in the buildings devoted to that purpose in Munich. Why shall it not be further utilized to make an already great work the greatest boon to Latin scholarship that can be conceived?

The extent in which the *Thesaurus* falls short of completeness may be seen from the following statistics in regard to the word *antequam*, of which word the writer has collected all examples from Plautus to Suetonius: under the word *antequam* in the *Thesaurus* (Vol. II, fasc. 1) only about *two-fifths* of the examples occurring in the literature from Plautus to Suetonius are cited; among those omitted are many of great importance to one investigating the syntax of *antequam*. It would not be pertinent to the object of this paper to enumerate and discuss these examples here. It is fairly evident that, in editing such a work as the *Thesaurus*, no human mind can make a *selection* of examples such that it will meet the needs of every investigator. Completeness is the remedy.

A lack of funds, Professor Wölfflin says, is the chief reason why the *Thesaurus*, as now being edited, is not more nearly complete. The income for the purpose of editing, subscribed almost in its entirety by five German Universities, is limited in amount and in the number of years it is to run; arrangements have been made with the Teubner press to issue twelve folio volumes of one thousand pages each; to this limit the editors are restricted, and estimated by that which has appeared they will even now exceed their limit. It thus becomes evident that following their present plan as to extent of quoted language, which has doubtless been considered with much care and critical judgment, the absence of valuable material becomes inevitable.¹

The purpose of this paper is to ask the American Philological Association to take under consideration the publication of supplementary volumes, containing all of the examples omitted by the *Thesaurus*. For economy of space and expense these supplementary citations should be given without text, by numerical indices only. A careful calculation based upon the article on *antequam* shows that all of the examples omitted could be given by *numerical indices* in about one-eighth

¹ An interesting account of the methods employed and the difficulties met in editing the *Thesaurus* is given by Vollmer, *Neue Jahrbücher*, XIII, XIV, 1, 1904.

of the space occupied by the article as it stands in its present form. If, then, the word *antequam* can properly be taken as a basis for estimate, the supplementary volumes which will make the *Thesaurus* complete in its most essential particular, will add only a small fraction to the bulk of the publication, and will cost a correspondingly small fraction of the expense now being incurred. It is, of course, possible that the same proportion would not obtain for other words than *antequam*; but, even if this should prove true, and the fraction should prove to be greater, as much as one-fourth (which is highly improbable), is not that a small addition for so notable an increase in the value and usefulness of this monumental work? Cannot America raise this small fraction of the amount contributed by five German Universities? There seems little reason to doubt that the money can be raised, if the matter is put into the hands of the right men. An appeal to the Carnegie Institute may solve this difficulty. It is possible that such an appeal will have a better prospect of success than attended the project for an American Latin Dictionary several years ago, since the *Thesaurus* is an undertaking of *universal* interest and usefulness, and one which will stand out for centuries to come as one of the landmarks of classical research, as important in one country as in another. The amount needed will not be very great; probably not more than \$2500 or \$3000 a year, reckoning from the amount now being expended annually upon the *Thesaurus*.

If the Carnegie Institute is unwilling to give the money, it is conceivable that fifteen or twenty American Universities may be induced to combine to subscribe the amount needed; which will be employed to support two or three Latin Fellows at Munich, who shall work there under the control of a Committee of Direction in this country. (Of course, this presupposes that permission can be obtained from the Editors of the *Thesaurus* for such Fellows to use the already collected material.)

It seems probable that two or three men doing nothing but collecting and arranging citations, and freed from many of the embarrassing questions involved in the quotation of text, could keep pace with the rest of the work. It will be observed that these workers will have the tremendous advantage of having before them in the published fascicles of the *Thesaurus*, that part of the work which costs most labor and research. Revision of the work of these Fellows by a sufficiently large number of our maturer scholars will insure that degree of accuracy and scholarship which the *Thesaurus* must possess, as well in the supplementary volumes as in the main treatise.

Any further consideration of the details of the plan herewith presented would carry this paper beyond the limit prescribed. It is, therefore, submitted thus to the members of the Philological Association in the hope that some action will be inaugurated toward the accomplishment of the publication advocated.

The Auditing Committee reported that it had examined the Treasurer's Report and found the same correct.

20. Some Grammatical Myths, by Professor J. E. Harry, of the University of Cincinnati.

Of the twenty-five or thirty Greek grammars examined, all gave as much prominence to the perfect subjunctive, optative, and imperative active in the

paradigms as to the perfect indicative. Instead of throwing obstacles in the way of the beginner by compelling him to learn such mythical forms as these, we should help the tyro on his way by excising everything from our manuals, except essentials, both in form and in syntax. Sonnenschein in his preface claims that he has done this. His "scheme dispenses with a large number of unnecessary paradigms." In the advertisement of the authorized English translation of Kaegi's grammar a reference is made to the German grammarian's "omitting entirely or relegating to an unimportant place in his grammar all peculiarities or irregularities rarely met with." To the Roman the perfect subjunctive was indispensable; for the Greek the present and aorist sufficed; and the persistence of the perfect active in our grammars is doubtless due to a prepossession that Latin syntax and Greek syntax run on strictly parallel lines. The first sentence of Sonnenschein's preface runs: "The main object of this book is to turn to account for teaching purposes the close relation which exists between Latin and Greek . . . in . . . grammatical structure." Much that we find in Krüger and Kühner and Kaegi, as well as in Goodell and Babbitt and Goodwin and Hadley-Allen with their *παιδευκῶς* and *παιδευκῶς*'s and *λελύκῶς* would have made Sophocles and Thucydides open their eyes in wonderment. Jelf writes *ββουλεύκω*. So Kühner, who translates: *ich habe geraten*. Krüger gives *λελύκω* and translates: *ich habe gelöst*, and *λελύκοιμι, möge gelöst haben*. Croiset and Petitjean (Paris, 1896) write *λελύκω* and render: *que j'aie fini de délier*. Isocrates uses the adverb *παιδευμένως*; Plato employs the perfect indicative, infinitive, and participle of *παιδεύειν* by the score; but not a solitary example of the subjunctive, optative, or imperative active, which are so conspicuous in the paradigms of Kaegi and Kleist and Romana, can be found anywhere in Greek literature—*οὔτοι γάρ που μύθους τοῖς παισὶ ψευδεῖς συντιθέντες ἔλεγον τε καὶ λέγουσιν*. Goodwin, in his revised edition, comes nearer the truth than any of his predecessors or successors. Adjoining *λελύκω* (in parenthesis) is the number 720. This is to warn the unwary pupil to be on his guard. But how many would even take cognizance of the marginal reference—to say nothing of their being misled if they did? The note in Hadley-Allen (457) is even more misleading. Goodwin is a little more explicit with reference to the imperative.

There are only three or four perfect subjunctives in Greek literature. One of these is a Platonic idiosyncrasy (*Rep.* 614 A, *ἵνα τελέως αὐτῶν ἕκαστος ἀπειλήφῃ τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου ὀφειλόμενα ἀκοῦσαι*); the other example in Plato is a production of the Platonic passion for *ποικιλία* (*Rep.* 376 A, *ὃν μὲν ἂν ἴδῃ ἀνῶντα, χαλεπαίνει, οὐδὲν δὲ κακὸν προπεπονηῶς· ὃν δ' ἂν γνῶριμον, ἀσάφζεται, κἂν μὴδὲν πῶποτε ἐπ' αὐτοῦ ἀγαθὸν πεπόνθῃ*).¹ Xenophon's *λελήθης* (*Hierarch.* 4, 15) hardly counts, while Demosthenes' *πεποιήκη* (19, 3) is not surprising to one who has watched the behavior of "active" and "passive" verbs (*πάσχειν* and *ποιεῖν*). Even the quasi-perfects (the periphrastic subjunctives) are practically confined to Xenophon (one or two in Plato, one or two in the whole Demosthenean corpus), and in Xenophon the participle is often a mere adjective. Periphrases in any mood with the aorist are rare, with the perfect frequent. Forms like *δῶλῃ* (*Δ* 164), *μεμήλη* (*ib.* 353), *δεδίη* (*Rep. Athen.* i, 11), *ἔφαστήκη* (Plato, *Symp.* 175 B),

¹ Cf. *Crito* 43 B, *ἐπιγείρας* . . . *ἡγειρον*, *Charm.* 153 C, *ἡγγελαί* . . . *ἀπηγγελαί*, *Protag.* 329 A, *ἐπερωτήσῃ* . . . *ἐρωτηθέντες*, *Euthyd.* 276 B, *ἀνεθορύβησαν* . . . *ἐθορύβησαν*.

ἐστήκωμεν (Xen. *Anab.* 6, 5, 10), though not common, are found, inasmuch as they are virtual presents, in all periods of the literature.

Even the periphrastic active, which is emphasized by all the manuals, is very rare and is confined to one or two verbs. In some cases the periphrastic form is merely a variant for the regular perfect (present), e.g. Xen. *Cyrop.* 8, 7, ἐπειδὴν ἐστῆκότα ᾗ. The participle here is felt as an adjective pure and simple, the verbal idea in the participle being neutralized by the verb with which it is juxtaposed.

The grammarians cannot escape criticism for giving such a prominent place to the perfect subjunctive in the paradigm by saying that it was intended to be a model for such forms as ἐσθήκη, for they invariably — German, French, Italian, English — attempt to give the *force* of the perfect in translation.

There are very few examples of the perfect optative in -κοιμι, -κοις, -κοι. Herodotus has πεποιήκοι once, Xenophon ἐμπεπτώκοι once, Lysias ὠφλήκοι once. Plato shows πεπόνθοι, but under circumstances that prove that it was yielded only under pressure. The pure perfect optative middle and passive is even rarer than the active. In Andocides 2, 24 we read ὅτω ἂν μοι δικαίως διαβεβλήσθε, where any other writer would probably have used the periphrastic form, e.g. Xen. *An.* 7, 6, 44, διαβεβλημένος εἶη. Cf. Plato, *Phaedrus* 255 A, εἰάν διαβεβλημένος ᾗ. Present optatives in perfect form occur as early as Homer (*Ω* 745, μεμνήμην) and appear in all departments of literature. The form τεθναίην is common. Euripides has κεκτώμεθα, Aristophanes κεκλήμεθα, μεμνήτο, Andocides μεμνήσθε, Xenophon κεκτῆτο. Even the periphrastic forms of the perfect optative active are very rare in the earlier language, and are not frequent in any authors except Plato, Xenophon, and Demosthenes; and the passive is not so common as might be supposed, hardly appearing in the language at all before Euripides, and in prose by no means frequent except in Xenophon and Plato.

Krüger is the only grammarian who has been careful enough to bracket the perfect imperative active. That the passive is often used is well known; but even this form is not found very frequently outside of Plato's *Laws*. In the orators hardly any other form besides the inevitable εἰρήσθω occurs, and even this not painfully frequent. But in Plato, who uses more imperative passives (and actives too for that matter) in the third person (hundreds in the *Laws* alone) than all the Greek authors together, the perfect imperative passive would be expected, and we are not surprised to find an occasional ὠμολογήσθω, τετολήμῃσθω, ἀπειργάσθω, πεπλάσθω, ἀπολελογίσθω, ὠναμάσθω, δεδόσθω, λελέχθω, πεφάσθω, ἤρωτήσθω, κερχρησμφήσθω, ἐπιεδείχθω, πεπεράνθω, γεγράφθω, ἡτιμάσθω, δεδόχθω, κενομοθετήσθω, ὠρίσθω, ἐπιτεγράφθω.

This paper, with complete statistics, will be published as a University of Cincinnati Bulletin.

Adjourned at 6 P.M.

FIFTH SESSION.

Monday morning, September 19, 1904.

The session was opened at 10.20 A.M.

The President, Professor Hempl, reported for the Joint Committee on a Phonetic Alphabet.

On motion of Professor J. H. Wright it was

Voted, That the Association accepts the preliminary report of the Committee, and has a serious interest in the deliberations and recommendations of the Committee; that it requests the members of the Joint Committee that now represents the Association to continue in their present capacity, and to submit their final report, when this shall be ready; and that the Executive Committee be authorized to expend one hundred dollars, or thereabouts, towards the expenses of the Joint Committee.

21. The Latin Subjunctive of the Second Singular Indefinite as a Mood of Statement, by Professor William Gardner Hale, of the University of Chicago.

This paper will appear, it is hoped, in the next volume of the TRANSACTIONS. Remarks were made by Professors Ashmore and Elmer, and the author.

22. On the Minor and Problematic Indo-European Languages, by Professor Maurice Bloomfield, of Johns Hopkins University.

This article was requested for the TRANSACTIONS, but appears here in abstract by the author's preference.

The question of the number and extent of the Indo-European peoples has both a positive and a negative side. Positively, the addition of an Indo-European people to the familiar list (Indo-Iranian, Greek, Latin, etc.) serves to increase our knowledge of I.-E. speech and I.-E. ethnology. Negatively, the exclusion of certain peoples from the I.-E. sisterhood calls attention to the limitations and foreign surroundings of our family of speech, and helps to determine its scope among the remaining linguistic families. This is a necessary preliminary to the question of the home of the Indo-Europeans before their separation into the ethnical units of historical times.

The Scythians that roamed to the north of Iran, in the Russian steppes about the Black and Caspian seas, were Indo-Europeans, connecting the Asiatic East Indo-Europeans (Indo-Iranians, or Aryans) with the Slavs in the northeast of Europe, and, through them, with the remaining North-Europeans, the Teutons and Celts. In this great belt there is no record of minor or problematic I.-E. peoples. With all the intricacies of ethnic and geographic interrelation between Celts and Teutons, and Teutons and Slavs, there is in the north of Europe no I.-E. dialect whose broader family traits are obscure, and no claimant for membership in the I.-E. family that is not freely admitted. Even in this region, however,

there may have existed other I.-E. peoples of independent character. There are no linguistic records from this area earlier than the first centuries after Christ: its remoteness from the ancient centres of civilization, Greece, Rome, and Western Asia, may have silenced records, either of other I.-E. languages, or of non-I.-E. languages in the northern continent of Europe. The solidarity of recorded I.-E. speech in the same area does not of itself prove that the proper or original home of the Indo-Europeans is to be sought there rather than elsewhere.

All records of minor or problematic I.-E. peoples are from the regions adjacent to the northeastern Mediterranean, that is to say, from the countries that came most directly under the influence of Greece and Rome. Beginning where France joins Italy in the ancient land of Liguria; stretching from there and adjoining Etruria across Venetia to Illyria, Thrace, and the rest of the Balkan peninsula; from there again, across Hellespont, Propontis, and Bosphorus, in and clear through Asia Minor, including Armenia, until we touch again the Asiatic Iranians—that is the territory within which existing records of some sort point to the presence of varieties of Indo-Europeans outside of the well-known families.

Egyptian records and the Cuneiform inscriptions of western Asia might have shown, but they do not show additional traces of independent I.-E. languages. Recent attempts to pass the Kossaeian, Mitani, and Arezawa languages, or dialects, recorded in Cuneiform, as Indo-European have been confidently disproved by the present writer in an article, "On Some Alleged Indo-European Languages in Cuneiform Character" (*A.J.Ph.* XXV, 1 ff.). But, incidentally, there came to light the fact that the Mitani and other Western Asia records are sprinkled generously with Iranian, or 'Iranoid,' proper names. In the single Mitani letter, written by a Mitani king of the name of Dušratta to an Egyptian Pharaoh, there figures Dušratta himself, his brother Artašuvara, their father Sutarna, and their grandfather Artatama. The Mitani correspondence is part of the famous collection of tablets found in Tel-el-Amarna in Upper Egypt. The Mitani dynasty dates back to 1600 B.C.: we have therefore in these proper names the earliest recorded I.-E. word-forms. The existence at such a time of the West-Iranian stem *arta-* = Achaemenian *arta-* = Avestan *aša-* = Vedic *ṛta-* will tend to reduce the dislike to assume ancient dates for I.-E. texts like the Veda. The present writer, for his part, feels much more inclined to listen to the date 2000 B.C. (or earlier) after this discovery than before.

The language of the so-called Hatti, Hattians, or Hittites is found in inscriptions dating from the first half of the first millennium B.C. in Cilicia and Commagene, just at the bend where Syria passes into Asia Minor. These inscriptions are written in a mixed pictographic (ideographic), syllabic, and alphabetic writing of very obscure nature. That Hittite is Indo-European, a kind of prehistoric Armenian, is urged very vigorously and repeatedly by P. Jensen, the protagonist of these studies;¹ but careful critics like Winckler and Messerschmidt² do not agree with him. These studies are far from ripe; they are ripe enough to say that it seems more than unlikely that the Hittite is Indo-European. Certainly Jensen's most recent statement will appear to few as convincing as it seems to be to its author.

Cuneiform inscriptions in Assyrian and also in a non-Shemitic language, dating

¹ Recently, *Indogermanische Forschungen, Anzeiger*, Vol. XIV, p. 47 ff.

² See Winckler, *Der alte Orient*, Erster Jahrgang, 1900, p. 20.

from the ninth century B.C., show the existence in the land of Urartu, on the lake of Van in Armenia, of a pre-Armenian language. The name of this language is Chaldic, or Vannic¹: it is neither Indo-European nor Shemitic. The presence of a non-I.-E. language in Armenia supports the theory that the Armenians were Europeans who migrated from the Thraco-Phrygian region into Armenia, subduing the allophylic natives. It also helps to clear the ground of Asia Minor, whose aboriginal inhabitants seem everywhere to have been neither Indo-Europeans nor Shemites.

The native languages of Asia Minor, especially the Lycian, of which the stele of Xanthos offers a connected specimen, were non-Indo-European.² Greek colonies on the one hand and early off-shoots from the Thraco-Phrygian stock, the Trojans, Phrygians, Bithynians, and Armenians, on the other, have brought Asia Minor under I.-E. influences at a very early time. The allophylic character of Asia Minor, to our mind, offers good reason to assume that the Indo-Europeans originated *somewhere in Europe*, and not *somewhere in Asia*, providing we include the Scythian steppes in the name Europe. If the spread of the Indo-Europeans had been from Asia to Europe the omission of contiguous Armenia and Asia Minor is hardly explainable; on the other hand, a gradual spread of nomadic Indo-Europeans from continental Europe through Scythia into the Aryan region could easily have passed around the water-hedged peninsula of Asia Minor. At a later time, a sea-faring time, Asia Minor was settled sporadically from Hellas and Thrace; then the Aegean Sea, Hellespont, Propontis, and Bosphorus cemented rather than put apart the two peninsulas of the Balkans and Asia Minor.

Ancient Greece does not show a single trace of a non-Hellenic I.-E. language, leaving out of the question Macedonian, which seems to be an isolated Greek dialect.³ The excavations at Mycenae, Tiryns, Crete, Troy, and various other parts of Greece, have brought to light a Pre-Hellenic civilization which precedes the literary age of Greece by many centuries.⁴ A marked feature of this advanced civilization, rich in skilful architecture, plastic art, and treasures of gold, is the absence, in general, of inscribed monuments, or any other form of written records. With one notable exception: Crete has yielded engraved articles of pottery and stone and engraved gems with what is unquestionably some form of writing. The excavations at Knossos, on the northern shore of Crete, moreover, have unearthed formal wall inscriptions. The system, or perhaps systems, of writing seem to have been both pictographic (ideographic or hieroglyphic) and linear or syllabic. Not a single one of these inscriptions has been deciphered; all theories as to their nature and origin, whether they coquette with the idea of Hittite, Phoenician, or Egyptian sources, are mere guesses.

In the eastern part of Crete, in the neighborhood of the town of Praisos, the home of the so-called 'Eteo-Cretans,' two inscriptions in Greek character, but not in Greek speech, have been found of recent years.⁵ Herodotus, vii, 170-171,

¹ Sayce. *J.R.A.S.* XIV, 377 ff.; *A Primer of Assyriology*, p. 36; Winckler, *ibid.* p. 28; Hübschmann, *J.F.* XVI, 200 ff.

² Kretschmer, *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*, p. 289 ff.

³ Hatzidakis, *J.F.* XI, 313 ff. ⁴ Tsountas and Manatt, *The Mycenaean Age*, chaps. i and xi.

⁵ See R. S. Conway. "The Pre-Hellenic Inscriptions of Praisos," *Annual of the British School at Athens*, No. VIII (1901-02), p. 125 ff.

states that Crete was depopulated by early migrations under Minos to Italy, and that 'in Crete, however, as the men of Praisos report, after it had been stripped of inhabitants, settlements were made by various nations, but especially by Hellen.' These inscriptions, dating, perhaps, from 500-400 B.C., seem to show that the Eteo-Cretans nevertheless continued their speech into historic times. The scant material leaves the character of the language undefined; antecedently it is not unlikely that it is related to the indigenous languages of Asia Minor.

The isle of Lemnos, at the head of the Aegean, shares with Crete the distinction of harboring a trace of speech that is not Greek. This also is a record engraved in Greek character. In 1886 two French scholars, G. Cousin and F. Durbach,¹ discovered in the village of Kaminia a stone containing two inscriptions of somewhat similar content on two of its sides. The same French scholars noted at once certain resemblances with Etruscan; also the reports of Thucydides, Strabo, and Plutarch that Lemnos and Imbros were colonized by Tyrrhenians or Pelasgians, who dwelled there until the Athenian conquest, 510 B.C. Pauli, Bugge, and others also concluded that the Lemnos inscriptions are a form of Etruscan, or, as Pauli expresses it more precisely, 'The Lemnic Tyrrhenians are Viking-like pirates from Etruria.'² He is struck especially by the resemblance of the words $\xi\lambda\alpha\gamma\psi\phi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\xi\lambda\alpha\gamma\psi\phi\iota\varsigma$ (sialxveiz, sialxviz) on each of the two inscriptions with the numeral $\epsilon\alpha\lambda\chi\iota\varsigma$, $\epsilon\alpha\lambda\chi\upsilon\varsigma$ of an Etruscan inscription on a mummy band in Agram, found by the Vienna Egyptologist, J. Krall. There is, to be sure, some doubt about the identity of ψ with χ , since the value of ψ in the Aeolic alphabet is ψ , not χ .³ Nevertheless the relationship of the Lemnic with Etruscan is rather more probable than lies in the habit of such combinations.

The two most prominent tongues of land which the continents of Europe and Asia hold out towards one another, the Balkan peninsula and Asia Minor, contain the remnants of the most prominent of the minor I.-E. languages, the Thracio-Phrygian.⁴ In the northeast of the Balkan peninsula, adjoining Macedonia, lies Thrace, a country inhabited from earliest times by I.-E. tribes. Perhaps as early as the third millennium B.C. there began a series of successive migrations into Asia Minor. The inhabitants of Troy in Homer's time were of Thracian origin and Thracian culture, immigrants from Europe who settled right at the door of Asia Minor. The Mysians to the north of Lydia in Asia Minor were Thracians, as also the Bithynians, and probably the Armenians. The most important migration from Thrace into Asia Minor is that of the Phrygians who occupy a large region east of the coastlands of Caria, Lydia, and Mysia. The Phrygians are the single one of the minor I.-E. peoples whose records, scant and broken as they are, suffice to lift their language out of the depths of profound obscurity.

Phrygia was the main locality of the orgiastic worship as a supreme divinity of the 'Great Mother,' Matar Kubile (Κυβέλη, Cybele), the same worship which was introduced into Greece about 500 B.C., into Rome about 200 B.C.⁵ It is

¹ See *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, Tenth Year, January, 1886, p. 1 ff.

² *Italische Forschungen*, II, 2, p. 225. ³ Solmsen, *KZ.* XXXIV, 41; Kretschmer, *ibid.*, p. 408.

⁴ Fick, *Spracheinheit der Indogermanen Europas*, p. 417 ff.; Kretschmer, *ibid.*, chap. vii.

⁵ See Showerman, "The Great Mother of the Gods," *Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin*, No. 43, p. 230 ff.

likely, however, that the worship of the Mother, as well as the characters associated with her: her lover Attis, his mother Kana, and her mythical attendants, the noisy Corybantes, were of Pre-Phrygian origin, somewhere in Asia Minor. From their native Thrace the Phrygians brought with them a god, Savazios (Σαβάσιος, Σαβάσιος), of uncertain origin and meaning. Another goddess, Zemelō, has been identified doubtfully with Ζεμελή, as the Thraco-Phrygian Goddess of Earth (cf. Old Bulg. *zemlja* 'earth,' Lat. *humus*, Gr. χαμαί). According to Hesychius, Βαγαίος: Ζεὺς Φρύγιος μέγας πολλὸς ταχύς, they worshipped a supreme being under the special name Bagaïos. That this name is connected with Indo-Iranian Bhaga 'god of fortune or goodness' (Skt. Bhaga, Avestan Bagha, Achemian Baga) is quite certain. Torp's attempt¹ to explain Ζεὺς Βαγαίος as an oak god, quasi Ζεὺς Φηγηωνάιος, seems to me quite fanciful. Hesychius seems, moreover, to mean Iranians rather than Phrygians: in another gloss, Μαζεύς: ὁ Ζεὺς παρὰ Φρυγί, the god Mazeus (popular etymology upon Zeus) is surely Ahura Mazda, the chief god of the Iranians. Bagaïos is the Iranian Baga and nothing more.

Phrygian inscriptions are of two kinds, dating from periods possibly 1000 years apart. Old Phrygian,² dating perhaps from the sixth century B.C., is engraved on the so-called grave of Midas in the valley of Doganlu, and other rock monuments, about a dozen in number. Neo-Phrygian,³ a kind of Pigeon-Greek, is exposed upon bilingual inscriptions from late Roman times. They are for the most part curses written upon tombs, both in Greek and Phrygian, and directed against possible violators of the grave: 'Whosoever does evil to this grave cursed be he,' *ios* (or *ios ni*, or *ai ni kos*) *semonn* (or *semon*) *knoumanei kakoun* (or *kakwn*, or *kakoun*) *adḏaket* (or *abβeret*) *eti tetikmenos eitou* (or *ητου*, or *ητω*). In addition to the two Neo-Phrygian verbs *adḏaket* and *abberet* (quasi *afficit* and *afferit*) Old Phrygian contains the interesting verbs *edaes* and *egaes* (doubtful as to reading) to which may be added, as a third, *estaes* on an inscription of Tyriaion.⁴ They seem to be augmented preterites, doubtfully sigmatic aorists, from the I.-E. roots *dhē* 'set,' *gī* 'go,' and *stī* 'stand.' The space of an abstract forbids the closer analysis of the Thraco-Phrygian. So much, however, is clear: it is an independent I.-E. language, sharing certain qualities, as it should, with its neighbors in every direction. It is 'European' rather than 'Asiatic' in its vowel triad *e, o, a*: *ios*, *tekikmenos*, and the augment *e*. It is a *satem*-language as appears from *semonn*, *semou*, plausibly identified with Old Bulg. *semŭ* from an I.-E. stem *ke-smo*.⁵ The I.-E. voiced aspirates lose their aspiration: *-daket*: stem *dhēk*, and *-beret* from root *bher*. The most noteworthy point of contact with Greek, aside from loan-words, are the formation of the perf. middle participle in *-menos* (*tetikmenos*) and the declension of the Old Phrygian 'third declension' type, genitive *Akenolafos*, accusative *Akenolafan*.

The collective name Illyrian⁶ is understood to refer to Indo-Europeans north-west of Greece and west of Thrace, *i.e.* to begin with, the ancient Illyrians them-

¹ *IF*. V, 193.

² Ramsay, *J.R.A.S.*, New Series, Vol. XV (1883), p. 120 ff.; *BB*. XIV, 309 ff.; Solmsen, *KZ*. XXXIV, 36 ff.

³ Ramsay, *KZ*. XXVIII, 381 ff.; Hogarth, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XI, 158 ff.; Kretschmer, *WZKM*. XIII, 359 ff.; Torp, *BB*. XXVII, 280 ff.

⁴ Torp, *ibid.* 288.

⁵ Fick, *BB*. XIV, 50.

⁶ Kretschmer, *ibid.* 244 ff.

selves. North of Illyricum dwelled the Istrians or Histrians on the small peninsula of Istria, and west of them, in Italy, the Venetians. Moreover, Illyric migrations across the Adriatic into Calabria are indicated by identical or similar proper names of places and persons on both sides of the Hadria. What is more important, in Calabria are found certain inscriptions, which are neither Greek nor Italic, but are ascribed to the Messapians or Japygians who came there from Illyria. The remnants of Illyrian speech are supposed to be the modern Albanian, a development of ancient speech in Illyria herself; the Venetian, and the Messapian. The character of Albanian is relatively clear, but its relation to Venetian and Messapian, as also the interrelation of all three, is far from clear. The 300 inscriptions, in round number, gathered in the ancient province of Venezia and adjacent districts contain all together but little material, and that of very uncertain character.¹ They contain the two parallel words *eχo* and *meχo* which are generally rendered 'I' and 'me,' but may equally well mean respectively 'this' (nominative) and 'this' (accusative).² Especially noteworthy is a type of dedicatory inscriptions which state that some person 'has given me,' or, 'has given this' (*meχo zonasto*, or, *meχo zoto*) to some divinity, especially a goddess Rehtia (Rectia) whose name suggests a Goddess of Justice, a kind of *Θέμις* or *Δίκη*:

meχo zonasto rehtiaħ nerika lemetorina = me (or hoc) dedit Rectiae Nerica Lemetorina. Another reads

<i>vħremahstna</i>	<i>zoto</i>	<i>rehtiaħ.</i>
<i>Fremaxtina</i>	<i>dedit</i>	<i>Rectiae.</i>

The verb *zonasto* is explained as a sigmatic aorist middle third sing. from a verb = Lat. *donāre*; the verb *zoto* as a non-thematic 'second' aorist middle third sing. = Gr. *δδρω*.

The phonetic indications of Venetian are scant and precarious. Owing to the uncertain meaning and etymology of *eχo* and *meχo* it is impossible to say whether Venetian is a *satem*-language, as is Albanian, or a *centum*-language. But in one certain and important particular Venetian differs from the rest of the supposed Illyrian dialects: it treats I.-E. *o* as *o*, not as *a*: e.g. *zoto* with I.-E. ending *-to* = Gr. *-τω*; or in the numerous nominatives and accusatives of the second declension like *Volttiomnos* (nom.) or *Ostiaakon* (acc.). It is possible, though not certain, that Venetian is a North-Illyrian dialect, marked off pretty sharply from Albanian and Messapian, and inclining in its main characteristics toward the Italic languages. But there is, after all, very little but geographical vicinity, and a moderate correspondence with Messapian proper names. Perhaps it is not too much to say that but for these two facts, there is nothing to prevent the Venetian from being an independent I.-E. language.³

The Messapian inscriptions,⁴ about 160 in number, are also mostly brief, and crowded with proper names. Two larger ones, one at Basta (Vaste), the other at Brundisium (Brindisi), are unfortunately of uncertain tradition and great

¹ See Pauli, "Die Veneter," *Altitalische Forschungen*, Vol. III.

² See Pedersen, *KZ.* XXXVI, 302 ff

³ Cf. Kretschmer, *l.c.*, 269 ff.

⁴ Mommsen, *Die unteritalischen Dialecte*, p. 43 ff.; Bugge, *BB.* XVIII, 193 ff.; Kretschmer, *ibid.* 263 ff., 272 ff.

obscurity. The opening statement of the inscription of Basta, a kind of contract, is reconstructed and translated variously : —

K'lohi zis thotoria martapidogas tei basta veinan aran,

'Hear every one! Thotoria (daughter) of Martapidox sold to the town of Basta this field.'¹

Or again,

K'lohizis thotoria marta pido gastei basta veinan aran,

'Hear thou, Thotoria Marta made over to the town Basta her field.'²

Under such and other similar circumstances the character of the language is not easily established. The comparison of Messapian should be with Albanian, but Albanian is modern and mixed; Messapian, ancient, fragmentary, and corrupt. Direct lexical comparisons with either Albanian or Venetian words are practically wanting. The Messapian family name, genitive Barzidihi, is supposed to be derived from a stem *barza* = Alb. *barθ* 'white' (cf. Skt. root *bhrāj* 'shine'). This would make Messapian a *satem*-language. The most important phonetic correspondence of Messapian and Albanian is the treatment of I.-E. *o* as *a*. The genitive sign of consonantal stems in Messapian is *as*, e.g. *kalatoras*, gen. of *kalator*, 'herald.' The stem vowel of I.-E. *o*-stems (sec. decl.) is *a*: nom. *Dazomas*, gen. *Dazimahi*; in this respect Messapian differs markedly from Venetian (above). All together the ties between Messapian and the other Illyrian languages are rather ethnological and geographical than linguistic. Its character, like that of Venetian, remains undetermined.

Passing from the Venetian across the Etruscan, which is certainly not Indo-European, we arrive at the last of the problematic I.-E. languages, the Ligurian.³ In historical times the Ligurians were situated in the northwest of Italy in the province known to this day as Liguria. The stem *borm-*, clearly connected with the idea of warm springs, appears in the name of the town of Bormio (Bagni di Bormio) and other proper nouns. It is clearly derived from I.-E. *ghormo* 'warm,' in Skt. *gharma* 'heat,' Gr. *θερμός*, Lat. *formus*, Germ. *warm*, etc. The initial *b* of *borm-* marks the Ligurian as independent from the Celtic where the treatment is as *g*: Old Irish *gorim*, *guirim* 'to heat'; Breton *gor* 'burning.' In 1890 two cemeteries containing inscriptions were discovered near the town of Ornavasso. The most important inscription is on a vase: LATUMARUI SAPSUTAIPAE VINOM NASOM = *Latumari Sapsutaeque vinum Naxium*; it seems to contain a dedication of wine of Naxos to a deceased couple, Latumaros and Sapsuta, whose names are connected by the enclitic conjunction *pe* = I.-E. *qe*, Lat. *que*, Oscan-Umbrian *-p*, Greek *τε*, Sanskrit-Avestan *ca*. Furthermore, an epitaph found in the vicinity of the lake of Lugano,

staniai : verkalai : pala

tisui : pivotialui : pala

¹ Deecke, *Rhein. Mus.* XL, 133 ff. Here *k'lohi*, 'hear,' is imperative sec. sing = Vali *çrosi*; *zis* = Gr. *τις*; *tei veinan* = Lat. *dat venum*; and *aran*, accus. of *ara*, 'field' (cf. Lat. *arare*).

² Torp, *IF.* V, 195 ff. Here *k'lohizis*, 'hear thou,' is sec. sing. optative of a sigmatic aorist; *pido* 'made over' = Skt. *api-dāt*, Gr. **επι-δωρ*: *gastei*, 'to the town,' is emended to *vastei* (F for Γ); and *veinan*, '*suam*,' is acc. sing. fem. from a stem *veina*, **sveina*, formed like Goth. *seina*, 'suus'

³ Kretschmer, *KZ.* XXXVIII, 108 ff.

commemorates a husband and his wife: 'Of Slania Verkala the grave. Of Tisios Pivotalios the grave.' Kretschmer identifies *pala* plausibly with Celtic **qalo* 'I dig,' in Old Irish *to-chlain* 'I dig,' Cymric *palu* 'fodere.' All three, stem *borm-*, *pe*, and *pala* show that Ligurian is a *centum*-language.

Certain proper names of the Ornavasso inscriptions exhibit a close resemblance to Gallic (Celtic) proper names: *Latumaros* in its first part suggests *Latobrigi*, *Latobici*, etc.; the second part *-maros* is one of the commonest elements in Gallic names. *Vasamos*, a name on another Ornavasso vase, suggests Gallic names in *Vass-*, like *Vassorix* and *Dagovassus*. But the treatment of the I.-E. labio-velar explosives as labials in *pe*, and especially in *borm-*, shows of itself enough distinction between Ligurian and Celtic to admit the provisional conclusion that Ligurian is an independent I.-E. language, closest to Celtic, but yet not Celtic.

23. A Suggestion for a New Latin Dictionary, by Professor H. C. Elmer, of Cornell University.

The aim of this paper was to show that in a revision of such a work as Harper's Latin Dictionary, or some of our smaller general dictionaries intended for less advanced students, a vast amount of matter might be omitted altogether, not merely without detriment to any class of dictionary-users, but with decided and important gains to all. The treatment of the word *bibere* in Harper's Dictionary was used for purposes of illustration and examined in detail. As the paper appears in full in the *Classical Review* (April, 1905), I will content myself here with merely making an extract from it that will suffice to illustrate the general character of my criticisms. I select for this purpose that part of the paper that concerns itself with the treatment of such uses as those found, for instance, under I, 3 (β) of Harper's Dictionary. Under this subdivision *bibere* is defined as meaning "arrive at," "come to." This is a good example of what seems to me to be one of the most serious faults of our Latin dictionaries, viz., their treatment of figurative expressions. It will do very well for the instructor of a class in rhetoric to analyze every rhetorical figure, and to point out the various methods by which rhetorical effects are produced. But such a method of procedure on the part of a Latin dictionary seems to me very unfortunate. I have frequently noticed in the course of my teaching that a student was losing all the charm and beauty of a passage solely because he had unfortunately consulted his dictionary, and the dictionary had deadened his susceptibility to the finer points of style. Let me give a few illustrations. If a student had learned from his dictionary merely that *bibere* means *to drink, drink of, drink in*, he would be prepared to translate each of the following passages in the manner indicated immediately after it:—

Verg. *E.* 1, 62: Ante . . .

