



The Dialect Gloss, Hellenistic Poetics and Livius Andronicus

George A. Sheets

The American Journal of Philology, Vol. 102, No. 1. (Spring, 1981), pp. 58-78.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-9475%28198121%29102%3A1%3C58%3ATDGHPA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Q>

The American Journal of Philology is currently published by The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/jhup.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE DIALECT GLOSS, HELLENISTIC POETICS AND LIVIUS ANDRONICUS

In his *Poetics* Aristotle states that γλώτται, or unusual words, are particularly appropriate to heroic poetry (1459a 9). They help to elevate poetic diction by imparting a certain solemnity to it (1458a 21). The way in which Aristotle distinguishes between “glosses” and other kinds of poetic and unusual words (e.g., neologisms) makes it clear that he thought of the former as dialect words—i.e., words which were, or once had been, current in dialects other than that of the poet and his audience.¹

The richly exotic vocabulary of the oral epic tradition provided the original basis for an awareness of glosses as independent elements of style. Over generations the epic *Dichtersprache* had acquired an extensive heterogeneity of dialect features stemming from differing periods and regions. When the Homeric poems were reduced to written form this language was codified and it became possible to study and describe its components, one of the most salient of which were the glosses. Already by the later fifth century Homeric glosses were listed and defined in isolation from their contexts.² Homer’s language exerted some measure of influence on virtually every literary genre, but it was the tragedians in particular who employed glosses along with other features borrowed from Homer in order to achieve exactly that *σεμνότης* to which Aristotle refers in the passage cited above. In this way glosses, through being independently cataloged and creatively reused, increasingly acquired a stylistic identity which transcended time, place and genre.

At the beginning of the fourth century Antimachus of Colophon, a stylistic innovator in so much else besides, gave a novel turn to the use of glosses. Looking beyond the traditional

¹ 1457b 3ff. (ed. Kassel): λέγω δὲ κύριον μὲν ὅς χρώνται ἕκαστοι, γλώτταν δὲ ὅς ἕτεροι ὥστε φανερόν ὅτι κύριον εἶναι δυνατόν τὸ αὐτό, μὴ τοῖς αὐτοῖς δέ.

² In a well-known fragment (222 Kock) of Aristophanes’ *Banqueters* (427 B.C.) a father interrogates his refractory son on the subject of Homeric glosses: πρὸς ταῦτα σὺ λέξον Ὅμηρον ἐμοὶ γλώττας. τί καλοῦσι κορύμβα; τί καλοῦσ’ ἀμηνῆνὰ κάρηνα; κ.τ.λ.

sources for such words, namely the epic and lyric poetry of the archaic period, Antimachus seems to have been the first poet who deliberately imported contemporary dialect words into "higher" poetry.³ At least three factors may have contributed to the growing interest in dialect words which made this innovation feasible. One would be the influence of Ionian ethnography reflected, for example, in the occasional glottological digression in Herodotus.⁴ A second factor was the evolving debate on the origin of language, namely whether *ὀνόματα* were *φύσει* or *θέσει*. This issue naturally inspired a rudimentary dialectology—e.g., in several passages of Plato's *Cratylus*—as evidence for the debate was marshalled.⁵ Lastly one might mention the florescence of Attic comedy as a factor. The pro-Attic language of Aristophanes, in which exquisitely refined lyric existed side by side with vernacular and foreign expressions, perhaps as influenced by the contemporary and starkly dialectal literary mime, may have helped to point the way to the importation of dialect words into the new kind of elegy and epic being written by Antimachus.

It was not until the Hellenistic period, however, that the use of glosses attained its greatest popularity as a poetic device. The gloss particularly suited the literary tastes of Hellenistic poets. It complemented their interest in novel variations on traditional themes and situations. It provided an opportunity for the subtle and not-so-subtle display of their learned researches into the byways of Greek culture. It was a perfect ornament not only for dialect compositions, like the *Hymns* of

³ E.g., fr. 67 Wyss (= M. L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*, II, p. 40) from the *Lyde*: *ἔνθα Καβάρνους θῆκεν ἀβακλέας ὄργειῶνας. Καβάρνους* (a proper name referring to priests of Demeter in Parium), *ἀβακλέας* (evidently an otherwise unattested agent noun derived from the "hapax" *ἀβακλή*, which is glossed by Cyril as *ἄμαξα*), and *ὄργειῶνας* (originally an Attic legal term describing congregants at a cultic ceremony, later a metaphor for "priests") are all glosses. The "wagoner-priests" known as "Kabarnoi" exemplify exactly the kind of recondite folklore which would fascinate the Alexandrians a century later. For other Antimachean glosses, including contemporary dialect words, see the index in Wyss, p. 101.

