The Position of Archaic Forms in the Verse of Plautus

Philip W. Harsh

Classical Philology, Vol. 35, No. 2. (Apr., 1940), pp. 126-142.

THE POSITION OF ARCHAIC FORMS IN THE
VERSE OF PLAUTUS[1]

PHILIP W. HARSH

ONE of the most widely accepted criteria for determining archaic forms in early Latin is the occurrence of a given form only at the ends of verses or cola.[2] It is assumed that such limitation of position in the verse indicates that the form was retained because of its metrical convenience and that otherwise it would not have been used. This assumption, which seems entirely reasonable at first glance, has been fostered by several studies arbitrarily confined to certain words occurring exclusively or almost exclusively in such positions. At least one such study came to the conclusion that all words so limited in Plautus were either archaisms or new formations.[3] This was a rash conclusion, especially since this study had considered only certain peculiar words occurring at ends of lines and not all words occurring here with equal regularity.

Before undertaking an investigation of the position of words in Plautine verse, one should realize the difficulties which the poet faced in attempting to write Latin verse which should fulfil the requirements of Greek quantitative meter without doing too great violence to Latin regard for accent. That this was the task which the Roman poets set themselves seems obvious from a study of the differences between the Latin senarius and the Greek trimeter, and the data to

---

[1] The following works are cited throughout this paper merely by the name of the author: Hermann Jacobsohn, *Quaestiones Plautinae metricae et grammaticae* (Göttingen, 1904); W. A. Laidlaw, *The Prosody of Terence* ("St. Andrews University Publications," No. XL) (London: Humphrey Milford, 1938); W. M. Lindsay, *Early Latin Verse* (Oxford, 1922); F. Neue and C. Wagener, *Formenlehre der lat. Sprache*[3] (Berlin, 1892–1905); Wilhelm Noetzel, *De archaismis qui apud veteres Rom. poetas scaenicos inveniuntur in finibus* .... (Berlin, 1908); Ferdinand Sommer, *Handbuch der lat. Laut- und Formenlehre*[2-3] (Heidelberg: Winter, 1914); and Eirik Vandvik, *Rythmus und Metrum* ("Symbolae Osloenses," Fasc. Supplet. VIII) (Oslo: Brøgger, 1937).

[2] Cf. Sommer, p. 536, citing Jacobsohn, pp. 18 f. Leumann (Stolz-Schmalz, *Lat. Grammatik*[5], p. 324) says: "*siem siēs siēt sient* hat Plautus nur im Versschluss, dem Platz für Archaismen. ....." This is wrong on both counts. But contrast Jachmann, *Glotta*, VII (1915), 49–53.

[3] Noetzel, p. 39.

be presented in this paper are most easily understood on this assumption. In the trochaic septenarius, the most frequent of all the meters of Plautus, the avoidance of clash between ictus and accent is a relatively easy matter (if iambic words can be avoided). Only the end of the verse causes some difficulty, and this difficulty is readily solved when a cretic word (or ending) is used in this position.[4] Let us take a "popular" example (Suetonius *Jul.* 49, cf. manuscripts):

> ecce Caesar nunc triumphat qui subegit Gallias.

Again (the first septenarius of the *Mercator*, vs. 141):

> hominem ego iracundiorem quam te novi neminem.

The senarius, however, not only has this same difficulty at the end but, like all iambic verse in Latin, has a difficulty at the beginning as well. A "popular" epigram (Suet. *Aug.* 70):

> postquam bis classe victus naves perdidit,
> aliquando ut vincat, ludit assidue aleam.

Clash occurs at the beginning of the first line but has been avoided at the beginning of the second, and both lines end with cretic words. Obviously cretic endings are at a distinct premium in both these meters, which together constitute some four-fifths of all Plautine verse. A glance at typical passages will illustrate the frequency of cretic endings. In the first thirty lines of the prologue of the *Mercator*, sixteen verses end with cretics. Five of these have an additional cretic (dactylic) word within. Only three of the thirty (*Mer.* 12, 25, 26 [note the list, 25 ff.]) contain a cretic word or ending but do not end in a cretic.[5] In the thirty senarii, *Rudens* 780–810, fifteen end with cretics, of which three also have cretic words or endings within. Three of the thirty have one or two cretic words within but do not end in a cretic (*Rud.* 786, 795, 807). So with the thirty septenarii, *Mercator* 141–71, seventeen have cretic endings, of which eight have additional cretics within. Of the thirty, four lines have one or two interior cretics but do not end in cretics (*Mer.* 147, 149, 158, 171). Of the thirty septenarii, *Rudens* 559–88, sixteen have cretic endings, four of which

---

[4] The term "cretic form" is used in this paper to include words or endings that might be dactyls within verses.

[5] Possible word-groups are here ignored in order, as far as possible, to avoid controversial ground. The text is uncertain in *Mer.* 17 and *Rud.* 798.

have additional cretics within. Four of the thirty have cretics within but do not end in cretics (*Rud.* 563, 569, 571, 575).

Furthermore, when either the trochaic septenarius or the iambic senarius ends with a word or phrase filling precisely one iambic metron (since both verses are constructed in the same manner at the end, it is convenient to use the term "iambic metron" of both), then the accentual difficulty is transferred to the previous foot, somewhat lessened, however, since a spondaic foot may occur here, although clash on such a foot here is usually avoided.[6] This explains why cretic forms often occur before the last iambic dipody. For example (*Rud.* 791):

> si te non ludos pessumos dimissero.

Again, the iambic nature of the iambic septenarius is shown not at the end of the verse but before the dieresis after the fourth foot, which is usually pure. This raises the same difficulty as that at the end of the line in the other meters, and so it is here before the dieresis that cretic and iambic forms naturally occur in the iambic septenarius. So (*Most.* 159):

> eventus rebus omnibus, velut horno messis magna.