Aut Ararim Parthus bibet aut Germania Tigrim,

Quam nostro illius labatur pectore voltus.

Sooner will the Parthian drink of the Arar, or Germany of the Tigris,
than the countenance of that man be effaced from my heart.

Verg. *Aen.* 11, 803: Hasta . . .

. . . virgineumque alte bibit acta cruorem.

The spear, driven home, drank deep of virgin blood.

Mart. I, 42, 5:

. . . ardentibus avido bibit ore favillas.

She drank in with greedy lips the fiery sparks.

Hor. Od. 2, 13, 32:

Pugnans et exactos tyrannos

Densum umeris bibit aure volgas.

The throng, pressing together shoulder to shoulder, drinks in with eager ear the accounts of battles and the banishing of tyrants.

Verg. Aen. I, 749:

Infelix Dido longum . . . bibebat amorem.

The unhappy Dido drank in long draughts of love.

In translating the *bibere* of these passages in the manner indicated, he would be doing full justice to the meaning and the style of his author. Is there any schoolboy who, in translating thus, would not at once catch the meaning and the spirit of each and every one of the passages? If there is, it would be only because his soul is dead and the study of language and literature is hopelessly beyond him. For the boy of ordinary intelligence such translations would breathe with life and vigor, would quicken his interest in the author he is studying and his appreciation of the poet's style. The boy would catch something of the real atmosphere surrounding the words. He would know, even before he was told, that such expressions are not to be found in ordinary prose styles. But if, in an unhappy moment, he notices that his dictionary treats of these very passages, he feels in duty bound, of course, to read what it says about them, and to profit by its suggestions. And he there finds these passages treated as follows: *Ante Ararim Parthus bibet* is translated *sooner will the Parthians "come to" Germany, etc.* (I, 3, β); *hasta virgineum bibit cruorem* is said to mean the spear "*drew*" the virgin's blood, or "*killed*" the virgin (I, 5, β); *avidus bibit ore favillas*, "*breathed in*" the sparks with greedy mouth (I, 6, α); *pugnans . . . bibit*, "*eagerly listens to*" the accounts of battles (I, 6, β); *bibebat amorem*, "*was affected with*" love (I, 6, β). When a student has read all that the dictionary says about such expressions, what has he accomplished? In the first place, he has wasted a considerable amount of valuable time, for he has been compelled to read very many lines of very fine print without reaping the slightest benefit therefrom. Worse than that, he has been lured away from all that places his author above prosaic common-place. And if, after being thus treated by the highest authority with which he is familiar, he still gets some appreciation of the grace and charm and the vigor of his author's style, it is only because he has something within him that can rise superior to his dictionary. I am inclined to believe that it would be a decided gain to omit all explanations and translations of purely figurative uses of a word, or at the very least to reduce them to the smallest possible compass. It may be objected that it is frequently difficult to tell when a word ceases to be felt as purely figurative in a certain connection and acquires an entirely different literal meaning. Very well—if it is uncertain whether in a certain connection a word is used figuratively or literally, certainly nothing whatever is gained by treating it in a dictionary as figurative. If the dictionary merely cited such

cases, without comment, there could be no possible loss to any one, and every reader would have a full and adequate appreciation of the word's meaning. When a word has clearly ceased to be felt literally and has acquired a distinctly different meaning, then, of course, the new meaning must be recognized and duly illustrated in the dictionary. But purely figurative uses, and even possibly figurative uses, may best be left to take care of themselves except in treatises on rhetoric and style. Full justice will be done them by merely citing them. If all the explanations and translations of the passages belonging to this class, which every one would be sure to understand perfectly without help, were omitted from the dictionary, there would be a saving of some twenty lines under *bibere*.

In my complete paper I attempt to show how a similar amount of space is wasted under other subdivisions of the treatment of *bibere* in Harper's and also in smaller dictionaries. This waste of space involves a similar and equally deplorable waste of time, energy, and money on the part not only of the students who use the books, but on the part of authors and publishers as well. The makers of our dictionaries of the various grades should consider more carefully the needs of the various classes of people for whom their works are intended. It seems to me that the faults I have pointed out are very serious faults, and of far-reaching consequences to the welfare of classical studies among us. In spite of the increase of late in the number of pupils engaged in the study of Latin in our schools, it is a fact, nevertheless, that the study of the classics is in a sense upon the defensive. The objection that is most frequently and most forcibly urged is that the time required to accomplish anything with the classics is altogether out of proportion to the results attained. It is in recognition of the force of this objection that men have rushed to the front with no end of "easy methods" and "short cuts"—with what lamentable results, we all know too well. We may as well recognize at the outset that there is no easy method of learning the classical languages. To gain anything like a fair mastery of Latin or Greek must ever require years of concentrated study. But this is the best of reasons why, in preparing aids for the students, one should not increase their inevitable burden. I am fully persuaded that a classical student is often compelled to sacrifice unnecessarily a vast amount of valuable time and energy because he has not the right sort of tools with which to work. What seems to me to be imperatively needed all along the line of his classical studies is the elimination of non-essentials, and the elevation of essentials into greater prominence, a more thorough grounding in general principles and less memorizing of divisions and subdivisions and of apparently isolated rules and facts, a more skilful and logical grouping of everything possible about a common centre with a view to aiding the memory by a closer association of related ideas. I have attempted in the paper from which this extract is made to indicate in the most general way how such a reform might be carried out in our Latin dictionaries, not only without loss, but with a positive gain, to the student in his appreciation of the language and literature, and in the interest and enthusiasm with which he pursues his study. For it seems to me that, with his present dictionaries, he is often compelled to work his way through thickets where he might be led through groves.

The paper was discussed by Professors Lanman, J. H. Wright, Slaughter, and F. G. Moore.

24. The *Accentus* of the Ancient Latin Grammarians, by Dr. C. W. L. Johnson, of Baltimore, Md. (read by title).

This contribution appears in full in the TRANSACTIONS.

25. Contributions to the Study of *Suppletivwesen*, by Dr. Mary C. Welles, of Newington, Conn. (read by title).

A. In the works of the Latin grammarians the phenomenon of composite inflection or "*Suppletivwesen*" attracts general attention, the obvious cases of it are noted, and some unscientific attempts are made to explain it by the principles of authority, usage, euphony, and difference.

Probus distinguishes between fusion of inflected endings as illustrated by *mula*, *mulabus*, and fusion by substitution as illustrated by *Iuppiter*, *Iovis*, and adds that such irregularities run through all the parts of speech. (Keil, IV, 48.)

Its extent is appreciated by Priscian alone, who groups together as kindred phenomena instances of it in the different parts of speech. He places in the same category:—

1. Iuppiter, Iovis, iter, itineris, femur, feminis, supellex, supellectilis, hospes, hospita, gracilis, gracila.
2. ego, mei, quis, quae, quod, alius -a -ud, ipse -a -um.
3. fero, tuli, volo, vis, vult, edo, es, est, sum, eram, ero, and sum, fui.
4. bonus, melior, optimus.
5. masculine and feminine pairs of words, as *eg.*: pater, mater, frater, soror, patruus, amita, avunculus, matertera (K. II, 418, III, 413, 415).

He calls attention to the irregular derivation of the numeral adjectives and adverbs; unus, primus, singuli, semel, duo, secundus, bini, bis (K. III, 413, 415), though he fails to form definitely these two groups, as Osthoff does (*vom Suppletivwesen d. indog. Spr.* 1899), and to associate *unus, primus* with *fero, tuli*, etc.

The following instances of composite inflection are given by the grammarians in addition to those just mentioned:—

I. Of nouns: fidicen, fidicinis, fidicinae, jecur, jecoris, jecineris, pecus, pecudis, pecoris, penus, peni, penoris, semis, semissis, senex, senis, tibicen, tibicinis, tibicinae (Charisius, K. I, 83, 134, Prisc. K. II, 229, 279); the feminine nouns which take the ending *-abus differentiae causa, nata, filia, dea, equa, mula, liberta, asina* (Prisc. K. II, 293).

II. Of pronouns: ego, tu, ille (Sergius, K. IV, 546); ego, mei, nos (Prisc. K. III, 144-145); those which take the genitive in *-ius* and dative in *-i* (Prisc. K. III, 5); the relative, interrogative, and indefinite pronouns, which form the dative and ablative, *quibus* (Char. K. I, 158-159).

III. Of adjectives: *ambo* and *duo*, which form *ambabus* and *duabus* by analogy with *deabus*, etc. (Prisc. K. II, 294); *duo*, which forms *duorum* in the neuter *differentiae causa* (Prisc. K. II, 310); *malus, peior, pessimus; magnus, maior, maximus; parvus, minor, minimus; senior, magis anus* (Cledonius, K. V, 38, Pompeius, K. V, 153); cases of the substitution of one grade for another in phrases: *Juno sancta dearum, Juno magna dearum*, in which the positive is a

superlative in force (Donatus, K. IV, 390); Juppiter optimus maximus, in which the superlative is a positive in force (Donatus, K. IV, 375. See also I, 325, V, 39, 158, 342).

IV. Of verbs: 1) those in which forms from different roots are grouped into one system: arguor, convictus sum; facio, fio; ferio, percussi, ictus; fero, tuli, latum; furis, insanisti; medeor, medicatus sum; reminiscor, recordatus sum; sideo, sedi; sum, fui; vescor, pastus sum (Char. K. I, 249, 380).

2) those in which active and deponent are combined, called *neutro-passiva* by Priscian (K. II, 566): audeo, fido, gaudeo, soleo, and fio, factus sum.

3) those in which a periphrastic form supplies the place of an inflected form: angor, anxius sum; meminī, memorem futurum; meto, messem feci, messus; novi, notum habuerim, notum habiturum esse, notum habiturus.

4) those in which a prepositional compound supplies the place of a simple form: odi, exosus, perosus (Servius, K. IV, 440-441, Char. K. I, 257); tollo, sustuli, sublatum.

5) those in which there is a fusion of two conjugations: sono, sonare, sonui (Eutyches, K. V, 386, Prisc. K. II, 445, 571); nexo (Prisc. K. II, 409); mico (*ib.* 472); plico (*ib.* 473); meio (Char. K. I, 245, 262, Diom. K. I, 369); similar verbs whose parts are given without comment.

The fact is observed that sometimes forms which the simple verb has lost are retained in prepositional compounds: absens, praesens, abiens, praeteriens, exosus, perosus (Prisc. K. II, 435); -fendo, -fragor, -perio, -pleo, -specio, which occur only in composition (Consen. K. V, 379); and that in some cases the lost form has been supplanted by an analogical formation or a form from another inflected system: *applicui*, etc., but *duplicavi*, etc. (Prisc. K. II, 469, 473); *conficior*, etc., but *adsuefio*, etc. (Char. K. I, 248, 251; Diom. K. I, 358; Prisc. K. II, 377, 398, 401, 402, III, 269); perf. *sevi*, but *-serui* in prepositional compounds (Prisc. K. II, 532).

V. Masculine and feminine pairs of words: puer, puella (Prisc. K. II, 231, 232); senex, anus (Probus, K. IV, 61).

VI. Composite groups of phrases: pondo duo, tria, etc., but una libra, etc. (Char. K. I, 35); miramur opera, admiramur virtutes (Agroecius, K. VII, 116); vir ducit, mulier nubit (Beda, K. VII, 281); stipulor abs te and quaero abs te for interrogo te (Prisc. K. III, 275).

B. A reading of the text of Plautus brought to light the following composite groups:—

I. The composite verb: fio, factus sum, futurus.¹

Priscian gives three participles to *fio*: fiens, factus, futurus (K. II, 566), and Charisius three future infinitives: fiendum esse, factum iri, futurum esse (K. I, 251). That *futurum* supplied the place of a future participle to *fio* is confirmed by the following group of sentences from Plautus, in which *futurum* (or *fore*) is used parallel with some form of *fio*:—

Fit quod futurum dixi. Cas. 788.

Quae futura et quae facta eloquar. Am. 1133.

Quod certe scio nec fore nec Fortunam id situram fieri. Poen. 624.

¹ Gildersleeve-Lodge, *Lat. Gram.* p. 119, quotes *futurum esse* as the infin. of *fio*, which has not heretofore been proved: also *factum fore*, which is still to be proved.

Quo id sim *facturus* pacto, nil etiam scio,
Nisi quia *futurumst*. *Ps.* 567.

Me.) (Auctionem) fore quidem die septimi.

Mes.) Auctio fiet . . . mane sane septimi. *Men.* 1156-7.

Sed quid *futurumst*, quom hoc senex resciverit ?

Quom se excucurrisse illuc frustra sciverit

Nosque aurum abusos, quid mihi fiet postea ? *Ps.* 358.

Pa.) Atque huius uxorem tu volo adsimulare. Ac.) Fiet.

Pa.) Quasi militi animum adieceris simulare. Ac.) Sic *futurumst*. *Miles*, 908-9.

Again, *futurum* is used with the dative of the indirect object, and in this construction is to be associated with *feri*, not *esse*.

Quid illis *futurumst* ceteris, qui te amant ? (*Mos.* 331) is to be compared with Si sic aliis moecbis fiat (*Mil.* 1436), and

Reliquit deseruitque me : tibi idem *futurum* credo (*Mos.* 202) is parallel with Quod . . . ceteris omnibus *factumst*¹ (*Poen.* 1183 ; cf. *Truc.* 418, 633).

II. The composite group : act. *sino*, pass. *licet*.

The verb regularly used in the active in the sense of 'permit' in Plautus is *sino* :—

Immo neque habebis neque sinam. *Bac.* 145.

Patior occurs, but always with the accessory idea of sufferance, as e.g. : *As.* 240, 738, 739, 810 ; *Aul.* 88 ; *Bac.* 1191 ; *Cis.* 500 ; *Ep.* 148 ; *Mil.* 395 ; *Poen.* 368, 965.

Permitto occurs, but in the sense of 'yield' :—

Ut eam illi permittat. *Cas.* 270.

Tibi permittimus. *Curc.* 703. Cf. *Cas.* 394.

The regular and only passive of *sino* is some form of *licet* :²—

Ab eo licebit quamvis subito sumere. *Bac.* 339.

The perfect passive of *sino* occurs, but in the sense of 'be placed,' and has become a synonym of *esse* :—

Res omnis in incerto sitast. *Cap.* 536.

Ego, quoi libertas in mundo sitast. *Ep.* 618.

Quoi cor modeste situmst. *Men.* 971.

Cf. *Aul.* 609, 615 ; *Bac.* 178, 179 ; *Mil.* 1156 ; *Poen.* 342, 625, 1178 ; *St.* 53, 62.

Two phrases which occur in Plautus should be mentioned, one a synonym of *sino* and the other of *licet*, which stand therefore in the relation of active and passive to each other and to these verbs :—

veniam dedit. *Bac.* 532.

habent licentiam. *Tri.* 1034.

¹ Cic. *de Orat.* ii, 113 : Quid fiat, factum, futurumve sit ; Caes. *B.G.* iv, 6, 2 : ea, quae fore suspicatus erat, facta cognovit.

² On meanings of *licet*, see Emory B. Lease, "Zur Konstruktion von licet," *Archiv f. lat. Lex. und Gram.* XI (1898-1900), p. 9.

III. *Dico* and its synonyms *loquor*, *aio*, *inquam*.

The following sentences illustrate the degree to which these verbs have become synonymous : —

Sic est ut loquor. *Bac.* 468.

Sicut dicis. *Aul.* 294.

Bal.) Erus tuos? Har.) Ita dico.

Bal.) Miles? Har.) Ita loquor. *Ps.* 1152.

Ita vosmet aiebatis. *Cap.* 676.

Audin quae loquitur? *Bac.* 861.

Audis quae dico? *Am.* 977.

Audin quid ait? *Cap.* 592.

Loquere quis is est. *Bac.* 553.

Dic mihi quis tu's. *Bac.* 600.

Quidquid istaec de te loquitur. *Mil.* 1012.

Velim de me aliquid dixerit. *Poen.* 1206.

Str.) Pergin male loqui mihi?

Ast.) Quid tibi ego maledico? *Truc.* 265-6.

That they should be more exact synonyms than appears from the above illustrations is not necessary to this discussion.

The study of these four verbs produced the following results : —

a) In comparisons, only *loquor* is used in the first person, and only *dico* in the second person; always *ut loquor*, but always *ut dicis*. This may be due to the frequent use of *loquere* as an imperative.

b) In the imperative: *dic igitur* is a stock phrase; *loquere* both when joined with *porro* and often when alone means 'speak on.'

Br.) Sine me dicere . . . Am.) Loquere. *Am.* 1090. Cf. *Aul.* 820, *Bac.* 739, *Truc.* 796, 799.

Quid fit deinde? *porro* loquere. *Am.* 1119. Cf. *Bac.* 745, *Merc.* 199, 615.

When Plautus wished to use *dico* in this sense, he substituted for the simple imperative a phrase : —

Perge dicere. *Cis.* 517, 751.

Perge porro dicere. *Cis.* 754, *Tri.* 777.

Inque and *inquito* express no distinction in time, but are used alike always of the immediate future, "Say now." *Dicito* is always used of the more distant future : —

'Ita di faxint' inquito. *Aul.* 788. Cf. *Tri.* 427; *Rud.* 1342; *Bac.* 883; *Ps.* 538. Ubi tu lepide voles esse tibi, mea rosa, mihi dicito 'Dato qui bene sit.' *Bac.* 83.

Cf. *Aul.* 94, 97; *Bac.* 228; *Cap.* 395, 401.

c) *Aio* alone is used in exclamatory questions; *dico* and *loquor* always in questions which receive an answer.

d) *Inquam* alone is used in parenthesis with quotations.

The following typical sentences illustrate the way in which these verbs have differentiated in usage : —

Decies dixi: domi ego sum, inquam. *Am.* 577.

'Ita di faxint' inquito. *Aul.* 788.

Tum aquam aufugisse dicito, siquis petet. *Aul.* 94.
 Quid ais tu ?
 Dic igitur.
 Loquere porro.
 Ut loquor.
 Ut dicis.

IV. The composite question and answer, *Quid agis?* *Valeo.*
 As a greeting, *quid agis* is a synonym of *ut vales* : —

Phr.) *Quid agis ? ut vales ?* Co.) *Valeo.* *Truc.* 577.

Both greetings may be put into the passive : —

Quid agitur, Sagaristic ? ut valetur ? *Per.* 309.

It is frequently unanswered, but may receive a direct reply : —

Di.) *Quid agis ?* Ast.) *Valeo et validum teneo.* *Truc.* 126.

Pa.) *Salveto : quid agis ?* Ca.) *Vivo.* *Curc.* 235.

Ly.) *Quid agis, mea salus ?* Ol.) *Esurio, hercle, atque adeo hau salubriter.*
Cas. 801.

The same idiom occurs in the third person : —

Ep.) *Quid (agit) erilis noster filius ?*

Th.) *Valet pugilice atque athleticæ.* *Ep.* 20.

Ca.) *Tua uxor quid agit ?* Me.) *Immortalis est.* *Tri.* 55.

The verb *ago* in its literal use does not occur as a reply. It is found once in an idiomatic expression : —

Tr.) *Salve, Ampelisca : quid agis tu ?*

Am.) *Aetatem haud malam male (ago).* *Rud.* 336-7.

And once *quid agis* (= *ut vales*) is purposely understood as *quid agis* (= *quid facis*) and answered in this vein : —

Str.) *Quid agis, mea commoditas ?*

Ep.) *Quod miser (agit).* *Ep.* 614.

V. Instances of composite inflection in nouns appear to be rare in Plautus. Two obvious cases occur : —

a) Sing. *aedes, aedium, a house.*

Plu. *aedificia, houses.*

b) Sing. *aedes, aedis, a temple (= fanum).*

Plu. *aedes sacrae, temples (= fana).*

The plural *aedificia*, houses, occurs but once : —

Haec argumenta ego aedificiis dixi : nunc etiam volo

Dicere, ut hominis aedium esse similis arbitremini. *Mos.* 118-119.

The noun *templum* in the meaning of temple does not occur in Plautus. Two synonyms appear to have been in common use, *aedes* and *fanum* : —

ego in aedem Veneris eo. *Poen.* 190. Cf. *Curc.* 481; *Bac.* 312.

In the *Rudens*, *fanum* is used with the same meaning: —

In *fanum Veneris*. *Rud.* 128. Cf. *Curc.* 204.

The plural *fana* is twice used: —

Heus tu, qui fana ventris causa circumis. *Rud.* 140. Cf. *Rud.* 821.

In the same sense we find *aedes sacrae*: —

apud omnis aedis sacras
Sum defessus quaeritando. *Am.* 1013.

26. Critical Note on *προθέουσι*, *Iliad* I, 291, by Professor H. C. Tolman, of Vanderbilt University (read by title).

Line 291 remains a *locus desperatissimus* as it did in antiquity, for all difficulties connected with *προθέουσι* have never been explained away. The well-known theory (which is as old as Aristarchus) that the verb is the simple *προθέω* "run" forces us to account for the bold personification of *ὄνειδεα*. Shall we say "disgraceful words (like warriors) rush forth to his lips"? If so, we are bound to feel that the natural word which the poet would use for such hasty utterance is *προρέω* (cf. i, 249, *τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέειν ἀδδή*). Furthermore this interpretation gives to *μυθήσασθαι* a harsh construction; yet I don't accept Schöll's view that it is an impossible one. Even Döderlein's attempt to make the infinitive dependent on *ὄνειδεα* in the sense of the adjective *ὄνειδεια* (*dictu contumeliosa*) would give a construction not a bit more violent than the Aeschylean *θραύματ' ἔμοι κλύειν* (*Agam.* 1166), which is regarded by most critics as the sound reading.

The more common theory that *προθέουσι* is for *προτιθέασι* must, of course, involve the loss of all reduplication in the transfer of the verb from the unthematic to the thematic conjugation, thus giving us a form absolutely unique.

Even in the Indo-Iranian languages reduplicated forms of this same root (I.-E. DHE) are retained when the verb has become thematic (cf. Sanskrit *dadh-a-ti*, Avestan *daβ-a-iti*). Freytag's conjecture that we read *προθέουσι* for *προθέουσι* would avoid this difficulty, while the subjunctive might with some degree of plausibility be regarded as a dubitative subjunctive with implied negation, "Can it be that the gods would permit," etc., yet the justification of the meaning "permit" (*freistellen*, Voss) presents a serious problem. It seems impossible to reconcile such meaning with the ordinary signification of the verb, especially when we compare i, 178, *εἰ μάλα καρτερὸς ἔσσι, θεὸς που σοὶ τὸ γ' ἔδωκεν*. Bergk, influenced by a gloss of Hesychius (*καιροθέουσιν· κρατοῦσιν· προτρέχουσιν*), restores *καὶ* for *οἱ*, and, as is well known, interprets *προθέουσι* as dative of the participle (*iis qui auctoritate potiores sunt*, cf. xxiii, 890, *προβέβηκας ἀπάντων*). This interpretation not only forces a foreign signification upon the word but gives certainly a colorless expression for the "king of men."

I suggest the emendation *προέχουσι* for *προθέουσι*, not a violent change palaeographically (certainly not so violent as *προϊέουσιν* Heyne, *πῶλλ' ἔστιν* Bent., *φ' οἷγ' εἰώσιν* Gent.). This form, which occurs uncontracted only once in the Homeric poems (*Od.* xii, 11), I would take as the dative of the participle with

the familiar interpretation as seen in *H. Hom. Cer.* 151, δῆμον τε προῦχουσιν. Furthermore, we could understand an ellipsis of ἐστὶ in the line and translate "For this reason is it his right to speak contemptuous words to his chiefs?"

Such an interpretation, I believe, finds support from (1) Nicanor's remark (ὑποστικτέον ἐπὶ τὸ αἰὲν ἔδντες, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ δνελδεα μνθῆσασθαι· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔλλειπει, ὡς ψῆθσάν τινες), which certainly shows that some supposed an ellipsis in the passage; (2) the interpretation of the Scholiast to B. L. (ἀρα ὀφελει διὰ τοῦτο ἄλλοις ὀνειδίζειν· καὶ κακῶς λέγειν ἡμᾶς βασιλέας), implying at least that by the word in question βασιλέας was understood; (3) the gloss of Hesychius (καιροθέουσιν· κρατοῦσιν), which favors a dative participle with the meaning of κρατεῖν, a word which actually occurs three lines above.

27. On the Date of Pliny's Governorship in Bithynia, by Professor Elmer Truesdell Merrill, of Wesleyan University (read by title).

The object of the paper was to prove that 109-111 A.D., rather than (as Mommsen thought) 111-113, was the date concerned. It is expected that the paper will be published in full elsewhere.

28. Studies in Latin Accent and Metric, by Professor Robert S. Radford, of Elmira College (read by title).

This article will be found in the TRANSACTIONS.

29. A Quantitative Difficulty in the New Metric, by Professor Edward B. Clapp, of the University of California (read by title).

The shortening of diphthongs and long vowels in hiatus is an Epic practice, and in later Greek poetry is consequently confined for the most part to dactyls. *E.g.*, in the extant remains of Greek melic poetry [some 8000 verses], shortening in hiatus occurs 352 times. According to the ordinary scansion 338 of these 352 instances of shortening appear in dactyls, five in tribrachs, four in cretics, while in dissyllabic feet there is no instance where text and scansion can be regarded as certain.

These facts are adduced as casting some doubt upon the substitution of $_ \cup | _ \cup | _ \cup | _ \cup$ for $_ > | _ \cup \cup | _ \cup | _ \wedge$ in the Glyconic, which is characteristic of the new metric. This change of scansion involves the breaking up of many so-called "cyclic dactyls" into trochees and iambs, and, as a consequence, the frequent occurrence of shortening in hiatus in dissyllabic feet. This is so difficult to accept, in view of the facts mentioned above, that the present writer is inclined to query whether, after all, it is not probable that $_ \cup \cup$ in the Glyconic, and similar series, was felt by the poets as a dactyl, rather than as a trochee plus half an iamb. If it were not so felt, why should they resort so often to the characteristic dactylic shortening in hiatus under these circumstances?

This paper is printed in full in the *Classical Review* for October, 1904.

30. The Puteanus Group of Mss. of the Third Decade of Livy: A Revision of the Classification of β and λ , by Professor F. W. Shipley, of Washington University, St. Louis (read by title).

The President announced that in lieu of the customary Report from the Standing Committee on Spelling Reform, its Chairman, Professor F. A. March, had asked Mr. E. O. Vaile, editor of *Intelligence*, to make a statement to the society of what had been done in the National Educational Association in the interest of simplified spelling.

MR. VAILE:

The first practical step in this matter taken by the national organization of teachers was the adoption of a resolution in 1897 by the Department of Superintendence directing the secretary in publishing the PROCEEDINGS of the Department to adopt, until further instructed, such amended spellings as might be prescribed by the following committee: Dr. W. T. Harris, Commissioner of Education, Dr. F. Louis Soldan, Superintendent of Schools, St. Louis, Missouri, and Dr. T. M. Balliet, Superintendent of Schools, Springfield, Massachusetts. This committee designated the following amended spellings for the secretary to adopt: program, tho, altho, thoro, thorofare, thru, thruout, catalog, prolog, decalog, demagog, pedagog.

This action was approved by the Board of Directors, and made to apply to all matter issued by the N. E. A.; and these spellings have been regularly used since, excepting in a few papers in the PROCEEDINGS, the authors of which objected to the use of these new forms and were allowed to have their papers printed in the regular spelling. The adoption of these twelve shortened forms by the N. E. A. was followed by their adoption by a growing number of publications and advertisers.

In the meeting of the Department of Superintendence in 1901, another advance step was proposed in the shape of a resolution petitioning the Board of Directors of the N. E. A. (1) to appoint a commission of twenty eminent scholars and business men — they were named in the resolution, with their approval — to become a head to the movement, and (2) to give this commission \$1000 a year for five years, to be used by it according to its judgment in furthering the cause. This resolution brought on an animated debate, but it was defeated by a vote of 105 to 97, I believe.

In 1904 at the meeting of the Department of Superintendence in Atlanta, the same proposition was introduced, slightly modified, petitioning the Board of Directors to appoint a commission and appropriate for its use \$2000 a year for five years, providing that only as much of the appropriation should be given to the commission each year as should equal the amount of money raised for its use from other sources. These resolutions were passed by the superintendents by a majority of about four to one. This action was supplemented by a canvass of the entire N. E. A. active membership on the subject of the petition, with the result that 1545 active members signed the petition to the Board of Directors, while only 171 signed the petition in opposition.

The petition was duly presented to the Board of Directors at the late meeting (in St. Louis), who, according to the regular order in such matters, referred it for advice to the Committee on Investigations and Appropriations of the Council of Education. This committee, after considerable deliberation, thought it advisable to take expert advice on the subject, and so referred it to a special committee consisting of Professor Calvin Thomas, of Columbia University, Professor George Hempl, of the University of Michigan, President H. H. Seerley, of the Iowa State Normal School, Superintendent C. M. Jordan, of Minneapolis, Minnesota, with the President of the N. E. A. (Superintendent William H. Maxwell, New York City) chairman *ex officio*. This committee is to report to the president of the Council by June 1, 1905.

Here is where this movement rests at present, so far as the N. E. A. is concerned. The sentiment expressed in favor of having the N. E. A. provide an efficient business organization for wisely encouraging and directing this movement and of devoting a small portion of its large annual resources under wise safeguards, for the use of this committee, is so pronounced that strong confidence is felt that the course outlined in the petition of the Department of Superintendence to the Board of Directors will be approved by the committee to whom the matter has been referred, each member of it being on record as favoring moderate and reasonable steps in the interest of the movement. It is generally understood that if this committee of experts so reports, all further opposition to having the N. E. A. lend its moral and financial support to this cause will be withdrawn.

The Committee on the Time and Place of the Meeting in 1905, by Professor Elmer, Chairman, reported its inability to make a definite report, whether to hold the next meeting at Cornell University or at Dartmouth College. Professor Perry expressed a desire to have the next meeting at Columbia University in 1905, and moved that after the adjournment of the Association the Committee have the power to decide the place and time of the next meeting. Carried.

Professor J. H. Wright reported for the Committee on the Nomination of Officers, presenting the following list of officers for the ensuing year : —

President, Professor Herbert Weir Smyth, Harvard University.

Vice-Presidents, Professor Mortimer Lamson Earle, Columbia University.

Professor Elmer Truesdell Merrill, Wesleyan University.

Secretary and Treasurer, Professor Frank Gardner Moore, Dartmouth College.

Executive Committee, The above-named officers, and

Professor Charles E. Bennett, Cornell University.

Professor Edward B. Clapp, University of California.

Professor Francis A. March, Lafayette College.

Professor Morris H. Morgan, Harvard University.

Professor Paul Shorey, University of Chicago.

The report of the Committee was accepted, and the Secretary was directed to cast the ballot of the Association for the persons nominated.

Professor Wright's term of service as a member of the Standing Committee to Nominate Officers expiring in 1904, the President appointed Professor M. L. D'Ooge, of the University of Michigan, to serve for five years from 1904.

The present membership of the Committee is as follows :—

To serve for *one* year, Professor W. G. Hale, Chairman.

To serve for *two* years, Professor T. D. Seymour.

To serve for *three* years, Professor Samuel Hart.

To serve for *four* years, Professor M. W. Humphreys.

To serve for *five* years, Professor M. L. D'Ooge.

On motion of Professor Smyth the office of Assistant Secretary was created. Due notice to this effect was given by the Executive Committee at the last annual meeting (see PROCEEDINGS for 1903, p. xix). The Assistant Secretary is to assist the Secretary during the sessions of the Association, but is not to be a member of the Executive Committee.

Professor Smyth then reported for the Executive Committee that at the last meeting Dr. Scott had proposed the following resolution :—

Resolved, That the Executive Committee be requested to consider and to report at a future meeting of the Association, whether it is expedient to change the method of publishing the papers read before the Association; and whether, in particular, it is desirable to publish the papers, or those chosen for the purpose, each in a separate monograph with a separate title-page, but all bearing the name and sanction of the Association, and a serial number; and whether, if this be done, it is expedient to abolish the TRANSACTIONS as such and to reduce the PROCEEDINGS to a mere official record.

In accordance with the request of the proposer of the resolution, who desired that his argument in favor of the change be printed in brief in the next number of the PROCEEDINGS, the Executive Committee has decided to postpone consideration of the matter, and to report at the next meeting.

The argument presented by Dr. Scott is as follows :—

THE METHOD OF PUBLISHING THE PAPERS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

From the beginning of the Association the papers have been published in two series, one called the Transactions, consisting of papers chosen for publication in full, and printed in large type; the other called the Proceedings,

consisting of abstracts of the other papers, in connection with the minutes of the meetings, and printed in small type.

The papers in the Transactions have been printed in an order determined each year according to the length or subject or importance of the papers, or to other considerations necessarily left to editorial discretion. The papers in the Proceedings have been printed, in abstract, in the order in which they were read, intermingled with the minutes.

It has been the custom to print off a number of separate copies of each paper for the use of the author. No separate copies are issued to other members. The separate copies are not provided with a separate title-page. They are not always so printed as to begin with a recto, as convenience of separate publication requires. This plan is possible only by happy accident or by adjustment involving some extra expense.

The Transactions and Proceedings together constitute two long miscellanies, in two principal sizes of type. They extend now over a period of thirty-five years. They contain many hundred papers on many hundred topics. These papers are not classified. They are indexed in one general index, not now covering the whole period, and in many annual indexes.

On adjacent shelves the members of the Association and other subscribers may possess many feet or many yards of other philological miscellanies, as the Publications of the Modern Language Association, the Journal of the American Oriental Society, the publications of the Archaeological Institute, the Transactions of the Philological Society of London, and an indefinite number of long sets of other philological transactions and journals. On other crowded stacks of stuffed shelves there are other "continuing series" of other scientific transactions and journals, taking up a great deal of space, and involving no small expense in the acquirement and care thereof.

All these miscellanies are to the owner or consulter confused heaps of material containing much that is to him of the highest interest and value, papers that he would gladly place on his shelves as independent books, and also much that may be of interest and value to others, but is not to him — papers that he does not understand, that he will never attempt to read, and that he would never buy as separate works. But he has no choice, either to pick out what he wants, or to place it with other matter on the same subject. The method of publication blocks his choice, checks his study, chills his interest.

This should not be so. No method of publication, indeed, no bibliographic device, will ever enable any one to attain learning without hard labor and long research. But it is the dictate of science that all unnecessary obstacles be removed. All the time devoted to learning should be productive of results, either in knowledge or in discipline.

The method of publishing scientific matter in the form of miscellaneous and insequent papers inseparably printed and bound together is not scientific. It originated in an unscientific age, out of accidental conditions. It was circumstances of place, expense, temporary convenience, literary amateurism, forced expediency, that determined the form of the early Transactions of the learned societies of Italy, France, and England. It is custom that continues what accident began.

The result is that there is an immense number of valuable papers, and what

should be recognized as valuable books, buried beyond easy reach and sight in great heaps of printed blocks. These heaps are, indeed, provided with labels, but the labels are vague and nearly futile. The title or label "Philosophical Transactions" or "Transactions of the American Philological Association" is only a very general indication of the matters contained in the blocks of paper so labelled. Considered as scientific classification or practical guidance, the information is too meagre. What is wanted is precise information. This requires close classification. The guiding title should be, not "Philosophical Transactions," not "Observations on Fishes," but "The Shad," "The Fishes of Ireland," "The Freshwater Fishes of County Cork"; not "The Transactions of the American Philological Association," but "The Greek Dialects," "The Ionic Dialect," "The Vowel System of the Ionic Dialect"—always the closest classification, the most definite direction, that is convenient.

That papers on such subjects are published or sanctioned by the Royal Society or the American Philological Association is a fact of interest and value in interpreting or judging the work, but it is a subordinate fact, to some extent a mere accident, and it is unscientific to make this accidental fact, in effect, the title of the paper, or what is worse, to make the name of the publishing society a blanket title for a score or a thousand of works whose real title is hidden from view.

The acquirement of learning is best subserved by an abundance of separate books, each one dealing squarely and in detail with one subject, and not printed or bound inseparably with books or papers on other subjects, or on remote branches of the same subject. That a book contains 400, or 40, or 20, or 4 pages, is a mere accident. If it deals with one subject, call it book or paper or pamphlet or what not, it is entitled to a separate existence, to go whithersoever the owner wills. If not actually separate, it should always be separable. If two works are very closely related, they may indeed be bound together, like the Siamese twins. The condition is inconvenient, but it may be tolerable. But diverse works should be twain, not twins. Think of the annoyance and mortification of a gentle Siamese who finds himself an inseparably ligatured twin with a Rough Rider or a Congo cannibal!

The general principle is, that except for temporary purposes and within a convenient minimum, it is unscientific to print or publish scientific works or any matter that constitutes a distinct item in the sum of knowledge, in any other than (*a*) a classified form, namely, either as a systematic treatise, or as a part of a dictionary or encyclopædia, where the perfectly known alphabetic classification is for the general convenience better than any logical classification; or (*b*) a classifiable form, namely, as an individual work, or as one of a series of individual works, not previously classified or ossified or hopelessly ankylosed with other works by a printer or binder, and therefore left to the classification of the user, who may put it where it will best serve his purpose.