⁴ E.g., 1.120; 2.161; 5.9; 7.197.

⁵ Cf. the *βεκός* story in Herod. 2.2. These remarks on the origin of glossography owe much to K. Latte's very informative article: "Glossographika," *Philologus* 80 (1925) 136-75.

Callimachus or Theocritus' *Idylls*, but also for the aetiological and didactic poetry which dominates the taste of the age.

In the tradition begun by Antimachus, the Hellenistic poets did not restrict their search for glosses to archaic and classical literature. They also borrowed freely from contemporary dialects and technical jargons. That the Alexandrians delighted in traditional glosses and pseudo-traditional glosses (by which I mean the learned coinages based on etymological interpretation of literary words—e.g., Callimachus' *ἔδνηστις* "paid for bride" based on epic *ἀνάεδνον* "without bride price")⁶ is too well known to require illustration. But the use of contemporary dialect words—both regional and technical—may be illustrated by the following examples: *εἴσπνηλος* (Theoc. 12.13, also used by Call. fr. 68.1 P.), a Laconian word for "lover"; *δίφραξ* (Theoc. 14.41, also used and later rejected by Ap. Rhd. 1.789—see scholion ad loc.), a technical term for a certain kind of couch; *γέντα* (Call. fr. 322 P. also used by Nicander *Al.* 62.557), a Thracian word for "viscera"; *κεβλή* (Call. fr. 657 P.), the Macedonian reflex of *κεφαλή*; and the list could be extended.⁷ One might wonder how such words ever became known to these poets were it not for the fact that the third century was an age of almost feverish glossographic research.⁸ This research is undoubtedly reflected in the exotic expressions collected from past and present which adorn the poetry of the period.

Toward the end of the third century Rome was for the first time directly confronted by the full force of Greek art and literature. It is well known that the experience was a revelation

⁶ Fr. 67.10 P.—see Pfeiffer's note ad loc.

⁷ See, e.g., Pfeiffer's "Index Rerum Notabilium" to *Callimachus*, vol. II (Oxford 1951) s.v. "Dialectica" and A. S. F. Gow's "English Index" to *Theocritus*, vol. II (Cambridge 1952) s.v. "Dialect."

⁸ See R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. I. (Oxford 1968) 87-210. Many of the principal poets of the age themselves engaged in glossographic research—e.g., the programmatic *Ἀτακτα* of Philitas, Callimachus' *Ἐθνικαὶ Ὀνομασῖαι*, and the *Φρύγιοι Φωναὶ* of Neoptolemos of Parium. The impulse for much of this work was the developing science of philological criticism, as in the *Γλώσσαι* of epic and lyric poets compiled by Zenodotus. Other studies seem to reflect Peripatetic interest in systematic description—e.g., Eratosthenes' *Ἀρχιτεκτονικός*, a treatise devoted to the explanation of architectural terminology. Both traditions merge in the monumental *Ἀέξεις* of Aristophanes of Byzantium.

for the Romans. One of its immediate effects was to inspire the instantaneous creation of a native Latin literature. Recent classical scholarship has become increasingly aware of the extent to which this "archaic" literature reflects the careful application of Hellenistic literary theory. Most of the attention has been given to the poetry of Ennius,⁹ whose proud boast to be the first *dicti studiosus* among the Romans helped to engender a lasting prejudice against the Saturnian epic of his predecessors, Livius Andronicus and Naevius.¹⁰ Nevertheless both Naevius and Livius were themselves very much attuned to the Greek literary theory and practice of the Hellenistic age. The case for Naevius is made very convincingly by S. Mariotti in his edition of the *Bellum Punicum*.¹¹ At this point we may turn to a brief review of the evidence for Livius.

In his much-cited article on Livius Andronicus,¹² E. Fraenkel demonstrated that the language of the *Odyssey* fragments is qualitatively different from that of the tragedies. Perhaps the strongest argument concerns the a-stem genitive singular ending *-as*, a feature which Fraenkel calls "hochaltertümlich." Priscian (see n. 50 below), who elsewhere reveals familiarity with Livius' tragedies, cites six examples of this ending: one from Ennius' *Annales*, two from the *Bellum Punicum* of Naevius, and the remaining three from Livius' *Odussia*. The pattern of citations seems to indicate that the ending was felt to be appropriate for epic poetry but inappropriate for the relatively less grand and solemn language of tragedy. In other words Livius (and his successors) demonstrates a sensitivity to the Greek literary convention whereby the idioms of different genres must be formally differentiated from each other.