Another difficulty in writing these meters as Plautus wrote them is found in using iambic words. If or when these were accented according to the ordinary rule for individual Latin words, it was impossible to use them in these verses (as in dactylic hexameter) without a clash between ictus and accent.[7] Apparently, such a clash often occurs, especially at the ends of lines and cola; but within the line, the form of the word is often changed by iambic shortening, dropping of a final *s* after a short vowel, elision, synizesis, and sometimes the accent is shifted or lost because of the use of the word in a phrase or word group, such as *intered loci*.[8] Of the lines considered above,

---

[6] Cf. Lindsay, pp. 15–16; 269; Laidlaw, pp. 6 and 100; F. W. Hall, *Class. Quart.*, XV (1921), 99–105.

[7] The accent of such words in various syntactical groups is a highly controversial matter. Vandvik (pp. 5–33) views the theories of Fraenkel and of Drexler with extreme skepticism and has disproved them in certain instances. It seems clear that metrical exigencies did at least some violence to natural accent in these as in other meters, but the contentions of Vandvik himself must be viewed with great caution.

[8] There is external evidence that this phrase is a word-group; cf. Donatus, *Gram. Lat.* iv. 371, 22K; also, *Gram. Lat.* iii. 520. 21K ff. Another word-group not usually cited is found in the combination, *Sacravia*, which Verrius Flaccus deplored, on which an adjective, *Sacraviensis*, was formed (cf. Festus 190; 372 [Lindsay, Teubner]).

twelve of the senarii, *Rudens* 780–810, end in iambic words (including three in *modo*), and eleven of the senarii, *Mercator* 1–30. In the thirty septenarii, *Mercator* 141–71, twelve have iambic endings, as do twelve of the lines in *Rudens* 559–88. Iambic words, though very common in Latin, were obviously difficult in these meters, and naturally (since the final foot must be pure), they frequently occur at the ends of verses.

These remarks may appear elementary and out of place in the present paper, but their implications have frequently been overlooked or deliberately ignored, although they would seem to be fundamental in any consideration of the position of words in Plautine verse—fundamental, too, for any attempt to determine the accent of the spoken language from Plautine verse or any consideration of iambic shortening and various other features of Plautine usage. Still, the nature of ictus and accent is a matter of theory, and the validity of the data to be presented in this paper is in no way dependent upon the above explanation or any other. This explanation has been suggested in order that the following data, which otherwise might seem unintelligible, should appear entirely reasonable and consistent.

The exigencies of metrical composition have suggested that cretic words are usually, and iambic words often, placed at the ends of verses and cola. Since the majority of the possibly archaic forms which have received most attention are cretic or have cretic endings and the remainder with few exceptions are iambic (sometimes enclitics such as *siem*, etc.), their limitation of position in the verse begins to appear a questionable criterion for determining archaisms in Plautus. Let us now turn to specific examples of such words, comparing the position of words which have been cited as archaisms with metrically similar words which obviously are not archaisms. Sommer assumes that *mavolo* (*mavelim*, etc., cretic forms only) is an archaism in Plautus because it is used only in certain positions in the verse.[9] It occurs at ends of verses in Plautus and Terence twenty-one times; five times it occurs before a final iambic dipody (perhaps also *Truc.* 775, cf. manuscripts), twice in a canticum (*Pseud.* 140, *Mer.* 356) and once

---

[9] Sommer, p. 536. The contention that this was an archaism even for Plautus may be true, but one should not overlook the *mavoluit* of Trimalchio (Petronius lxxvii. 5) (cf. *Thesaurus Ling. Lat.*, VIII, 193, ll. 34–46).

elsewhere within a verse (*Trin.* 306). But the ordinary cretic word *condidi* (*condito, condite, conditus*) occurs in Plautus thirteen times (including *Aul.* Arg. i. 3), invariably at the ends of verses except in anapests (*Pseud.* 575, 941) and in *Truculentus* 920, where the last syllable is elided. The form *conferam* (*conferunt*, etc.) occurs fourteen times, eight times at ends, five times before a final iambic dipody, once elsewhere within a verse. The form *reddidit* occurs five times (including *Pseud.* Arg. i. 9), all at ends except one in a canticum (*Bac.* 664); *redditur* occurs nine times (on *Most.* 575, cf. manuscripts), always final except once before the dieresis in iambic septenarii (*Rud.* 1289) and once in anapests (*Bac.* 1185). *Consequi* (*consequor*) occurs eight times, five times at ends and three times before a final iambic dipody; *consulo* (etc., cretic forms) occurs twenty times, fourteen at ends, two in lyrics, two before a final iambic dipody, and two elsewhere within lines (*Trin.* 396, *Men.* 700, elision; *Truc.* 942 not considered). The word-group, (*i in*) *malam crucem*, occurs twenty times (besides *Cas.* 641, lyric), seventeen times at the ends of lines. The word-group *interea loci* occurs three times, always final.