It may be said that the published Transactions and Proceedings of learned societies throughout the world have failed of a certain part, sometimes of half or three-fourths or nearly all, of their possible utility, because of difficulties due to their style, their bulk, their weight, their print, their cost, their rarity, their language, their unknownness, their inaccessibility, their indexlessness, or their method of publication. No one can compute how much farther science would have progressed by this time if in these respects the conductors of these societies had

used the best judgment of their period. It is clear that in many cases mere custom, vanity, indolence, ignorance, parsimony, timidity, and other unscientific qualities have determined or deteriorated the form and the contents of scientific publications.

Few of the difficulties mentioned exist in the case of the Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association. In style, in bulk, in weight, in size, in type, in print, they are models. In these and other respects open to choice they reflect the judgment, the taste, and the scholarship of the executive officers, and in particular of the eminent scholars who have borne the burden of editorship. The method of publication was not, and has not been, a matter of deliberate choice and preference. It was and is an inherited custom.

The custom is not followed by all societies. A number of scientific societies publish their papers separately. Publishing societies like the Early English Text Society keep their issues distinct, in several numbered series. The series are commonly catalogued and shelved together, but scientific librarians break up such series, and place the separate works with their subject. It is unreasonable to keep such works together merely because they were issued by the same publisher. No library would keep in one series all the works published by the Clarendon Press or by John Murray. No library should be compelled to keep in one series all the works published by the Early English Text Society or the American Philological Association.

To a housemaid it looks nice to see a long row of Transactions of the same height, the same thickness, and the same color, with the same gilded labels. To a user of books it is a melancholy sight. The slight difference of thickness, when there is any, is a redeeming feature. I once had occasion to send to the binder a set of the publications of the English Dialect Society. They came back bound as ordered; but I did not order him *not* to pad out the thinner volumes, so, with great intelligence and judgment he padded them all to a double or triple thickness, so as to produce an elegant housemaid uniformity, devoid of all distracting individuality.

For the reasons I have mentioned, and for others which will appear on a consideration of the matter, I offered the resolution looking to a change in the method of publishing the papers of the Association. Put into concrete form, subject to changes in detail after discussion, my suggestion is this:—

That the papers chosen for publication shall be issued in the present size of page and the same, or any chosen, size and style of print, each in a separate or separable pamphlet, with an independent title-page, or a separate title on the first page, with a stiff, colored, paper cover, bearing the same title. That the title shall begin with the actual title of the paper, followed by the name of the author, as in an independent pamphlet or book. That the author's name be followed by a fixed formula, showing that the paper is published by the American Philological Association, and that it was read at a session, place, and date stated. That this formula, which would be in effect the series-title (and should therefore not come first on the title-page), be followed by a serial number, and then by the usual imprint. That each paper contain also a complete list of all the papers of the Association read at the same session, and thus retain all the advantages of the present method of publication.

The principle of separate publication should be applied so far as possible to the papers now printed in the Proceedings. Some of these are in fact full papers, covering several pages. Such papers could be printed in a four-page or larger folder. Shorter papers could go together on another folder, and the official minutes on another. All could be issued together, bound in one pamphlet, but still separable by the user. This would reduce the necessary miscellany to a minimum. It cannot be wholly abolished, in respect to the Proceedings.

The papers could be sent to the members and subscribers in separate pieces but all in one package, or at intervals when they are ready. Members and subscribers who so desired might receive them bound. They would still be separable. The main point is, that the present inseparable order shall not forever remain the only one. Let the receiver have the power to place the papers where he will.

There are two objections to the proposed separate publication.

One objection is, the greater expense, caused by the separate printing and handling, and especially by the addition of a separate title-page and cover for each paper. This objection deserves consideration. It may be at present a serious one. The Secretary will be able to estimate the probable difference, and to state other objections related to this one. My belief is, that the added expense will not be great, and that it will be amply balanced by the added advantages. And the added expense could be met by assessing it upon the authors themselves, or by the sale of the separate papers to non-members, or of extra copies to members. The amount of such sales would probably exceed the present sales of the bound Transactions.

The other objection is, that many of the papers, as separately published, would be so thin (I refer of course to their physical dimensions) as to leave no room, if they were bound, for a title on the back edge. The statement is true, but it applies to all pamphlets, and I think that all scientific librarians agree in the opinion that pamphlets should be kept distinct, bound if possible, but each within its own covers. The conventional distinction between pamphlets and books is merely conventional, and can be abolished by any binder. It ought to be abolished as soon as the owner can meet the expense.

Other objections and apparent difficulties will occur to the mind, but they will not prove serious. The thing proposed can be done. It has been done by other societies. Indeed, I doubt whether any member of the Association, if the method of miscellany publication were a new one, proposed for adoption against an existing method of separate publication, would vote for miscellany publication. For he would say, the separate publication is better.

I wish to add that this proposition arose from my own experience in the consultation and management of large quantities of miscellaneous material in the form of scientific transactions and journals, and that it reflects an acquired sympathy with the efforts of practical librarians to bring within some control the ever-growing floods of miscellanies and polygraphs. The matter requires consideration. My object in these remarks is simply to open the discussion, with the hope that the Executive Committee will deem it worth while to report the matter to the Association in a way favorable to its further consideration and discussion.

If the Executive Committee and the Association are favorable to the proposition, they may deem this a fitting year to make the change. But I am inclined to think that the special circumstances of the present meeting, amid the pressure and distractions of a world's fair and crowding congresses, will make it inex-

pedient to do more than to state the case to the Association, call for a general expression of opinion, and then remand the matter to the Committee for a report next year.

But I think that there never will come a year in which it will be scientific to publish scientific matter in an unscientific way.

Professor Bloomfield then raised the question of the advisability of holding the regular annual session of the Association in the winter, instead of in the summer vacation. In the discussion that ensued remarks were made by Professors Lanman, Seymour, Smyth, Hale, D'Ooge, and F. G. Moore. At the request of Professor Bloomfield an informal ballot was taken on his motion that it was the sense of the members present that the annual meetings be held in the winter, with the following result: twenty-five in favor, five against the proposed change. After further discussion Professor Bloomfield moved that, by way of experiment, the next two meetings of the Association be held during Convocation Week in 1905 and 1906. Carried.

It was understood that, if practicable, a meeting should be arranged conjointly with the Archaeological Institute of America, or with the Modern Language Association.

Professor Perry moved the following vote of thanks, which was adopted unanimously by a rising vote:—

Whereas, Professor Herbert Weir Smyth has performed the arduous duties of the Secretaryship and Treasurership of the American Philological Association for the past fifteen years with singular devotion and success, be it

Resolved, That the hearty thanks of the Association be extended to Professor Smyth for his untiring and efficient services as its Secretary and Treasurer from 1889 to the present time.

Adjourned at 12.50 P.M.

In accordance with the resolution adopted upon motion of Professor Bloomfield the next meeting of the Association will be held during Convocation Week, 1905.

The place of the meeting having been left to the decision of a committee, that committee has reported in favor of accepting the invitation of Cornell University for a joint meeting with the Archaeological Institute of America, at the time above indicated.

PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC COAST.

The Fifth Annual Meeting was held at the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art in San Francisco on December 28, 29, and 30, 1903.

SAN FRANCISCO, December 28, 1903.

The Association was called to order at 2.30 P.M. by the first Vice-president, Professor W. A. Merrill, of the University of California, the President, Professor A. T. Murray, of Leland Stanford Jr. University, being unable to attend the meeting.

The Secretary of the Association, Professor John E. Matzke, of Leland Stanford Jr. University, presented the following report :

1. The Executive Committee has elected the following new members of the Association :

Prof. W. F. Badè, Pacific Theological Seminary, Berkeley, Cal.
Mr. C. Bransby, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Mr. B. H. Cerf, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Prof. M. S. Cummins, Occidental College, Los Angeles, Cal.
Mr. L. J. Demeter, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Mr. H. B. Dewing, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Prof. A. Emerson, Affiliated Colleges of the University of California, San Francisco, Cal.
Mr. W. M. Hart, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Miss Hodgkinson, Lowell High School, San Francisco, Cal.
Mr. I. M. Linforth, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Mr. E. W. Martin, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal.
Mr. C. Paschall, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Prof. T. F. Sanford, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Mr. M. J. Spinello, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Prof. C. W. Wells, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

Through transfer from the American Philological Association there has been added :

Dr. Charles J. O'Connor, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

2. Professor Matzke then presented his report as Treasurer of the Association for the year 1902-1903 :

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, Dec. 28, 1902	\$51.90
Annual dues and Initiation fees	205.00
	<hr/>
	\$256.90

EXPENDITURES.

Sent to Prof. H. W. Smyth, June 16, 1903	\$209.80
Postage and Printing	15.50
Incidentals	1.50
	<hr/>
Total	\$226.80
Balance on hand, Dec. 27, 1903	30.10
	<hr/>
	\$256.90

The President appointed the following committees :

On Nomination of Officers for 1903-1904: Professors Senger, Elmore, and Mr. Gleason.

To Audit the Treasurer's Report: Messrs. Mower, Cogswell, and Professor J. T. Allen.

On Time and Place of Meeting in 1904: Professors Cooper, Nutting, and Mr. James.

The reading and discussion of papers was then begun.

1. The Plural of Segolates, by Professor Max L. Margolis, of the University of California.

In the plural of Hebrew segolates (forms of the type *malk-*, etc.) we find a vowel (*a*) between the second and third radicals (e.g. *mālāḳ-īm*). Whence this *a*? The following answers have been given: (1) The plural is derived from a parallel singular form: *mālāḳ-īm* from *malak-*. This statement is usually accompanied by the assumption that *malk-* itself goes back to *malak-*. So Luzzatto (*Prolegomeni*, 1836, 116 ff.; *Grammatica*, 1853, 358), Philippi (*BSS.*, 2 (1894), 373, 376 f.: the preservation of the *a* in the plural is put to the account of the accent of which it was the bearer; Philippi enumerates the traces of the *a* in the plural in the other Semitic dialects, as Aramaic *mālāḳ-īm* with spirantization, Arabic *'araḳ-ūna*, Ethiopic *kalab-āt*). (2) The Ethiopic and Arabic forms just quoted afford Praetorius (*BSS.*, 1 (1890), 374-377) the opportunity for a different explanation. Observing that the supernumerary vowel appears to be limited to the feminine plural, he concludes that it arose by conforming to the vowel in the singular, which is either an original or a helping vowel in front of the consonantal ending *-t*; then it spread into the masculine plural. In adjectives the supernumerary vowel is wanting, because of the analogical influence of the masculine. Praetorius' conception about the character of the consonantal suffix *-t* is certainly erroneous when applied to primitive Semitic speech. Lagarde (1884, 1889) derives *mālāḳ-īm* from *malak-*, which latter he considers to be a corruption of *malik-*. He is quite right about deriving certain *malk-* forms from *malik-*; but his explanation of the plural is not convincing. Stade (1879) speaks of the analogical influence of the plural of the *dhār-īm* type; but Ungnad (see below)

rightly asks for the cause inducing the analogy. (3) König (*Lehrgebäude*, 2 (1895), 408 ff.) and, in an improved form, Ungnad (*Z.A.*, 17 (1903), 333-334) see in the supernumerary *a* a parasitic vowel the insertion of which is connected with accentual conditions. Ungnad misinterprets the dual *karûn-aiṁ* and (this is the vulnerable spot) explains the spirantization in *malḳ-ai* as due to the analogy of *mālāk-ai-nū* forms. (4) Nearer the truth, but a long way off yet, is Lambert (*REJ.*, 24 (1892), 104-106). He compares the Arabic broken plurals of the type *fi'al-* and *fu'al-*, and arrives at the conclusion that originally the plural of segolates was distinguished from the singular only by giving the characteristic vowel a different position. His explanation of *malḳ-ai* is phonetically impossible. (5) The explanation which I have made my own is that given by Salter Brooks, *Vestiges of the Broken Plural in Hebrew*, Dublin, 1883 (the pamphlet appears to be unknown in Germany). Brooks, it seems, was unaware of the fact that he had been anticipated by Ernst Meier, *Die Bildung und Bedeutung des Plural in den semit. und indogerman. Sprachen*, 1846. The German publication just referred to contains much that is confused; hence the oblivion to which it has been consigned. Nevertheless, it elicited the praise of Johannes Schmidt (see his *Pluralbildungen der indogerman. Neutra*, 1889, 10, footnote). Meier sees in the plural suffix *-im* an abstract suffix. Hence *zakûn-im* "old age," etc. But the abstract may be used for the concrete (comp. *Sult-ân*; hence *Elôh-im*, Deity, God). Abstract nouns become collectives, then plurals. He points to the broken plural of *malḳ-* forms (Hebrew, Arabic, Ethiopic). He knows of the plural of the plural: *raḡul-, riḡâl-, riḡâl-ât-*. Accordingly he explains *mālāk-im* on p. 78 as the plural of a plural. The shortening of the vowel is explained neither by Meier nor by Brooks. Here Barth's Law of Compensation (*Nominalbildung*, xiii.) steps in to furnish the wanting explanation. Barth unnecessarily confines himself to the feminine suffix; his law, however, holds good of any abstract suffix. Hence *mālāk-im* (nevertheless we find *'z lôh-im* without compensative shortening, cf. *'âbôd-â(h)*). Compensative forms are found also in Arabic (also in broken plurals). *Malḳ-ai* (with *a*) I explain as due to the analogical influence of the singular. The consonantal environment is another influence. Cf. *kanf-ai* by the side of *dibr-ai*. (Ultimately compensative shortening will be found to rest upon accentual conditions; perhaps some light will come from Grimme's forthcoming essay on the Semitic "ablaut.")

2. Concessive *Si*-Clauses in Plautus, by Professor H. C. Nutting, of the University of California.

In this paper a distinction is made between simple and intensive concessive clauses. The latter are characterized by intentional exaggeration, e.g. "Though *Jupiter himself* should come to your assistance." The usage of *si* and each of its compounds is examined from this point of view. The tables at the end show the peculiarity of the intensive type, with reference to both the introductory particle and the mood of the verb. A discussion of the reason for these peculiarities is appended.

The paper was discussed by Professors Clapp, Merrill, Elmore, and Fairclough.

3. The Subjunctive in the So-called Restrictive *Quod*-Clauses, by Professor J. Elmore, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

After discussing the views of this construction which are held by the grammarians, the paper sought first, with respect to the mode, to establish the actual usage of the language, many examples being brought to show that in every type of these so-called restrictive clauses both indicative and subjunctive are found. The reason for this modal behavior is to be looked for in the logical relation of the clauses to the sentences in which they stand. It was held that this logical function is to denote the special consideration (or considerations) in view of which a statement is made; that is, to constitute the mental point of view from which the speaker utters his thought. In this case the antecedent, of which these *quod*-clauses were originally an expansion, would be a demonstrative in the ablative case, — the so-called ablative of specification or respect, — by means of which the clauses would be closely connected with the rest of the sentence. The mode was determined by the relation existing between the antecedent and its clause. If the clause was felt as merely determinative, the indicative occurred; if, on the other hand, it was descriptive of the antecedent, there resulted naturally the subjunctive of characteristic. Each mode gave to the clause a special shade of meaning. After the mode had become established, we need not, of course, assume a definite consciousness in the speaker's mind of its origin. The modal coloring, however, was no less strong on this account.

This paper was discussed by Professors Nutting, Clapp, Fairclough, Noyes, and Merrill.

4. The Chinese Drama, by Professor John Fryer, of the University of California.

The Chinese drama has hitherto received but little critical attention from European and American students of the language, literature, and customs of the country. Hence by those who are strangers to China and the Chinese it has been inferred that the drama does not occupy a very conspicuous place in the general esteem of the *literati* and better classes of the people. Such, however, is not the case; but, on the contrary, it has been made one of the greatest and most popular means of enlightening the masses as to the important events in their national history, and of illustrating the great ethical principle laid down by the ancient Chinese sages, that "virtue is its own reward, while vice is its own punishment." Hence the drama has been fostered and promoted by some of the best of the officials and guardians of public morals in China, who have sought to elevate its tone by encouraging what is good in it, and eliminating what is evil.

I. ORIGIN OF THE CHINESE DRAMA.

Chinese history seems to point to about one thousand years before Christ as the date when dramatic plays were first dimly conceived of. This is about the time of Solomon, who had "multitudes of singing men and singing women," and whose elegant dramatic composition known as the *Song of Solomon* is supposed to have been written for his marriage-feast celebration.

The origin of the Chinese drama is usually traced to the Emperor Ming-Huang. The legend states that one of his three souls took a journey to the moon, which the Chinese believe to be inhabited. When he reached the Palace of Jadestone in the moon, where the ruler of that orb resides, he found the people were engaged in some theatrical performances to which he paid particular attention. On the soul's return to his body he remembered what he had seen, and started to produce the Chinese drama in imitation of it. He engaged several of his people to train themselves as performers. Being very fond of music, he established a sort of musical school, held in a pear orchard, where about three hundred people of both sexes were instructed and prepared for carrying on various kinds of amusements for the entertainment of the imperial court. There were instrumentalists, singers, and dancers or actors, who were known as "Youths of the Pear Orchard,"—a term still applied to all followers of the Thespian art. The exact nature of these performances is not very well known or understood. They probably partook considerably of the nature of the opera, or of the lyric drama, very much as the Greek tragedies did.

In recognition of the efforts of the Emperor Ming-Huang in starting the first school of performers, he has been canonized, and is still worshipped under another name as the patron god of play-acting. Hence, in the chests containing the accoutrements or properties of a troupe of players, there will always be found, on a larger or smaller scale, an image of their god of the theatre, which is superstitiously carried about with them wherever they go.

The drama as we now find it in China is evidently of foreign or Mongol-Tartar origin, and was introduced from that country when the Mongolian conquest of China took place and the Yuan dynasty was established. The "Hundred Plays of the Yuan Dynasty" have become as much the standard work on the subject of the drama as the plays of Shakespeare have with us. During that dynasty there were eighty-one authors of more or less note who had written separate plays to the total number of five hundred and sixty-four. These are all regarded as of a classical character.

Since the Mongol dynasty the Chinese drama has originated an immense amount of literature, in spite of all the imperial restrictions that have been imposed upon it, for it supplies a universal want. Hence every class of society in China has its own popular dramatic entertainments of a higher or a lower order.

2. THE ACTORS AND ARRANGEMENTS OF CHINESE THEATRES.

It is interesting to find that the Chinese drama has several points of similarity with that of the Greeks. In Greece the plays would commence at sunrise and continue all day until sunset, just as they do still in the open-air stages of the country districts in China. Women were not allowed to perform; there was no interval between the pieces; there was no curtain, no scenery, no prompter, and no attempt at realism. The words of the play were partly spoken and partly sung,—the quality of the voice of the actor being of the utmost importance. Before masks were invented, the Greek actor painted his face and wore shoes with very thick soles or "cothurns." These and other points of resemblance are all to be found in the better class of Chinese theatres of the present day.

A full company of actors consists of about sixty men, each of whom has com-

mitted to memory from one hundred to two hundred plays. There being no prompter, it is only an excellent memory that can retain so much. The actors are generally divided into five classes, according to the nature of the parts they have made a special study of.

Those who take the better class of women's parts have to wear imitation small feet, and have to sing or say their parts in a shrill falsetto that requires much practice to produce the best effects.

The songs and words are generally in the ancient Mandarin language, which differs entirely from the local dialects of different places, and is, of course, unintelligible to the masses. Hence the audience does not go to listen to the words, but to see and hear the skill of the actor.

The stage has only two doors,—one for entrance and one for exit. As the performers of one set leave the stage those of the next part enter by the other door, so that there is never a break in any performance or set of plays. What cannot be inferred from the more or less gorgeous clothing, or the movements of the actors, has to be told to the audience by the actor himself, who states whom he represents, what he has done, and what he has to do.

3. THE LITERATURE OF THE CHINESE DRAMA.

The Chinese divide their classical dramatic literature into three principal groups, according to the age when the plays were written. First come the earlier plays produced during the T'ang dynasty, or, roughly, between the years 720 and 960 A.D. Second, those dating from the Sung dynasty, or from 960 to 1127 A.D. Third, those written during the Yuan dynasty, or between 1127 and 1368 A.D. Since the Yuan dynasty, the number of plays that have been published is enormous, but they have never succeeded in supplanting those of the older classic times in the estimation of cultured Chinese.

Among the thousands of plays that might be mentioned, the pathetic drama in twenty-four acts entitled "Record of a Pi-pa" (or Chinese guitar) partakes as much of the nature of the novel as of the drama. The first representation of this affecting play took place at Peking in A.D. 1404 during the Ming dynasty. It is said that this masterpiece, which gives an account of the sad life of a talented singing girl, if performed by a highly trained troupe, not only brings tears to the eyes of the whole audience but even the actors themselves are so much affected as to be unable at times to continue their parts.

Modern plays are nearly all of the "*Wu*," or the military, kind. They pander too much to the popular demands for noisy display and fierce fightings, to say nothing of licentiousness. The "*Wen*," or civil, plays are usually of a much higher order, and certainly teach a better class of moral sentiments, but are little patronized even in the great cities.

A wealthy Chinese gentleman of a philanthropic turn of mind, named Liang-yu-chih, not long since attempted to reform the tone of the popular theatres by encouraging the performance of what may be called "morality plays," of which he published an original collection and sent me a copy, which suggested the writing of this paper. The title of one of these plays is "The Story of Grinding at the Mill," and it may be taken as a sample of the whole collection. The heroine is a young girl, the daughter of respectable parents of the poorer middle

class, who is betrothed to the son in another family, living at some distance. She is brought up in the future mother-in-law's house, as is sometimes the Chinese custom. Though treated in the most cruel manner, she meekly submits till the very gods are moved by her dutiful conduct to interfere on her behalf. Yet the mother-in-law is professedly a devout Buddhist. Her visits to temples to burn incense and pray to Buddha, as well as her invocations of Buddha's name, are introduced in the midst of all her cruelty in order to ridicule the followers of that religion. She makes the poor, half-starved child turn the heavy flour mill half the night and grind for the whole family, beating her every now and then for imaginary offences. Her gross hypocrisy when the mother of the child comes to visit her is only too true to the life. The play finishes by the mother-in-law being struck down by one of the gods and lying dangerously ill, when the girl cuts out a piece of her own flesh to make soup for her cruel tormentor, according to the popular belief that such means would insure recovery. Then comes the old lady's restoration to health, her knowledge of this piece of self-sacrifice, and her bitter repentance; while the dutiful conduct of the daughter-in-law is promulgated by official authority far and near.

The style of these twenty-seven plays is chiefly adapted to the common people, but they have the usual amount of poetry and songs, without which they could never hope for popularity. Even with these accompaniments, there is doubtless too much of the "goody-goody" element in them to make it at all likely they will ever please the vitiated taste of the general Chinese public enough to grow into much demand.

Adjourned at 4.30 P.M.

SECOND SESSION.

The second session was called to order at 8 P.M. by Professor E. B. Clapp, of the University of California.

In the place of the address scheduled to be given by Professor A. T. Murray, the Association listened to the following lecture:

5. The Etruscan Nekropolis of Abbadia del Fiume, near Pitigliano, by Dr. Alfred Emerson, of the University of California.

Abbadia del Fiume is an uninhabited hill on the west bank of the river Fiora, a little more than halfway from Orvieto to the seacoast. One leaden slingshot with the inscription STAT came to light among the ruins of a tricellar Etruscan temple which has been identified at the northern end of the hill. The document has been invoked in behalf of identifying Abbadia with the Roman Statonia. Signore Riccardo Mancinelli, an experienced explorer, whose headquarters are at Pitigliano, discovered and excavated the Etruscan cemetery and town-site, between 1895 and 1898. The locality was frequented at that period by a band of outlaws who had one of their safest refuges in the forest of Lamone, five miles across the river, and whose exploits were a recent memory when I visited this section of southern Tuscany in 1902. Seven complete tomb-outfits from Mancinelli's harvest of Etruscan antiquities on this spot were secured for the Phoebe.

A. Hearst collections at the University of California, in July of that year. Other specimens have found their way to the *Museo etrusco* in Florence, and to the Royal Museum of Berlin. Pellegrini and Boehlau have reported upon them in the *Giornale degli scavi* (1896, 1898), and in the *Jahrbuch des deutschen archaologischen Instituts* for 1902. Mancinelli's plans of the principal tomb-types, and his careful records of the conditions in which the leading varieties and shapes of sepulchral earthenware occur in this cemetery, and in other Etruscan cemeteries explored by him, increase the value for science, both of the tombs and of their contents. A door is opened to a more exact chronology than experts have ordinarily attempted.

Lantern illustrations from drawings and photographs, made at Pitigliano, were presented. They showed the variety of tomb plans and sections, the probable evolution of sepulchral architecture, and the principal classes of pottery as found in the pit, trench, lateral recess, simple and multiple chamber-tombs of Abbazia del Fiume. A coincident progress can be traced in the variation of tomb designs, and in the occurrence of special types of earthenware in tombs of shifting plan. Members of the Association and visitors verified these general indications on the morrow of the lecture, by a personal inspection of seven tomb-units from Abbazia, in the State University's temporary Museum of Anthropology. The seven Abbazia tombs are lettered A to G. They comprise 430 exhibits, of which 366 are specimens of plain and of decorated earthenware. Iron and bronze weapons and other utensils constitute most of the remnant. There is a predominance of iron over bronze. Bronze belt-buckles, frequently adorned with heads of horses, more rarely with little dogs, bronze bracelets, fragments of bronze bits, spear-heads and spear-shoes, knives and plowmen's hoes of both metals accompanied the bodies of men. Lighter bracelets, bronze fibulae of the leech-bow shape (*fibule a sanguisuga*), other bronze pins, reinforcements for wooden-soled Tyrrhenian sandals made of both metals, accompanied the bodies of women. Wine-goblets of heroic proportions and armies of normal wine-cups were buried with the men, sets of conical spinwhorls, of cylindrical and clubbed weaving-spools, were buried with the women, to help the shades of the dead realize the missions of their sexes in Hades. They are of terra-cotta. The absence of precious metal, amber, and ivory, in the Abbazia tombs, and their scant wealth, even of bronze, persuade us that sumptuary laws forbade the burial of costly objects with the dead more severely there than they did in other Etruscan cities. It is true that many tombs were surely pillaged in the sixteenth century, when the hill of Abbazia got its alternative name of Poggio Buco.

In the trench and lateral recess tombs the dead were laid with their heads to the west. Antique worshippers of Greece and Italy normally faced the rising sun. The faces of the dead would turn easiest as their feet lay.

Only one cremation tomb was discovered at Abbazia. It is a round pit (*tomba a pozzo*), and contained a cinerary urn with the customary footless, one-eared drinking vessel of coarse gray ware for cover. One cup of this type occurs in our plain trench-tomb A. Tomb D, a trench with two lateral recesses, has one with a foot. But the older rite of inhumation held its ground triumphantly. Our tomb B was a large trench-tomb, with one lateral recess for the occupant's body. Thirty-seven drinking vessels found in it include no example of the urn-lid type. Earless goblets of a finer gray ware, handsome gadrooned cups of

black composition with loop handles have taken its place. Earthenware stands accompany the gadrooned vessels. A little tumbler (*poculum*) of uncolored and unpolished clay is the earliest type of wine-cup in this tomb. Signore Mancinelli tells me he has found tumblers of this sort in Etruscan graves of every period, in Roman graves of the Republican and Imperial periods, in Christian graves of late Roman and of Lombard periods. Plain forms often survive advances of technique and changes of fashion and faith better than the ornate do. The early gray and *flambé* earthenware, polished by hand, — hardly sized with wax, as Boehlau supposes, — will presently develop, by gradual stages, into the so-called Etruscan *bucchero* pottery of finer composition and blacker hue. The uniform red firing of some pieces (*rosso rame*) was a development, like the uniform smoked blacks, of the earlier *flambés*. Prehistoric earthenware in Phrygian mounds, and the predynastic potteries of Egypt, offer examples of the same accidental effects followed by intentional bichrome and monochrome firings black and red.

The dominant class of pottery in the recessed and unrecessed trench-tombs, after the *bucchero italici*, is the indigenous imitation, interspersed with imported specimens, of the painted geometric patterns of prehistoric Greece. Is it true that these rectilinear patterns succeeded the earlier profusion of animal and floral and spiral motives, and to the richer ceramic palette of the Mycenaean styles, coincidentally with the Dorian invasion's overthrow of Achaean dynasties in the Peloponnesus? If so, we can assign the early popularity of Greek geometric potteries in Etruria, and the first reproductions of these Greek models by native kilns, to about 1000 B.C. Montelius has proposed an earlier, Boehlau a later date. Certain distinctly Etruscan amphibia, as painted on geometric ware from other Etruscan tombs, persuade me to describe most of the geometric make from Abbadia as native manufacture of perceptibly later period. An exquisite pink and orange skyphos with a trellis of delicate parallel lines, in Tomb B, is a manifest Greek importation. It is the counterpart of a specimen which Schliemann found in the ruins of Tiryns.

Broad and narrow horizontal stripes of black, brown, red, and purple alternate with friezes of straight and waved verticals, and of cross-hatched lozenges, on the coarser geometric ware. The vertical bars recall the triglyphs and metopes of a Doric frieze, by their alternate crowdings and blanks. The ground is oftenest the pink or yellow body of the clay. Some grounds are creamy white and pale buff.

Purely native patterns include two striking varieties. Small bowls and amphoras of brown clay, and of bulbous shapes, often show regularly distributed bars, squares, and triangles, and rectilinear decorations of opaque white. A close examination proves it to be oxide of lead. A still closer scrutiny discovers that the crocks were plated with laminae of metallic lead. Distributions of tiny, cup-like impressions served to hold the leaden plates tighter in place. Many big jars and a few drinking vessels of the same period wear singular patterns in applied relief. Vertical and horizontal bands alternate with systems of horseshoe ridges. These overarch the handles. Rams' heads and plainer protuberances, midway between the handles, are similarly arched, and appear to be a reminiscence of spouts. Paired and multiplied nipples recall the humanized jars and pitchers of Troy and Thera.

The geometric styles did not long survive the substitution of sepulchral chambers

for open trench-tombs. The native smoked ware of smooth finish did. Painted Corinthian pitchers, with round bellies and trilobate mouths, flat plates, low, bulbous cups with horizontal handles, globular and alabastroid flasks, superseded the Tuscan imitations of Greek geometric ware. The Corinthian polychrome effects, in buff, brown, black, purple, and white, the Greek style's painted processions of panthers and geese across flowered fields, contrast strangely, in the chamber-tombs, with the Etruscan potter's crude incised drawings of birds and fishes, on dark gray amphoras of silicious *bucchero*. Native imitations of the Corinthian forms in ivory-white clay remain rare enough to be classed as a tradesmanly experiment. A pearl-gray monochrome ware appears to resist the encroachment of the shiny black pottery for a moment. The black *bucchero* that is found in the tricameral tombs presently assimilates the Corinthian shapes. These shapes were themselves copies primarily of metallic forms. The latest of the Abbadia del Fiume tombs contain black Etruscan pitchers covered with blunt reliefs, like hammered metal. Their designs of petals, of walking men and women, of passant lions, are retouched with engraved lines. The two-chamber tomb, with an open trench between, has given place by this time to tricameral avenue-tombs. One avenue-tomb at Poggio Buco, the latest in order of rational development, shows a tandem arrangement of two chambers, separated by two pillars of rock. The burials at Abbadia stop short of the underground complexes which can be seen in other Etruscan cemeteries. The imported vases do not reach the red-figured style. Only one specimen of the black-figured style has been recorded. The terra-cotta friezes of the three cellas of the temple, on the crest of Poggio Buco, represent war-chariots, infantry, and wild animals, in late seventh-century or early sixth-century Greek style. All the later remains are Roman. We conclude that the crest and slopes of Abbadia del Fiume were vacated by its Etruscan burghers about 600 B.C.

THIRD SESSION.

The third session was called to order by Professor W. A. Merrill on Tuesday, December 29, at 9.30 A.M.

The Committee on Time and Place of the next Meeting reported through the Chairman, Professor Cooper, a recommendation that the Association meet for its sixth session, as heretofore, at the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art in San Francisco, on December 27, 28, and 29, 1904.

The question of the advisability of changing the time of meeting to some other season of the year having been raised, the report was received, but its final adoption was postponed, on motion of Professor Clapp, to the afternoon session.

The Committee appointed to audit the Treasurer's report announced through the Chairman, Mr. Mower, that the books had been examined and found exact.

The report was adopted.

The second Vice-president, Professor Goebel, of Leland Stanford Jr. University, was then called to the chair, while Professor Merrill read the first paper of this session.

6. Lucretiana, by Professor W. A. Merrill, of the University of California.

In this paper all the passages in Lucretius' poem where the name of Memmius occurs were examined, and the hypothesis was set up that all references to Memmius after i. 62 were due to a recasting of the poem in Memmius' honor, the work having previously been addressed to the general reader. An effort was made to show that spondaic and trochaic words, common in Lucretius' vocabulary, could easily have been withdrawn to make way for the word *Memmi* without changing the sense materially. Even in the more difficult passages, such as v. 8, the original form may have been *dicendum est, deus ille fuit, deus inclutus acer*, cf. i. 40, 66; iii. 10; and in v. 867 the earlier form was possibly *omnia denique sunt tutelae tradita nostrae*. In most cases a Lucretian substitute for *Memmi* may be made without disturbing the rest of the verse. Some remarks were made on ii. 1080, where doubt was expressed as to the propriety of the conjecture *Memmi*. The general conclusion reached was that the poem was written for the general reader who was not an Epicurean; that the poet prefixed an Introduction to the entire poem, mainly complimentary to Memmius; and that in a few places in the remainder of the poem he replaced spondaic or trochaic words by the noun *Memmi*. For some reason unknown he did not continue the revision throughout the poem.

This paper was discussed by Professors Clapp and Randall.

7. Cabala and Alchemy in Goethe's Faust, by Professor Julius Goebel, of Leland Stanford Jr. University.

Goethe's sources for the first soliloquy of Faust and the subsequent conjuration of the Earth-spirit are not to be found in the writings of Swedenborg (E. Schmidt, M. Morris), but in the alchemistic and cabalistic literature which Goethe studied, according to his own account, after returning from the University of Leipzig to Frankfurt. The revival of the study of Alchemy, Astrology, and the Cabala, which began during the latter part of the fifteenth century, had spread into all classes of society; in Goethe's immediate circle we find the family physician of his parents and Fräulein von Klettenberg devoted to this study. Despairing of human knowledge and believing in the possibility of obtaining an intuitive insight into the secrets of nature and of the deity, certain religious sects, such as the Pietists, the Moravians, and others, indulged in alchemistic and cabalistic speculations and practices. The oldest scenes of Goethe's Faust are the product of the spirit of these mystic movements of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to a degree much greater than of the spirit which found expression in the Faust story of the sixteenth century.

In connection with this fact it is significant that Faust's father, according to

Goethe, was an alchemist, and that young Faust assisted him in his alchemistic quackery, believing at the same time, like a "pietist," in the efficacy of prayer:

An Hoffnung reich, im Glauben fest,
Mit Thränen, Seufzen, Händering n
Dacht ich das Ende jener Pest
Vom Herrn des Himmels zu erzwingen.

Alchemistic and cabalistic terms and conceptions are frequent in Faust's soliloquy. The explanations of these, which were offered in the present paper, will be contained in the author's forthcoming edition of Goethe's Faust.

The paper was discussed by Professor Schilling.

The Committee on Nomination of Officers, originally named, being absent, the Chair appointed Professors Bradley, Randall, and Searles in their stead.

The Secretary presented the following resolution :

Every member desiring to read a paper at the annual meeting shall furnish the Secretary, not later than two weeks before the first session, with a short abstract of not more than two hundred and fifty words, outlining the argument and the conclusions of his study. These abstracts shall be printed on the programme for the purpose of allowing members to inform themselves about the nature of the papers, and forming a basis for discussion. The author shall also furnish the Secretary with an estimate of the length of time, not exceeding twenty minutes, which he wishes to occupy.

Upon the suggestion of the Chair, action on this resolution was postponed to the afternoon session.

8. On Hiatus in Greek Melic Poetry, by Professor E. B. Clapp, of the University of California.

This paper is printed in full in the first issue of the *Publications in Classical Philology* of the University of California. An abstract of a portion of the paper was printed in Vol. XXXIII of the *Proceedings*, under the title *Hiatus in Pindar*. The writer uses the term "hiatus" loosely to include all cases where a word ending in a vowel is followed immediately, in the same verse, by a word beginning with a vowel.

1. Hiatus due to the loss of *ϕ* occurs in Pindar about one-third as often as in Homer. The pronoun *οι* is the only word which regularly shows the influence of *ϕ*, both in Pindar and in the other melic poets. Less consistent are *ἀναξ*, *ἀδύς*, *ἐλπὶς*, *ἔπος*, *ἔργον*, *οἶδα*, *εἶδον*. Terpander and Alcman recognize *ϕ* almost as regularly as Homer. Alcaeus, Sappho, and Bacchylides show approximately the same usage as Pindar. Simonides exhibits few traces of *ϕ*, and Anacreon practically none. In a fragment of Timotheus we find *ἀκλέα* [*ϕ*] *ἔργα*, but in the *Persians* there is no instance of hiatus before a digammated word.