E. Fraenkel's study demonstrated that Livius was attentive to a fundamental precept of Greek literature, but not necessarily to a precept which was specifically Hellenistic. In an article

⁹ See, e.g., O. Skutsch, *Studia Enniana* (London 1968) 5ff.; G. Williams *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford 1968) 696ff.; J. E. G. Zetzel, "Ennian Experiments," *AJP* 95 (1974) 137-40.

¹⁰ The passage in question is the famous proem to Book 7 of the *Annales* (213-19 V.³). On the reconstruction and interpretation of the proem see Skutsch, *Studia Enniana*, 119ff. and W. Suerbaum, *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter* (Hildesheim 1968) 249ff.

¹¹ *Il Bellum Punicum e l'arte di Nevio* (Rome 1955) chaps. I and III.

¹² *RE* suppl. V (1931) cl. 598ff.

appearing one year later, however, H. Fränkel pointed out that the nature of Livius' translation of the *Odyssey* sometimes reveals the unmistakable influence of Hellenistic commentary to Homer.¹³ For example *O.* 28-29 (Warmington)—*nexabant multa inter se flexu nodorum / dubio*—answers to *ταρφε' ἀμειβομένω* (8.379) which is explained in the "V" scholia ("pseudo-Didymus") as *πυκνῶς πλέκοντες εἰς ἀλλήλους*. Clearly Livius has incorporated some version of this scholion into his own interpretation and rendition of the passage. One is reminded of the notice in Suetonius (*de Gram.* 1.2) that Livius and Ennius represented the beginning of *ars grammatica* among the Romans, and that they did so in part because they "interpreted" Greek authors (*Graecos interpretabantur*). What Suetonius means by *interpretabantur* is clarified by a later passage (4.1) where he accepts Nepos' definition of *litterati* (for which label Livius and Ennius seem to qualify) as *poetarum interpretes qui a Graecis 'grammatici' nominentur*. In short, Livius (and Ennius) might be described by the same phrase which Strabo (14.657) used of Philitas of Cos: *ποιητῆς ἄμα καὶ κριτικός*—i.e., the typically Hellenistic combination of poet and scholar.

We have other indications of Livius' Alexandrianism. A. Ronconi¹⁴ has argued plausibly that expansions in Livius—i.e., passages in which the Latin version expands the content of the Greek locus to which it seems to correspond—are often the result of "contaminazione a distanza." For example he would see *O.* 18 W.—*Igitur demum Ulixi cor frixit prae pavore*—as a "contamination" of the primary Homeric locus (5.297): *καὶ τότε Ὀδυσσεύς λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ*, with another passage (23.215-16): *αἰεὶ γάρ μοι θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισιν ἐρρήγει*.¹⁵ This "contamination of Homer with Homer" is a compositional device typical of Alexandrian poetry, where it is employed as a means of alluding to or incorporating a literary precedent (of theme, situation or style) in a creative and learned way.

The preceding discussion focused on Livius' method of

¹³ "Griechische Bildung in altrömischen Epen I," *Hermes* 67 (1932) 303-11.

¹⁴ "Sulla tecnica delle antiche traduzioni latine da Omero," *SIFC* n.s. 34 (1962) 5-20.

¹⁵ Compare Macrobius (5.3,9) on *Aen.* 1.92: *Hic de duobus unum fabricatus est (Od. 5.297 and Il. 15.436)*.

composition. The evidence which was reviewed suggests that Livius, far from being the literary amateur he was once considered,¹⁶ was in fact a careful stylist who was informed about Hellenistic poetics and sought to apply their precepts to his Latin creations. Scevola Mariotti would go one step further. In his brief but penetrating book on Livius¹⁷ he argues that the poet was sufficiently sensitive to the literary issues which were occupying the Alexandrians during the third century that he actually took sides in the famous debate concerning the feasibility of writing traditional epic poetry. Mariotti points out that Livius' translation of Homer often alters the emphasis of the Homeric model by accenting the "pathetic"—one might think sometimes to the point of sentimentalism.¹⁸ For example *O.* 23-26 *W.* read as follows:

. . . namque nullum
peius macerat humanum quamde mare saevum;
vires cui sunt magnae topper confringent
importunae undae.