It has been pointed out that adjectives in -*arius* (e.g., *manufesta-rius*), also, often occur at the ends of verses, while the more ordinary forms (e.g., *manufestus*) occur within verses.[10] Obviously, if alternate forms are at hand, the poet will use the long one with a cretic ending at the end of the line and the shorter form within. So *argentarius*, used as a masculine substantive, as commonly in later Latin, occurs ten times in Plautus, with a single exception (*Cur.* 679, troch. sept., first) always at the ends of verses, while the more easily adaptable *tarpessita* is used within verses. It occurs fourteen times in Plautus (eight times in the *Curculio*). Here the common Latin term occurs at the ends of verses, the unusual one (at least for later Latin), within verses, but this is just as we should expect from the form of the words: one must always be *árgentárius*, while the other may be either *tárpessíta*, filling a trochaic metron (*Cur.* 341) and participating in three iambic feet (*Cur.* 406), or *tarpéssita*, filling an iambic metron (*Trin.* 425) and participating in three trochaic feet (*Cur.* 721). Being composed of long, stable syllables, it cannot fail to be comprehended

---

[10] Cf. Fritz Conrad, *Glotta*, XV (1927), 33, and Runte, *De Plautinae elocutionis rationibus quibusdam metricis qu. sel.* (Münster, 1917) (not available to the author).

regardless of where ictus or accent may fall,[11] whereas *argentarius* could be distorted and perhaps become incomprehensible.[12]

An interesting theory has been brought forward concerning the final feet of verses to the effect that Plautus here employed these adjectives in -*arius* and various archaic or other unusual forms in order to achieve a coincidence of "Vers-Ende und Sinnesabschnitt."[13] This theory seems to overlook the metrical or, more properly perhaps, accentual difficulties at the ends of lines and the fact that the center of lines could be easily expanded. It is noteworthy, also, that some of these very forms which are cited as being used to fill out the line and sentence are occasionally found at the ends of verses where there is no syntactical pause.[14] Frequentative verbs are cited as occurring at the ends of verses for the same reason, and the statement is made that they often have no frequentative force when so used. But we shall see below that the forms *rogas* and *rogitas* are used in precisely the opposite manner, i.e., the frequentative form occurs within, and the simple form occurs at the ends of lines because the forms of this particular pair lend themselves best to this usage. Again, the fre-

[11] Cf. *piscátorés*, *Capt.* 813, *Mil.* 1183, but *píscatóres*, *Rud.* 978 (all troch. sept.). On the accent of these and other forms, cf. E. H. Sturtevant, *Class. Phil.*, XIV (1919), 234–44. On the accent of molossus forms, cf. Vandvik, pp. 30–31. It will be noted that the statistics of Vandvik and Sturtevant on molossus forms in the *Persa* do not agree, but do approximately agree for the *Andria*. This may possibly be due to Sturtevant's inclusion of words with short final syllable.

[12] The author is indebted to Mr. Oscar Powers, of the University of Texas, for pointing out these two interesting words and the variation in their usage. Besides its ten occurrences as a masculine substantive, *argentarius* is found in nine other occurrences in Plautus, invariably at the ends of lines. The form and scansion of *tarpessita* (*trapezita*) is somewhat uncertain in the lines cited.

[13] Cf. Conrad, *op. cit.*, pp. 28–44, who points out that Terence differs strikingly from Plautus in his use of *ut*, *ex*, *inde*, *qui*, etc., and of exclamations at ends of lines, and the conclusion is drawn that Terence admitted many more such lines with no syntactical pause at the end than Plautus did. It is true that lines ending with *ut*, etc., are relatively much more frequent in Terence, but they are known in Plautus, and Lindsay (pp. 110–11) warns that manuscripts may be misleading in this regard. In general, however, verses with no syntactical pause at the end are apparently as frequent in Plautus as in Terence. The writer notes some seventy-five in the *Mercator* (including exclamations at ends, really a different phenomenon). It may also be pointed out that diminutives, infinitives in -*ier*, etc., occur at the ends of lines in Terence just as they do in Plautus, and so it is inconsistent to claim that Plautus used such forms at the ends of lines because, unlike Terence, he deliberately avoided beginning a phrase or clause at the end of a line (cf. W. Appuhn, *Quaest. Plautinae* [Diss., Marburg, 1893], pp. 75–80).

[14] *Miles* 106, 240, 538, 1161 (all infinitives in -*ier*); cf. *Mil.* 130 (*clanculum*). For other lines with no pause at the end (among many) cf. *Mil.* 768 (*uti*), 857, 865, 1132 (*aut*), 1152, 1229.

quentative *minitas* occurs within verses (except, of course, forms with
cretic endings), but *territo* is used at the ends of verses (except *Epid.*
530, lyric).[15]

The passive infinitives in *-ier* constitute the classic example of the
theory that archaic forms are placed at the ends of verses and, at
first glance, the figures seem overwhelming: of some two hundred and
forty-five forms (omitting those in cantica), approximately ninety-
eight per cent occur at the ends of verses or before the dieresis in
iambic septenarii.[16] But even this severe limitation may be explained
as due almost wholly to the metrical structure of these forms. With
one or two exceptions they have cretic (dactylic) endings, and often
they are very long.[17] They are invariably doublet forms, and it is
quite natural that the shorter forms ending in a vowel and so subject
to elision should almost invariably be preferred within verses. That
the metrical structure of certain words is mainly responsible for their
limitation of position is clearly shown by the forms of perfect tenses
in *-averam* (*-everim*, *-ivero*, etc.). They usually have precisely the same
length as the corresponding infinitives in *-ier*, and they have the same
cretic endings, but they are somewhat more tractable than these in-
finitives because they may be elided (*Mil.* 566, only case), and it is
possible that shorter doublet forms, which are not common in Plautus,
may not have been current in the time of Plautus and Terence in
certain cases such as *spreverit* (*Phor.* 584, not final) and *laverit* (*Haut.*
618, not final). Of some one hundred twenty-three cases of these

---

[15] As *rogitas*, so the similar *minitas* (*Cap.* 743), *miniter* (*As.* 47) occur within the
verse (Plautus prefers *minitare*, 2d sing., used five times), but *minitamini* (*Bac.* 1144)
at the end.