2. Hiatus after a diphthong or long vowel, with the metrical value of a short syllable, is frequent in all the melic poets. Correction in hiatus seems to have

originated with the diphthongs *-ai* and *-oi*, where it is best explained in accordance with the views of Grulich. From these it spread, with the assistance of certain dialectic forms of the genitive and dative endings of the first and second declensions, to the other diphthongs, and even to the long vowels. Grulich should have included the Boeotian dative in *-āi* in his discussion.

According to the older metric, correption in hiatus is practically confined to dactyls; but, if we accept the views of the new school, we must admit numerous cases of shortening in trochees and even in iambs. The writer has elsewhere¹ called attention to this fact as having an important bearing upon the whole metrical question.

3. Most of the instances of hiatus after a diphthong or a long vowel, with long quantity retained, may be explained as by Grulich. The evidence does not justify us in laying much weight on the effect of the dactylic ictus in explaining the hiatus.

4. Hiatus after a short vowel, or "illicit hiatus," scarcely occurs in melic poetry. Here, as in the other kinds of hiatus, the melic poets occupy a middle ground between the freedom of Homer and the extreme finish of the Attic tragedians, though their usage is, on the whole, nearer the latter than the former.

This paper was discussed by Professors Allen, Merrill, Fairclough, Emerson, and Noyes.

9. The Pronunciation of Gallic Clerical Latin in the Merovingian and Later Periods, by Professor C. C. Rice, of Leland Stanford Jr. University.

The chief sources utilized in the investigation were the following: (1) Latin spellings; (2) Old French spellings; (3) the forms of Old French loan-words; (4) the testimony of grammarians. The most important Merovingian spellings were found in the documents transcribed by Tardif in his *Monuments historiques de la France*. In doubtful cases the facsimiles of the Mss. (published by Letronne) were consulted. For the spelling of the Carolingian and later periods, some hundred volumes of cartularies were examined. The significance of the forms of Old French loan-words was pointed out by Paris (*Journal des savants*, 1900, pp. 294 ff., 356 ff.), who showed that a reform in the pronunciation of Latin must have taken place in the time of Charlemagne, when *i* and *ī* were phonetically identified in order to prevent the graphic confusion of *ī* and *ē*. It is generally assumed that the "correct" pronunciation of Latin was not affected by the operation of vulgar sound-laws; cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung in d. Stud. d. rom. Sprw.*, p. 83. This assumption will not explain the linguistic material of any period, and cannot be reconciled with established physiological principles. The learned pronunciation must have followed all the gradual vulgar sound-changes for long periods, after which it was subject to correction or reform. The spelling of early French monuments reflects faithfully the Latin pronunciation of French scribes, who naturally assigned to the letters of the alphabet the value

¹ In the *Classical Review* for October, 1904.

which they had in their Latin. The Strassburg Oaths (842), which, as is generally admitted, cannot belong to a southern region where free *d* remains *a* (note the neutral vowel in *fradre, fradra, fazet, suo part, sendra, Karlo, Karle, Karlus*) apparently show no trace of the important vowel-changes which are clearly attested in the *Eulalia* (881).

Latin source,	<i>d</i>	<i>ĕ</i>	<i>ĕ, ĭ</i>	<i>ō</i>	<i>ō, ŭ</i>
Symbol in 842,	<i>a</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>u</i>
Symbol in 881,	<i>e</i>	<i>ie</i>	<i>ei</i>	<i>uo</i>	<i>ou</i>

It is not clear that all the sounds from the same source are identical, for the reason that, although Paris assigns the monuments to the same region, the dialect of the Oaths is not established. In the case of nearly every vowel, however, surprise has been expressed at the apparently archaic phonology of the Oaths; note, for instance, *salvar, fradra; meus, sendra, er; sil, savir, podir; vol, poblo; amur, suo*. Paris and others consider the much-discussed *d* "a graphic expression of a sound which was no longer *a*." Many scholars also regard the *i* in *podir*, etc., as a reminiscence of the countless Merovingian spellings in which *i* had the same value as *ē* (cf. *habire, fedilis, ligebus, simet, fimena, deberimus*, etc.). It has never been shown that the scribe of the Oaths spoke a form of French different from that of the scribe of the *Eulalia*, in point of antiquity or of dialect; and all the peculiar spellings of the former seem to be due to the Merovingian pronunciation of Latin which, as was held by Paris, we should assume as the phonetic basis of this monument. No vowel-shift can be dated after 842 on the ground that the development is not indicated in the spelling of the Oaths. All the important vowel-developments (*a* > *e*, *ĕ* > *ei*, *ĕ* > *ie*, *ō* > *ou*, *ō* > *uo*) should be set back into Merovingian or earlier periods, although they naturally found no graphic expression until after the Carolingian reform. The correct pronunciation of the accented vowels in the eighth century was as follows: free *a* > *e*—a front vowel not identical with *e* < *i* nor with *e* < *ĕ*, but probably identical with the *e* < *d* in the *Eulalia*; checked *ĕ, ĭ* > *e*; free *ĕ, ĭ* > *ei*; free *ĕ* > *ie*; checked *ō, ŭ* > *o*; free *ō, ŭ* > *ou*; free *ō* > *uo*; *ū* > *ū* or *u* as in the vernacular. No account is here taken of nasalization, and cases in which no change occurred are not mentioned. The unaccented vowels seem to have followed the vulgar development to *ɔ*; cf. the English pronunciation of *domus, puellas*, with the same final vowel. After the Carolingian reform, the vowels, accented and unaccented, were sounded as follows: *a* = *a*; *ĕ, ĕ* = *e*; *ĭ, ĭ* = *i*; *ō, ō* = *o*; *ū, ŭ* = *ū* or *u*. The distinct articulation of post-tonic vowels made necessary a transfer of the accent to the ultima, where it has remained to this day. The reformed pronunciation did not remain fixed, but followed all the later French sound-changes step by step for long periods. At the time of the Renaissance, a new reform-movement changed the quality of certain vowels which had become nasal, and reintroduced consonants which had become silent in obedience to vulgar sound-laws; after which Latin was pronounced practically as it is pronounced in France nowadays.

The paper was discussed by Professor Matzke.

10. The Parodos of Sophocles' *Antigone*, by President B. I. Wheeler, of the University of California.

The choral passages of Sophocles, particularly in the *Antigone*, are distinguished by an elaborate harmonic arrangement of ideas and figures which, however delicately presented or suggested, betrays to careful inspection a highly conscious and almost artificial analysis. In marked contrast hereto, the current interpretations of the parodos of the *Antigone* yield a lack of balance in the ideas, a confusion of the imagery, and an absence of all unity of plan. The belief that all this is the fault of the interpretations and not of the parodos instigates the writing of this paper.

Leaving out of account the final anapaestic system, which heralds the appearance of Creon, the subject-matter of the ode proper is set forth in seven stanzas, four strophes (or antistrophes), with three alternating anapaestic systems. The first stanza (*i.e.* the first strophe) welcomes the beams of the rising sun, dispelling the terrors of the night, bringing peace to the battle-leagured town, — “fairest light that e’er shone on Thebes of the seven gates, at last hast thou appeared, O lid of golden day.” The seventh stanza (*i.e.* the second antistrophe) brings the echo hereto in the personal embodiment of Nike, who advances “smiling to greet Thebe of the many chariots,” appointing men to forget the battle and strife. In the first, the beams of the sun are driving the white-shielded Argive foe “a headlong fugitive, prodding him on with ever tightening bit.” In the last, Nike, as counterpart and exponent of the gladsome sun, sends the folk of Thebes in festal procession to the temples of their gods. The ἦλθε Νίκα repeats the ἀκτίς ἀελίου μολοῦσα, as the τᾶ πολυαρμάτων ἀντιχαρῆσα Θήβα reflects τὸ κάλλιστον ἔπταπύλῳ φανέν Θήβα.

Framed between these two stanzas, which reveal the spiritual attitude of the song and yield the atmosphere of the picture, — which voice the exceeding joy of light out of darkness, and of victory out of impending defeat, — stands the body of the ode, the five central stanzās, which tell the story of the battle itself. The battle is presented in its three phases — the onslaught of the foe, the even-matched struggle, the sudden discomfiture and rout of the Argive at the moment when his triumph seemed sure. The story is not told, however, as a continuous narrative, but is fashioned rather as a thrice-told tale. Stanzas two and three tell it all, — onslaught, struggle, and rout, — under the figure of the conflict between the white-winged eagle and the serpent. Then stanzas four and five tell it again, — onslaught, struggle, and rout, — but under another figure, and introduce the second tale as an explanation or epexegetis of the first. Of this epexegetis the particle γάρ, of line 127, is the symbol. Thereupon again stanza six begins the tale, this time without figure and in the directer language of fact: “For seven captains at the seven gates arrayed, equals matched against equals,” but again introducing it as epexegetis of the preceding with the particle γάρ of line 141. Three times under three forms or figures the onslaught has been set forth, each time with use of an anapaestic system.

The third form of the statement, namely that of stanza six, which, as we have seen, reaches at last the plain language of fact, lays its stress on the even matching of strength against strength, man against man; it is “seven against seven,” “equal against equal”; yea, with one of the pairs, the contest is even matched to the extent of πατρός ἐνὸς μητρὸς τε μιᾶς, and therefrom arises no issue of victory; with them the battle remains drawn; forever evenly matched (δικρατεῖς . . . κοινοῦ . . . ἀμφῶ). For the others there is a decision, as shown by the πάγχαλκα

τέλη, the symbols and prizes of victory (cf. Pindar, *Olym.* 11, 67; *Isthm.* 1, 27) left in the hands of the arbiter Zeus.

Returning now to the first form of the story, that contained in stanzas two and three, I believe there can be no doubt that the imagery suggested by the words is that of a self-consistent picture, namely, the picture of a contest between the eagle representing Argos and the serpent representing Thebes. The Thebans are the *δρακοντογενεῖς*. The eagle comes from without—flies over to the land. It comes in noisy and defiant onset, shrill screaming (*δέξα κλάζων*), for lo, it was from out of the wrangling strifes of Polyneikes that it had taken wing. Over the snake as genius of the place and symbol of home, over the roof-trees of Thebes (*ὑπὲρ μελάθρων*) it poises itself, and its blood-thirsting beak yawns before the seven-gated mouth of its prey. But before it could glut its jaws with Theban blood,—before Hephaestus could lay his grip on the coronet of towers,—it was gone, scared away by the din that Ares raised.¹ That the imagery of metaphor is here, and that it is presented according to a self-consistent picture, there can be no doubt; but it is only a pattern glimmering through the fabric, sketched in golden threads. So we shall find it to be in the second form of the story, though there the pattern is still more dimly sketched.

This second form of the story is presented in stanzas four and five. The parallelism with the first form, *i.e.* stanzas two and three, is unmistakable. The onset of the antagonist is loud and defiant; there are the “boasts of a haughty tongue” (*μεγάλης γλώσσης κόμπους*), “the pride of rattling gold” (*χρυσοῦ καναχῆς ὑπεροπλίας*), “the snorting blasts of hostile winds” (*ἐπέπνει ριπαῖς ἐχθίστων ἀνέμων*). Defeat overwhelms the foe just as he is “hasting to raise the cry of victory” (*νικην ὀρμῶντ’ ἀλαλάξαι*). Zeus is here, too, the arbiter, the supreme *βραβεύς*, whose will allots defeat and victory. “*Ἡφαιστον* (l. 123) returns as the *πυρφόρος* (l. 135). Ares appears as the helper of Thebes at the crisis; *μέγας Ἄρης δεξιόσειρος* at the end of stanza five echoes and exactly parallels the *πάταγος Ἄρεος* at the end of stanza three. Of the picture of eagle and serpent there is, however, no longer a trace; that, having served its purpose, has faded away, and another takes its place. The scene shifts to the stadion, and the contest assumes the form of the four-horse chariot race. We can hear the shouts of the charioteer in the lead, the rattle and clank of harnesses and trappings, the snort of the steeds. Already the foremost chariot is making the last turn to the goal *βαλβίδων ἐπ’ ἄκρων*, and its driver is impatient to raise the claiming cry of victory (*νικην ὀρμῶντ’ ἀλαλάξαι*), when the competing team, in which great Ares is the right trace-horse (*δεξιόσειρος*), surges against him, and, pushing him and his aside (*στυφελίζων*), hurls him from his car to the earth (*ἀντιτύπα δ’ ἐπι γῆ πέσε τανταλωθεῖς*), and scatters all in confusion and ruin (*εἶχε δ’ ἄλλα τὰ μὲν, ἄλλα δ’ ἐπ’ ἄλλοις ἐπένωμα*).

That the effect of the picture lingers on, even in the seventh stanza, is betrayed by the appearance of Nike advancing with smiles of congratulation to meet the victorious Thebes, Thebe of the many chariots. It is not a Nike like that of Paeonius which the poet has here in mind, but the type familiar to us from the vase-paintings, the cupid-like Nike who, with the fillet as badge of victory in her

¹ We can scarcely avoid the conviction that *δυσχείρωμα* (l. 126) was coined to echo *στεφάνωμα* (l. 122); through the din raised by the fighters on the towers the *στεφάνωμα* became the eagle’s *δυσχείρωμα* (*στεφανῶ : χερῶ*) instead of its easy prey.

hand, flits down to greet and decorate the victorious charioteer (*e.g.* Reinach, *Peintures*; Millin, Pl. II, 60; II, 72; cf. also Millin, I, 43, 45, and Baumeister, *Denkmäler*, fig. 2137; Panofka, *Cabinet Pourtalès*, Pl. 33; *Arch. Zeit.* 1867, Pl. 226).

If the interpretation here offered for stanzas four and five may appear from internal evidences possible and even probable, it is raised to what we must consider a demonstrated certainty, as certainty goes in things so human as these, by reference to the full-drawn picture of the four-horse chariot race of the Pythian games, which the same artist has left us for comparison in the pages of the *Electra* (ll. 696-760). The two passages differ in their character, and especially in their use of scenes and incidents taken from the chariot race, as widely as in their date of composition. One uses the material delicately in suggestive metaphor and as decoration; the other introduces it directly in narration. And yet it appears, if our interpretation of stanzas four and five be correct, that in both similar features and similar incidents dominate the poet's attention as characteristic of the event. There is the shout of the drivers and the clatter of the cars; "And all with one accord shouted at their horses, and shook the reins with both hands; the whole course was filled with the din of clattering cars." And there is the snorting of the horses as they come on; "And all in confused mass plied their goads and spared not, each that he might pass the wheels of his rivals and the snorting of their steeds, for alike at their backs and at their advancing wheels the breath of the horses foamed and cast its spray." Here, too, the right trace-horse (*δεξιόσειρος*), as *δεξιὸν σειραῖον ἵππον*, plays a distinguished part, though mentioned, I believe, nowhere outside of these two passages in all Greek literature. Here, too, chariots collide and are scattered in ruin about, "till the whole arena of Crisa was strewn with the wreck of chariots." And then at the last, and as the supreme incident, just as the foremost driver was making the last turn to the goal with victory all but in his grasp, he is thrown from his car with all the swing of the Antigone's *ταρταλωθείς* and dashed to the ground (cf. *ἀντιτύπη δ' ἐπὶ γῆ, Antigone*, 134).

This paper was discussed by Professors Fairclough, Emerson, and Merrill.

FOURTH SESSION.

The Fourth Session was called to order at 2.30 P.M., by Professor Merrill, in the lecture room of the Museum of the Department of Anthropology, of the University of California, in the Affiliated Colleges in San Francisco.

The Committee on Nomination of Officers for the ensuing year made the following nominations:

President, W. A. Merrill, University of California.

Vice-Presidents, J. Goebel, Leland Stanford Jr. University.

E. B. Clapp, University of California.

Secretary and Treasurer, J. E. Matzke, Leland Stanford Jr. University.

Executive Committee, The above-named officers and
H. R. Fairclough, Leland Stanford Jr. University.
A. F. Lange, University of California.
J. E. Church, Jr., University of Nevada.
H. K. Schilling, University of California.

On motion of Professor Clapp, the report was adopted, and the Secretary was instructed to cast the ballot of the Association for the gentlemen as nominated.

The question of time and place of the next meeting was then called up again, and after some discussion it was voted not to make any change, and to adopt the recommendation of the committee, that the sixth annual meeting be held on December 27, 28, and 29, 1904, at the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art, as heretofore.

The resolution of the Secretary affecting the form of the programme, was called up, and after reading and discussion, was adopted on motion of Professor Bradley.

11. A Neglected Source of Corneille's *Horace*, by Professor J. E. Matzke, of Leland Stanford Jr. University.

The paper has appeared in full in *Modern Philology*, I, pp. 345-354. It was discussed by Professor Clapp.

12. Influence of Greek and Roman Art on Vergil, by Professor H. R. Fairclough, of Leland Stanford Jr. University.

This paper, to be published elsewhere in full, was prompted by a recent visit to the principal European museums of Greek and Roman art. It presented in outline a study of the influence of earlier or contemporary art upon Vergil, as seen in his descriptions, mythology, similes, and otherwise.

This paper was discussed by Professors Merrill, Goebel, and Emerson.

13. Numeral Systems of the Native Languages of California, by Dr. A. L. Kroeber, of the University of California.

The numeral systems of the many and often unrelated Indian languages of California show great variability. Frequently the numeral words of two closely kindred dialects differ in great part. This is due to the fact that the numerals above three are often compound or derivative words, descriptive of an arithmetical process, and that quite different processes are sometimes followed even by cognate languages. Besides the more common quinary, decimal, and vigesimal modes of counting, there are frequent traces of a quaternary method, and one numeral system of Northern California is quaternary throughout. Other processes that occur in the formation of numerals are subtraction, duplication, and

multiplication. The variety of the systems found proves that there is no necessary or even usual relation of the quinary and vigesimal methods, as opposed to the decimal; quinary-decimal and decimal-vigesimal systems occur. Though numeral systems, visibly descriptive of the process of counting, have usually been considered undeveloped, so far as known the systems of all the languages of California extend into the hundreds. Phonetic analogy exerts considerable influence, the words for two and three being often similar. On account of the diversity of structure of the numerals, they are of less value in California, for determining linguistic affinity, than is usually the case.

This paper was discussed by President Wheeler, Professor Clapp, and Mr. Goddard.

The meeting was then adjourned at 4.15 P.M., and the remainder of the afternoon was spent in an examination of the collection of Etruscan, Greek, and Peruvian antiquities of the Museum.

FIFTH SESSION.

The Fifth Session was called to order by Professor Merrill at the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art at 9.45 A.M.

14. Notes on Chapter XII of Plutarch's *Life of Pericles*, by Professor W. S. Ferguson, of the University of California.

This paper appears in full in the TRANSACTIONS.

It was discussed by Professor Clapp.

15. Word-Accent in Latin Verse, by Dr. B. O. Foster, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University. The author having been called to his home, the paper was read by title.

16. The Study of English Etymology during the Seventeenth Century, by Professor Ewald Flügel, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

The author characterized briefly the etymological remarks in Camden, Verstegan, Selden, Howell, Sir Thomas Browne, Fuller, and the earlier Lexicographers from Minsheu to Somner. He dwelt more fully on Casaubon, *De lingua Saxonica* (1650), and Passeratius, *De literarum inter se cognatione ac permutatione* (1650), an essay containing a number of observations which make him a forerunner of Jacob Grimm. Stephen Skinner (died in 1667; *Etymologicon* published after his death in 1671) stands highest among the etymologists of the seventeenth century; he is the first systematic etymologist who works with the idea of etymological laws (which were ridiculed by Casaubon, and not recognized by Junius). His *Prolegomena* contain in their *Canones Etymologici* the first methodical equations for the sound changes (of *a* into *o*, *cg* into *dg*, *d* into *th*, etc.). Skinner is

the first to recognize the facts of a history of the changes of meaning and of popular etymology (*voces exterae cum in nostram linguam transeunt saepe per errorem vulgi propinquitate soni decepti, mirificis terminationibus ex sermone nostro depromptis donantur*). His great fault is the lack of application of his *Canones* in the articles of the Etymological Dictionary. Even if he is freer from the habit of introducing Greek etyma than Casaubon before him, or Junius after him, he falls constantly into the mistake of all the seventeenth-century etymologists of not being satisfied with establishing the relationship of a word with the nearest related language, but of trying to hunt his words through half a dozen remote languages, adding from each one a new fantastic etymon, so that the *vel's* and *sive's* become numberless.

Franciscus Junius was a great pathfinder in other fields than etymology. Here he was not in advance of his time. The idea of a law, of a necessary mutation of sounds according to certain fixed principles, was yet foreign to him, and is scarcely traceable in George Hickes' *Institutiones*, 1689.

This paper was discussed by Professor Merrill.

17. The Construction of Juvenal, Satire I, by Professor J. E. Church, Jr., of the University of Nevada.

In the absence of the author, the paper was read by Professor Elmore.

Regarding the date, original form, and coherence of Juvenal, Satire I, considerable diversity of opinion still exists.

An analysis of the satire in question reveals two facts: first, that this satire is purely introductory in purpose, and second, that it is largely argumentative in style. The method of argument is, however, peculiar, since it consists of a series of word-pictures — after the style of modern newspaper cartoons — accompanied by rhetorical questions to present and enforce the argument. This argument advances consecutively from beginning to end, although at one point the transition is abrupt, and the latter part of the satire unduly extended by a digression.

These statements may be best illustrated by an outline of the satire :

Exordium, vs. 1-21 :

1. Shall I always be a listener merely, though tormented by wearisome and worn-out themes? 1-14.
2. I too have had an education and it is foolish when you meet so many poets everywhere to spare paper that will surely go to waste, 15-18.
3. But I shall be a satirist, and if you have the time, I'll tell you why, 19-21.

Confirmatio, 22-146 :

1. I am overwhelmed with living examples of prosperous incapacity and successful villainy, 22-80.
2. The scope of my activity shall be *all* the extremes of human life known since the Flood, 81-86; for when were vices more abundant or more extreme? 87-146.

Peroratio, 147-171:

Vice has reached its climax. Now's the time to make the effort of one's life.

To pass into detail, it will be seen that the author's main purpose is to defend his choice of a career as a satirist, and to discuss briefly the scope and method of his work. The tone of the poet is declamatory, rather than epistolary, and the public is his audience. The argument broadly follows the lines of the simpler orations of classical times, while refutations of supposed objections freely occur.

The *exordium* is skilfully wrought out. The "sarcastic indignation" with which he attacks the wearisome tribe of poets and declaimers, and threatens to turn poet in self-defence, wins attention for the new aspirant and a keen desire to hear him further. He ends his *exordium* by declaring his intention to specialize in satire.

In the *confirmatio* the impetuosity of his indignation increases until it reaches its climax at v. 80, when it comes to an abrupt close. This effort is made up of a series of outbursts, each more indignant than the preceding, and occasioned by a series of scenes, each group of which is more exasperating than the one before. To illustrate again by an outline of the verses in question, but with the class substituted for the person:

1. (a) When a eunuch marries, 22,
(b) and women have lost their pristine modesty, 22-23,
(c) and money is preferred to ancestry, 24-25,
(d) and slaves have become insufferable dudes, 26-29,
— it is difficult not to write satire.
2. For who is so tolerant and emotionless that he could restrain himself at sight of
(a) disgusting pettifoggers, 32-33,
(b) informers and betrayers, 33-36,
(c) and men who earn their legacies at night ? 37-39.
Digression in illustration, 40-44.
3. Why tell how my blood boils at the arrogance of
(a) successful betrayers of innocent wards, 46-47,
and the defeat of justice by
(b) the betrayers of a public trust ? 47-48.
Digression in illustration, 49-50.

The outburst now takes the form of a *refutatio*. The intensity increases and the illustrations, although chosen at random, have been selected, with one exception, from the worst class of offenders, viz., from the criminal and very immoral.

4. Do I not consider such themes unworthy of Horace? Not treat them, but rather tales of Hercules and the winged carpenter ! 51-54,
(a) when the adulteress' husband inherits the property of her paramour, if she be debarred, 55-57,
(b) and the young sport is permitted to look forward to an army captaincy, 58-62.
One feels impelled to choose more modern subjects and write them up in full when
(c) the luxurious forger rides by in state, 64-68,
(d) and the influential husband-poisoner confronts you, 69-72.

Rhetorical outburst : Do something worthy of the penitentiary if you wish to be anybody, 73-76.

Who can rest in the presence of

(e) the seducer,

(f) betrothed maidens ruined,

(g) and adulterers in their teens! 77-78.

If nature refuses, indignation will write as best it can, — such verse as *I* write, or Cluivienus.

The central thought which binds this portion of the *confirmatio* together and gives it unity is the overwhelming awfulness of human perversity, which compels one to cry out against it. The external evidence of this unity is the arrangement in order of climax of rhetorical outbursts, as for example, "it is difficult not to write satire," "who is so emotionless that he could restrain himself," "my blood boils," and "if nature refuses, indignation will write." Furthermore, in one place a transitional particle is employed, while the *refutatio*, which forms an organic part of this climax, is skilfully employed to relieve the strain of the long recital of examples, and yet to increase their cumulative effect. The short epigrammatic digressions in illustration and the rhetorical outburst, 73-76, need no defence.

There are some exceptions to the increasing emphasis from our point of view, but not from Juvenal's; yet these are few. The allusion to Matno, the pettifogger, in class 2, instead of class 1, is probably due to Matho's trickiness, together with his disgusting physique. That the latter was in large measure the reason, is shown by Juvenal's ready eye for corpulent individuals. (See 2. 141, 8. 147, 12. 11.) The mention of the young sport looking forward to an army captaincy, 58-62, in connection with things morally black, is strong evidence of a biased judgment on the part of Juvenal. He seems to have been disappointed in his military ambition and to have magnified his wrongs.

Verses 77-78: "Who can rest for thought of the seducer who plays on his daughter-in-law's greed, of betrothed girls ruined, and adulterers in their teens?" on the ground of distortion have been attacked by Teuffel, who was inclined to consider them, or the preceding rhetorical outburst, as a later insertion. Though Juvenal is open to the charge of unnecessary diffuseness, still no one would charge him with great lack of judgment for placing unnatural moral depravity at the climax of his recital of vice.

The portion of the satire beginning with verse 81 is more moderate in tone and abounds in reminiscent digression. The first verses are abrupt. For these reasons, the unity of the poem and the integrity of the text have been assailed.

Pearson and Strong (*Thirteen Satires of Juvenal*, 1892) suggest that "the author had written two different prefaces at various times, and had then decided to weld them together." The difficulty in the way of this interpretation is that the two introductions referred to are in no particular alike, and furthermore that the second half of the satire is supplementary to the first. Even if verses 81-146, *i.e.* the second half of the *confirmatio*, as they propose, were inserted into the poem at a later date, the unity of the whole was thereby in no wise impaired. If, however, any portion were inserted at a later date, I should be inclined to suggest verses 81-86; for with verse 87 the argument ending at verse 80 is resumed. But such concession is scarcely necessary, in view of Juvenal's tendency to state

general truths which lead skilfully back to the main theme (Vahlen, *Ind. lect. aest.*, Univ. Berlin, 1884), and the frequent instances of abrupt, and even awkward transitions found in his works, as 7. 36, 13. 86, and others.

The earliest date at which this book was published seems according to all evidence to be 100 A.D. The latest date, however, has not been so unanimously agreed upon. Friedländer has proposed a date between the years 112 and 116, in order that this book may not be separated from Book ii by a longer interval than that which separates the other books of Juvenal's satires. F. Haverfield, quoted by Wilson, *Juvenal*, p. xii, n. 1, on the other hand, thinks that these poems, which "reek of Domitian's reign," were published soon after 100 A.D. The real difficulty in the way of assigning a date much later than 100, was pointed out by Lewis, in his translation of Juvenal as early as 1882; namely, that Juvenal could not have mentioned "informers" and "accusers" after Trajan "had put an end to their nefarious trade," a thing that must have occurred before the delivery of Pliny's Panegyric, or at least before its present revision was published.

This argument should receive greater consideration in view of the fact that Juvenal ceases entirely his references to the acts of Domitian in the other books of his satires.

Though the time allowed for writing is quite short, yet it is possible, by assuming that the first satire was written last, or that the statement regarding Marius was a later insertion, to place the publication of Book i before Trajan proceeded against the informers. The long interval that would in that case elapse before 116 A.D., when the second book was published, may have been employed, as the poet's earlier life had been, in declaiming.

This paper was discussed by Professors Flügel, Merrill, and Elmore.

18. *Cretati pedes*, by Dr. Charles J. O'Connor, of the University of California.

The paper was an attempt to account for the practice of whitening the feet of slaves who were imported and sold in the markets at Rome, a custom which is referred to in Tibullus 2. 3. 60, Ovid, *Amores*, 1. 8. 64, and Juvenal 1. 111. The theory proposed is that the chalk and gypsum were applied to the feet and legs of slaves as remedies for ulcers and other ailments which were induced or aggravated by the hardships of confinement. It seems that only newly imported slaves had their feet whitened. There are numerous passages in Celsus and Pliny the Elder which show that diseases of the feet played an important part in Roman medical practice. Instances are given of diseases of this nature introduced into Italy from other countries. The crowding on shipboard, the use of fetters, the salt water, must have affected the feet and legs considerably. In Celsus and Pliny there are many passages which indicate that Roman physicians considered chalk and gypsum valuable therapeutic agents, employing them frequently in the treatment of ulcers. Although these may not have possessed great healing properties, they would have formed a protecting crust when applied to a sore, and thus might have afforded relief and prevented the spread of the disease.

Adjourned at 11.45 A.M.

PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC COAST

The Sixth Annual Meeting was held in San Francisco at the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art on December 27, 28, and 29, 1904.

SAN FRANCISCO, December 27, 1904.

The meeting was called to order on Tuesday, December 27, at 2 P.M., by the President, Professor W. A. Merrill, of the University of California.

The Secretary read his report.

The Report of the Finances of the Association, presented next, was as follows:—

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, Dec. 27, 1903	\$30.10
Annual dues and Initiation fees	240.00
	<hr/>
	\$270.10

EXPENDITURES.

Sent to Professor Smyth, June 25, 1904	\$214.97
Postage and expressage	15.30
Printing	23.00
Incidentals50
	<hr/>
Total	\$253.77
Balance on hand, Dec. 26, 1904	16.33
	<hr/>
	\$270.10

The Chair then appointed the following committees:—

Nomination of Officers: Professors Murray, Bradley, and Ferguson.

Time and Place of Next Meeting: Professors Chambers, Elmore, and Mr. Mower.

Treasurer's Report: Professors Margolis, Searles, and Mr. Burrill.

The reading and discussion of papers was then begun.

1. On *Iliad* IX, 334-343, by Professor A. T. Murray, Leland Stanford Jr. University.

In the great speech in which Achilles declares his refusal to accept Agamemnon's overtures and his scorn of his gifts, occurs the well-known passage (I, 334-343), the most splendid outburst in the whole impassioned speech.

For poetic quality and force the passage has commanded universal admiration.

One thing only calls for comment : Achilles speaks of Briseis, the captive slave, as his *ἄλοχος*. Objecting to this, some of the older editors altered the punctuation, putting a period, or at least a semicolon, after *εἶλετ'*, and in this they have been followed by Cauer, van Leeuwen and da Costa, Leaf in his second edition, and, most recently, Ludwich.

We may first say frankly, in the light of what we know of the Heroic Age, that Briseis certainly was not the *ἄλοχος* of Achilles. That word properly denotes a wedded wife, and she was an alien and a captive. She had been given to him by the Greeks as a prize of valor, as his share of the spoil. She was a chattel, according to the ethics of the age (see II, 57), and Achilles himself speaks contemptuously of her in T, 58, asking Agamemnon if it had been worth while for them to engage in strife *ἔνεκα κόρης*, for a mere girl's sake, — words which are put into the mouth of Agamemnon, B, 377. More than this ; Agamemnon offers to give to Achilles any one of his own daughters in marriage (I, 144 ff., 286 ff.), and Achilles speaks of taking a wife on his return to Phthia (I, 393 ff.).

Yet there are other aspects of the case. This very fact that Achilles is unwedded proves that Briseis does not occupy the position of a *παλλακίς* beside a lawful wife. If she did, we may say that the word *ἄλοχος* could not possibly be used of her. Again we must note the deep and mutual affection existing between the two. This is manifest in A, 348 ff., and especially in the passage before us. We may refer also to T, 282 ff. Now, because of this love of Achilles for Briseis, she holds a place different from that of the other captive women (*δμῶαι*, Σ, 28). This is seen plainly if Ω, 643 be contrasted with Ω, 675 ff. Here the *ἔταροι* and *δμῶαι* are bidden to wait on Priam and the herald, and to make beds for them without in the corridor. Achilles naturally sleeps in the *μυχός* of the house, and Briseis at her lord's side. This is the place that is hers. The language used is closely parallel with that applied to Alcinous and Arete (η, 346 f.), to Menelaus and Helen (δ, 304 f.), to Zeus and Hera (A, 611). This is only in part weakened by the fact that very similar language is used of Achilles and Diomed (I, 663 ff.). In that case there is no hint that Diomed occupies a place hers by recognized right ; there is no contrast between her and the other *δμῶαι*, no suggestion that she is beloved by Achilles. These facts account for the use of the epithet *θυμαρέα* in the passage under consideration. Besides κ, 362, where it is used of the bath, it occurs, ψ, 232, of Penelope : —

κλαῖε δ' ἔχων ἄλοχον θυμαρέα, κεδνὰ ἰδύϊαν.

We are, therefore, justified in using a strong equivalent in translating.

The passage is clearly interpreted by the scholiasts and by Eustathius : *ἠδῆσσε τὴν ὕβριν ἄλοχον αὐτὴν εἰπὼν καὶ θυμαρέα.*

With this the following lines are in complete accord. Cauer, *Rheinisches Museum*, XLIV, 357, finds the passage incoherent, so that an analysis may be permitted. The sense of the wrong done him leads Achilles to utter the bitter words *τῇ παραύων τερπέσθω*. He has given up Briseis ; Agamemnon may keep her ; but these words show the impossibility of a reconciliation. Great as was his love for Briseis, his wrath against Agamemnon is greater ; he will not be appeased by her return. Similarly in T there is no reconciliation ; there a new and vaster passion, the thirst for vengeance for his fallen friend, fills his soul. To this, even his hatred of Agamemnon is subordinated. "But," he goes on, "why must the

Argives war against the Trojans? Why has he marshalled and brought hither a host, this son of Atreus? Was it not for fair-tressed Helen's sake? Do they then, alone of mortal men, love their wives, the sons of Atreus? Nay, since whoso is a good man and of right mind loves and cherishes his own, even as I, too, loved *her* with all my heart, captive of my spear though she was." For comment we need go no further than the scholiast on vs. 339: *εἰ μὲν γὰρ μικρὸν ἡγείται τὸ ἀδικηθῆναι περὶ γυναῖκα, πολεμῆν οὐκ ἔδει περὶ Ἑλένης . . . εἰ δὲ χαλεπὸν καὶ μέγα, πῶς ἄπερ παθῶν ὑπ' ἄλλοφύλων ἀγανακτεῖ, ταῦτα εἰς τοὺς φίλους ποιῶν οὐκ ἀδικεῖν νομίζει;*

The passage is one of great power. It is the rhetoric of passion; and it is this passion that justifies the employment of the word *ἄλοχος*.

We turn now to the altered punctuation. A full stop is put after *εἶλετ'*. The following passage then means: "He has a *wife*, the darling of his heart; let him have joy of *her*, not rob another of his prize—a slave-girl." In regard to this, I note the following points: (1) The splendid rhetoric, the passion is gone. This is, of course, no argument, if the old interpretation is philologically untenable, the new philologically sound. (2) We are asked to refer the phrase *ἄλοχον θυμαρέα* to Clytemnestra,—to her, concerning whom Agamemnon had publicly said that he preferred the captive Chryseis (A, 113). This may, of course, be said with irony, and may refer back to Agamemnon's words in A; but Cauer's further suggestion that mention of Clytemnestra is needed to lead up to the mention of Helen seems to me based upon a misapprehension. (3) The phrase *τῇ παριαύων τερπέσῳ* also refers, on this interpretation, to Clytemnestra. Yet she is in Argos, and has been there these nine years past, so that the words, thus read, are, at best, an empty mockery. (4) The sacrifice of so much of the force and spirit of the passage is wholly in vain. Even if we read it thus, Achilles still speaks of Briseis as his *ἄλοχος*. This is inherent in the argument; it cannot be eliminated. "If *they* love their wives, do not I love mine?" Leaf, a staunch advocate of the altered punctuation, is, in his note on 339, honest almost to the point of *ναϊνελέ*, "i.e. were we not brought hither on account of a stolen wife by one that is himself a wife-stealer?"—a paraphrase that virtually admits the identification which he so strenuously denies.