The corresponding passage in Homer (8.138-39) is noticeably less elaborate:

*Οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ γέ τί φημι κακώτερον ἄλλο θαλάσσης
ἄνδρα γε συγχεῖναι, εἰ καὶ μάλα καρτερὸς εἴη.*

Mariotti calls attention to three Livian additions to this γνώμη as expressed by Homer: 1) the emphasis on the idea of destruction through two metaphors in the Latin as opposed to one in the Greek; 2) the gratuitous qualification that such destruction is swift (*topper*) in the case of the strong; 3) the double emphasis on the cruelty of the sea—*mare saevum* and *importunae undae* as opposed to the simple θαλάσσης. Mariotti sees this emphasis on the pathetic as a reflection of the new kind of epic poetry which had been written by Antimachus

¹⁶ E.g., J. W. Duff, *A Literary History of Rome. From the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age*³ (London 1960) 91-92: "Livius . . . makes blunders of omission and commission. The extant specimens prove that he can positively mistranslate." Compare the patronizing "Aber es war doch ein grosser Schritt" in Schanz-Hosius, *Gesch. der röm. Literatur*, vol. I (Munich 1927) 46.

¹⁷ *Livio Andronico e la Traduzione Artistica* (Milan 1952).

¹⁸ *Livio*, p. 47ff.

and, later, Apollonius. As further Antimachean features in Livius he cites the poet's striving for solemnity and his delight in elaborate rhetorical figures.¹⁹ Mariotti concludes that Livius sought to imbue his poetry with much the same ethos as critics would observe in the poetry of Antimachus: e.g., Quintilian (10.1,53): *vis et gravitas et minime vulgare eloquendi genus*. It was left to Ennius to adopt the Callimachean position in this stylistic debate which had been transferred from Alexandria to Rome.²⁰

Livius' Antimacheanism further confirms his sophistication as stylist and critic. It seems most probable that such a stylist, who reflects the Greek literary tastes of his age in so many other respects, would also adopt the gloss as a device for amplifying the connotative dimension of his poetry and, particularly in his epic and tragicomic compositions, for enhancing the solemnity of the idiom. Indeed if one defines glosses simply as rare and archaic words, most critics would acknowledge that Livius did incorporate them into his poetry.²¹ It will be remembered, however, that at least for Hellenistic poets the gloss was preeminently a dialect word.²² In fact it is precisely at this period of Greek that the traditional literary dialects begin to be described in terms of ethnic and regional labels: e.g., the text of Alkman is established in the "Lakonian" dialect, Theocritus is said to employ the "Mild Doric" of Epicharmus and Sophron, the epic genitive in *-οιο* is called "Thessalian,"

¹⁹Livio, p. 38ff., 57ff.

²⁰ Despite their overall length, the *Annales* reveal a Callimachean manner in: 1) the proem to Book 1, which combines the dream motif of the opening of the *Aitia* with explicit allusions to the opening of the *Theogony*; 2) the Hesiodic approach which the annalistic method entails; 3) the fact that it is the first Roman epic to be composed in book-length units—i.e., with a view to smaller-scale effects; 4) the literary polemic of the proem to Book 7.

²¹ E.g., Mariotti, *Livio*, p. 25: "Così ritroviamo in lui il tipico gusto antimacheo ed ellenistico per la glossa, per il vocabolo o la forma rara e disusata." Compare E. Fraenkel (n. 12 above) col. 606: "Immer wieder zeigt es sich wie L. bemüht ist gerade mit Hilfe hochaltertümlichen Sprachgutes seinem Epos Würde und Distanz zu geben"; and J. H. Waszink, "Tradition and Personal Achievement in Early Latin Literature," *Mnemosyne* 4.13 (1960) 16ff.

²² This is not to say that the term was used exclusively with that signification—cf. the contrast between *γλώτται παλαιαί* and *ξένα ὀνόματα* in Dion. Hal. *Comp. Verb* 1.3, 15 (my thanks to Prof. A. R. Dyck for this reference).

and so forth.²³ It would follow, then, that Livius also accepted regional dialects as a valid source for glosses. He would have attempted to adorn his poetry with dialect words that were conceived of as being analogous to the ornamental glosses favored by Antimachus and his successors. And indeed analogous words were right at hand in the form of Etruscan, Sabine and other Italic idioms which are known to have much influenced the pre-literary evolution of the Latin language.²⁴