[16] Noetzel (p. 16) says that there are one hundred and sixty-eight cases of infinitives in
-ier at ends of verses in Plautus (Hodgman, *Class. Quart.*, I [1907], 105, says one hundred
and seventy-five), thirty-seven in Terence, and twenty-two in other early dramatists.
As forms not final, he lists six cases before the dieresis of iambic septenarii, two cases
before a final iambic dipody (Accius *praet.*, p. 329, l. 28R[3]; *And.* 500, cf. manuscripts),
three in various lyric meters, and three cases within iambic octonarii (*Epid.* 40, before
dieresis; *Men.* 1005; *Adel.* 535). At least one apparent exception is not listed by Noetzel,
Poe. 742 (*egredier*, cf. manuscripts). Cf. Jachmann, *op. cit.*, p. 50. For occurrences of
these forms in early prose, cf. Neue-Wagener, III[3], 230.

How often these forms could have been worked into other positions in the verse and
how often metrically equivalent words which are not doublet forms actually occur with-
in verses are questions not strictly pertinent to the present consideration, since these
infinitives are invariably doublet forms.

[17] Of the four cited (n. 14 above) from the *Miles*, one has four syllables, one has five,
and two have six.

longer forms, approximately ninety-four per cent occur at the ends of lines or before the dieresis of iambic septenarii.[18] One could hardly ask for a clearer demonstration that limitation of position is not a sound criterion for determining archaisms.

Turning to iambic words, we find *minae*, "threats," three times in Plautus and once in Terence (*And.* 210, confused with the Greek commercial term in the index of Jenkins); three times final and once at the dieresis of an iambic septenarius (*As.* 405).[19] In the senarii of the *Miles*, the form *domum* occurs eight times, invariably at the end of a line except once (*Mil.* 859) where it stands before a final dipody. In the trochaic septenarii of the same play, the form occurs nine times, five times at the end, while of the four occurrences within, two are elided (*Mil.* 450, 806), and one shows iambic shortening (*Mil.* 655), leaving only one case within the line with apparent clash (*Mil.* 256). The word occurs also in *Mil.* 1089 (anapests, elision) and 1278 (iamb. sept., within, elision). The form *coquos* (*cocos*), accusative plural, occurs seven times in Plautus (omitting *Aul.* Arg. ii. 5), six times at ends and once within (anapests). The forms *coqui* (gen. sing.), *coco*, *cocum*, occur twelve times in senarii and twice in trochaic septenarii. Seven times they are final, twice before a final iambic dipody and five times elsewhere within the verse where, with one exception at the beginning of a line (*Pseud.* 793), they are elided (*Aul.* 292, 322, 323; *Men.* 218). Such forms occur twice in iambic octonarii, once final (*Pseud.* 157) and once first with iambic shortening (*Capt.* 917). There is one other occurrence (*Aul.* 417, lyric). Obviously, forms which can

[18] Noetzel (pp. 16–17) lists one hundred and twelve cases of these forms (forms from *novi* are not included by the present author; being shorter, they occur more often within verses) in Plautus and Terence at the ends of lines, four cases before the dieresis of iambic septenarii (*As.* 561, *Rud.* 330, 401, *Mil.* 1265), three before a final iambic dipody (*Most.* 401, *Pseud.* 100, *Haut.* 618), and four other cases within verses (*Mil.* 263; 566, elided; *Most.* 1007, *vocaverit* within, *cenavero* at end; *Phor.* 584).

Cf. Lindsay-Nohl, *Die lat. Sprache*, pp. 582–83. The corresponding shorter forms are not common in Plautus. A. Brock (*Quaest. gram. cap. duo* [Dorpati, 1897], p. 136) lists only ten forms in *-arim*, etc. (first conjugation only), of which five occur in the *Asinaria*, the authenticity of which is sometimes questioned, but seventy-four forms in *-averim*, etc. In Terence, however, the shorter forms are common. Brock lists eighteen shorter forms in *-arim*, etc. (on *Adel.* 602, cf. manuscripts), only seven longer forms in *-averim*, etc.

[19] The commercial term *mina* is not included here because it may have been accented on the final syllable in ordinary speech. It occurs some one hundred and sixty-three times in early comedy, eighty-six times final, eleven times before the dieresis in iambic septenarii.

be elided are more tractable and more frequently are used within verses.

Of the approximately equivalent alternatives *rogas* and *rogitas,* the iambic form occurs some forty-seven times: thirty-three times final, four times before a final iambic dipody, once before the dieresis in iambic septenarii, four times not final in lyrics, and only five times elsewhere within verses, invariably in the phrase *me rogas*[20] in trochaic septenarii (*Men.* 640, *Mil.* 426, *Most.* 907) and *rogas me* in iambic verse (*Men.* 713, *Per.* 43). The anapestic word, *rogitas,* occurs apparently twenty-two times and, of course, is never final (except in the glyconic line *Men.* 114; cf. manuscripts). Thus the simple classical verb is regularly placed at the ends of lines or cola, the weakened frequentative, within lines.

Again, the use of *siem,* etc., usually at the ends of verses is frequently cited as an archaism.[21] We may well question whether these forms actually possessed any archaic color in the time of Plautus or Terence. Cato often uses them, not only in the *De agri cultura* but also in his other works.[22] It occurs in Lucilius not infrequently.[23] If *sim* and *siem* are equivalent forms, then it is an obvious conclusion that Plautus, in accordance with his usual practice where alternate forms exist, will almost invariably use the monosyllabic *sim* within verses, the iambic *siem* at the end of verses.