Finally I add some notes on the use of the word *ἄλοχος*. This, with *ἄκοιτις*, *παράκοιτις*, *δάμαρ*, *θαρ* (rarely), and very often *γυνή*, is regularly used in the meaning, *wife*. The corresponding masculines are *ἄκοιτης* and *παρακοιτης*, with *ἄνθρωπος* and *πόσις*. *ἄνθρωπος* and *γυνή* are so common in other than these special meanings that they hardly concern us here. There are in Homer more than one hundred and fifty occurrences of these feminine words (omitting *γυνή*). They all denote properly a wedded wife; with *ἄλοχος*, in particular, the epithets *κουριδίη* and *μνηστή* often occur. Further, it should be observed that *ἄλοχος*, *ἄκοιτις*, and *παράκοιτις*, with the two masculines *ἄκοιτης* and *παρακοιτης*, are virtually etymological equivalents: *ἡ μετέχουσα τῆς κοίτης τοῦ ἀνδρός*. There is nothing to denote that the union is a lawful one.

The ethics of the Heroic Age regarded union of an irregular character, with captives *e.g.*, as a matter of course. The injured wife might object (Aesch. *Ag.* 1438 ff.), though she did not always. Two remarkable passages, Soph. *Trach.* 445-449 and 459 ff. and Eur. *Andr.* 222 ff., point to the contrary. But for a woman standing in this relation to one of the princes, *Homer has no fixed term*.

The word *παλλακίς* occurs but thrice (I, 449 and 452, and ξ, 203), always denoting a concubine, as contrasted with a lawful wife. We have, of course, *δούλη* and *δμψαί*, but these words have no special reference to the relationship which we are considering.

It will be seen at a glance, therefore, that in speaking of Briseis, Homer was practically forced to use one of the words normally denoting wife; she was no mere *παλλακίς*.

ἄλοχος beyond question denotes properly a wedded wife. It is contrasted with *δούλη*, Γ, 409 (cf. Eur. *Andr.* Fr. 132 N²), with *παλλακίς*, ξ, 202. It appears as a synonym of *ἄκοιτις*, I, 399, and *ἄκοιτις* is contrasted with *παλλακίς*, I, 450. The following passages, however, suffice to show that we are entirely justified in claiming a certain laxity in the use of these words. Save the doubtful instance, δ, 623 (where Eustathius has *παραχρώμενος τῇ λέξει*), we shall find no case of *ἄλοχος* applied to a slave; but it will appear that these terms are applied to those who cannot strictly be called lawful wives.

Helen is, past question, the lawful wife of Menelaus (*κουριδίη ἄλοχος*, Η, 392, Ν, 626, *παρακοιτις*, Γ, 53). Yet she speaks of herself as the *ἄκοιτις* of Paris, Ζ, 350; the poet so speaks of her, Γ, 447; and Paris calls her his *ἄλοχος*, Ζ, 337. We may pass over the fact that she was to be the *ἄκοιτις* of the victor, Γ, 138, but if she is herself the *ἄλοχος* of Paris, and the word is restricted to this meaning, how can she say to Aphrodite, —

εἰς ὃ κέ σ' ἡ ἄλοχον ποιήσεται ἢ ὃ γε δούλην (Γ, 409) ?

So, too, we must note her attitude toward her union with Paris, as seen in her better moments (Γ, 410 ff.).

Hera is constantly called the *ἄλοχος* and *παρακοιτις* of Zeus, nor will any one question her right to the title. Yet in λ, 580, this title is given to Leto, and in Φ, 498 f., Hermes says to Leto that he will not fight with her : —

*ἀργαλέον γὰρ
πληκτίζεσθ' ἀλόχοισι Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο.*

So in Soph. *Trach.* 1149, Alcmena is called the *ἄκοιτις* of Zeus.

In ε, 118 ff., Calypso uses *ἄκοιτις* of mortal men beloved by goddesses, meaning Odysseus in her own case.

There remain in Homer two important passages: Τ, 298, and δ, 623. The latter is almost certainly spurious. In the former, Patroclus is said by Briseis to have promised to make her the *κουριδίη ἄλοχος* of Achilles. This has, of course, disturbed many. Yet we are dealing with the words of the kindest of Homer's heroes, who is attempting to console a desolate woman. What wonder that he promises more than he can perform? (Lang).

Many interesting passages could be adduced concerning similar extensions of meaning in the case of *γάμος* or *γάμοι*, of *νυμφίος*, etc., of *πόσις*, of *σύνευνος*, and so on; but the Homeric instances adduced above suffice. Interesting, too, are many passages in drama, notably the portrayal of Tecmessa in the *Ajax*, and Teucer's proud defence of his mother — a princess, yet a captive and a slave.

The paper was discussed by Professor Clapp.

2. Athenian Politics in the Early Third Century before Christ, by Professor W. S. Ferguson, University of California.

The result of this investigation is that between 301 and 295, and again in 276/5 ff., an oligarchy friendly to Macedon had control of the Athenian government.

The chief evidence is as follows:—

A. During both of these periods and, with a few explicable exceptions, at no other time within the era under consideration, men who, either in person or through their relatives, were connected with earlier oligarchies, took part in public life.

B. In 301 and again in 276/5 a government hostile to Macedon was superseded by one friendly to that country. This hostile government is proved by its personnel to have been democratic.

C. Constitutional changes took place in 301, 295/4, and 275. Their character is intimated by the following observations:—

1. In 295/4 an important treasury (*ἐπι τῇ διοικήσει*), intrusted between 307/6 and 295/4 to a single officer, was placed in the hands of a college. It was restored to a single officer in 276/5. The dates are, however, only approximate.

2. In 301 another treasury administered during the fourth century by the "treasurer of the people" (*ταμίης τοῦ δήμου*) was abolished. Its funds were transferred to "an inspector and the trittarchs" (*ὁ ἐξέδραστης καὶ οἱ τριττάρχοι*). There had earlier been a board of inspectors; now there was a single officer. Both the inspectors and the trittarchs were earlier connected with military funds. The inspector was elected; the treasurer whom he superseded was chosen by lot. The inspector and the trittarchs disappeared after 295/4, and their functions were taken over by the college then constituted, as described above in 1.

3. A scrutiny (*δοκιμασία*) of the qualifications of applicants for the citizenship, instituted under the extreme oligarchy of 322/1–319/8 and dispensed with subsequently, was revived in 301. It was extended in 276/5 (in at least one case) to citizens who had applied for civic honors.

D. We have direct evidence in an inscription of the year 271/0 (Pseudo-Plutarch, *Lives of the Ten Orators*, 851 D) that between 303/2 and 271/0 oligarchies controlled Athens on two different occasions. On the first occasion, Demochares, Demosthenes' nephew, was in exile, on the second, aloof from public life.

E. It is impossible to explain the continuance of Demochares' exile between 301 and 295 except on the assumption of oligarchic control during that interval.

F. In consequence of factional strife between the democrats and the oligarchs, a tyrant, Lachares by name, succeeded in making himself master of Athens in 295. Demetrius Poliorcetes restored a democracy in 294. Had that party thrown him over seven years earlier, he would not have trusted it again.

Printed in full in *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*, V, 1 (1905).

Discussion by Professors Murray and Clapp.

3. Luigi Pulci, the First of the Courtly *Cantastorie*, by Professor C. Searles, Leland Stanford Jr. University.

The paper began with the discussion of the different opinions in regard to

Pulci's literary position. A comparison of the *Morgante Maggiore* with its source the *Orlando* (Hübscher, Marburg, 1886) supports the view that the poet was chiefly concerned in changing *materia da piazza* into *materia da camera* (*Morg. Mag.* XXVIII, 142, l. 5). Pulci's work, then, serves to connect the works of his famous artist-successors, Ariosto and Tasso, with their predecessors the *cantastorie* and the *jougleurs*.

Discussion by Professors Matzke and Johnston.

4. The Siamese Vocabulary : its Formal and Conceptual Features, by Professor Cornelius Beach Bradley, of the University of California.

The Siamese is not strictly a monosyllabic language, though it is constantly so characterized. In order to ascertain the actual proportion of monosyllabic in a representative section, as well as the origin and nature of the variants from the monosyllabic type, a vocabulary of one thousand separate words was compiled from a very simple piece of native writing. Only seven hundred and fifteen words were actually monosyllables, but fifteen more seemed to be mere extensions or perversions of monosyllabic forms, and were classed with them. Of the remaining two hundred and seventy, sixty-two were recognized as loan-words, chiefly from the Pali. One hundred and sixty-eight were derived from monosyllabic originals — either reduplicates (which were discussed at some length), or compounds, or prefix-derivatives. Forty were undetermined. There are no suffixes or trace of inflection. The native core of the language is thus seen to be a mass of monosyllabic words, around which there is a scanty fringe of derivatives. All these words are invariable in form, and undifferenced in function, save only as content may determine, or rather limit, function. They are, that is, of no Part of Speech, but are symbols of concepts merely, unmixed with tokens of syntactic function. The sentence is thus of the nominal or notional sort exclusively, and generally without copula. Syntax is reduced to the simplest formulas of sequence, corresponding closely with those of sign-language, as set forth by Wundt. The paper further touched upon the important part played by the verbal predicate in developing the Parts of Speech and the intricate syntax of Indo-European languages.

Discussion by Professors Merrill, Clapp, Nutting, Murray, and Messrs. Allen and Linforth.

5. The Vowel *R* and the Coronal Vowels in English, by Professor Samuel A. Chambers, of the University of California.

Definitions. — A *vowel* is produced by a modified but unobstructed passage of the fundamental sound through the mouth ; a *consonant*, by an obstruction of some kind, namely, occlusion, explosion, or friction. There is nothing absolute in these definitions, for there are sounds in which the obstruction is so slight that they are generally placed in a sub-class of consonants and called *liquids*. They are also called *semi-vowels*, and Sievers (*Grundzüge der Phonetik*, p. 84) says : "Der Unterschied zwischen den Vocalen und Liquidien ist sehr gering ; er beruht lediglich auf einer verschiedenen Articulationsform der Zunge." This shifting

and intermediate character of the liquids has been confirmed experimentally by Rousselot (*Principes de Phonétique Experimentale*, p. 404 ff.) and by Scripture (*Elements of Experimental Phonetics*, pp. 432-433).

The *i* of *eat*, the *j* of *you*, and the *j* of *beyond*, emphatic, represent the *i*-sound as vowel, liquid, and consonant. *U* exists in its three stages in *soon*, *we*, and *we*, emphatic. In the same way *r* is vowel, liquid, and consonant in *sir*, *run*, and *run*, emphatic. In French there is a liquid, if not a consonant, form of the vowel *y* in *lui*, *puis*. Scripture adds, "Perhaps other vowels have liquid forms."

Vowels are produced from fricative consonants by opening the passage till the friction ceases. The consonant *r* is a buzzing produced by the tongue-tip being held close to the front palate. If the tongue is lowered till the friction ceases, the pure vowel *r* is produced. Compare the *r* of *red* and of *sir*. Vowels may be formed in the same way from other fricatives, *w*, *j*, *z*, *v*, but *z* and *v* produce one of the already existing obscure vowels.

The R-sound. — Sievers classes *r* among the *Sonoren* or pure-voiced sounds, and says that it differs from a vowel only in tongue-articulation; that of the vowels being *dorsal*, that of *r* being *coronal*. But later he discusses *r* as a consonant, which leads Viator (*Elemente der Phonetik*, p. 207) to accuse him of inconsistency. Viator follows tradition and classes *r* as a fricative consonant, but he adds that it differs in many respects from the other fricatives, especially in the fact that the narrowing may be very slight without the sound losing its characteristic resonance. It seems to me that neither Sievers nor Viator have reached "Das Wesen der Laute," the real nature of the *r*.

The essence of an *r* is undoubtedly its coronal character — a sound made by the upturned tip of the tongue, as it keeps its peculiar resonance whether as vowel, liquid, or consonant, alone or with other sounds. The typical *r* is probably the untrilled English fricative, as in *red*. The trilling is secondary, as a *b* may be trilled as well. But from long association this secondary characteristic has been taken as primary, and for the trilling of the tongue-tip that of the uvula has been substituted in probably more than half of France and Germany. The attempt to trill the back of the tongue leads to the guttural *r*. These are not *r*'s at all, but substitutes for it. Trilling is a kind of intermittent friction, hence these *r*'s are consonants.

The English R. — I. In North England *r* in all positions in the word is trilled, and is, therefore, always a consonant.

II. In West England and America *r* is a *consonant* when before a vowel.

It may have three positions: —

(a) Initial, as in *red*.

(b) Intervocalic, as in *very*.

(c) Between a consonant and a vowel, as in *dry*.

It is a *vowel* when,

(a) Before a consonant, as *bird* (brɪd), *heard* (hrɛd), *urgent* (rgɛnt).

(b) Final, as *sir* (sr), *poor* (pur), *butter* (butr).

III. In South England, London especially, the vowel *r* is weakened into some obscure vowel. Sweet calls it obscure *e*, and prints it as *ɛ* in his *Primer of Spoken English*. But Meyer (*Englische Lautdauer*, p. 8) doubts this, and says that in such expressions as *the cutter*, the *ɛ* of *er* seemed to him a lower, deeper sound than the *ɛ* of *the*.

In liaison, vowel *r* becomes a consonant. Compare *He is here, Here he is*. This liaison is made in London as well as in American English, which might indicate that Meyer's "lower, deeper sound" is caused by a sufficient upturning of the tip to depress the dorsal part of the tongue—a reminiscence of the *r*.

The Vowel R.—In the production of the consonant *r*, both the tip and the dorsum are raised, which leads Vietor to class *r* as a mixed sound—"das *r* ist hiernach ein 'gemischter' Laut" (p. 208). To be consistent, he must call it a mixed consonant, which is a doubtful classification.

The *mixed vowels* are produced by the tongue-position of one vowel and the lip-position of another; for instance, *y* from *i* and *u*. *R* is not formed in this way.

In the *pure vowels*, such as *i* or *a*, the oral passage is modified by the raising of the dorsum of the tongue. In the *r*-vowel the modification is made by the point, so that *r* is as pure a vowel as *i* or *a*.

The Coronal Vowels.—(a) If, when forming the vowels, we move back the velum so as to throw part of the voice through the nose, we get modifications of the original vowels,—mixed sounds which we call *nasal vowels*.

(b) If, when forming *i, e, ε, a*, we round the lips, we get modifications which we call *rounded vowels*.

(c) Likewise if, when forming the vowels, we turn up the tip of the tongue, we get modifications of the original vowels,—mixed sounds which we call *coronal vowels*.

Thus, *ε* may be nasalized to *ẽ*, rounded to *œ*, coronalized to *ẹ̃*.

The low vowels are coronalized with ease, as *a* in *far*, *u* in *fur*, *ε* or *æ* in *fair*, *o* in *for*; the others with difficulty, since the tip of the tongue must be raised without deranging the dorsum.

R in Liaison.—*I* and *a* in liaison add to themselves their corresponding consonant; e.g. He and I = hiyndai; you and I = juwndai. Vowel *r* also is followed by consonant *r*; e.g. More and more = Morrnmor.

R in Diphthongs.—*R* forms *diphthongs* readily with other vowels, as *mere*, *mayor*, *mare*, *mir*, *for*, *four*, *moor*; these words all being monosyllables.

R forms *triphthongs* with *ai* and *au*. Thus, *air* in *fire*, *aur* in *flour*, *flower*. In poetry *flower* may be made a dissyllable; thus, *flawor*.

In such words as *fear*, *poor*, and *mayor*, the union of the two vowels of the diphthongs seems loose, but there seems to be no doubt of the monosyllabic character of these words in ordinary speech. Compare *I* and *aye*. It does not seem necessary to consider that such words require glide vowels. I should write *fear* = *fir*, *poor* = *pur*, *mayor* = *mer* or *mer*.

Discussion by Professors Clapp, Matzke, and Richardson.

Adjourned at 5.15 P.M.

SECOND SESSION.

The members of the Association came together again at 8 P.M. to listen to the address of the President, Professor Merrill.

On the Problem of Literary Influence as illustrated by the Relations of Horace to Lucretius.

The first part of this address was published in *The Latin Leaflet*, 1905, Vol. V, Nos. 119 and 120; the principal part is to be found in the *University of California Publications*, Classical Philology Series, Vol. I.

THIRD SESSION.

The Session was called to order on Wednesday, December 28, at 9.30 A.M., by the second Vice-President, Professor E. B. Clapp.

The reading and discussion of papers was continued.

6. Notes on the Conspiracy of Catiline, by Professor H. C. Nutting, of the University of California.

I. THE ATTEMPT TO MURDER CICERO AT HIS HOUSE.

The chronology of the events of the early part of November in the year 63 has provided a fertile theme for discussion. The aim of the earlier work¹ was mainly to establish the date of the delivery of the first speech against Catiline. Unfortunately at this time there was a tendency to discredit or manipulate what we learn directly from Cicero in favor of what Asconius seems to say; and the results of the earlier investigations have therefore been generally rejected, so far as the date of *in Cat. i* is concerned. But during the discussion of this point much of value was brought to light with reference to our present theme. Yet the excellence of this part of the work has received little recognition in our text-books, and it has therefore seemed worth while to restate the facts already brought to light, applying them to the correct date of *in Cat. i*, and adding some further suggestions.

From *p. Sulla* 18. 52 we learn that it was on the night of the 6th of November that Catiline slipped away from the house of M. Marcellus, where he was in nominal confinement, to preside at a meeting of the conspirators at the home of M. Laeca. The business transacted that night included the making of an arrangement whereby two Roman knights should visit Cicero under pretext of an early morning call, and, when admitted in this way, kill him in his bed. With scarcely an exception the text-books in common use state that the attempt to carry out this plan was made immediately after the meeting broke up, *i.e.* in the early morning hours of the 7th. Indeed, at first sight, this seems to be the meaning of *in Cat. i*, 4. 9: *confirmasti te ipsum iam esse exiturum; dixisti paulum tibi esse etiam nunc morae, quod ego viverem. Reperti sunt duo equites Romani qui te ista cura liberarent, et sese illa ipsa nocte paulo ante lucem me in meo lectulo interfectoros esse pollicerentur.*² The narrative then continues as though the original plan was carried out without change — *Haec ego omnia, vixdum etiam coetu vestro dimisso, comperi; domum meam maioribus praesidiis munivi atque firmavi; exclusi eos quos tu ad me salutatum miseras.*

If this were all that Cicero had to say upon the subject, we should not perhaps think of questioning the correctness of the general assumption that it was on the morning of the 7th that the attempt was made. But *in Cat. ii*, 6. 12 has a

¹ *E.g.* Madvig, *Opusc.* I, 194 ff.; Mommsen, *Hermes*, I, 431 ff.

² Cf. the less explicit statement *p. Sulla*, 18. 52.

different story to tell. There, speaking of the delivery of *in Cat. i*, Cicero says — *Quid ? ut hesterno die, Quirites, cum domi meae paene interfectus essem, senatum in aedem Iovis Statoris convocavi, rem omnem ad patres conscriptos detuli.* The plain and obvious sense of this passage is that the attempt on Cicero's life was made on the same day as that on which *in Cat. i* was delivered. But *in Cat. i* was not delivered on the 7th — it could not have been earlier than the 8th. For in it Cicero speaks several times of the night of the meeting at Laeca's house, using the terms *nox illa, nox prior, illa nox superior* — phrases which he could not have used until at least the second day after the meeting. We are therefore compelled to date *in Cat. i* as late as November 8,¹ and this seems to carry forward the attempt on Cicero's life to that day.

Those who hold to the earlier date suggest that in ii, 6. 12 *hesterno die* belongs only with *convocavi* and *detuli* (actions which took place on the 8th), whereas the subordinate clause *cum domi meae paene interfectus essem* refers to what happened a day earlier. This difficult interpretation is certainly a desperate expedient, and is apparently resorted to under the impression that i, 4. 9 definitely confirms the earlier date. But does it ?

Looking more carefully at the phrasing of that passage, it will be seen that it is not stated that the knights made the attempt on Cicero's life *illa ipsa nocte*, but that they *promised* to do so. It is therefore a mere assumption from the general tenor of the passage that puts the attempt on the morning of the 7th. That the assumption is a mistaken one seems clear even from the internal evidence of this very passage. For when we come to assign a time for all the events narrated as preceding the arrival of the conspirators at Cicero's house, it seems incredible that the men should have arrived when day had scarcely broken (*paulo ante lucem*) on the 7th.

For, in the first place, the meeting at Laeca's house must have convened at a late hour to avoid suspicion, and the session was doubtless a protracted one ; for we learn from the passage in hand of the important final business that was transacted with a view to Catiline's speedy departure from the city : *distribuisti partis Italiae ; statuisti quo quemque proficisci placeret ; delegisti quos Romae relinqueres, quos tecum educeres ; discripsisti urbis partis ad incendia, etc.* It goes without saying that a meeting of this sort was not a short one — we should not be surprised if it were protracted until nearly dawn. If so, by hastening at once to Cicero's house, the conspirators would scarcely arrive in time to be among the very first of the morning visitors, when the opportunity to kill Cicero would be most favorable.

If we assume that they did thus come before daylight on the 7th, where shall we find a place for the various things which happened before their arrival ? According to i, 4. 9 it was not until the meeting broke up that the news of the plot against his life was carried to Cicero. How much time was consumed in transmitting the message we do not know. Cicero, with characteristic boastfulness, to show how well he has the situation in hand, says that he was informed when the meeting had hardly been dismissed. But if the news came through the usual channel (Curius and Fulvia), some considerable time must be allowed for the transmission. After the news arrived, we are told that additional guards

¹ The argument against this date is weakened by the observation that Asconius reckons by both the English and the Roman methods, and that he is perhaps using the former (p. 6 Or.).

were called in to protect Cicero's house; and, most interesting of all, at the end of the passage we learn that Cicero had interviews with many prominent citizens, telling the names of the would-be murderers and predicting the time of their coming (*cum illi ipsi venissent, quos ego iam multis ac summis viris ad me id temporis venturos esse praedixeram*).

It really strains the probabilities of the case seriously to bring all these events within a compass that would allow of the conspirators arriving before daylight on the morning of the 7th, and since Cicero says only that the knights *promised* to kill him *illa ipsa nocte*, the whole case for the earlier date is very weak, especially in view of the fact that in order to maintain it we must violently force the meaning of ii, 6. 12.¹ We therefore welcome the suggestion that the *plan* was made originally for the morning of the 7th, but that, because of the length of the meeting, the *execution* of the plan was postponed until the following morning. This would allow an interval of twenty-four hours for the news to reach Cicero, for him to call in additional guards, and have interviews with prominent men regarding the plot. It would also fit perfectly with the statement in ii, 6. 12, which clearly indicates that the attempt was made on the day on which *in Cat. i* was delivered, *i.e.* on the 8th.

Further confirmation for this later date is afforded by *in Cat. ii, 6. 13*. Here Cicero is relating to the people what he had said on the 8th when delivering *in Cat. i* before the senate: *quaesivi a Catilina in nocturno conventu ad M. Laecam fuisset necne. Cum ille . . . reticuisset, patefeci cetera; quid ea nocte egisset, quid in proximam constituisset*. Cicero is manifestly taking up that part of *in Cat. i* in which 4. 9 falls. Referring back to that passage, it will be seen that after telling what business was transacted during the meeting at Laeca's house (*quid ea nocte egisset*), the very next thing mentioned is the plan made to murder Cicero. That this was the plan for the following night (*quid in proximam constituisset*) would be a natural assumption from a comparison of the two passages; and this assumption grows to conviction when diligent search throughout the first oration against Catiline fails to bring to light a reference to any other plan for the night which followed that on which the meeting at Laeca's house took place.

There seems, therefore, to be no reasonable doubt that it was on the morning of the 8th that the actual attempt took place, but Cicero has not made it at all clear whether *the original plan* was for that morning or for that of the 7th. Of course, at first sight, i, 4. 9 seems to decide that question definitely in favor of the earlier date, for Cicero says that the knights *promised* to kill him *illa ipsa nocte*, which would naturally mean in the early morning hours of the 7th. But, as has already been noted, in this passage there is no hint of a postponement; the narrative runs along as though, in arriving on the morning of the 8th, the conspirators were carrying out their original plan. And the wording of ii, 6. 13 (*quid in proximam constituisset*) also looks clearly in this direction.

This point is of minor importance, but it presents greater difficulty than the larger question discussed above. We might be tempted to suppose that Cicero had made a slight slip, were it not for the fact that he was speaking of events so recent, and that these speeches were carefully revised by him. A second

¹ Sallust's account (chap. xxxviii) is not explicit on this point, and is, of course, of no critical value.

alternative would be to suppose that Cicero has allowed himself to speak carelessly or awkwardly. Thus *illa ipsa nocte* might conceivably refer, not to the night of the meeting, but to the following night. For we might fancy that the meeting did not break up until dawn was streaking the east; if then, as the conspirators separated, the two emissaries should say "We will kill him this very night," they would mean the night following the day now breaking, *i.e.* the night between the 7th and the 8th. Quoting this speech indirectly, Cicero would say *illa ipsa nocte*. But such an interpretation is extremely hard, and is suggested only as a means of avoiding the last alternative, namely, that of supposing that we have to do with a corruption of the text of which the manuscripts give no hint.

2. *Huic sceleri obstat*, SALLUST, *B.C.* LII, 32.

This phrase occurs in Cato's speech delivered on the Nones of December, when the fate of the conspirators was hanging in the balance. The sentence in which it stands is ironical, as is shown by *videlicet*. There are in general two lines of interpretation:

(a) "Doubtless their past lives secure them from suspicion of this crime," *i.e.* of having conspired against the state. See Harper's *Lex.* and Hoffmann, *ad loc.* This interpretation would fit better *crimini huius sceleris* than *huic sceleri*.

(b) "Doubtless their past lives counterbalance this crime." So Jacobs-Wirz and Stegmann. The meaning assigned to *obstat* is unusual, but supported by Livy i, 26. 5.

There is a third possible interpretation that would assign to *obstat* its usual meaning. The spirit of Cato's speech is very different from that of Caesar; it fairly bristles with sarcasm, innuendo, and irony. In this passage he has cited the example of Torquatus, who ordered the execution of a son who persisted in fighting against the enemy when ordered to desist; and then he adds "And that splendid youth by his death paid the penalty for his unbounded bravery; are you in doubt as to the action you should take with reference to most wicked traitors?" He means, of course, that the death penalty should be passed on the prisoners; and I suggest that *huic sceleri* is an ironical reference to this proposed action. For Caesar, in his speech, had pointed out that to put to death a Roman citizen without a trial would be illegal; and so Cato says with bitterest irony, "Doubtless their past lives—their past good record—stands in the way of this outrage¹ (on our part)."

Discussion by Messrs. Martin and Allen.

7. The Derivation and Meaning of *Luscinia*, by Mr. E. W. Martin, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

To the Romans was *luscinia* the "dawn-singer" or the "grief-singer"? Discussion based on Professor E. W. Fay's article, "Studies of Latin Words in *-cinio*, *-cinia*. I. *Luscinia*."—*Classical Review*, July, 1904.

¹ The choice of the term *scelus* in this connection is natural enough; cf. Cic. *in Verr* ii, 5, 66. 170.

1. Derivation from **lucēs*-, "dawn-singer." Weakness of the poetic citations. Improbability in view of reality and the records of the nightingale as a night-singer in ancient poetry and folklore.

2. Derivation from **lugēs*-, "grief-singer," more probable in consideration of the word's semasiology. Evidence of (1) the myth; (2) epithets; (3) ancient and modern bird-lore; (4) nearly universal poetic feeling; (5) parallels.

Discussion by Professors Fairclough, Emerson, Matzke, Rice, and Dr. O'Connor.

Professor Merrill then took the chair.

8. A Plan for the Republication in a Revised Form of the Hebrew-Aramaic Equivalents in the Oxford Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament, by Professor M. L. Margolis, of the University of California.

In giving the Hebrew-Aramaic equivalents, the editors, according to the explicit statement in the preface, have aimed at no final judgment in the sometimes very intricate questions of identification. Hence we very often find a mere *quid pro quo*, not to mention the obelized passages upon which the editors have refrained from all judgment. In the proposed revision it is intended to exclude erroneous identifications, to include new identifications, and to indicate, as well as to discuss, doubtful cases. There will be references to publications in which a certain identification has been proposed. The equivalents will be arranged in accordance with frequency. Under the simple verbs all the compounds will be given. The later translations will be dealt with each separately under each word. An index of Hebrew and Aramaic words will be found at the end. The proposed publication, which will give no quotations except in the case of words requiring discussion, will in nowise take the place of the larger work upon which it will be based, but rather supplement it, and pave the way for a new Lexicon of the Septuagint, which is a scientific *desideratum*.

Printed in full in *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XXV (1905), 205-293.

Discussion by Professors Murray and Fairclough.

9. Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 817, and Secrecy in Voting in the Athenian Law Courts, Fifth Century B.C., by Professor J. T. Allen, of the University of California. Read by Professor Clapp in the author's absence.

The paper is published in the *Classical Review*, December, 1904, p. 456 *sqq.* (Vol. XVIII).

Discussion by Professors Emerson, Murray, Ferguson, Fairclough, and Clapp.

10. On Figures of Prosody in Latin, by Professor L. J. Richardson, of the University of California.

(1) The term *figure of prosody* defined and described. (2) Current classification of such figures. (3) A proposed classification. (4) Current terminology. (5) A proposed terminology.

Discussion by Professors Clapp, Fairclough, Murray, and Chambers.
Adjourned at 12.50 P.M.

FOURTH SESSION.

The Association convened again at 2.30 P.M.

The Committee on Nomination of Officers reported through the Chairman, Professor Murray, the following list of nominations:—

President, J. Goebel, Leland Stanford Jr. University.

Vice-Presidents, E. B. Clapp, University of California.

H. R. Fairclough, Leland Stanford Jr. University.

Secretary-Treasurer, L. J. Richardson, University of California.

Executive Committee, The above-named officers and

A. F. Lange, University of California.

J. E. Church, University of Nevada.

H. K. Schilling, University of California.

J. E. Matzke, Leland Stanford Jr. University.

The report was accepted, and on motion of Professor Chambers the Secretary was instructed to cast the ballot of the Association for the gentlemen as nominated.

On motion of Professor Senger the Association passed a vote of thanks to the retiring Secretary-Treasurer for his services.

The Committee on Time and Place of the next Meeting reported through the Chairman, Professor Chambers, as follows:—

Your Committee have considered the suggestion of holding a special meeting during the coming summer in Portland, Oregon. They deem the plan not feasible.

They recommend that the next regular meeting be held as usual at Mark Hopkins Institute of Art in San Francisco, on December 27, 28, 29, 1905.

The report was accepted.

The reading and discussion of papers was then continued.

11. English Notes, by Professor Frederick M. Padelford, of the University of Washington.

The author being absent, the paper, through lack of time, was merely read by title. It is published in *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*.

12. The Etymology of Mephistopheles, by Professor J. Goebel, Leland Stanford Jr. University.

This paper is published in the TRANSACTIONS. Discussion by Professors Schilling, Emerson, Senger, Bradley, and Clapp.

13. The Master Playwright of Wakefield, by Professor C. M. Gayley, of the University of California.

The paper discussed those portions of the Towneley Cycle, whether complete miracles or insertions, which are written in the nine-line stanza peculiar to this cycle. It derived the stanza from its more unwieldy predecessors of York, and attempted to show that in all probability the contributions in that stanza are by one writer. It presented the characteristics of his thought and style, and suggested other portions of the cycle, not in the nine-line stanza, which may be attributed to him.

The exposition appears as a whole in an article entitled "The Later Miracle Plays of England" in the *International Quarterly*, April, 1905.

14. The Figurative Expressions in the Works of Heinrich von Kleist, by Professor J. H. Senger, of the University of California.

The paper gave an account of the method of investigation and classification with respect to the objects used as tropes in the *complete* range of pictures employed by a poet, a process which may offer a more reliable method than the present subjective treatment used by critics to determine an author's position not only within the limits of his own literature, but also to establish with great precision his affinity to an author of another nation.

By means of the complete material of an author's literary utterances it is possible to obtain a personal equation which, by comparison with that of other writers, leads to what may be called the personal equation of a nation as expressed in its literature.

For the purpose of attaining the greatest objectivity the great masters choose expressions which, like musical sounds, have over- and undertones connecting with the objects present in the picture words. The *plastic* effect of an expression by words depends upon the fact that it immediately conveys the idea of its object; its *poetic* effect requires that the objectivity of the expression be accompanied by harmonious suggestions similar to the harmonics produced by aliquot parts of a vibrating string or column of air, of which we are rarely conscious, but which are essential to the beauty of the sound. Through these harmonious suggestions may ultimately be revealed the peculiar national quality of an author.

The forcible imagery of Heinrich von Kleist lends itself quite naturally to an analysis as proposed. Minde-Pouet in his treatise, *Heinrich von Kleist. Seine Sprache und sein Stil*. Weimar, 1897, treats Kleist's language and the style peculiar to him as regards grammar and the orthodox rhetoric. He deals but imperfectly with the author's imagery, although he tries to classify the images

employed. On little more than four octavo pages (pp. 167-171) he gives what might be called an index of word pictures, classified: animals, plants, metals, etc., merely stating the leading word and the corresponding passage. In this way he registers 205 passages, apparently merely those he has selected originally for grammatical and rhetorical reasons.

The 656 passages so far found contain 831 objects for classification. Of these the poems in the first volume of Zolling's edition contain 18 passages, *Familie Schroffenstein* 80, *Variations in Familie Ghonorez* 5, *Zerbrochener Krug* 24, *Robert Guiskard Fragment* 22, *Amphitryon* 55, *Penthesilea* 106, *Käthchen von Heilbronn* 77, *Hermannsschlacht* 75, *Prinz von Homburg* 42, the prose pieces of the fourth volume 36, the letters to *Wilhelmine von Zenge* 68, to his sister *Ulrike* 30, other letters 18.

The author explained his classification of Kleist's tropes as employed in the forthcoming publication of his treatise.

Discussion by Professor Bradley.

Professor Clapp took the chair.

15. Romance Etymologies, by Professor Carl C. Rice, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

1. French *flechair*, Old French *fleschir*, *fleschier*, "to bend." *Fleschier* < **flexicāre* < *flexus* < *flectere*, "to bend." Phonetic development regular. The form in *-ir* is due to a change of conjugation.

2. Spanish *rosca*, "screw," *roscar*, "to furrow." *Rosca* is a postverbal from **rōsicāre* < *rōsus* < *rōdere*, "to gnaw." Phonetic development regular: cf. *rascar*, "to scratch" < **rāsicāre*, "to scratch." For the postverbal formation, cf. Italian *leva*, "lever," from *levare*, "to raise." For the sense-development, cf. English *bit*, i.e., "a biting instrument."

3. French *ruche*, "hive," *rouche*, "hull of a ship on the stocks," Old French *rusche*, Provençal *rusca*, Piedmontese and Lombard *rusca*, "bark," Comascan *ruscā*, "to scale off." *Ruscā* < **rūspicare* < **rūspīre*, "to scratch" (cf. Italian *ruspare*, "to scratch," and the rare Latin *rūspīri*, "to explore"). Sense-development: 1) "to scratch off," "to peel"; 2) "peel," "bark"; 3) "hive made of bark"; 4) "hive." The phonetic development assumed is certainly regular in French and Provençal territory, and appears to be regular everywhere.

4. Spanish *sesga*, "oblique," *sesgar*, "to cut obliquely." *Sesgar* < **sēsēcāre*, "to cut apart." Phonetic development regular. The adjective is a postverbal.

Discussion by Professors Noyes and Matzke.

16. The Duration of English Vowels in Monosyllabic Words, by Dr. P. E. Goddard, of the University of California.

By employing monosyllabic words uttered separately, the complicating effects of accent and emphasis were avoided for the present. Rousselot tracings were made with the cylinder travelling at a speed of about 28 centimetres per second. The error in making and measuring these tracings need not exceed .01 second.

The results first given are from records made and tabulated by a man about thirty years of age, who has lived all his life in the Rocky Mountain region. He held, at the time, the popular notions concerning vowel lengths.

First, words having the same initial and final consonants were compared. The differences in length were very small, indicating that English vowels and diphthongs have the same duration under the same phonetic conditions. The so-called long vowel or diphthong in *mate* is no longer than the vowels in *mat* or *met*.

Next, the same and other words were arranged so that their vowels and initial sounds were the same, but their final sounds varied as surds and sonants. The average length of the vowels preceding voiced consonants was .393 second, and of the same vowels preceding unvoiced consonants of the same kind .286 second, a difference of .107 second, or 38 per cent.

A table made from the author's speech shows that vowels before unvoiced consonants, voiced consonants, and without consonant endings, have the ratios of 100 : 140, and 100 : 175.

<i>A</i> ¹		<i>B</i>	<i>A</i>		<i>B</i>	<i>A</i>		<i>B</i>
bay544	.579	bait. . .	.333	.368	bayed398	.456
bow561	.491	boat333	.316	boûe398	.439
me526	.491	meat253	.351	mead398	.439
he491	.561	heat281	.298	heed414	.421
rye684	.649	right368	.288	ride564	.516
fry597	.597	fright368	.288	fried558	.439
pea439	.421	piece263	.193	peas498	.376
fay491	.491	fate263	.263	fade414	.379
sigh632	.561	sight263	.263	sighed457	.439
lay632	.527	late333	.355	lade498	.368
may579	.527	mate246	.256	made515	.368
rue561	.491	root351	.267	rude457	.456
ray561	.597	rate421	.404	raid564	.551
lie649	.579	light368	.368	lied531	.421
her474	.459	hurt298	.281	heard464	.404
spur439	.368	spurt281	.281	spurred464	.333
Average551	.524		.314	.310		.469	.425
Per cent . . .	175	169		100	100		147	137

Adjourned at 5.45 P.M.

FIFTH SESSION.

The Fifth Session was called to order by the first Vice-President, Professor Goebel, at 9.30 A.M., on Thursday, December 29.

The Committee appointed to examine the Treasurer's Report

¹ The results under *A* were obtained by speaking the words according to their vertical position, and those under *B* in their horizontal order.

announced through the Chairman, Professor Margolis, that the books had been examined and found correct.

Report accepted.

17. The Correction of Diphthongs and Long Vowels in Hiatus, in Greek Hexameter Poetry, by Professor Edward B. Clapp, of the University of California. This paper will appear in full in the *Publications in Classical Philology of the University of California*.

This conspicuous feature in Greek hexameter poetry is difficult to explain. Two questions must be answered: first, why was the diphthong or long vowel treated as short? and, second, why was hiatus, under these circumstances, regarded as justifiable? The most satisfactory answer is that proposed by Hartel and by Grulich, which is based on the fact that in Homer more than 80 per cent of all cases of correction occur in diphthongs consisting of a *short* vowel followed by *ι* or *υ*, which may be called the short diphthongs. Assuming that the practice originated in these short diphthongs, the explanation is easy. Before a word beginning with a vowel the final *ι* or *υ* of the diphthong would easily change to the corresponding consonant, thus removing hiatus, and the first vowel of the diphthong, standing alone, would show its natural short quantity.

The present paper is based on a study of this practice through the whole range of hexameter poetry, from Homer to Tryphiodorus, including about thirty poets. It was felt that if the correction should show a tendency to *spread* from the diphthongs mentioned above to the long diphthongs and the simple long vowels, this fact would afford a strong confirmation of the truth of the views of Hartel and Grulich as to the origin of the practice.

But the result of the investigation points in the opposite direction. Far from showing a tendency to spread, and to affect all diphthongs and long vowels with approximate equality, correction in the later poets tends to confine itself more and more strictly to the short diphthongs, and especially to *-αι* and *-οι*. These two diphthongs alone furnish 98 per cent of all cases of correction in Tryphiodorus, in contrast to 90 per cent in Oppian, 85 per cent in Callimachus, and 78 per cent in Homer.

This result leaves the main question still in doubt, the views of Hartel and Grulich receiving no additional confirmation from the investigation here reported.

Discussion by Professors Richardson and Noyes.

18. Notes on Horace, *Sat.* 1. 6. 126, and Aristophanes, *Peace*, 990, by Professor J. Elmore, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

1. HOR. *Sat.* 1. 6. 126, *fugio campum lusumque trigonem*.

In *lusumque trigonem* — the much-discussed reading of Cruquius' *Blandinius vetustissimus* — we should recognize the characteristically Augustan usage of the participle in agreement with a substantive to express the abstract idea of action. The phrase thus means, not the "game of ball" (where *lusum* = *ludum*) nor "the ball game I have already played," but "the playing of the ball game," — "I leave behind me the campus and the ball-playing."

This use of the participle is frequent in Horace. Among the examples are the following: *Car.* 1. 1. 4; 1. 3. 29; 1. 5. 6; 1. 8. 12; 1. 36. 9; 2. 4. 10; 2. 9. 10; 2. 13. 31; 3. 6. 29; 3. 15. 10. *Sat.* 2. 1. 67; 2. 1. 84. *Ep.* 1. 16. 42. Of these cases *Car.* 1. 5. 6, 2. 9. 10, and 2. 13. 31 have the participle and its substantive in the accusative of the direct object, as in the present passage. Cf. *Liv.* 2. 36. 6 and *Mart.* 2. 75. 2. It is also proper to have this construction with the participle of *ludere*, which is often construed with an accusative of the so-called inner object. (So by Horace in *Sat.* 2. 3. 248.)

This interpretation avoids the necessity of regarding *lusum* as a concrete substantive — a late and rare use, and involving here the harsh apposition of *trigonem* — or of taking it in the ordinary sense of the participle. The latter places an undue emphasis on the completion of the action, as if it were only at the end of the game, and for this reason, that Horace took his departure. It is also unnecessary to assume, as both of these interpretations do, that Horace himself, in spite of his expressed distaste for it (*Sat.* 1. 5. 49), made ball-playing a part of his daily routine. The expression is a perfectly general one, not referring to any particular person or game. There were, doubtless, several of these games going on at the same time, and Horace may very well have been engaged in his favorite occupation of looking on.

This view of *lusumque trigonem* gives excellent sense, and the whole sentence with its combination of concrete and abstract in the same clause has a peculiarly idiomatic turn, reminding one of the similar combinations of *metaque . . . Evitata rotis* in *Car.* 1. 1. 4, and of *fidem* and *Multosque deos* in *Car.* 1. 5. 6.

2. ARISTOPH. *Peace*, 989-990: οἷ σου τρυχόμεθ' ἤδη
τρία καὶ δέκ' ἔτη.

Aristophanes (*Achar.* 266) accepts 431 as the beginning of the war with Sparta, and the *Peace*, according to the generally accepted statement of the first hypothesis, was brought out in 421. Hence the chronological difficulty remarked by the scholiast and insisted on by the editors. This difficulty has been met in three ways, — by assuming a second production of the play in 418, by supposing that Aristophanes is referring to the preliminary hostilities between Corcyra and Corinth, and by emending the text. It is possible that there was a second performance of the *Peace* in 418, but Thucydides (5. 75) counts the whole period 421-416 as among the years of the war. As to the second explanation, the first battle between Corcyra and Corinth took place in 435 and the second in 432. The year required is 434, but there is no apparent reason for dating the beginning of the war from this year. Reviewing the whole question, Van Herwerden is inclined to believe that the text is unsound, though in his opinion no convincing correction has been proposed.

Before giving up the text there is another possibility that may be considered, — that Aristophanes is here using *τρία καὶ δέκα* as an indefinite number. There are three other passages where he unmistakably employs the number in this sense, — *Plut.* 194, 845, and 1083. In the second example we have the precise phrase *ἔτη τρία καὶ δέκα*. Other passages showing the same use are Homer E 387, Bacchylides 10. 192, and Herodotus 1. 119. 6. To be noted also is the statement attributed to Chares by Gellius (5. 2. 2) that Alexander's steed was bought

for thirteen talents. Compare also the use of *terdecies* as an indefinite number in Juv. 14. 28.

In the passage in the *Peace* there is no apparent difficulty in seeing the same usage. Trygaeus is under no compulsion, artistic or otherwise, to speak with literal accuracy, while the use of popular expressions quite befits his character. In his address to *Peace* he merely desires to convey the idea that she has been absent a long time. The fact that thirteen is near the actual number (ten) which historical accuracy requires, is no objection, since, as König has pointed out, the approximation—real or imagined—to the definite number is usually a characteristic of the indefinite one.

Discussion by Professors Clapp and Nutting.

19. A Study of the Forms of Interrogative Thought in Plato, by Professor H. R. Fairclough, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

This study, made for the new Plato Lexicon, aims at classifying the various interrogative idioms in Plato, summarizing their uses and showing their relative frequency, their variety of meaning, and their bearing upon the question of the authenticity of the doubtful dialogues.

The paper, when completed, will be published in full in the Lexicon referred to.

20. Sources of the Lay of Yonec, by Professor Oliver M. Johnston, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

A comparison of the lay of *Yonec* with the other stories containing similar motives shows that the lay represents a fusion of the legend of the *Jealous Stepmother* and of the well-known tale bearing the name *Inclusa*. The motive for combining these two stories doubtless lay in the desire of the minstrels, or the story-tellers from whom Marie de France heard the lay, to substitute a supernatural for a natural means of reaching the imprisoned lady. The first part of the story of the *Inclusa*, the theme, according to which a jealous old man has a young and beautiful wife whom he confines in a tower, was used in the lay. On the other hand, the second part of the *Inclusa*, where a handsome youth visits by means of an underground passage a lady imprisoned in a tower, is not contained in Marie's lay. However, the author of Marie's original substituted for the motive of the underground passage the theme of the *Jealous Stepmother*, where the lover assumes the form of a bird in order to reach the lady.

21. Direct Speech in Lucan as an Element of Epic Technic, by Dr. J. W. Basore, of the University of California.

An investigation of the speeches of the *Pharsalia* in point of (1) form, (a) monologue, (b) speech-scenes involving address and reply, (c) single speeches, and (2) their relation to the action and plot of the poem, to estimate by comparison with Vergil's usage of the speech as a naïve form of expression (Heinze, *Vergil's Epische Technik*, Leipzig, 1903, pp. 396 ff.), the independent character of Lucan's epic methods. By reason of a certain crude power and the originality

of a sententious though declamatory style, Lucan has been assigned freely in ancient estimate a place among older writers of established reputation (cf. Martial, vii, 22; i, 61; vii, 21; x, 23; x, 64; Tac. *Dial.* 20; Quint. x, 1. 90; Stat. *Silv.* ii, 7; Chaucer, *Il. of Fame*, iii, 400). It did not, however, remain for the more discriminating judgment of modern taste to discover that he had produced not an epic, but a history in verse (cf. *eg.* Dryden, *pref. Annus Mir.* with Petr. 118; Serv. *Aen.* i, 382). But this verdict of his failure has been drawn rather from the character of his subject-matter and style than from analysis of his epic form in which, by even superficial comparison with others of the later school, he is seen to be the most unconventional. Direct speech figures conspicuously in the *Aeneid* as a part of Vergil's artful imitation of the realistic spirit of the Homeric epic, and, consciously or unconsciously, he must have been Lucan's model for what he conceived to be an epic manner. Technically a monologue may be either a speech uttered alone to an imaginary hearer, or a soliloquy, *i.e.* a self-address in a similar situation. The form is essentially dramatic, and not epic. The clearest dramatic type is that in which the conflict of opposing inclinations is depicted, with the final victory of one which serves to motivate action. This may be illustrated from Homer, *Il.* x, 99 ff., and Dido's soliloquy in Vergil, iv, 534 ff. Lucan shows it not at all. He has used more freely than Vergil (cf. *Aen.* i, 37 ff.) the form which gives a psychological characterization of the individual in a given situation (cf. *eg.* ii, 522 ff.; iv, 702 ff.; viii, 622 ff.), and is most free in the use of the characteristic type of Vergil, involving an address to an imaginary hearer, animate or inanimate (cf. *eg.* v, 521 ff.; vi, 241 ff.). In introducing such he has avoided wholly the artless recurrence of stock phrase found in Homer and adopted by Vergil. Note the studied variants at i, 247; ii, 521 f.; iv, 701; viii, 621; often simple *ait* is used (cf. ii, 38; iii, 38) or *dixit, inquit, satur*, etc. (*eg.* v, 654; v, 521; iii, 90), or verb of saying is omitted (cf. ix, 989; ii, 493). Vergil has employed within much narrower lines than Homer the device of introducing into a given scene speakers involved in a lengthy series of address and reply (Heinze, *l.c.* 397 ff.), and this tendency to restrict the elaboration of speech-scenes is more marked in Lucan. In only one instance does he group more than two speakers, and only twice exceeds the limits of simple address and reply (cf. iii, 123 ff.; ix, 123 ff.; v, 130 ff.). The other speeches of the poem represent groups involving mere dialogue situations or single addresses; and require no emphasis here as being in no way characteristic. In discussing the relation of the speeches to the plot of the poem, further detailed comparison with Vergil will not be possible. To treat epically a historical event of recent occurrence is an impossibility, for invention and imagination are confined within the limits of the literally true. In the attempt Lucan finds scope for imagination by devising for his characters in definite situations, set harangues which they might have delivered. His manner in these, therefore, is that of the pragmatic historian. Though characteristically the speeches of Lucan are not integral to the narrative and seem to serve as mere halting places for declamation, it is possible to discover in his usage some marks of epic treatment. It may be noted, as in the older epic, that they are introduced in emotional situations as the vehicle of anger, sorrow, fear, joy, and the like, and with an effort at epic realism are usually duly tagged as such (cf. i, 192; ii, 44, 493; iv, 701, *et saepe*).

Aristotle (*Poet.* 34) has laid emphasis upon $\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$ as an essential of epic narrative, and, though Lucan is often led astray by windy declamation, it is clear that many of his speeches are introduced for purposes of characterization. To illustrate, the speech of Brutus to Cato (ii, 242 ff.) is pointed by 234 f., *At non magnanimi percussit pectora Bruti | terror*, as an effort to portray his undaunted courage amidst the alarm of Caesar's approach. Cato, in ix, 256 ff., is shown in calm dignity nerving his comrades to a struggle without hope; in 505 ff., his words reveal his endurance in physical suffering; in ii, 512 ff., the speech of Domitius in captivity marks his haughty contempt and high-born courage. A second comprehensive group is more directly concerned with the narrative in motivating action (cf. e.g. i, 273 ff.; ii, 483 ff.; vii, 68 ff.); others amplify the situation by the introduction of vivid detail. I cite, e.g., viii, 172 ff., where the pilot discourses to Pompey about the stars in the silence of the night upon the sea, so in ix, 176 ff., Caesar, after feasting, seeks to prolong the night in familiar discourse to the priest of Isis. Finally may be shown a type which usually, in the form of the *cohortatio*, is wholly extraneous to the narrative in subject-matter and purpose (cf. e.g. vii, 342 ff.; ix, 379 ff., *et saepe*). As a result of the analysis thus outlined, it may be observed that in the forms of direct speech Lucan approximates Vergilian usage most nearly in the free employment of monologue; he observes the restrictions set by Vergil in avoiding the introduction of elaborate speech-scenes, employing in fairly equal proportions monologue and groups involving dialogue situations, while single speeches are far more numerous. In subject-matter the speeches are characteristically non-essential to the development of the narrative, though serving somewhat to characterize, to motivate action, or to supply picturesque detail. Though Lucan's art is that of the historian, his spirit and style that of the orator, he has used the speech as the expression of emotion with some consciousness of its epic fitness, but in no case may be said to reproduce the Vergilian simplicity.

22. Examples of French as Spoken by Englishmen in Old French Literature, by Professor J. E. Matzke, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

The paper made a study of four instances in Old French literature intended to represent the speech of an Englishman using French: (1) Renart as an English jongleur (*Roman de Renart*, ed. Martin, I, 62 ff.); (2) The *Fabliau de deux Angloys et de Paniel* (ed. Montaiglon et Raynaud, II, 178 ff.); (3) The Duke of Gloucester in *Jehan et Blonde* of Philippe de Beaumanoir (ed. Suchier); (4) Various characters in the *Mystère de Saint-Louis* (ed. Fr. Michel).

The following two papers were read by title:—

23. Old Problems in Horace and Vergil, by Professor J. E. Church, Jr., of the University of Nevada.

(a) Horace, *Carm.* i, 3, 1-8.

A reply to *PAPA*, xxxiv, xxii, based on Fückeler, *Carm. Lat. Fpigr.* 196, 197, 198, 215; Tibullus, i, 4, 1-3, etc.

(b) Vergil, *Aeneid*, i, 249 . . . placida compositus pace quiescit.

The evidence of burial inscriptions favorable to the theory that this verse refers to the rest of Antenor in the tomb is weak, while the evidence of the *Aeneid* itself (i, 241 f., iii, 393, 495 f.) and the use of *placidaque . . . morte* (not *pace*) *quievit* (ix, 445) strongly support the generally accepted belief that Vergil is here referring to the peaceful retirement of Antenor after a strenuous life.

(c) Vergil's Use of the Proper Names of the Winds in the *Aeneid*.

Vergil employed the proper names *Aquilo*, *Eurus*, etc., as he did the general, *aura*, *turbo*, etc., not to designate the direction of the air current, but the condition of the weather. In his use of proper names for rhetorical effect Vergil resembles Horace, but is less extreme. The theory that Vergil used the proper names of the winds interchangeably is not supported by the evidence.

24. The Name of the Slave in Plautus's *Aulularia*, by Professor H. W. Prescott, of the University of California.

The slave in Plautus's *Aulularia* is called Strobilus consistently in the text, and, with one exception, in the scene-headings. In the first part of the play the slave is the property of Megadorus; in the second part he is the slave of Lyconides, nephew of Megadorus, and perhaps a member of Megadorus's household. Immediately following the scenes of the first part is a monologue apparently spoken by the same slave Strobilus who is active in the preceding scenes, but the scene-heading of this monologue in the Palatine Mss. gives his name as FITODICVS, itself corrupt, but perhaps standing for Pythodicus.

Various methods of reconciling the difficulties have been proposed: (1) The theory of *retractatio* is acceptable only as a last resort; (2) Pythodicus may be substituted, without offence to the metre, for Strobilus, either in the first part of the play (Dziatzko, Leo), or in the second part (Le Breton). The former substitution destroys the effective alliteration in vs. 334; the latter is unlikely because the only evidence for Pythodicus occurs in the first part of the play.

A third solution has most in its favor: the names in the scene-headings of the Palatine Mss. are thought to have no independent value, but to be derived in all cases from the text itself. The corrupt scene-heading FITODICVS, then, probably arose from a corruption in the text of the play, not necessarily of the name Strobilus, but of some phrase or word occurring in a speech addressed to Strobilus, as Stalicio in the *Casina* from *staltio* (347) and *sta ilico* (955). The name Strobilus should be read throughout: parallel cases of one slave serving two masters in the same household have already been quoted by Dziatzko.

The Association adjourned at 12.15 P.M.

At the meeting of the Executive Committee the following two new members were admitted:—

Mr. Monroe E. Deutsch, San Francisco, Cal.

Mr. C. F. Schmutzler, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University, Palo Alto, Cal.

INDEX.

Arabic numerals indicate pages of the *Transactions*; Roman numerals indicate pages of the *Proceedings*.

- Abbadia del Fiume, Etruscan necropolis: lviii ff.
- Accent, Greek: 65, 66, 74.
- Accent, Latin: 65 ff.; of adjectives: 48-49; of conjunctions: 34-36; of pronouns: 36-48.
- Accent and ictus, in late Latin hexameters: x f. (cf. lxx).
- Acute accent: 67 ff., 70 ff.
- Aeschylus, *Agam.* 817: lxxxvii.
- Alchemy: lxii.
- ἄλλοιωσις, problem of, in pre-Socratics: xiv.
- ἄλοχος in Homer: lxxv ff.
- Alphabetic notation of variant sounds: xxii.
- Amulets: 87, 89, 104-106, 108, 119, 120, 122.
- Aristophanes, *Peace*, 990: xcii ff.
- Art, influence of, on Vergil: lxix.
- Atharva-Veda, criticism of: xxi; Çāntikalpa of: 77 ff.
- Athenian courts: lxxxvii.
- Athenian politics (early third century B.C.): lxxix.
- Athens, economics of building: 12 ff.; transportation: 17.
- Beneventum, arch of Trajan: xiv ff.
- Çāntikalpa: 77-127.
- Cassiodorus, and Livy: xvi.
- Catiline, conspiracy of: lxxxiii ff.
- Catullus, lxxviii, 93, critical note on: vii ff.
- Chinese drama: lv ff.
- Cicero, *comitia* and *concilium* in: 22 ff.
- Cicero, in *Cat.*: lxxxiii ff.
- Cicero, on Latin accent: 66, 70.
- Circumflex accent: 68-70.
- comitia* and *concilium*, distinction between: 21-32; rule of Laelius Felix unknown to Livy: 21; to republican period: 22-26; new generalizations: 26-29; their explanation: 29-32.
- Conjunctions, occasional oxytonesis of, in Latin: 34-36.
- Corneille, *Horace*, sources of: lxix.
- cretati pedes*: lxxiv.
- Crete, language of: xxix f.
- Dictionary, Latin, suggestions for a new: xxxiv ff.
- Direct speech in Lucan: xciv ff.
- Donatus on Latin accent: 71-73, 75.
- English, in America: ix.
- English etymology (seventeenth century): lxx.
- Etruscan tombs (near Pitigliano): lviii ff.
- Etruscans: xxx.
- fēchir*, etymology of: xc.
- French, as spoken by Englishmen in Old French literature: xcvi.
- Goethe, Faust, Cabala and alchemy in: lxii.
- Grammatical myths: xxiv ff.
- Grave accent: 67, 69, 71.
- Guilds, Rome: 18 f.
- Hermes Trismegistos: 152.
- Hexameters, accent and ictus in (late Latin): x f.
- Hexameters, correption in (Greek): xcii.
- Hiatus, Greek: xliii; xcii.
- Hiatus in Greek Melic poetry: lxiii f.
- Hittites: xxviii.
- Homer, Hades and the dead in: xiii.
- Homer, *Iliad*, i, 291, critical note on: xlii f.; ix, 334-343: lxxv ff.
- Horace, as a poet of nature: v ff.
- Horace and Lucretius: lxxxii.
- Horace, imitation of Ovid: *Carm.* iv. 1. 16 and *Am.* ii. 12. 28; *Epist.* i. 8. 3 and *Am.* i. 11. 13: 136-147.

- Horace, *Carm.* i. 3. 1-8: xcvi.
 Horace, *Sat.* i. 6. 126: xcii f.
 House, ceremony for protection of: 88, 107, 121.
 Iambic words, how far oxytone in Latin: 58-59.
 Ictus: 73.
 Illyrians: xxxi f.
 Indo-European languages, minor and problematic: xxvii ff.
 Juvenal i, construction of: lxxi ff.
 Kleist, figurative expressions in: lxxxix f.
 Laelius Felix on *comitia* and *concilium*: 21, 26, 31.
 Latin, Gallic clerical, pronunciation of: lxiv f.
 Lemnos, language of: xxx.
 Ligurian: xxxiii f.
 Livy, *comitia* and *concilium* in: 21, 28 f.
 Livy, Oxyhynchus epitome: xvi.
 Livy, third dec., Puteanus group of mss.: xliiv.
 Lucan, direct speech in: xciv ff.
 Lucretius, influence on Vitruvius: xvi ff.
 Lucretius and Horace: lxxxii.
 Lucretius and Memmius: lxiii.
luscina, derivation of: lxxxvi f.
 Lycians: xxix.
 Mahācānti: 78-80, 83, 86-89, 101-109, 117-122.
 Mephistopheles, etymology of: 148 ff.
 Mephistophil: 151.
 Messapian: xxxii f.
 Metaphor, lexical treatment of: xxxiv ff.
 Metric, new, a quantitative difficulty in: xliii.
 Metric, Latin, studies in: 43-48.
 Mommsen on *comitia* and *concilium*: 22 f., 31, n. 1.
 Motion in pre-Socratic cosmogonies: xiv.
 Musical accent: 66 ff.
 Nakṣatrakalpa: 78-83.
 Nakṣatrayāga: 81-83, 92-100, 109-116.
 Nature, in Horace: v ff.
 Nirṛtikarman: 84-86, 101, 116-117.
 Numeral systems, California languages: lxix f.
 Obsequens, and Livy: xvi.
 Ὀφελῆς: 149.
 Ophiel: 152.
 Optative: iv f.
 Ōschiros (*ὠσχιρός*): 156.
 Ovid, imitated by Horace: *Am.* i. 11. 13 and *Epist.* i. 8. 3: 140; *Am.* ii. 12. 28 and *Carm.* iv. 1. 16: 136-147.
 Ovid, allusive reminiscences of Horace: 143 f.
 Ovid, Harvard manuscript of *Heroides* xxi. 1-144: 128-136 ff.
 Paṛiṣṭas of the Atharva-Veda: 79-81, 84-87.
 Perfect active, Greek, rarity of forms of imperative, optative, and subjunctive: xxiv ff.
 Pericles, his building policy: 5-20.
 Philosophy, early Greek: xiv (*bis*).
 Pitch, musical, in language: 66.
πλάσμα, use of, in poetical recitation: 58, 61 n., 64 n.
 Plato, forms of interrogative thought in: xciv.
 Plato, *Rep.* vii, simile of the cave: xxii.
 Plautus, concessive *si*-clauses in: liv.
 Plautus, *Aul.*, name of slave in: xcvii.
 Pliny, Jr., date of governorship of Bithynia: xliii.
 Plutarch, method in biography: 8 ff.
 Plutarch, *Pericles*, 12: 5-20.
 Poetry, ancient, song-like recitation of: 53-57; effect of this upon quantity and word-accent: 57-60.
πρωαυρετα, meaning of: xi ff.
 Pronouns, forming oxytonesis of, in Latin: 36-48.
 Prosody, figures of (Latin): lxxxviii.
 Pulci, Luigi: lxxix f.
 Quantity, affecting accent: 70.
 Quintilian on Latin accent: 70, 72.
Quod-clauses, restrictive, subjunctive in: lv.
R, vowel, in English: lxxx ff.
 Ritschl's theory of the influence of the accent upon Latin verse-forms: 62; merits and defects of this theory: 63-64.
 Rome, building guilds at: 18 f.
rosca, etymology of: xc.
ruche, etymology of: xc.
 Sallust, B.C., lii. 32: lxxxvi.
 Segolates, plural of: liii f.
 Septuagint, Oxford Concordance to: lxxxvii.
sesgo, etymology of: xc.
Si-clauses, concessive, in Plautus: liv.

- Siamese vocabulary: lxxx.
 Sophocles, *Ajax*, 186: iv ff.
 Sophocles, *Antigone*, parodos of: lxxv ff.
 Subjunctive, Latin, second singular indefinite, as mood of statement: xxvii.
Suppletivwesen, Latin: xxxvii ff.
 Tabula smaragdina: 154.
Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, proposed supplement: xxii ff.
 Thracian-Phrygian: xxx f.
tróvos, 'musical mode,' 'melody': 53 n., 56, 64 n.
 Toth: 152.
 Trajan, arch of, Beneventum: xiv ff.
 Vari, cave at: xxii.
 Venetian: xxxii.
 Vergil, *Aen.* i. 249: xcvi f.
- Vergil, influence of art on: lxix.
 Vergil, wind-names in: xcvii.
 Verse-ictus, problem of in ancient poetry: 50; ancient testimonies upon: 51-53; relation to word-accent in Latin: 60-64.
 Vitruvius, and Lucretius: xvi ff.
 Vowels, correction of (Greek) in hiatus: xcii.
 Vowels, coronal, in English: lxxx ff.
 Vowels, duration of English, in monosyllables: xc f.
 Wakefield, master playwright of: lxxxix.
 Word-accent in Latin verse: x ff., lxx.
 Yonac, sources of the lay of: xciv.
 Zabulon (diabolus): 156.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL RECORD.

JULY 1, 1903, TO JULY 1, 1904.

The Bibliographical Record, which is at best a very incomplete summary of the work of the members, aims to include not only publications that are distinctly philological in character, but also those that deal with the educational aspects of the study of language and literature. The Record is intended to contain only such publications as have appeared within the above-mentioned year.

ABBREVIATIONS: *AHR* = American Historical Review; *AJA* = American Journal of Archaeology; *AJP* = American Journal of Philology; *AJSL* = American Journal of Semitic Languages; *AJT* = American Journal of Theology; *Archiv* = Archiv für latein. Lexicographie; *Bookm.* = The Bookman; *CR* = Classical Review; *CSCP* = Cornell Studies in Classical Philology; *ER* = Educational Review; *HSCP* = Harvard Studies in Classical Philology; *H SPL* = Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature; *IF* = Indogermanische Forschungen; *JAOS* = Journal of the American Oriental Society; *JBL* = Journal of Biblical Literature; *JGP* = Journal of Germanic Philology; *JHUC* = Johns Hopkins University Circulars; *MLA* = Publications of the Modern Language Association; *MLN* = Modern Language Notes; *Nat.* = The Nation; *NW* = The New World; *PAPA* = Proceedings of the American Philological Association; *SR* = School Review; *TAPA* = Transactions of the American Philological Association; *UPB* = University of Pennsylvania Bulletin; *WRUB* = Western Reserve University Bulletin.

FRANK FROST ABBOTT.

The Toledo manuscript of the Germania of Tacitus; *University of Chicago Decennial Publications*, first series, vol. vi., 215-259.

ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY.

Recent literature on the New Testament; *AJT.*, viii. (April, 1904), 405-412.

SIDNEY G. ASHMORE.

A plea for the classics in our schools, with particular reference to Latin; *Union University Quarterly*, May, 1904, i., 30-46.

FRANCIS M. AUSTIN.

Cacophony in Juvenal, Horace, and Persius; *AJP.*, xxiv., 452-455.

WILLIAM W. BAKER.

The Greek comic poets as literary critics; *PAPA.*, xxxiv. (1903), p. xxxiv.
Quandō-quidem or *quandō-quidem*; *CR.*, xvii., 313-316.

PHILLIPS BARRY.

The ballad of Lord Randal in New England; *Journal of American Folk-lore*, xvi., 258-264.

J. EDMUND BARSS.

Writing Latin (bk. ii., third and fourth year work), pp. 171; New York: University Publishing Co., 1903.

Latin requirements for Harvard and for Yale; *Latin Leaflet*, iv., No. 83.

The proper ratio between reading and writing in the study of Latin; *Ib.*, No. 92.

SAMUEL ELIOT BASSETT.

The cave at Vari: terra-cotta lamps; *AJA.*, vii. (1903), 338-349.

WILLIAM N. BATES.

Iphigenia in Tauris, edited with an introduction, notes, and critical appendix (The American Book Co.); also text edition.

Scenes from the Aethiopis on a black-figured amphora; *Trans-*

actions of the Department of Archaeology, University of Pennsylvania, vol. i., 45 ff.

PAUL BAUR.

Review of Gardner's Ancient Athens; *CR.*, Feb., 1904.

CHARLES E. BENNETT.

Cicero, selected orations; Boston, 1904.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

On some alleged Indo-European languages in cuneiform character; *AJP.*, xxv., 1-14.

Cerberus, the dog of Hades; *The Monist*, xiv., 523-540.

GEORGE WILLIS BOTSFORD.

The story of Rome as Greeks and Romans tell it: an elementary source-book, pp. xii + 328; New York: The Macmillan Co. [With Lillie Shaw Botsford.]

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

Concerning the unwritten history of the Modern Language Association of America; *MLA.*, xviii., xli-xlii.

Brief mention of books: March's Thesaurus dictionary of the English language; *MLN.*, xviii., 161-162.—The international edition of Shakespeare, and T. S. Osmond's Study of metre; *MLA.*, xix., 63-64.

Rev. of R. Warwick's edition of The complete works of John Lyly; *AJP.*, xxv., 201-206.

Chaucer and Lollius; *MLA.*, xix., xxii-xxiii.

CARL DARLING BUCK.

A Latin grammar for schools and colleges, pp. xi + 388; Ginn & Co., 1903. [With W. G. Hale.]

A grammar of Oscan and Umbrian, pp. xvii + 352; Ginn & Co., 1904.

A sketch of the linguistic conditions of Chicago, p. 20; *The Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, 1903.

CURTIS C. BUSHNELL.

The attitude of Plato toward contemporary Greek thought concerning the future life; *Bulletin of Syracuse University*, Series 4, No. 1 (1903), 3-13.

Verse-translation of "O lux beata"; *Syracuse University Herald*, xxxii., 3 (1903), 75.

Verse-translation of "Quid, tyranne, quid minaris?"; *Ib.*, xxxii., 7 (1904), 215.

Hymnus ad matutinum dominicae diei (original Latin poem); *Ib.*, xxxii., 8 (1904), 244.

Latin selections (Martial and Juvenal), with notes, pp. 24; New Haven: J. T. Hathaway, 1904.

EDWARD CAPPUS.

The introduction of comedy into the city Dionysia at Athens; a chronological study in Greek literary history; *University of Chicago Decennial Publications*, first series, vol. vi., 261-288 (1903).

The 'Nemesis' of the Younger Cratinus; *HSCP.*, vol. xv. (1904), pp. 61-75.

MITCHELL CARROLL.

Observations on the harbors and walls of ancient Athens; *AJA.*, viii., 88-91 (1904).

Editor: *The George Washington University Bulletin*; published by the University, 1904.

J. E. CHURCH, JR.

Sepultura = sepulcrum; *PAPA.*, xxxiv., lxxiii-lxxiv; *Archiv.*, Bd. xiii., Hft. 3, S. 427-428.

Editor: *Nevada State University Tri-Decennial Celebration, Memorial Volume*, Reno, Nevada, 1904, pp. 204.

EDWARD BULL CLAPP.

- Hiatus in Pindar; *PAPA*, xxxiii, lxxx-lxxxii.
 Hiatus in Greek melic poetry; *University of California Publications, Classical Philology*, i, 1-34.

ARTHUR STODDARD COOLEY.

- The bronze Hermes from Antikythera; *Records of the Past*, July, 1903.
 Greece in 1903; *Boston Evening Transcript*, Oct. 21, 1903.
 In old Orchomenos; *ib.*, Jan. 1, 1904.
 How the Greeks vote; *Youth's Companion*, Feb. 25, 1904.
 The Macedonian tomb and battlefield at Chaironeia; *Records of the Past*, May, 1904.

WALTER DENNISON.

- The movements of the chorus chanting the *Carmen Saeculare* of Horace; *University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series*, i, 49-66.

BENJAMIN L. D'OOGÉ.

- New Latin grammar, with J. B. Greenough, G. L. Kittredge, and A. A. Howard, being a revision of Allen and Greenough's Latin grammar; Boston: Ginn & Co., 1903, pp. x + 490.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

- De Horatii *Serm.*, I. 1; *Revue de Philologie*, xxvii., 233-235.
 The supplementary signs of the Greek alphabet; *AJA.*, vii., 429-444.
 Observatiunculæ ad locos quosdam poetarum romanorum; *Revue de Philologie*, xxvii., 269-272.
 Rev. of Newman's edition of the Politics of Aristotle; *Political Science Quarterly*, xix., 157-160.
 Notes [Horace, *Carmm.*, I. 3. 1-8; Plato, *Rep.*, 423 B]; *PAPA.*, xxiv., xxii-xxiii.

De Sophoclis *Antigonæ* vv. 45 et 46; *Revue de Philologie*, xxviii., 122.

Ad Ciceronis *Catonem Maiorem*; *Revue de Philologie*, xxviii., 123 f.

H. EDMISTON.

- The question of the coincidence of word-accent and verse-ictus in the Latin hexameter; *CR.*, xvii., 458-460, and *PAPA.*, xxxiv., xxv-xxviii.
 Diaeresis after the second foot of the hexameter in Lucretius; *PAPA.*, *ib.*, lx-lxi.

EDGAR ALFRED EMENS.

A Tanagra figurine of Eros; *Syracuse University Bulletin*, iv., No. 1.

HENRY RUSHTON FAIRCLOUGH.

- Recent archaeological discoveries in Crete; *The University of Toronto Monthly*, December, 1903.
 P. Terenti Afri *Andria*, pp. lxxxi + 181, second edition; Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1904.

EDWIN W. FAY.

- Further notes on the *Mostellaria* of Plautus; *AJP.*, xxiv., 245-277.
 Lateinisch *cena*, *caesna* (Festus) „fest”; *Archiv*, xiii., 436-437.
 The word for nightingale in the romance languages; *MLN.*, xviii., 195-196.
 Some Greek cognates of the Sanskrit root *twiṣ-*; *CR.*, xviii., 207-208.
 Studies of Latin words in *-cinio-*, *-cinia-*, I. *Luscinia*; *ib.*, 303-307.

W. S. FERGUSON.

The oligarchic revolution at Athens of the year 103/2 B.C.; *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*, iv. (1904), 1-17.

CHARLES MILLS GAYLEY.

Poetry of the people, with a preface on the proper way of introducing the young to the study of poetry; Ginn & Co., 1903, pp. 403.

- The principles and progress of English poetry, pp. xc + 600 (Principles by C. M. G.; Progress in collaboration with C. C. Young); New York: The Macmillan Co., 1904.
- PLINY EARLE GODDARD.
- Hupa texts; *Univ. Calif. Publ., American Archaeology and Ethnology*, vol. i., No. 2, pp. 290, 1904.
- EDWIN L. GREEN.
- ἰδιος* as a possessive in Polybius, *PAPA.*, xxxiv. (1903), iv-v.
- The optative mood in Diodorus Siculus, *Ib.*, lxii-lxiii.
- ALFRED GUDEMAN.
- Rev. of Bornecque's *Sénèque le rhéteur*, etc.; *AJP.*, xxiv., 337-340.
- Theodor Mommsen; *Latin Leaflet*, Nov. 30 and Dec. 7, 1903.
- Rev. of John E. Sandys's *History of classical scholarship*; *CR.*, xviii., 271-276, 316-321.
- FREDERIC ALDIN HALL.
- Homeric stories, pp. 200; American Book Co., 1903.
- KARL P. HARRINGTON.
- Studies in the metrical art of the Roman elegists; *PAPA.*, xxxiv. (1903), xxviii-xxx.
- The letters of Lipsius; *Methodist Review*, lxxxvi., 255-263.
- J. E. HARRY.
- On the omission of the copula in certain combinations in Greek; *PAPA.*, xxxiv. (1903), viii-x.
- The meaning of *ἄμμα τέτραπται* in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, 246; *Ib.*, xli-xlii.
- The same in full; *CR.*, Dec., 1903.
- Zu Euripides' *Hippolytos*; *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie*, June 22, 1904, pp. 699 f.
- W. A. HEIDEL.
- The logic of the pre-Socratic philosophy, in "Studies in logical theory," by John Dewey and others; *Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, second series, vol. xi.
- Rev. of Carlo Pascal, *Studi critici sul poema di Lucrezio*, *AJP.*, xxiv., 3, 330-335.
- Rev. of Hermann Diels, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker griechisch und deutsch.*, *Ib.*, 4, 456-465.
- OTTO HELLER.
- Die deutsche Schriftstellerin von gestern und heute; *Paedagogische Monatshefte*, iv., 8-9 (Oct., 1903), 251-264.
- Vom germanischen Museum; *Mississippi-Blätter*, Nov., 1903.
- Rev. of Dillard, *Deutsche Lyrik*; *MLN.*, Jan., 1904.
- Rev. of Kloss, *Lyra Germanica-Latina*; *Mississippi-Blätter*, 20 March, 1904.
- ARTHUR WINFRED HODGMAN.
- Adverbial forms in Plautus; *CR.*, xvii., 296-303 (July, 1903).
- Carmen Harvardianum, *Harvard Graduate Magazine*, xii., 47-48 (Sept., 1903).
- CHARLES HOEING.
- Vica Pota; *AJP.*, xxiv., 323-326.
- MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.
- Classification of the Barringer find of Alexandrian coins (about 300 in number), in *University of Virginia Alumni Bulletin*, iv., No. 2.
- A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON.
- Early Persian literature, Rev. of Browne's *Literary history of Persia*; *Atlantic Monthly*, xci., 275-278.
- Bibliographie 'Iranisch'; *IF., Anzeiger*, xiii., 162-174.