A thorough consideration of iambic forms is far beyond the scope of this paper, though it would doubtless prove of considerable interest and is an essential prerequisite to a satisfactory solution of accentual

[20] Cf. H. Drexler, *Pl. Akzentstudien* (Breslau, 1932–33), I, 168. Note *me rogas* before a final iambic dipody in *Men.* 606, *Mer.* 185, 633 (troch. sept.) and in Terence, *Haut.* 780 (iambic sen.). The variation in order does not necessarily denote a difference in syntactical relationship or emphasis but is, at least sometimes, a mere metrical phenomenon, contrary to what we should expect if Drexler's theories were sound. Thus, in *men rogas?* in *Men.* 606, the *me* is emphatic, as we should expect, but *me rogas?* of *Men.* 640 (troch. sept.) is parallel to *rogas me?* in *Men.* 713 (iamb. sen.). The cretic phrase is used in cretic positions, including those in senarii (Terence, *Haut.* 780, before the final dipody).

[21] Cf. Noetzel, p. 26; Lindsay, p. 184; Laidlaw, p. 80. The fact that *sim,* etc., is sometimes found in the manuscripts at the end of verses where a dissyllable is required (cf. Neue-Wagener, III, 598) is of little consequence, since *siem* is a *lectio difficilior.* *Siem* is found in the manuscripts a considerable number of times within verses, sometimes where a monosyllable is obviously demanded.

[22] Cf. Gellius vi. 3.14; Neue-Wagener, III, 598–99; indexes to Cato; cf. Varro *Ling. Lat.* ix. 77 (cf. manuscripts).

[23] Lucilius 22, 374, 469, etc. [Marx]; cf. Cicero *Orat.* 157.

problems. (We have obviously reached this point in considering *me rogas*.) But it is clear from this brief consideration that some iambic words tend to be used at the ends of lines and corresponding positions, especially iambic forms which end in a consonant preceded by a long vowel (elision impossible) and of such a nature that they cannot be reduced to one syllable by synizesis. It is also clear that where alternate forms exist, the iambic is consistently used in final positions. We have already seen above that roughly one-third of the senarii and septenarii of Plautus end in iambic words. Obviously, this position is a favorite one for all such forms. Limitation of iambic forms to this position, therefore, cannot be considered evidence of archaism.

In the past, scholars have gone to extremes in maintaining that limitation of position may be used as evidence of archaism. Thus it has been contended that if Terence uses *scies* and *sciet* only in final position (except *Haut.* 972) but *scibo* in all positions, then *scibo* was the usual form in his day regardless of which was the older form, and likewise, if the longer forms in the perfect tenses never occur in Terence except in final positions, these forms were obsolete in ordinary speech.[24] According to such a theory, is *scies* an archaism because it occurs at ends of verses, but *scietis* (*Mil.* 794) a popular form because, of course, it occurs within? Since *scies* (one form) occurs some thirty-one times in Plautus and ten times in Terence, while *scibis* (one form) occurs eight times in Plautus and twice in Terence, few will doubt that, at least in the second person singular, the classical form was the usual one in ordinary speech.[25] In this case, the early form is somewhat more convenient "metrically" and so is used within; the usual and classical form is normally final. So in Terence the perfect forms *tuli*, etc., are the usual forms (reduplicated forms occur only twice and only in the *Andria*, 808, 832) but these dissyllabic forms occur ten times final, once at the dieresis in iambic octonarii (*An.* 188) and only twice elsewhere, where the forms are scanned as pyrrhics (*Hec.* 128, 594). Few will doubt that such forms as *admisero* (end, *Cas.* 1002) were more common than those like *amasso* and *occepso* (within

---

[24] Cf. Jacobsohn, p. 10, n. 3, but compare pp. 19–20. Jachmann (*loc. cit.*) has pointed out the fallacy of this position.

[25] Cf. Sommer, p. 526. In Plautus, *scies* occurs twenty-three times final, once not final in lyrics (*Truc.* 116), twice before a final dipody (*Bac.* 831, *Mil.* 572), and five times elsewhere, always, apparently, with synizesis (*Bac.* 853, *Cas.* 115, *Cist.* 496, *Mil.* 1367, *Most.* 434).

line, *Cas.* 1001-2) or that *dixeris* was more common than *dixis* (with *cave*, both occur twice in Plautus, but otherwise *dixeris* occurs seven times and *dixis* only four).[26]

Still, we must not assume that Plautus never uses moribund forms at the ends of lines for mere convenience or that he never uses such forms within lines for mere convenience, although this use within lines would not be expected to occur as frequently, since the interior of lines presents fewer difficulties. How often Plautus may use such forms for mere convenience, however, only further study can determine. It is quite possible, also, that Plautus, wishing to use an archaic form for stylistic effect, should place it always at the ends of verses or cola if it is an iambic form or if it terminates in a cretic. As an example of a probable archaism which occurs only at the ends of lines or at the dieresis of an iambic septenarius we may cite the old imperative forms *arbitramino* (*Epid.* 695), *progredimino* (*Pseud.* 859), and *opperimino* (*Truc.* 197). Such forms are certainly archaisms when they occur in later writers and in inscriptions (especially laws), and probably they were archaisms even for Plautus.[27] But position in the line does not prove them archaisms, for the metrically equivalent forms of the same verbs, *arbitramini* (*Mil.* 499; *Trin.* 505), *progredimini* (*Mil.* 610), and *opperibere* (*Bac.* 48) occur only at the ends of verses. It is obvious that mere limitation of position in the verse does not prove a form moribund or unusual in any way. The criteria for determining whether a given form is an archaism in Plautus must be found in the nature of the passages in which it occurs in Plautus and the nature of the subsequent use of the form, including the frequency or rarity with which it occurs.

This centering of attention upon words in final positions has led to a more or less unconscious neglect of many possible archaisms in Plautus which do not have cretic or iambic forms. For instance, in the study of Plautine style it has been contended that archaisms which were admitted only at the ends of senarii were used indiscriminately in the other meters for stylistic purposes.[28] Incidentally, it seems diffi-

---

[26] Cf. Lindsay-Nohl, *op. cit.*, pp. 535-36.

[27] Cf. Sommer, p. 520, and Conrad, *op. cit.*, p. 31. It is a mistake, however, to say that these forms do not occur after Plautus.

[28] Cf. H. Haffter, *Untersuchungen zur altlat. Dichtersprache* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1934), pp. 114-16. The form *fuam*, etc., is cited, but of the six examples cited within

cult to understand why an archaic word at the end of a senarius
would not lend just as much archaic color to the style of the verse
as an archaic word within, and unless the evidence were very com-
pelling we should not like to assume that Plautus marred the style
of his verses because of mere metrical convenience. However that
may be, the theory is distinctly weakened by the fact that only a few
possibly archaic forms, all cretic or iambic, have been mustered for
its support, and our previous consideration has shown how natural
is limitation of position in the verse for these forms.

Not only from the point of view of style but also in regard to the
study of the position of words, it seems advisable to examine the use
of an apparently archaic form in Plautus which has a spondaic end-
ing. An interesting example is found in forms like *faxo* and *amasso*.[29]
Sommer (pp. 586–87) says that these formations (including *faxim*
and *amassim*) were still "durchaus lebendig" in the time of Plautus,
although they are not as frequent as the *-er-* type and are found only
twice in Terence (with the exception, of course, of the words *faxo*,
faxim, etc., and *ausim*). For various reasons, however, we may well
doubt the opinion of Sommer that these forms were fully alive in the
time of Plautus. But the fact that they have practically disappeared
in Terence (cf. *And.* 760, *Phor.* 742) must not be pressed too enthusi-
astically. Certainly the change in the Latin language between the
time of Plautus and Terence must have been slight, but Terence is
writing at a somewhat different stylistic level, and the absence of a
given word or form from Terence does not of itself prove that the
word or form has dropped out of the language. But there is other
strong evidence which seems to show that these forms were not ordi-

---

meters other than senarii, one seems to be at the dieresis of an iamb. oct. (*Am.* 985, cf.
manuscripts), two before a final iambic dipody (*Cap.* 260, 443), and one in a cretic
phrase (*Mil.* 299) at the opening of a septenarius ("locus Jacobsohnianus"). These are
merely the positions suited for cretic and iambic words and phrases, and since these
positions are more frequent in trochaic verse (a cretic cannot begin an iambic verse)
and in iambic septenarius (where the dieresis corresponds to the end of a senarius), it
is natural for such words to occur more often in the interior of these long verses than in
the interior of a senarius. It may be noted, also, that certain forms usually cited as
archaic, such as passive infinitives in *-ier*, are not used freely within any type of verse
(except the iambic septenarius, where the dieresis corresponds to the end of the senarius,
etc.).

[29] Cf. Leumann (Stolz-Schmalz, *op. cit.*), pp. 343–44; Neue-Wagener, III, 506–21;
Jachmann, *op. cit.*, p. 59 n.

nary ones even in the time of Plautus, and the nature of their subse-
quent use arouses suspicion. They are not infrequent (always except-
ing *faxo, faxim*, and *ausim*, which are comparatively common), but
they often occur in citations from the Laws of the Twelve Tables
(e.g., Seneca *Nat. quaest.* iv. 7. 2) and various other laws (Cicero
De leg. iii. 3. 6, etc.), in inscriptions, and in old formulas (e.g., Livy
iii. 64. 10, cf. manuscripts). The optative forms are frequently found
in prayers and curses, especially in Plautus, Ennius, Pacuvius, and
other early writers.[30] The forms occur also in various other usages
similar to those in Plautus, but occurrences are rare in later authors
except the obviously archaic usages cited above. Interesting later
occurrences are found in Cato (*De ag. cul.* xiv. 1, *uti iussitur*), Lucilius,
(1195), Varro (*Modius* 304, senarius), and Vergil (*Aen.* xi. 467, *qua
iusso*).[31] But the most interesting of all the later usages is found in
Catullus (xliv. 16–20):

> quare refectus maximas tibi grates
> ago, meum quod non es ulta peccatum.
> nec deprecor iam, si nefaria scripta
> Sesti recepso, quin gravedinem et tussim
> non mi, sed ipsi Sestio ferat frigus. . . . .

To assert, as do some editors, that *grates* and *recepso* in this passage
are archaic forms used for metrical convenience is to overlook the
artistry of Catullus. These words are deliberately chosen to add mock
solemnity to this facetious prayer.[32] In general, editors are much too
prone to speak of metrical convenience. The fact that *gratias* does
not occur in Vergil is due to metrical necessity, and the fact that
cretic words in senarii usually occur at the ends of lines is due to
"metrical" convenience, but we should not be too ready to charge a
poet with distorting his style. To do so is sometimes to display our
own ignorance of the subtleties of the language.

---

[30] Prayers and curses often preserve old forms long after they have dropped out of
indiscriminate use. So *duint, perduint*, and *qui* (abl.) were in ordinary use in such ex-
pressions during the time of Cicero and later (cf. Cicero *Ep. ad Att.* iv. 7. 1; xv. 4. 3, cf.
manuscripts; Tacitus *An.* iv. 38 [quoting Tiberius]).