- By caravan and cavalcade; *N. Y. Evening Post*, Oct. 3, 1903.
 Notes from India, second series, illustrated; *J.A.O.S.*, xxiii., 307-317.
 Benares, the sacred city of the Hindus, its temples, its holy river, and its burning *ghats* of the dead, illustrated; *The Traveller*, i., 22-26.
 The great Behistun rock and some results of a reëxamination of the old Persian inscriptions on it; *J.A.O.S.*, xxiv., 77-95.
 Die iranische religion (Schluss); *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie*, ii., 641-710.
 Bibliographie 'Iranisch'; *IF., Anzeiger*, xv., 48-57.
 Contributor and editor of articles on Indo-Iranian subjects in *The New International Encyclopaedia*; New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1903.
 On Sanskrit *l* = Avestan *d*; *J.A.O.S.*, xxv., 175.
 Notes of a journey to Persia, I, *Ib.*, 176-184.

CHARLES W. L. JOHNSON.

- Must spelling reform necessarily be phonetic? *ER.*, xxvi., 5 (Dec., 1903), 516-525.

W. H. JOHNSON.

- Little Tullia, my darling; *Evening Post*, Saturday Supplement, May 7, 1904.
 Rev. of Gudeman's sources of Plutarch's Life of Cicero; *Nat.*, lxxvii., 17.
 Rev. of Lavissee's Education de la démocratie; *Ib.*, lxxviii., 75.
 Rev. of Henderson's Life and principate of Nero; *Ib.*, 174.
 Rev. of Sandys's History of classical scholarship; *Ib.*, 394.
 Rev. of Julian Hawthorne's Hawthorne and his circle; *Dial*, xxxv., 466.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

- Report on *Philologus* lxi. (N. F. Bd. xv.), 1902, in *AJP.*, xxv., 92-96.
 The use of the floating-ship motive

- in some ancient and renaissance fountains; *AJA.*, viii., 83-84.
 Review of the Williams Literary Monthly in the *Williams Weekly*, xvii., 290-291.

ROLAND G. KENT.

- On Albinovanus Pedo, vv. 1-7, apud Sen. *Suas.* i., 15, in *CR.*, xvii. (1903), 311-312.
 A history of Thessaly from the earliest historical times to the accession of Philip V of Macedonia; printed in part; doctoral dissertation; New Era Printing Co., Lancaster, Pa., 1904, viii + 27 pp.

A. L. KROEBER.

- The languages of the coast of California south of San Francisco; *Univ. Calif. Publ., American Archaeology and Ethnology*, ii., 31-80. June, 1904.

EMORY B. LEASE.

- Livy's use of *-arunt*, *-erunt*, and *-ere*; *AJP.*, xxiv., 408-422.
 Contracted forms of the perfect in Livy; *CR.*, xviii., 27-36.
 Natal monstrosities in Italy before the age of Augustus; *St. Louis Medical Review*, Sept. 5, 1903.

HERBERT W. MAGOUN.

- Is the present theory of Greek elision sound? *PAPA.*, xxxiv., xxiv.-xxv.
 The dactylic, heroic, and *κατ' ἐνόπλιον* forms of the hexameter, and their relation to the elegiac pentameter and the prosodiac tetrameter; *Ib.*, li.-lv.
 Meter or rhythm, which? *SR.*, xii. (1904), 380-381.

J. IRVING MANATT.

- Bevan's The house of Seleucus; *AHR.*, ix., i., 126-130.
 Timotheos and the Persians; *Atlantic Monthly*, xciii., 234-241.
 The germ of Greek culture; *Brown Alumni Monthly*, April, 1904, 185-188.

NELSON G. MCCREA.

The Latin papers of the college entrance examination board; *Latin Leaflet*, March 21 and 28, 1904, also *ER.*, xxviii. (June, 1904), 28-37.

Article on Lucretius; *New International Encyclopaedia*, xi., 554-555.

C. L. MEADER.

The value of general and comparative linguistics for the classical student; read at the classical conference of the Michigan schoolmasters' club on April 1; *SR.*, xii., 391-398.

Notes on the order of words in Latin; *PAPA.*, xxxiv., xxxi f.

TRUMAN MICHELSON.

On some verb-forms in the Rāmāyana; *PAPA.*, xxxiv., xl-xli.

Linguistic archaisms of the Rāmāyana, *JAOS.*, xxv. (first half), 89-145.

C. W. E. MILLER.

Hephaestion and the anapaest in the Aristophanic trimeter; *TAPA.*, xxxiv. (1903), 49-59.

FRANK G. MOORE.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Cato Maior de senectute (with introduction and notes), pp. 205; text edition, pp. 37; American Book Co., 1904 (Morris and Morgan's series).

Studies in Tacitean ellipsis: descriptive passages; *TAPA.*, xxxiv. (1903), 5-26.

LEWIS F. MOTT.

Articles on Provençal literature, romance languages and troubadours in *The New International Encyclopaedia*; New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1903-1904.

The position of the soliloquy, "To be or not to be," in Hamlet; *MLA.*, xix., 26-32.

H. C. NUTTING.

The modes of conditional thought, *AJP.*, xxiv., 278-303.

The Trinummus of Plautus, pp. vi + 80; B. H. Sanborn & Co., Boston, 1903.

Some theories on subjunctive protasis with indicative apodosis, *CR.*, xvii., 449-456.

GEORGE N. OLCOTT.

Notes on Roman coins; *A. J. Num.*, xxxvii.

Thesaurus linguae Latinae epigraphicae, a dictionary of the Latin inscriptions; vol. i., fasc. i. (A-AB), Rome (Loescher), 1904.

EDWARD T. OWEN.

Interrogative thought and the means of its expression; *Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters*, xiv., 355-470.

SAMUEL BALL PLATNER.

The topography and monuments of ancient Rome, xiv + 514 pp.; Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1904.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT.

Magister curiae in Plautus's *Aulularia*, 107; *TAPA.*, xxxiv. (1903), 41-48.

JOHN DYNELEY PRINCE.

The vocabulary of Sumerian, *JAOS.*, xxv., 49-67.

Le Bouc Émissaire; *Journ. Asiatique*, 1903, 133-156.

The Assyro-Babylonian scapegoat controversy; *AJSL.*, xx., 173-181.

The code of Hammurabi, *AJT.*, 1904, 601-610.

Nisroch and Nusku; *JBL.*, 1904, pt. i.

Dying American speech echoes from Connecticut; *Journ. Amer. Philol. Soc.*, 1904, 346-352.

Glossary of the Mohegan Pequot language; *Amer. Anthropologist*, vi., 18-45 (with F. G. Speck).

EDWARD K. PUTNAM.

The *Scalacronica* version of *Havelok*; *TAPA.*, xxxiv., xci-xciii.

ROBERT S. RADFORD.

The Latin monosyllables in their relation to accent and quantity; *TAPA.*, xxxiv. (1903), 60-103.

On the recession of the Latin accent in connection with monosyllabic words and the traditional word-order, first paper; *AJP.*, xxv., 147-162.

Rev. of West's Latin grammar for schools; *CR.*, xviii., No. 7 (Oct., 1904).

EDWARD KENNARD RAND.

On the composition of Boethius's *Consolatio philosophiae*; *HSCP.*, xv., 1-28.

CARL COSMO RICE.

The etymology of Italian *greggio*, *grezzo*; *Modern Philology*, i., No. 2 (October, 1903).

The etymology of the romance words for "to go"; *MLA.*, xix., No. 2; new series, xii., 2 (June, 1904).

LEON JOSIAH RICHARDSON.

Rhythm as concerned in poetry; *PAPA.*, xxxiv. (1903), lxxxvii-lxxxviii.

The 1904 University of California Summer Session; *Western Journal of Education*, ix., 393-394.

ERNST RIESS.

Studies in superstition: Pindar and Bacchylides; *AJP.*, xxiv. (1904), 423-440.

An old worship in Cos; *Latin Leaflet*, iv. (1904), Nos. 76, 77.

Rev. of Minckwitz's Cicero; *Ib.*, No. 80.

Miscellae Vergilianae; *Ib.*, No. 81.

The new treasures of the Metropolitan Museum; *Ib.*, No. 87.

The Ajax of Sophocles (criticism of

the performance in Greek); *Ib.*, No. 97.

Miscellanea Superstitiosa; *Ib.*, Nos. 98, 99.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

Afterthoughts: on *ab* before proper names beginning with a consonant; on *de tenero ungui*, *Hor. Carm.*, iii. 6. 24; on the meaning of *canicula*; *PAPA.*, xxxiv. (1903), lv-lx.

Articles in the New International Encyclopaedia and in the Encyclopaedia Americana.

As editor-in-chief of Allyn & Bacon's College Latin Series; see under PLATNER and WESTCOTT.

HENRY A. SANDERS.

The myth about Tarpeia; *University of Michigan Studies*, i., 1-47.

The lost epitome of Livy; *University of Michigan Studies*, i., 149-260.

Editor: *The University of Michigan Studies*; Humanistic Series, vol. i.

Roman historical sources and institutions; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1904.

HUGO K. SCHILLING.

Schenken, translated and abridged from *JGP.*, iv., 510-516 ("The semasiology of *schengen*, 'skink'") by E. E. Meyer; *Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung*, iv., 328-330.

Two reminiscences of children's rhymes in Goethe's *Faust I*; *MLN.*, xix., 153-155.

F. G. G. SCHMIDT.

Sudermann's dramatic development; *PAPA.*, xxxiii., ciii-civ (1902).

Wildenbruch's *Das edle Blut*, with vocabulary; D. C. Heath & Co., 1902.

Zur Elisabethen-Legende (Ms. fifteenth century); *JGP.*, v., 2, 161-179 (1903).

- Christian Gottfried Boeckh's Alt-deutsches Glossarium; *Alemannia*, v. (1904).
 August Sperrl u. seine Werke; *JGP.*, v., 4 (1904).
 Scribe's *Le Verre d'Eau*, edited, W. R. Jenkins; New York, 1904.
 Grupp's Kulturgeschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit; *AHR.*, ix., 3, 542-543 (1904).
 Dr. W. Kahl's Deutsche Mundartliche Dichtungen; *JGP.*, v., 4 (1904).
- JOHN ADAMS SCOTT.
 Vocative in Homer and Hesiod; *AJP.*, xxiv., 192 ff.
 Vocative in Aeschylus and Sophocles; *Ib.*, xxv., 81 ff.
 Homeric notes, first paper; *CR.*, xvii., 238 f.; second paper; *Ib.*, xviii., 145 ff.
- J. HENRY SENDER.
 Undine, by Friedrich Baron de la Motte Fouqué, with introduction, notes, and vocabulary; American Book Co.
- FREDERICK WILLIAM SHIPLEY.
 Certain sources of corruption in Latin manuscripts; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1904, 100 pp. (Reprinted from *AJA.*, vii., Nos. 1, 2, 4.)
- GRANT SHOWERMAN.
 The American college course; *ER.*, xxvi., 166-179.
 Cicero's appreciation of Greek art; *PAPA.*, xxxiv., xxxv-xxxvii.
 Rev. of Ernest Gardner's Ancient Athens; *AJP.*, xxiv. (1903).
- E. G. SIHLER.
 Autumn leaves; *Satura Senescentis*, in the *Violet* (Year Book of New York University) for 1904.
- EDGAR HOWARD STURTEVANT.
 Latin *s(s)* from *rs(s)*; *CR.*, xviii. (1903), 159.
- CHARLES WILLIAM SUPER.
 Aspects of Roman education; *Journal of Pedagogy*, March, 1904.
 Philosophers as failures, *Westminster Review*, June, 1904.
 Salt; *Popular Science*, July, 1904.
- HERBERT CUSHING TOLMAN.
Mycenaean Troy (with G. C. Scoggin), vol. v., Vanderbilt Oriental Series, edited by Herbert Cushing Tolman and James Henry Stevenson, 111 pp.; American Book Co., 1904.
 Danielsson's Assimilation mit nachträglicher Diektasis in Homer; *PAPA.*, xxxiv., xx.
- JOHN C. WATSON.
 The relation of the scene-headings to the miniatures in manuscripts of Terence; *HSCP.*, xiv. (1903), 55-172.
- RAYMOND WEEKS.
 Texts most used in teaching of Old French, *MLA.*, vol. xviii., 526-534.
 The newly discovered Chancun de Willame (first article), *Modern Philology*, June, 1904, vol. ii., 1-16.
- CHARLES H. WELLER.
 The cave at Vari, description, account of excavation, and history; *AJA.*, vii., 263-288.
 The pre-Periclean propylon of the Acropolis at Athens; *Ib.*, viii., 35-70.
- J. H. WESTCOTT.
 Livy: books i., xxii., xxiii., with introduction and notes; revised edition, pp. xxxv + 425; Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1904.
- HARRY LANGFORD WILSON.
 Notice of H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, ii., 1; *AJP.*, xxiv. (1903), 362.

Notice of Festschrift zu Otto Hirschfelds sechzigstem Geburtstage, Berlin, 1903; *Ib.*, 485-486.

Notice of A. Carnoy, Le Latin d'Espagne d'après les inscriptions, Louvain, 1902-1903; *Ib.*, xxv. (1904), 114.

The *Codex Canonicianus Lat.*, xli. and the tradition of Juvenal; *PAPA.*, xxxiv., xix.

Bericht über die Jahresversammlung des Archaeological Institute of

America, Dec., 1903; *Deutsche Lit.-Zeitung*, xxv. (1904), Nr. 28, Sp. 1784; *Ib.*, Nr. 29, Sp. 1845-1847.

HENRY B. WRIGHT.

The American college course; *ER.*, xxvii., 384-394.

The campaign of Plataea, pp. 148; New Haven: The Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor Co., 1904.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1904-1905.

PRESIDENT.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL.

SECRETARY AND TREASURER.

FRANK GARDNER MOORE.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The above-named Officers, and—

CHARLES E. BENNETT.

EDWARD B. CLAPP.

FRANCIS A. MARCH.

MORRIS H. MORGAN.

PAUL SHOREY.

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.¹

1904-1905.

- Prof. F. F. Abbott, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1886.
William F. Abbott, High School, Worcester, Mass. (38 William St.). 1893.
Prof. Charles D. Adams, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1892.
Dr. Cyrus Adler, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C. (1706 S St.). 1883.
Prof. George Henry Allen, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O. 1904.
Prof. Hamilton Ford Allen, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa.
1903.
Miss Katharine Allen, 228 Langdon St., Madison, Wis. 1899.
Prof. Francis G. Allinson, Brown University, Providence, R. I. (163 George St.).
1893.
Principal Harlan P. Amen, Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H. (Life mem-
ber). 1897.
Prof. Alfred Williams Anthony, Cobb Divinity School, Lewiston, Me. 1890.
Prof. W. Muss-Arnolt, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1890.
Dr. R. Arrowsmith, American Book Company, Washington Square, New York,
N. Y. 1898.
Prof. Sidney G. Ashmore, Union University, Schenectady, N. Y. 1885.
William G. Aurelio, Boston University, Boston, Mass. (75 Hancock St.). 1903.
Prof. Francis M. Austin, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Ill. 1902.
Prof. C. C. Ayer, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. 1902.
Prof. Frank Cole Babbitt, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. (65 Vernon St.). 1897.
Herbert L. Baker, 47 Moffat Building, Detroit, Mich. 1889.
Prof. William W. Baker, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. 1902.
Dr. Francis K. Ball, Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H. (Life member).
1894.
Dr. Floyd G. Ballentine, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. 1903.
Cecil K. Bancroft, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (213 Durfee Hall). 1898.
Prof. Grove E. Barber, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb. (1230 L St.).
1902.
Miss Amy L. Barbour, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1902.
Phillips Barry, 33 Ball Street, Roxbury Crossing, Boston, Mass. 1901.
J. Edmund Barss, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. 1897.

¹ This list has been corrected up to June 15, 1905; permanent addresses are given, as far as may be. Where the residence is left blank, the members in question are in Europe. The Secretary and the Publishers beg to be kept informed of all changes of address.

- George K. Bartholomew, Evanswood, Clifton, Cincinnati, O. 1893.
 Dr. Samuel E. Bassett, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (168 Sheffield Ave.). 1903.
 Dr. F. O. Bates, Detroit Central High School, Detroit, Mich. 1900.
 Prof. William N. Bates, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penn. (220 St. Mark's Square). 1894.
 Prof. William J. Battle, University of Texas, Austin, Tex. 1893.
 Prof. Paul V. C. Baur, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (246 Church St.). 1902.
 John W. Beach, Fort Worth University, Fort Worth, Tex. 1902.
 Dr. Edward A. Bechtel, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1900.
 Prof. Isbøn T. Beckwith, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1884.
 Charles H. Beeson, 6020 Ingleside Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 1897.
 Prof. A. J. Bell, Victoria University, Toronto, Can. (17 Avenue Road). 1887.
 Prof. Allen R. Benner, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. 1901.
 Prof. Charles E. Bennett, Cornell University. 1882.
 Prof. John I. Bennett, Union University, Schenectady, N. Y. 1897.
 Prof. George R. Berry, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. 1902.
 Prof. Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J. 1884.
 William F. Biddle, 4305 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1894.
 Prof. C. P. Bill, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. (853 Logan Ave.). 1894.
 Rev. Dr. Daniel Moschel Birmingham, Walden University, Nashville, Tenn. (addr.: Park Row Building, New York, N. Y.). 1898.
 Prof. Charles Edward Bishop, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va. 1890.
 Prof. David H. Bishop, University of Mississippi, Oxford, Miss. 1905.
 Prof. Robert W. Blake, Lehigh University, So. Bethlehem, Pa. (440 Seneca St.). 1894.
 Prof. M. Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1882.
 Prof. Willis H. Boccock, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga. 1890.
 Prof. C. W. E. Body, General Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y. (4 Chelsea Square). 1887.
 Dr. George M. Bolling, Catholic University of America, 1122 Vermont Ave., Washington, D. C. 1897.
 Prof. D. Bonbright, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1892.
 Prof. A. L. Bondurant, University of Mississippi, University, Miss. 1892.
 Prof. Campbell Bonner, University of Nashville (Peabody College for Teachers), Nashville, Tenn. (1512½ Demonbreun St.). 1899.
 Prof. George Willis Botsford, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1894.
 Prof. Benjamin Parsons Bourland, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. 1900.
 Prof. B. L. Bowen, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. 1895.
 Prof. Edwin W. Bowen, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va. 1905.
 Prof. Charles F. Bradley, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. 1886.
 Prof. J. Everett Brady, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1891.
 Prof. H. C. G. Brandt, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. 1876.
 Prof. Walter R. Bridgman, Lake Forest University, Lake Forest, Ill. 1890.

- Prof. James W. Bright, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1887.
Prof. John A. van Broekhoven, Fairview Avenue, Hyde Park, Cincinnati, O. 1902.
Miss Caroline G. Brombacher, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (399
Clermont Ave.). 1897.
Dr. Carroll N. Brown, Asheville School, Asheville, N. C. 1899.
Prof. Demarchus C. Brown, Butler College, Irvington, Ind. (125 Downey Ave.,
Indianapolis, Ind.). 1893.
Prof. F. W. Brown, Franklin College, Franklin, Ind. 1893.
Dr. Lester Dorman Brown, Drury College, Springfield, Mo. 1904.
Prof. Carleton L. Brownson, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.
(17 Lexington Ave.). 1892.
Principal C. F. Brusie, Mount Pleasant Academy, Ossining, N. Y. 1894.
Prof. Carl D. Buck, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1890.
Miss Mary H. Buckingham, Wellesley Hills, Mass. 1897.
Walter H. Buell, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. 1887.
Isaac B. Burgess, Morgan Park Academy, Morgan Park, Ill. 1892.
Dr. Theodore C. Burgess, Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Ill. 1900.
Prof. John M. Burnam, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O. 1899.
Prof. Sylvester Burnham, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. 1885.
Dr. William S. Burrage, Middlebury, Vt. 1898.
Prof. Harry E. Burton, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1899.
Prof. Henry F. Burton, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y. 1878.
Prof. Curtis C. Bushnell, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. (201 Dell St.). 1900.
Pres. Henry A. Buttz, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J. 1869.
Miss Miriam A. Bytel, Gilman School, Cambridge, Mass. (10 Avon St.). 1901.
Prof. Edward Capps, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1889.
Prof. Mitchell Carroll, Columbian University, Washington, D. C. 1894.
Frank Carter, The College, Winchester, England. 1897.
Dr. Franklin Carter, 324 Prospect St., New Haven, Conn. 1871.
Prof. Jesse Benedict Carter, American School of Classical Studies, Rome, Italy
(Via Vicenza 5). 1898.
Prof. Mary Emily Case, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y. 1895.
Prof. Clarence F. Castle, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1888.
William Van Allen Catron, West Side High School, Milwaukee, Wis. (1306 Grand
Ave.). 1896.
Prof. Julia H. Caverno, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1902.
Miss Eva Channing, Exeter Chambers, Boston, Mass. 1883.
Prof. A. C. Chapin, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1888.
Prof. Henry Leland Chapman, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me. 1892.
Prof. George Davis Chase, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1900.
Dr. George H. Chase, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (24 Grays Hall).
1899.
Prof. S. R. Cheek, Centre College of Kentucky, Danville, Ky. 1890.
Miss Emma Kirkland Clark, 545 A Quincy St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1896.
Dr. Frank Lowry Clark, Washburn College, Topeka, Kan. (1511 West St.). 1902.
Prof. Charles Nelson Cole, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O. 1902.
Prof. George Stuart Collins, Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1897.
Prof. Hermann Collitz, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1887.

- William T. Colville, Carbondale, Pa. 1884.
 Principal D. Y. Comstock, St. Johnsbury, Vt. 1888.
 Prof. Elisha Conover, Delaware College, Newark, Del. 1897.
 Edmund C. Cook, Berkeley School, 72d St. and West End Ave., New York, N. Y. 1904.
 Dr. Arthur Stoddard Cooley, 387 Central St., Auburndale, Mass. 1896.
 J. Randolph Coolidge, Jr., Chestnut Hill, Mass. 1884.
 Prof. William L. Cowles, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1888.
 Prof. W. H. Crogman, Clark University, South Atlanta, Ga. 1898.
 W. L. Cushing, Westminster School, Simsbury, Conn. 1888.
 Prof. William K. Denison, Tufts College, College Hill, Mass. 1899.
 Prof. Walter Dennison, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1899.
 Prof. Samuel C. Derby, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. 1895.
 Sherwood Owen Dickerman. 1902.
 Prof. Howard Freeman Doane, 252 West 104th St., New York, N. Y. 1897.
 Prof. Benjamin L. D'Ooge, State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich. 1895.
 Prof. Martin L. D'Ooge, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1873.
 Prof. Louis H. Dow, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1895.
 Prof. Joseph H. Drake, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1897.
 Prof. Eli Dunkle, Ohio University, Athens, O. 1904.
 Prof. Frederic Stanley Dunn, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore. 1899.
 Miss Emily Helen Dutton, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1898.
 Prof. Mortimer Lamson Earle, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1890.
 Dr. Herman L. Ebeling, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. 1892.
 Prof. William S. Ebersole, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Ia. 1893.
 Prof. W. A. Eckels, Miami University, Oxford, O. 1894.
 Dr. Homer J. Edmiston, Via Vicenza 5, Rome, Italy. 1894.
 Prof. George V. Edwards, State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich. (121 Normal St.). 1901.
 Prof. Katharine M. Edwards, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1893.
 Prof. James C. Egbert, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1889.
 Prof. Wallace Stedman Elden, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. (1462 Neil Ave.). 1900.
 Prof. A. Marshall Elliott, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1884.
 Prof. W. A. Elliott, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. 1897.
 Prof. Herbert C. Elmer, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1887.
 Prof. L. H. Elwell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1883.
 Miss E. Antoinette Ely, The Clifton School, Cincinnati, O. 1893.
 Prof. Edgar A. Emens, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. 1895.
 Prof. O. F. Emerson, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. (50 Wilbur St.). 1903.
 Prof. Annie Crosby Emery, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1896.
 Prof. George Taylor Ettinger, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa. 1896.
 Principal O. Faduma, Peabody Academy, Troy, N. C. 1900.
 Prof. Arthur Fairbanks, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. 1886.
 Prof. Charles E. Fay, Tufts College, College Hill, Mass. 1885.
 Prof. Edwin W. Fay, University of Texas, Austin, Tex. 1889.
 Pres. Thomas Fell, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md. 1888.

- Principal F. J. Fessenden, Fessenden School, West Newton, Mass. 1890.
Prof. Mervin G. Filler, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. 1905.
Dr. George Converse Fiske, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (609 Lake St.). 1900.
Prof. Edward Fitch, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. 1890.
Prof. Thomas Fitz-Hugh, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. (Life member). 1902.
Prof. Roy C. Flickinger, Epworth University, Oklahoma City, Okl. 1905.
Miss Helen C. Flint, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1897.
Prof. Herbert B. Foster, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa. 1900.
Prof. Frank H. Fowler, Lombard College, Galesburg, Ill. 1893.
Prof. Harold N. Fowler, Western Reserve University (College for Women), Cleveland, O. 1885.
Miss Susan Fowler, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1904.
Dr. Wilmer Cave France, Radnor, Pa. 1900.
Dr. Susan B. Franklin, Ethical Culture School, 63d St. and Central Park West, New York, N. Y. 1890.
Dr. I. F. Frisbee, 187 W. Canton St., Boston, Mass. 1898.
Prof. Charles Kelsey Gaines, St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y. 1890.
Dr. William Gallagher, Thayer Academy, South Braintree, Mass. 1886.
Frank A. Gallup, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. (320 Clinton Ave.). 1898.
Prof. Henry Gibbons, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (405 South 41st St.). 1890.
Principal Seth K. Gifford, Moses Brown School, Providence, R. I. 1891.
Prof. John W. Gilbert, Paine College, Augusta, Ga. (1620 Magnolia St.). 1897.
Prof. Basil L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1876.
Clarence Willard Gleason, Roxbury Latin School, Roxbury, Mass. (6 Copeland St.). 1901.
Prof. Thomas D. Goodell, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (35 Edgehill Road). 1883.
Prof. Charles J. Goodwin, Lehigh University, So. Bethlehem, Pa. 1891.
Prof. William W. Goodwin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (5 Follen St.). 1870.
Prof. Roscoe Allan Grant, De Witt Clinton High School, New York, N. Y. (60 West 13th St.). 1902.
Prof. E. L. Green, South Carolina College, Columbia, S. C. 1898.
Prof. Herbert Eveleth Greene, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1890.
Prof. John Greene, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. 1902.
Prof. Wilber J. Greer, Washburn College, Topeka, Kan. 1892.
Dr. Alfred Gudeman, Franz Josefstrasse 12, Munich, Germany. 1889.
Dr. Roscoe Guernsey, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1902.
Prof. Charles Burton Gulick, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (18 Walker St.). 1894.
Prof. George D. Hadzsits, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O. 1904.
Dr. Walter D. D. Hadzsits, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1904.
Miss Elizabeth Hazelton Haight, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1902.
Prof. William Gardner Hale, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1882.

- Prof. Arthur P. Hall, Drury College, Springfield, Mo. 1886.
 Prof. F. A. Hall, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. (531 Spring Ave.). 1896.
 Frank T. Hallett, Brown University, Providence, R. I. (283 George St.). 1902.
 Prof. T. F. Hamblin, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. 1895.
 Prof. Adelbert Hamilton, Elmira College, Elmira, N. Y. 1895.
 Miss Clemence Hamilton, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1901.
 Principal John Calvin Hanna, High School, Oak Park, Ill. (209 South East Ave.).
 1896.
 Prof. Albert Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1869.
 Prof. Albert Granger Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1896.
 Pres. William R. Harper, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1887.
 Prof. Karl P. Harrington, University of Maine, Orono, Me. 1892.
 Miss Mary B. Harris, 2252 Calumet Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1902.
 Prof. W. A. Harris, Richmond College, Richmond, Va. (1606 West Grace St.).
 1895.
 Prof. William Fenwick Harris, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (8 Mercer
 Circle). 1901.
 Prof. J. E. Harry, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O. 1896.
 Dr. Carl A. Harström, The Folly, Norwalk, Conn. 1900.
 Prof. Samuel Hart, Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn. 1871.
 Eugene W. Harter, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (121 Marlborough
 Road). 1901.
 Prof. Paul Haupt, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1884.
 Prof. Adeline Belle Hawes, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1902.
 Dr. Edward Southworth Hawes, Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1888.
 Rev. Dr. Henry H. Haynes, 6 Ellery St., Cambridge, Mass. 1900.
 Prof. F. M. Hazen, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1896.
 Dr. Theodore Woolsey Heermance, American School of Classical Studies, Athens,
 Greece. 1897.
 Prof. W. A. Heidel, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia. 1900.
 Prof. F. B. R. Hellems, State University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. 1900.
 Prof. Otto Heller, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 1896.
 Nathan Wilbur Helm, Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1900.
 Prof. George Hempl, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (1027 East Uni-
 versity Ave.). 1895.
 Prof. Archer Wilnot Hendrick, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash. 1904.
 Prof. G. L. Hendrickson, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1892.
 Adam Fremont Hendrix, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan. 1904.
 Prof. John H. Hewitt, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1886.
 Edwin H. Higley, Groton School, Groton, Mass. 1899.
 Prof. Henry T. Hildreth, Roanoke College, Salem, Va. 1896.
 Prof. James M. Hill, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa. 1900.
 Dr. Gertrude Hirst, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1902.
 Harwood Hoadley, 140 West 13th St., New York, N. Y. 1903.
 Archibald L. Hodges, Wadleigh High School, 114th St., near 7th Ave., New York
 City. 1899.
 Prof. Arthur W. Hodgman, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. (202 West 8th
 Ave.). 1896.

- Dr. Charles Hoceing, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y. 1899.
Prof. Horace A. Hoffman, University of Indiana, Bloomington, Ind. 1893.
Dr. D. H. Holmes, Eastern District High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (878 Driggs Ave.). 1900.
Prof. W. D. Hooper, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga. 1894.
Prof. E. Washburn Hopkins, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (299 Lawrence St.). 1883.
Prof. Herbert Müller Hopkins, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. (4 Trinity St.). 1898.
Prof. Joseph Clark Hoppin, American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece. 1900.
Prof. William A. Houghton, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me. 1892.
Prof. Albert A. Howard, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (12 Walker St.). 1892.
Prof. George E. Howes, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt. 1896.
Prof. Frank G. Hubbard, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1896.
Prof. J. H. Huddilston, University of Maine, Orono, Me. 1898.
Prof. Walter Hulihen, Grant University, Chattanooga, Tenn. 1904.
Prof. Milton W. Humphreys, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. 1871.
Stephen A. Hurlbut, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1903.
Dr. George B. Hussey, East Orange, N. J. 1887.
Frederick L. Hutson, 5727 Monroe Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1902.
Prof. J. W. D. Ingersoll, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (311 Crown St.). 1897.
Andrew Ingraham, 4 Bryant St., Cambridge, Mass. 1888.
Prof. A. V. Williams Jackson, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1884.
Prof. George E. Jackson, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. (4400 Morgan St.). 1890.
Prof. M. W. Jacobus, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. (14 Marshall St.). 1893.
Prof. Hans C. G. von Jagemann, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (113 Walker St.). 1882.
Dr. Samuel A. Jeffers, State Normal School, California, Pa. 1904.
Miss Anna S. Jenkins, 427 Nostrand Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1899.
Dr. Charles W. L. Johnson, 32 East Preston St., Baltimore, Md. 1897.
Prof. William H. Johnson, Denison University, Granville, O. 1895.
Prof. Eva Johnston, University of the State of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1902.
Dr. George W. Johnston, University of Toronto, Toronto, Can. 1895.
Augustine Jones, Providence, R. I. 1896.
Prof. J. C. Jones, University of the State of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1902.
Prof. George Dwight Kellogg, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1897.
Prof. Francis W. Kelsey, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1890.
Dr. Roland G. Kent, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (3707 Woodland Ave.). 1903.
Prof. Charles R. Keyes, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Ia. 1901.
Prof. John B. Kieffer, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. 1889.
Prof. William Hamilton Kirk, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J. 1898.
Chancellor J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. 1887.

- Prof. J. C. Kirtland, Jr., Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1895.
- Prof. George Lyman Kittredge, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (9 Hilliard St.). 1884.
- Dr. William H. Klapp, Academy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 1324 Locust St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1894.
- Prof. Charles Knapp, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (1773 Sedgwick Ave.). 1892.
- Charles S. Knox, St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H. 1889.
- Prof. A. G. Laird, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1890.
- Prof. William A. Lambert, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1888.
- Prof. W. B. Langsdorf, 189 Kokutajimura, Hiroshima, Japan. 1895.
- Prof. Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (9 Farrar St.). 1877.
- Lewis H. Lapham, 8 Bridge St., New York, N. Y. 1880.
- Prof. William Cranston Lawton, Adelphi College, Brooklyn, N. Y. (224 Willoughby Ave.). 1888.
- Prof. Abby Leach, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1888.
- Dr. Arthur G. Leacock, Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1899.
- Dr. Emory B. Lease, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. (1603 Amsterdam Ave.). 1895.
- Dr. J. T. Lees, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb. 1888.
- Prof. Thomas B. Lindsay, Boston University, Boston, Mass. 1880.
- Prof. Charles Edgar Little, University of Nashville, Nashville, Tenn. 1902.
- Miss Dale Livingstone, State Normal School, California, Pa. 1902.
- Prof. Gonzalez Lodge, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1888.
- Prof. O. F. Long, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1900.
- Prof. George D. Lord, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1887.
- D. O. S. Lowell, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass. 1894.
- Prof. Frederick Lutz, Albion College, Albion, Mich. 1883.
- Prof. Nelson G. McCrea, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1890.
- Prof. Walton Brooks McDaniel, College Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1901.
- Prof. J. H. McDaniels, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y. 1871.
- Prof. A. St. Clair Mackenzie, State College of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky. 1901.
- Prof. George F. McKibben, Denison University, Granville, O. 1885.
- Miss Harriet E. McKinstry, Lake Erie College, Painesville, O. 1881.
- Prof. H. Z. McLain, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind. 1884.
- Pres. George E. MacLean, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. (603 College St.). 1891.
- Prof. W. J. McMurtry, Yankton College, Yankton, S. D. 1893.
- Prof. Grace H. Macurdy, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1894.
- David Magie, Jr., Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. (33 Prospect Ave.). 1901.
- Prof. H. W. Magoun, 70 Kirkland St., Cambridge, Mass. 1891.
- Prof. J. H. T. Main, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia. 1891.
- Prof. J. Irving Manatt, Brown University, Providence, R. I. (15 Keene St.). 1875.
- Prof. John M. Manly, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1896.