[31] Cf. Silius xii. 175 (*ast ubi iusso*), and *Servii com. ad Aen.* xi. 467: "QUA IUSSO pro
'qua iussero': et est antiquum." Other occurrences are found in Quintilian *Declam.* 244
(Ritter, p. 3, l. 6), Fronto, p. 42. 7N (curse), p. 51. 15N. The forms *depoculassere, de-
argentassere*, and *despeculassere* occur in Lucilius 682–83 [Marx] (cf. manuscripts).
    Such forms are sometimes read in the following: Laberius 145 (Nonius 176. 8 [Lind-
say]), Lucretius iii. 444.

[32] Cf. A. Riese on Catullus xliv. 16–17: "zeigen in jedem Wort scherzhaft feierliches
Pathos."

The frequency of these occurrences must not be allowed to obscure their nature. Many are formulaic archaisms, and a few are poetic archaisms. Cicero, for instance, does not have the faintest idea of the true explanation of the form *capsis* (*Orat.* 154, speaking of early writers): "lubenter etiam copulando verba iungebant ut 'sodes' pro 'si audes,' 'sis' pro 'si vis.' iam in uno 'capsis' tria verba sunt."[33] More interesting still is the remark of Seneca (*Epist. Mor.* lviii. 4): "dicebant antiqui 'si iusso,' id est, iussero.   hoc nolo mihi credas, sed eidem Vergilio:

> cetera, qua iusso, mecum manus inferat arma."

It is obvious from this that it could not be taken for granted that even an educated person would recognize the form in the time of Seneca. The fact that the forms are not in the living language is clearly shown also by the failure of the forms in double *s* to be simplified after a long vowel.[34]

But there are indications of archaism in the use of the form by Plautus himself. Thus *faxint*, which we should expect to be in ordinary use more than forms of less common verbs, is used only in prayers with *di* as subject or partial subject in all of its sixteen occurrences except in a passage of the *Captivi* (320) in a very solemn entreaty.[35] This formulaic use seems to indicate that *faxint* was already obsolete in Plautus' own day except in these phrases, in which it remained in ordinary use for centuries, as the letters of Cicero show.[36]

Fifteen cases of futures in *-so*, as they are usually called, occur in Plautus of verbs belonging to the third conjugation, such as *capso* (*faxo* and *faxis* omitted). These forms are usually spondaic (trochaic) dissyllables. There are thirty-three cases in *-asso*, from verbs of the first conjugation.[37] Of these forty-eight cases, all except two are intro-

---

[33] This explanation is rejected by Quintilian *Inst. or.* i. 5. 66.

[34] Cf. Sommer, p. 587.

[35] In *Poe.* 1208, *faxint* is considered future by Hodgman. Here, also, *di* is a partial subject.

[36] The form occurs three times, always in the phrase *di faxint:* Cicero *Ad fam.* xiv. 3. 3; *Ad. Att.* xv. 29. 1; xvi. 1. 6.

[37] These figures are taken from Hodgman, *Class. Quart.*, I (1907), 46–48. The forms *faxo* and *faxis* (*faxis* always introduced by *si* except *quae*, *As.* 613) have been omitted in the present paper, but *faxit* and *faxint* (one occurrence each as futures, according to Hodgman) have been retained. These forms in some occurrences must (e.g., *Cas.* 1002) or might (e.g., *As.* 770, 794; cf. 785, indicative, and 764, subjunctive) be considered subjunctives. Infinitives in *-assere* have been omitted (Hodgman, *op. cit.*,

duced by a subordinating conjunction, usually *si*.[38] These two excep-
tions are even more enlightening than the other occurrences, since, in
each case, they occur in a negative stipulation (*Stich.* 149, *Rud.* 1028),
and the form (second person sing.) is used in parallel construction
with a future (first person sing.) in *-bo*.[39] The implication is obvious:
These forms (always excepting *faxo*) are not felt to have any strong
future-tense force in Plautus, for they are used only in conditional
or generalizing subordinate clauses where precise tense force is of
little importance and conditional-mood force is perceptible, or they
are used in prohibitive stipulations along with forms whose tense
force is unmistakable. Since this is so, we cannot agree with Sommer
that these forms were fully alive during the time of Plautus. Obvi-
ously, they were moribund, although they are formed on a consider-
able number of roots, and so we are apparently not dealing with
stereotyped phrases.

Let us examine the position of these forms within the verse and the
meters in which they occur. Of those from verbs of the third conjuga-
tion, two occur in lyric meters (*Cas.* 708, *Rud.* 679, cf. manuscripts);
and two in iambic septenarii (*Epid.* 363, *Rud.* 304), where the one
cretic form of this list occurs before the dieresis (*Rud.* 304). Five
cases occur in trochaic septenarii (*Am.* 673, *Bac.* 712, *Cas.* 1001, 1016,
Poe. 1208) and six in senarii (*As.* 770, 794, *Aul.* 58, *Per.* 70, cf. manu-
scripts; *Poe.* 428, *Pseud.* 1022). The positions within the verse are
varied, and there is no favorite position for them such as that for
cretic words. The ictus sometimes falls on the final syllable.[40]

The forms in *-asso* are naturally longer, and they usually consist
of four or more syllables. Of the thirty-three cases, one occurs in

---

p. 106). Omitted, also, are the rather large number of aorist "subjunctives" (Hodgman,
pp. 100–101), consideration of which would be too lengthy for the present paper. Be-
sides, they do not appear to be as interesting or as pertinent, since they usually occur in
prayers and curses and various prohibitions, as do similar forms in later authors, but
it must be admitted that these "subjunctives" cannot always be distinguished from the
"futures." Cf. *Rud.* 1028, on which see Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin* (Boston, 1910)
I, 171. To the forms listed by Hodgman should be added *siris*, etc.