- Prof. W. G. Manly, University of the State of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1902.
Prof. F. A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. 1869.
Prof. Allan Marquand, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1891.
Prof. Winfred R. Martin, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. 1879.
Miss Ellen F. Mason, 1 Walnut St., Boston, Mass. 1885.
Dr. Maurice W. Mather, 13 Mt. Auburn St., Cambridge, Mass. 1894.
Dr. Clarence Linton Meader, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1902.
Prof. John Moffatt Mecklin, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa. 1900.
Prof. Frank Ivan Merchant, 65 Irving Place, New York City. 1898.
Ernest Loren Meritt, 435 Elm St., New Haven, Conn. 1903.
Prof. Elmer T. Merrill, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1883.
Dr. Truman Michelson, 69 Walker St., Cambridge, Mass. 1900.
Dr. Alfred W. Milden, Emory and Henry College, Emory, Va. 1903.
Prof. C. W. E. Miller, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1892.
Prof. Walter Miller, Tulane University, New Orleans, La. 1900.
Prof. Clara Millerd, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia. 1902.
Dr. Richard A. v. Minckwitz, De Witt Clinton High School, Manhattan, New York, N. Y. (Amsterdam Ave. and 102d St.). 1895.
Charles A. Mitchell, Asheville School, Asheville, N. C. 1893.
Prof. Clifford Herschel Moore, American School of Classical Studies, Rome, Italy (Via Vicenza 5). 1889.
Prof. Frank G. Moore, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1888.
Prof. George F. Moore, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (3 Divinity Ave.). 1885.
Prof. J. Leverett Moore, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1887.
Prof. Lewis B. Moore, Howard University, Washington, D. C. 1896.
Paul E. More, 265 Springdale Ave., East Orange, N. J. 1896.
Prof. James H. Morgan, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. 1897.
Prof. Morris H. Morgan, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (45 Garden St.). 1887.
Prof. Edward P. Morris, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (53 Edgehill Road). 1886.
Prof. Lewis F. Mott, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. (17 Lexington Ave.). 1898.
Prof. George F. Mull, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. 1896.
Prof. Willfred P. Mustard, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. 1892.
Prof. Francis Philip Nash, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y. 1872.
Dr. K. P. R. Neville, University of Illinois, Champaign, Ill. (1002 Oregon St., Urbana, Ill.). 1902.
Dr. Charles B. Newcomer, Drury College, Springfield, Mo. 1900.
Prof. Barker Newhall, Kenyon College, Gambier, O. 1891.
Emily Norcross Newton (Mrs. James H.), Holyoke, Mass. (159 Chestnut St.). 1902.
Prof. Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1888.
Dr. William A. Nitze, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1902.
Prof. Richard Norton, American School of Classical Studies, Rome, Italy (Via Vicenza 5). 1897.

- Prof. George N. Olcott, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (438 W. 116th St.). 1899.
- Prof. Edward T. Owen, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1896.
- Prof. W. B. Owen, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. 1875.
- Prof. William A. Packard, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1872.
- Miss Elisabeth H. Palmer, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1902.
- Prof. Charles P. Parker, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (1075 Massachusetts Ave.). 1884.
- Prof. James M. Paton, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1887.
- John Patterson, Louisville High School, Louisville, Ky. (1117 Fourth St.). 1900.
- Dr. Charles Peabody, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. (197 Brattle Street, Cambridge, Mass.). 1894.
- Prof. E. M. Pease, 1423 Chapin Street, Washington, D. C. 1887.
- Prof. Tracy Peck, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1871.
- Miss Frances Pellett, Kelly Hall, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1893.
- Dr. Daniel A. Penick, University of Texas, Austin, Tex. 1902.
- Prof. Charles W. Peppler, Emory College, Oxford, Ga. 1899.
- Dr. Elizabeth Mary Perkins, 1355 Kenesaw St., Washington, D. C. 1904.
- Prof. Emma M. Perkins, Western Reserve University (College for Women), Cleveland, O. 1892.
- Prof. Bernadotte Perrin, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (136 Fa:nam Hall). 1879.
- Prof. Edward D. Perry, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (542 West 114th St.). 1882.
- Prof. John Pickard, University of the State of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1893.
- Dr. William Taggard Piper, 179 Brattle St., Cambridge, Mass. 1885.
- Prof. Samuel Ball Platner, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. (24 Cornell St.). 1885.
- Prof. William Porter, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. 1888.
- Prof. Edwin Post, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind. 1886.
- Prof. Franklin H. Potter, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. 1898.
- Henry Preble, 42 Stuyvesant Place, New Brighton, Staten Island, N. Y. 1882.
- Prof. William K. Prentice, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. (12 Nassau St.). 1895.
- Prof. Ferris W. Price, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa. 1895.
- Prof. Benjamin F. Prince, Wittenberg College, Springfield, O. 1893.
- Prof. John Dyneley Prince, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1899.
- Prof. Robert S. Radford, Elmira College, Elmira, N. Y. (710 Park Place). 1900.
- M. M. Ramsey, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1894.
- Dr. Edward Kennard Rand, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (104 Lake View Ave.). 1902.
- Prof. John W. Redd, Centre College, Danville, Ky. 1885.
- Prof. A. G. Rembert, Woford College, Spartansburg, S. C. 1902.
- Prof. Horatio M. Reynolds, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (221 Church St.). 1884.
- Dr. Rufus B. Richardson, *The Independent*, 130 Fulton St., New York, N. Y. 1882.

- Dr. Ernst Riess, De Witt Clinton High School, Manhattan, N. Y. (Amsterdam Ave. and 102d St.). 1895.
- Prof. Edmund Y. Robbins, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1895.
- Dr. Arthur W. Roberts, Brookline High School, Brookline, Mass. 1884.
- Prof. David M. Robinson, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1905.
- Dr. James J. Robinson, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. 1902.
- Prof. W. A. Robinson, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J. 1888.
- Prof. Joseph C. Rockwell, Buchtel College, Akron, O. 1896.
- Prof. F. E. Rockwood, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. 1885.
- Prof. Cornelia H. B. Rogers, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1903.
- George B. Rogers, Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1902.
- Prof. John C. Rolfe, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (4400 Chestnut St.). 1890.
- C. A. Rosegrant, Potsdam State Normal School, Potsdam, N. Y. 1902.
- Prof. Clarence F. Ross, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. 1902.
- Prof. August Rupp, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. 1902.
- Dr. Arthur W. Ryder, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (72 Perkins Hall). 1902.
- Dr. Julius Sachs, Classical School for Girls, 38 West Fifty-ninth St., New York, N. Y. 1875.
- Benjamin H. Sanborn, Wellesley, Mass. 1890.
- Prof. Henry A. Sanders, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (213 South Thayer St.). 1899.
- Prof. Myron R. Sanford, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt. 1894.
- Miss Catharine Saunders, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1900.
- Joseph H. Sawyer, Williston Seminary, Easthampton, Mass. 1897.
- Prof. W. S. Scarborough, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O. 1882.
- Prof. J. J. Schlicher, State Normal School, Terre Haute, Ind. 1901.
- Prof. H. Schmidt-Wartenberg, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1894.
- Edmund F. Schreiner, 486 N. Clark St., Chicago, Ill. 1900.
- G. E. Scoggin, Cambridge, Mass. 1904.
- Dr. Charles P. G. Scott, Yonkers, N. Y. (150 Woodworth Ave.). 1880.
- Prof. John Adams Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. (2030 Orrington Ave.). 1898.
- Miss Annie N. Scribner, 1823 Orrington Ave., Evanston, Ill. 1900.
- Prof. Henry S. Scribner, Western University of Pennsylvania, Allegheny City, Pa. 1889.
- Dr. Helen M. Searles, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1893.
- Charles D. Seely, State Normal School, Brockport, N. Y. 1888.
- Prof. William J. Seelye, Wooster University, Wooster, O. 1888.
- J. B. Sewall, Brandon Hall, Brookline, Mass. 1871.
- Prof. T. D. Seymour, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (34 Hillhouse Ave.). 1873.
- Prof. Charles H. Shannon, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn. 1900.
- Prof. R. H. Sharp, Jr., Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, Va. (College Park P.O.). 1897.
- Prof. J. A. Shaw, Highland Military Academy, Worcester, Mass. 1876.
- Pres. Andrew Shedd, University of Florida, Lake City, Fla. 1904.

- Prof. Edward S. Sheldon, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (11 Francis Ave.). 1881.
- Prof. F. W. Shipley, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 1900.
- Prof. Paul Shorey, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1887.
- Prof. Grant Showerman, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1900.
- Dr. Edgar S. Shunway, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1885.
- Prof. E. G. Sihler, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y. 1876.
- Prof. Charles F. Sitterly, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J. 1902.
- Prof. M. S. Slaughter, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1887.
- Principal M. C. Smart, Littleton, N. H. 1900.
- Prof. Charles Forster Smith, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1883.
- Prof. Charles S. Smith, Columbian University, Washington, D. C. (2122 H St.). 1895.
- Prof. Clement L. Smith, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1882.
- Prof. Harry de Forest Smith, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1899.
- Prof. Josiah R. Smith, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. (257 E. Broad St.). 1885.
- Prof. Kirby F. Smith, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1897.
- Prof. Herbert Weir Smyth, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (91 Walker St.). 1886.
- Dr. George C. S. Southworth, Gambier, O. 1883.
- Prof. Edward H. Spieker, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. (915 Edmondson Ave.). 1884.
- Dr. Sidney G. Stacey, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (119 Montague St.). 1901.
- Prof. Jonathan Y. Stanton, Bates College, Lewiston, Me. 1888.
- Eric Arthur Starbuck, Worcester, Mass. 1904.
- Miss Josephine Stary, 31 West Sixty-first St., New York, N. Y. 1899.
- Prof. R. B. Steele, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. (2401 West End). 1893.
- Prof. J. R. S. Sterrett, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. (2 South Ave.). 1885.
- Prof. F. H. Stoddard, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y. 1890.
- Dr. Duane Reed Stuart, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1901.
- Dr. E. H. Sturtevant, University of the State of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1901.
- Dr. Charles W. Super, Ohio University, Athens, O. 1881.
- Prof. William F. Swahlen, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind. 1904.
- Dr. Marguerite Sweet, 13 Ten Bronck St., Albany, N. Y. 1892.
- Prof. Frank B. Tarbell, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1882.
- Prof. Joseph R. Taylor, Boston University, Boston, Mass. 1902.
- Prof. Julian D. Taylor, Colby University, Waterville, Me. 1890.
- Prof. Glanville Terrell, Georgetown College, Georgetown, Ky. 1898.
- Prof. William E. Thompson, Hamline University, Hamline, Minn. 1877.
- Dr. Charles H. Thurber, 29 Beacon St., Boston, Mass. 1901.
- Prof. Fitz Gerald Tisdall, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. (17 Lexington Ave.). 1889.
- Prof. Henry A. Todd, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1887.
- Prof. H. C. Tolman, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. 1889.

- Prof. Edward M. Tomlinson, Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y. 1885.
Dr. O. S. Tonks, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1903.
Prof. J. A. Tufts, Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1898.
Prof. Milton H. Turk, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y. 1896.
Prof. Esther Van Deman, The Woman's College, Baltimore, Md. 1899.
Addison Van Name, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (121 High St.).
1869.
Prof. N. P. Vlachos, Temple College, Philadelphia, Pa. 1903.
Prof. Frank Vogel, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass. 1904.
Dr. W. H. Wait, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1893.
Dr. John W. H. Walden, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1889.
Prof. Arthur T. Walker, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan. 1895.
Dr. Alice Walton, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1894.
Dr. Edwin G. Warner, Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1897.
Andrew McCorrie Warren, care of Brown, Shipley & Co., Founders' Court, London.
1892.
Dr. Arletta Warren, State Normal School, Madison, S. D. 1904.
Prof. Minton Warren, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (105 Irving St.).
1874.
Prof. William E. Waters, New York University, University Heights, N. Y. (604
West 115th St.). 1885.
Dr. John C. Watson, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1902.
Dr. Helen L. Webster, Wilkesbarre Institute, Wilkesbarre, Pa. 1890.
Prof. Raymond Weeks, University of the State of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1902.
Dr. Charles Heald Weller, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (392 Orange St.).
1903.
Dr. Mary C. Welles, Newington, Conn. 1898.
Prof. Andrew F. West, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1886.
Prof. J. H. Westcott, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1891.
Prof. J. B. Weston, Christian Biblical Institute, Stanfordville, N. Y. 1869.
Prof. L. B. Wharton, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va. 1888.
Prof. Arthur L. Wheeler, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1899.
Prof. James R. Wheeler, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1885.
Prof. G. M. Whicher, Normal College, New York, N. Y. 1891.
Dr. Andrew C. White, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. (424 Dryden Road). 1886.
Prof. John Williams White, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (18 Concord
Ave.). 1874.
Vice-Chancellor B. Lawton Wiggins, University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn.
1892.
Prof. Alexander M. Wilcox, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan. 1884.
Prof. Henry D. Wild, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1898.
Charles R. Williams, Indianapolis, Ind. (1005 N. Meridian St.). 1887.
Prof. George A. Williams, Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich. (136 Thompson
St.). 1891.
Prof. Mary G. Williams, Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1899.
Prof. Harry Langford Wilson, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1898.
Miss Julia E. Winslow, 31 Sidney Place, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1903.
Dr. J. D. Wolcott, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1898.

- Prof. E. L. Wood, Manual Training High School, Providence, R. I. (271 Alabama Ave.). 1888.
- Prof. Henry Wood, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1884.
- Dr. Willis Patten Woodman, 6 Greenough Ave., Jamaica Plain, Mass. 1901.
- Prof. Frank E. Woodruff, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me. 1887.
- C. C. Wright, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. 1902.
- Prof. Ellsworth D. Wright, Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis. 1898.
- Dr. Henry B. Wright, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (136 Farnam Hall). 1903.
- Prof. Henry P. Wright, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (128 York St.). 1883.
- Prof. John Henry Wright, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (38 Quincy St.). 1874.
- Prof. Clarence H. Young, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (312 West 88th St.). 1890.
- Prof. R. B. Youngman, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. 1901.

[Number of Members, 505.]

WESTERN BRANCH.

MEMBERS OF THE PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF
THE PACIFIC COAST.

(ESTABLISHED 1899.)

Membership in the American Philological Association prior to the organization of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast is indicated by a date earlier than 1900.

Albert H. Allen, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.

Prof. James T. Allen, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2243 College Ave.). 1898.

Prof. Louis F. Anderson, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash. 1887.

Prof. M. B. Anderson, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1901.

Prof. H. T. Archibald, Occidental College, Los Angeles, Cal. 1901.

Prof. William D. Armes, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1902.

Prof. William F. Badè, Pacific Theological Seminary, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.

Dr. J. W. Basore, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1902.

Prof. C. B. Bradley, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2639 Durant Ave.). 1900.

Carlos Bransby, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.

Rev. William A. Brewer, San Mateo, Cal. 1900.

Elvyn F. Burrill, 2536 Bancroft Way, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.

Prof. Luella Clay Carson, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore. 1900.

B. H. Cerf, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.

Samuel Chambers, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.

Prof. J. E. Church, Jr., State University of Nevada, Reno, Nev. 1901.

Prof. Edward B. Clapp, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (1 Bushnell Place). 1886.

A. Horatio Cogswell, 2135 Santa Clara Ave., Alameda, Cal. 1900.

Prof. W. A. Cooper, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1901.

Prof. L. W. Cushman, Nevada State University, Reno, Nev. 1900.

J. Allen De Cou, Red Bluff, Cal. 1900.

L. J. Demster, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.

Monroe E. Deutsch, San Francisco, Cal. 1904.

Henry B. Dewing, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.

Prof. J. Elmore, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1900.

Prof. Alfred Emerson, Affiliated Colleges, San Francisco, Cal. 1903.

Prof. H. Rushton Fairclough, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1887.

Dr. W. S. Ferguson, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1899.

Prof. Ewald Flügel, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1900.

Dr. B. O. Foster, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1899.

Prof. P. J. Frein, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1900.

Prof. John Fryer, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.

- Dr. John Gamble, Haywards, Cal. 1902.
 Prof. Charles Mills Gayley, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1895.
 Charles Bertie Gleason, High School, San Jose, Cal. 1900.
 Mr. Pliny E. Goddard, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1902.
 Prof. Julius Goebel, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1900.
 Walter H. Graves, 1428 Seventh Ave., Oakland, Cal. 1900.
 Miss Rebecca T. Greene, Palo Alto, Cal. 1900.
 Prof. James O. Griffin, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1896.
 Prof. A. S. Haggett, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1901.
 Walter M. Hart, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.
 Miss Hodgkinson, Lowell High School, San Francisco, Cal. 1903.
 M. C. James, High School, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.
 Prof. Oliver M. Johnston, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1900.
 W. L. Keep, Red Bluff, Cal. 1900.
 Tracy R. Kelley, 2214 Jones St., San Francisco, Cal. 1900.
 Dr. A. L. Kroeber, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1902.
 Prof. A. F. Lange, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.
 Ivan M. Linforth, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.
 Prof. Max L. Margolis, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.
 E. W. Martin, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1903.
 Prof. John E. Matzke, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1900.
 Prof. William A. Merrill, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1886.
 Francis O. Mower, Napa High School, Napa, Cal. 1900.
 Edward J. Murphy, Cabias, Nueva Ecija, Philippine Islands. 1900.
 Prof. Augustus T. Murray, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1887.
 Prof. A. G. Newcomer, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Palo Alto, Cal. 1902.
 Rabbi Jacob Nieto, 1719 Bush St., San Francisco, Cal. 1900.
 Prof. George R. Noyes, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1901.
 Prof. H. C. Nutting, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (P. O. Box 272). 1900.
 Dr. Charles J. O'Connor, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.
 Dr. Andrew Oliver, San Mateo, Cal. 1900.
 Prof. F. M. Padelford, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1901.
 Clarence Paschall, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.
 Prof. Henry W. Prescott, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1899.
 Prof. Clifton Price, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1899.
 E. K. Putnam, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1901.
 Prof. A. Putzker, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.
 Miss Cecilia L. Raymond, 2407 S. Atherton St., Berkeley, Cal. 1900.
 Prof. Karl G. Rendtorff, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1900.
 Prof. C. C. Rice, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1902.
 Prof. Leon J. Richardson, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1895.
 Prof. H. W. Rolfe, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1901.

Prof. H. K. Schilling, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1901.

Prof. F. G. G. Schmidt, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore. 1900.

C. F. Schmutzler, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1904.

Prof. Colbert Searles, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1901.

Prof. Henry Senger, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.

S. S. Seward, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1902.

Prof. David Thomson, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1902.

Rabbi Jacob Voorsanger, 1249 Franklin St., San Francisco, Cal. 1901.

Prof. C. W. Wells, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.

President Benjamin I. Wheeler, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1879.

[Number of Members, 84. Total, 505 + 84 = 589]

THE FOLLOWING LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS (ALPHABETIZED BY TOWNS)
 SUBSCRIBE FOR THE ANNUAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

- Albany, N. Y.: New York State Library.
 Amherst, Mass.: Amherst College Library.
 Ann Arbor, Mich.: Michigan University Library.
 Auburn, N. Y.: Theological Seminary.
 Austin, Texas: University of Texas Library.
 Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Library.
 Baltimore, Md.: Peabody Institute.
 Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Library.
 Boston, Mass.: Boston Public Library.
 Brooklyn, N. Y.: The Brooklyn Library.
 Brunswick, Me.: Bowdoin College Library.
 Bryn Mawr, Pa.: Bryn Mawr College Library.
 Buffalo, N. Y.: The Buffalo Library.
 Burlington, Vt.: Library of the University of Vermont.
 Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard College Library.
 Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois Library.
 Chicago, Ill.: The Newberry Library.
 Chicago, Ill.: Public Library.
 Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Library.
 Clermont Ferrand, France: Bibliothèque Universitaire.
 Cleveland, O.: Library of Adelbert College of Western Reserve University.
 College Hill, Mass.: Tufts College Library.
 Columbus, O.: Ohio State University Library.
 Crawfordsville, Ind.: Wabash College Library.
 Detroit, Mich.: Public Library.
 Easton, Pa.: Lafayette College Library.
 Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Library.
 Gambier, O.: Kenyon College Library.
 Greencastle, Ind.: Library of De Pauw University.
 Hanover, N. H.: Dartmouth College Library.
 Iowa City, Ia.: Library of State University.
 Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Library.
 Lincoln, Neb.: Library of State University of Nebraska.
 Marietta, O.: Marietta College Library.
 Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Library.
 Milwaukee, Wis.: Public Library.
 Minneapolis, Minn.: Athenæum Library.
 Minneapolis, Minn.: Library of the University of Minnesota.
 Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University Library.
 Newton Centre, Mass.: Library of Newton Theological Institution.
 New York, N. Y.: Astor Library.
 New York, N. Y.: Library of Columbia University.
 New York, N. Y.: Library of the College of the City of New York (Lexington Ave. and Twenty-third St.).
 New York, N. Y.: Union Theological Seminary Library (700 Park Ave.).

Olivet, Mich. : Olivet College Library.
Philadelphia, Pa. : The Library Company of Philadelphia.
Philadelphia, Pa. : The Mercantile Library.
Philadelphia, Pa. : University of Pennsylvania Library.
Pittsburg, Pa. : Carnegie Library.
Poughkeepsie, N. Y. : Vassar College Library.
Providence, R. I. : Brown University Library.
Rochester, N. Y. : Rochester University Library.
Tokio, Japan : Library of Imperial University.
Toronto, Can. : University of Toronto Library.
University of Virginia, Va. : University Library.
Vermilion, South Dakota : Library of University of South Dakota.
Washington, D. C. : Library of the Catholic University of America.
Washington, D. C. : United States Bureau of Education.
Wellesley, Mass. : Wellesley College Library.
Worcester, Mass. : Free Public Library.

[Number of subscribing institutions, 60.]

TO THE FOLLOWING LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS THE TRANSACTIONS ARE
ANNUALLY SENT, GRATIS.

American School of Classical Studies, Athens.
American School of Classical Studies, Rome (Via Vicenza 5).
British Museum, London.
Royal Asiatic Society, London.
Philological Society, London.
Society of Biblical Archæology, London.
Indian Office Library, London.
Bodleian Library, Oxford.
University Library, Cambridge, England.
Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, Scotland.
Trinity College Library, Dublin, Ireland.
Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Shanghai.
Japan Asiatic Society, Yokohama.
Public Library of Victoria, Melbourne, Australia.
Sir George Grey's Library, Cape Town, Africa.
Reykjavik College Library, Iceland.
University of Christiania, Norway.
University of Upsala, Sweden.
Stadsbiblioteket, Göteborg, Sweden.
Russian Imperial Academy, St. Petersburg.
Austrian Imperial Academy, Vienna.
Anthropologische Gesellschaft, Vienna.
Biblioteca Nazionale, Florence, Italy.

Reale Accademia delle Scienze, Turin.
 Société Asiatique, Paris, France.
 Athénée Oriental, Louvain, Belgium.
 Curatorium of the University, Leyden, Holland.
 Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, Batavia, Java.
 Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences, Berlin, Germany.
 Royal Saxon Academy of Sciences, Leipsic.
 Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences, Munich.
 Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Halle.
 Library of the University of Bonn.
 Library of the University of Freiburg in Baden.
 Library of the University of Giessen.
 Library of the University of Jena.
 Library of the University of Königsberg.
 Library of the University of Leipsic.
 Library of the University of Toulouse.
 Library of the University of Tübingen.
 Imperial Ottoman Museum, Constantinople.
 Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.

[Number of foreign institutions, 43.]

TO THE FOLLOWING FOREIGN JOURNALS THE TRANSACTIONS ARE ANNUALLY SENT, GRATIS.

Athenæum, London.
 Classical Review, London.
 Revue Critique, Paris.
 Revue de Philologie (Adrien Krebs, 11 Rue de Lille, Paris).
 Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique, à la Sorbonne, Paris.
 Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, Berlin.
 Deutsche Litteraturzeitung, Berlin.
 Indogermanische Forschungen (K. J. Trübner, Strassburg).
 Literarisches Centralblatt, Leipsic.
 Musée Belge (Prof. Waltzing, 9 Rue du Parc, Liège, Belgium).
 Neue philologische Rundschau, Gotha (F. A. Perthes).
 Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie, Berlin.
 Rivista di Filologia, Turin (Ermanno Loescher).
 Bollettino di Filologia Classica, Via Vittorio Amadeo ii, Turin.
 Biblioteca delle Scuole Italiane (Dr. A. G. Amatucci, Maddalena Maggiore 43, Naples).
 Zeitschrift für die österr. Gymnasien (Prof. J. Golling, Maximilians-Gymnasium, Vienna).
 L'Université Catholique (Prof. A. Lepitre, 10 Avenue de Noailles, Lyons).

[Total (589 + 60 + 43 + 1 + 17) = 710.]

CONSTITUTION
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

ARTICLE I. — NAME AND OBJECT.

1. This Society shall be known as "The American Philological Association."
2. Its object shall be the advancement and diffusion of philological knowledge.

ARTICLE II. — OFFICERS.

1. The officers shall be a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Secretary and Curator, and a Treasurer.
2. There shall be an Executive Committee of ten, composed of the above officers and five other members of the Association.
3. All the above officers shall be elected at the last session of each annual meeting.

ARTICLE III. — MEETINGS.

1. There shall be an annual meeting of the Association in the city of New York, or at such other place as at a preceding annual meeting shall be determined upon.
2. At the annual meeting, the Executive Committee shall present an annual report of the progress of the Association.
3. The general arrangements of the proceedings of the annual meeting shall be directed by the Executive Committee.
4. Special meetings may be held at the call of the Executive Committee, when and where they may decide.

ARTICLE IV. — MEMBERS.

1. Any lover of philological studies may become a member of the Association by a vote of the Executive Committee and the payment of five dollars as initiation fee, which initiation fee shall be considered the first regular annual fee.
2. There shall be an annual fee of three dollars from each member, failure in payment of which for two years shall *ipso facto* cause the membership to cease.
3. Any person may become a life member of the Association by the payment of fifty dollars to its treasury, and by vote of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE V. — SUNDRIES.

1. All papers intended to be read before the Association must be submitted to the Executive Committee before reading, and their decision regarding such papers shall be final.
2. Publications of the Association, of whatever kind, shall be made only under the authorization of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE VI. — AMENDMENTS.

Amendments to this Constitution may be made by a vote of two-thirds of those present at any regular meeting subsequent to that in which they have been proposed.

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

(ORGANIZED 1869).

PRESIDENT.

1869-1870	William D. Whitney.
1870-1871	Howard Crosby.
1871-1872	William W. Goodwin.
1872-1873	Asahel C. Kendrick.
1873-1874	Francis A. March.
1874-1875	J. Hammond Trumbull.
1875-1876	Albert Harkness.
1876-1877	S. S. Haldeman.
1877-1878	B. L. Gildersleeve.
1878-1879	Jotham B. Sewall.
1879-1880	Crawford H. Toy.
1880-1881	Lewis R. Packard.
1881-1882	Frederic D. Allen.
1882-1883	Milton W. Humphreys.
1883-1884	Martin Luther D'Ooge.
1884-1885	William W. Goodwin.
1885-1886	Tracy Peck.
1886-1887	Augustus C. Merriam.
1887-1888	Isaac H. Hall.
1888-1889	Thomas D. Seymour.
1889-1890	Charles R. Lanman.
1890-1891	Julius Sachs.
1891-1892	Samuel Hart.
1892-1893	William Gardner Hale.
1893-1894	James M. Garnett.
1894-1895	John Henry Wright.
1895-1896	Francis A. March.
1896-1897	Bernadotte Perrin.
1897-1898	Minton Warren.
1898-1899	Clement L. Smith.
1899-1900	Abby Leach.

1900-1901	Samuel Ball Platner.
1901-1902	Andrew F. West.
1902-1903	Charles Forster Smith.
1903-1904	George Hempl.
1904-1905	Herbert Weir Smyth.

SECRETARY AND CURATOR.¹

1869-1873	George F. Comfort.
1873-1878	Samuel Hart.
1878-1879	Thomas C. Murray.
1879-1884	Charles R. Lanman.
1884-1889	John Henry Wright.
1889-1904	Herbert Weir Smyth.
1904-1905	Frank Gardner Moore.

TREASURER.

1869-1873	J. Hammond Trumbull.
1873-1875	Albert Harkness.
1875-1883	Charles J. Buckingham.
1883-1884	Edward S. Sheldon.
1884-1889	John Henry Wright.
1889-1904	Herbert Weir Smyth.
1904-1905	Frank Gardner Moore.

¹ The offices of *Secretary* and *Treasurer* were united in 1884; and in 1891-1892 the title *Curator* was allowed to lapse.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

THE annually published "Proceedings" of the American Philological Association contain an account of the doings at the annual meeting, brief abstracts of the papers read, reports upon the progress of the Association, and lists of its officers and members.

The annually published "Transactions" give the full text of such articles as the Executive Committee decides to publish. The Proceedings are bound with them as an Appendix.

For the contents of Volumes I-XXX inclusive, see Volume XXXIV, pp. cxliii ff.

The contents of the last five volumes are as follows:—

1900. — Volume XXXI.

Rolfe, J. C.: The formation of substantives from Latin geographical adjectives by ellipsis.

Bonner, Campbell: The Danaid-myth.

Fowler, H. N.: Pliny, Pausanias, and the *Hermes* of Praxiteles.

Showerman, Grant: Was Attis at Rome under the Republic?

Carter, J. B.: The cognomina of the goddess Fortuna.

Smith, C. F.: Traces of epic usage in Thucydides.

Seymour, T. D.: Notes on Homeric war.

Gudeman, A.: The sources of the *Germania* of Tacitus.

Capps, E.: Studies in Greek agonistic inscriptions.

Hale, W. G.: Is there still a Latin potential?

Heidel, W. A.: On Plato's *Euthyphro*.

Hempl, G.: The Salian hymn to Janus.

Chase, G. D.: Sun myths in Lithuanian folksongs.

Wilson, H. L.: The use of the simple for the compound verb in Juvenal.

Bennett, C. E.: The stipulative subjunctive in Latin.

Proceedings of the thirty-second annual session, Madison, 1900.

1901. — Volume XXXII.

Wheeler, B. I.: The causes of uniformity in phonetic change.

Clapp, E. B.: Pindar's accusative constructions.

- Merrill, E. T.: Some observations on the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum.
 Harry, J. E.: A misunderstood passage in Aeschylus (*Prom.* 119).
 Franklin, S. B.: Public appropriations for individual offerings and sacrifices in Greece.
 Morgan, M. H.: Rain-gods and rain-charms.
 Warren, M.: Some ancient and modern etymologies.
 Adams, C. D.: The Harpalos case.
 Steele, R. B.: Anaphora and chiasmus in Livy.
 Hempl, G.: The variant runes on the Franks casket.
 Bill, C. P.: Notes on the Greek *Θεωρός* and *Θεωρία*.
 Elmer, H. C.: On the subjunctive with *Forsitan*.
 Proceedings of the special session, Philadelphia, 1900.
 Proceedings of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, 1900.
 Proceedings of the thirty-third annual session, Cambridge, 1901.

1902. — Volume XXXIII.

- Earle, M. L.: Studies in Sophocles's *Trachinians*.
 Morgan, M. H.: Remarks on the water supply of ancient Rome.
 Richardson, L. J.: On certain sound properties of the Sapphic strophe as employed by Horace.
 Shipley, F. W.: Numeral corruptions in a ninth century Ms. of Livy.
 Steele, R. B.: Some forms of complemental sentences in Livy.
 Prentice, W. K.: Fragments of an early Christian liturgy in Syrian inscriptions.
 Allen, J. T.: On the so-called iterative optative in Greek.
 Wheeler, B. I.: Herodotus's account of the battle of Salamis.
 Perrin, P.: The Nikias of Pasiphon and Plutarch.
 Hempl, G.: The Duenos inscription.
 Proceedings of the thirty-fourth annual session, Schenectady, 1902.
 Proceedings of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, 1901.

1903. — Volume XXXIV.

- Moore, F. G.: Studies in Tacitean Ellipsis: descriptive passages.
 Goodell, T. D.: Word-accent in Catullus's galliambics.
 Brownson, C. L.: The succession of Spartan nauarchs in *Hellenica* I.
 Prescott, H. W.: Magister curiae in Plautus's *Aulularia* 107.
 Miller, C. W. E.: Hephaestion and the anapaest in the Aristophanic trimeter.
 Radford, R. S.: The Latin monosyllables in their relation to accent and quantity.
 A study in the verse of Terence.
 March, F. A.: Three new types.
 Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual meeting, New Haven, 1903.
 Proceedings of the fourth annual meeting of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, 1902.

1904. — Volume XXXV.

- Ferguson, W. S.: Historical value of the twelfth chapter of Plutarch's Life of Pericles.
 Botsford, G. W.: On the distinction between *Comitia* and *Concilium*.
 Radford, R. S.: Studies in Latin accent and metric.
 Johnson, C. W. L.: The *Accentus* of the ancient Latin grammarians.
 Bolling, G. M.: The Çāntikalpa of the Atharva-Veda.
 Rand, E. K.: Notes on Ovid.
 Goebel, J.: The etymology of Mephistopheles.
 Proceedings of the thirty-sixth annual meeting, St. Louis, 1904.
 Proceedings of the fifth and sixth annual meetings of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, 1903, 1904.

The Proceedings of the American Philological Association are distributed gratis upon application to the Secretary or to the Publishers until they are out of print.

Fifty separate copies of articles printed in the Transactions, ten of articles printed in the Proceedings, are given to the authors for distribution. Additional copies will be furnished at cost.

The "Transactions *for*" any given year are not always published in that year. To avoid mistakes in ordering back volumes, please state—not the year of publication, but rather—the year *for* which the Transactions are desired, adding also the volume-number, according to the following table:—

The Transactions for 1869 and		The Trans. for 1887 form Vol. XVIII.
1870 form Vol. I.		" " 1888 " " XIX.
The Trans. for 1871 " " II.		" " 1889 " " XX.
" " 1872 " " III.		" " 1890 " " XXI.
" " 1873 " " IV.		" " 1891 " " XXII.
" " 1874 " " V.		" " 1892 " " XXIII.
" " 1875 " " VI.		" " 1893 " " XXIV.
" " 1876 " " VII.		" " 1894 " " XXV.
" " 1877 " " VIII.		" " 1895 " " XXVI.
" " 1878 " " IX.		" " 1896 " " XXVII.
" " 1879 " " X.		" " 1897 " " XXVIII.
" " 1880 " " XI.		" " 1898 " " XXIX.
" " 1881 " " XII.		" " 1899 " " XXX.
" " 1882 " " XIII.		" " 1900 " " XXXI.
" " 1883 " " XIV.		" " 1901 " " XXXII.
" " 1884 " " XV.		" " 1902 " " XXXIII.
" " 1885 " " XVI.		" " 1903 " " XXXIV.
" " 1886 " " XVII.		" " 1904 " " XXXV.

The price of these volumes is \$2.00 apiece, except Volumes XV., XX., XXIII., and XXXII., for which \$2.50 is charged. The first two volumes will not be sold separately. A charge of fifty cents each is made for the Index of Authors and Index of Subjects to Vols. I.–XX. and to Vols. XXI.–XXX.

BINDING.

Back volumes will be bound in the style of this volume for thirty-five cents each by F. J. Barnard & Co., 17 Province St., Boston, Mass., provided at least twelve volumes are sent at a time, and the cost of transportation both ways is paid by the owner. All parcels should be plainly marked with the name and address of the sender, and the binders should be notified at the time the unbound volumes are sent in order that the sender may be identified.

Libraries may obtain bound copies of the annual volumes at twenty-five cents per volume in addition to the regular price.

REDUCTION IN THE PRICE OF COMPLETE SETS.

Single COMPLETE SETS of the Transactions and Proceedings will be sold, until further notice, at a reduction of 20%.

It is especially appropriate that American Libraries should exert themselves to procure this series while it may be had. It is the work of American scholars, and contains many valuable articles not elsewhere accessible; and, apart from these facts, as the first collection of essays in general philology made in this country, it is sure to be permanently valuable for the history of American scholarship.

THE INTERNATIONAL MODERN LANGUAGE SERIES

**Eighty-seven volumes, including the best works of
modern foreign literature**

This series has long been favorably known because of the practical and scholarly editing and the unequalled mechanical execution of its volumes. To make these books still more noteworthy, important changes have recently been made in the style of binding and in the prices. In addition to all the excellent features which have long characterized the series, the books now offer the advantages of a greater attractiveness in appearance, a better adaptation for school use, and a considerable reduction in price.

RECENT ADDITIONS TO THE SERIES

Goethe's Hermann und Dorothea

Edited, with Introduction, Notes, Exercises, and Vocabulary by PHILIP SCHUYLER ALLEN, Assistant Professor of German Literature in the University of Chicago.
List price, 60 cents.

Prepared with a view to its use in *advanced high-school work as well as with college classes*, this new edition of this famous masterpiece fully merits the attention of every teacher and student of German.

Carruth's German Reader

With Exercises based upon the text. Edited and Annotated, with Vocabulary, by WILLIAM HERBERT CARRUTH, Professor of Germanic Languages and Literatures in the University of Kansas.

List price, 50 cents.

Carruth's "German Reader" offers the advantage of furnishing, at a slight expense and in a wisely graded arrangement, a number of attractive selections available elsewhere only in several separate books.

About's La Mère de la Marquise and La Fille du Chanoine

Edited, with Notes and Vocabulary, by O. B. SUPER, Professor of the Romance Languages in Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.

List price, 50 cents.

These two selections, taken together, afford a better example of the author's power than is to be found in any single piece.

RECENTLY PUBLISHED

Heller's Studies in Modern German Literature

By OTTO HELLER, Professor of the German Language and Literature in Washington University, Director of German in the Chautauqua Institution.

List price, \$1.80.

A most timely contribution to the knowledge of present-day literature is offered in this volume, dealing, as it does, with conspicuous figures and the most important aspects of German modernism. The works of HAUPTMANN and SUDERMANN, particularly, are treated with greater fullness and accuracy than has been hitherto accorded them by English or American critics.

GINN & COMPANY Publishers

Boston

New York

Chicago

London

P American Philological Associ-
11 ation
A5 Transactions and proceed-
v.35 ings

**PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET**

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY**