[38] Other conjunctions used are *nisi, ni, ubi, sive, qui* (*Cas.* 1016), *uter* (*Stich.* 725),
ne ut (*Cas.* 1002), on which see Buecheler, *Kl. Schriften* (Leipzig, 1927), II, 330–31.

[39] Cf. Ennius *Ann.* 335 (cf. 319, where there is no *si* in the fragment preserved):
". . . . si quid ego adiuero curamve levasso"; Accius 454: "nunc si . . . . | capsit";
Pacuvius 325: "priusquam accepso"; Cato, *De ag. cul.* xiv. 1: "uti iussitur"; Catullus
xliv. 19: "si . . . . recepso"; Vergil *Aen.* xi. 467: "qua iusso" (cf. Laberius 145).

[40] Contrast *Bac.* 712 with *Pseud.* 1022; *Am.* 673 with *Cas.* 1001.

anapests (*Pseud.* 939a, end of line), five in iambic septenarii, of which
three are final (*Most.* 212, 223, same form; *Cas.* 825). Eight cases are
found in senarii; nineteen in trochaic septenarii, in which the favorite
position for the forms is clearly the third and fourth feet before the
dieresis. This is the usual position for long forms of equivalent metri-
cal value in trochaic septenarii (cf. *Mer.* 141, cited above), however,
just as the end of the verse is the usual place for such words in iambic
septenarii (cf. *Most.* 158, etc.). Forms with cretic endings invariably
occur at ends of lines (*Rud.* 731, 811, *Mil.* 163), and the ictus usually
falls on the -*a*- of the suffix.[41]

Since these forms do not appear to have possessed any particular
metrical convenience, we may well raise inquiry concerning their
stylistic value, especially in view of the theory that archaisms were
used in senarii normally only at the ends of lines but in the other
meters in all positions, since the longer meters are more highly stylized.
Examining the style of these passages, we find that some have a dis-
tinctly legal or official ring: the parasite Saturio declares in his extrav-
agant monologue in the *Persa* (68–72, cf. manuscripts):

> si legerupam qui damnet, det in publicum
> dimidium; atque etiam in ea lege adscribier:
> ubi quadrupulator quempiam iniexit manum,
> tantidem ille illi rusus iniciat manum,
> ut aequa parti prodeant ad trisviros.

No form could be chosen to suggest official jargon more effectively
than *iniexit*. Again, in the amusing contract in the *Asinaria*, a good
translation of which would be peppered with such expressions as
"the wherein aforesaid," these forms occur twice (*As.* 770, 794). Many
of the other passages have a distinctly formal or solemn tone, such
as the oath of Lysidamus at the end of the *Casina* (1001–2):

> si umquam posthac aut amasso Casinam aut occepso modo,
> ne ut eam amasso, si ego umquam adeo posthac tale admisero, ...[42]

These forms often occur in promises or agreements,[43] and they are
especially common in threats,[44] often accompanied with extravagant

---

[41] But cf. *Rud.* 1348 (contrast 1150) and *Stich.* 192.

[42] Cf. Lysidamus' promise to Pardalisca (*Cas.* 708) and the promise of the cast to
the audience at the end of the play (*Cas.* 1016); cf. also the oath which Gripus administers
to Labrax in the *Rudens* (1345, cf. manuscripts; 1348, cf. 1028).

[43] Cf. previous note; *Poe.* 428, 888, *Pseud.* 939a, *Per.* 393, *Stich.* 149.

[44] *Am.* 454; *Aul.* 58 (note *donicum*); *Cas.* 825; *Epid.* 122; *Mil.* 163; *Most.* 212, 223;
Per. 828; *Poe.* pr. 27; *Rud.* 731, 776, 811, 1150 (all spoken by Daemones).

language. Sometimes the passage has a tone of mock or genuine formality[45] or passionate intensity,[46] and not infrequently they occur in the braggadocio of slaves.[47] There remain the case in the highly stylized and poetic "chorus" of the *Rudens* (304) and a few other instances.[48]

From this consideration it seems reasonable to conclude that these forms had special stylistic qualities and that they were not used indiscriminately in ordinary speech even in the time of Plautus. It also appears that metrical convenience was not a primary consideration in the use of the forms. We note that the senarii contain fourteen examples, which is not their proportionate share but which is a sufficient number to suggest that senarii are not infrequently highly stylized. If we are correct in assuming that such forms were archaisms,[49] then these archaisms are used within senarii for stylistic effect just as in the other meters, though perhaps not so often. It is commonly admitted, of course, that prologues and sometimes opening scenes in senarii are highly stylized, but these forms occur not only here (which, of course, is the place where senarii are most freely used and where a considerable percentage of all senarii occur) but in other passages in senarii as well.

In conclusion, we may reiterate: The fact that a word of cretic or iambic form or ending occurs only at the end of verses or in other limited positions is not a sound criterion for judging archaisms in Plautus. Certain words of spondaic (trochaic) form or ending, furthermore, which appear to have been archaisms even for Plautus, occur in various positions both in senarii and in other verses and seem to be used primarily for stylistic effect rather than for metrical convenience.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

[45] *Epid.* 441 (cf. Ennius *Ann.* 335), 728; possibly *Rud.* 679, cf. manuscripts; *Cap.* 576.

[46] *Cas.* 307, *As.* 818, *Epid.* 363, *Men.* 416.

[47] *Am.* 673, *Pseud.* 1022 (note alliteration), and especially *Bac.* 712–13: "si id capso, geritote amicis vostris aurum corbibus, sicut animus sperat."

[48] *Poe.* 1208 (note *di*), *Most.* 228, *Stich.* 192.

[49] According to usage in later authors, these forms in -(s)s- have a better claim to being archaisms in Plautus than either *siem* or the infinitives in -*ier*.