That Livius may have employed dialect glosses is not an entirely novel idea. "Mots étrangers glottals" form one of the types of epic vocabulary which A. Cordier has reviewed in his lexical study of the *Aeneid*.²⁵ Cordier is interested in discovering the extent to which Vergil's predecessors, beginning with Livius Andronicus, used the dialect gloss as well as other types of epic vocabulary. His investigations have yielded comparative data with which to gauge this aspect of Vergil's traditionalism and originality. Cordier makes a distinction between Greek words and words from other sources, mostly Italic. A further distinction is made between words which have acquired the "droit de cité"²⁶—i.e., words which have been thoroughly assimilated in Latin—and words which still retain a dialect color. Only the latter qualify as dialect glosses. Cordier finds that non-Greek dialect glosses are quite rare in Vergil and almost non-existent in his predecessors, with one notable exception: Ennius, for whom such words account for 2.25 percent of his total vocabulary.²⁷ The other percentages reported by Cordier are: Vergil—1.6 percent (comprising 20 words of which at least seven are attested in Ennius and are therefore traditional), Catullus—0 percent, Lucretius—0.1 percent, Cicero—0.32 percent in the translations and 2 percent (com-

²³ See E. Risch, "Die Sprache Alkmans," *MH* 11 (1954) 20-37; *Scholia in Theocritum Vetera* (ed. Wendel) 6; R. Meister, *Die griech. Dialekte*, vol. I (Göttingen 1882) 305.

²⁴ A. Ernout, *Les éléments dialectaux du vocabulaire latin* (Paris 1909) 21ff. This otherwise useful study is unfortunately marred by incompleteness and numerous false references.

²⁵ *Études sur le vocabulaire épique dans l'Énéide* (Paris 1939).

²⁶ So called by Ernout and Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*⁴ (Paris 1967) xii.

²⁷ *Études*, pp. 118ff, 127, 180ff.

prised mostly of Ennianisms) in his other poetry, Naevius—0 percent, Livius Andronicus—0 percent.²⁸

It will be seen that Cordier's figures make Ennius exceptional in his use of non-Greek dialect glosses. If the data are correct, then the conventional view that the dialect gloss is not a stylistic device normally employed in Latin can remain unchallenged.²⁹ Certainly it is not impossible that the subject matter of the *Annales* and Ennius' own Messapic origin³⁰ and fluency in "Oscan"³¹ may be reflected in a comparatively high incidence of Italic words in his poetry.³² Yet a re-examination of the Livian evidence reveals that in him, at least, the dialect gloss³³ is not as rare as Cordier's tabulations suggest.

The method I have employed for identifying such glosses is to analyze Livian vocabulary from the comparative perspective afforded by the attested Italic dialects. My purpose has been to discover words which exhibit one or more formal characteristics which are both non-native to Latin and are independently attested in Italic. Unfortunately this procedure cannot be entirely diagnostic. It can be said of almost any alleged

²⁸ Cordier is inconsistent on Livius. He identifies four words as dialectal in origin—*Camena*, *balteus*, *carpentum*, *ocris*—but argues (118) that they "ne devaient pas avoir le caractère glottal." Nevertheless at pp. 180-81 he classifies these same words as dialect glosses. With respect to his first three examples, which are not purely "poetic" words (see *TLL* s.v.v.), Cordier is certainly right in denying them the effect of dialect glosses. The final example, *ocris*, will be discussed further on in this article.

²⁹ E.g., M. Leumann, "Die Entwicklung der lateinischen Dichtersprache," *MH* 4 (1947) 125: "Im Wortschatz dienen diesem Streben [for an elevated diction] die seltenen Wörter, zwar nie dialektische wie im Griechischen, aber doch altertümliche und feierliche, etwa aus der religiösen Sprache, dann Metaphern, schliesslich für die Dichtung neugeschaffene Wörter" (emphasis added); cf. L. R. Palmer, *The Latin Language* (London 1954) 100, who asserts that dialect glosses are normal in early Latin poetry—but Palmer appears to base his remark solely on Cordier's very equivocal evidence.

³⁰ Servius, in *Aen.* 7.691.

³¹ Gellius, *N.A.*, 17.17, 1.

³² Yet only two of the glosses inventoried by Cordier are specifically "Oscan" (or Samnite): *meddix* and *famul*.

³³ Greek words are excluded from consideration in the discussion to follow. It is debatable whether Greek loans have the force of poetic glosses at all, since they often seem to be employed in situations where a Greek concept or literary model has itself created the need for a word which the native resources of Latin cannot meet. Such situations are common, of course, in Lucretius—e.g., 1.830ff.

dialect gloss in Livius that, unless we possess express ancient testimony to its external provenance, the Livian usage itself certifies its Latinity. Such an objection is all the more likely in view of the prevailing opinion that dialect glosses are not common in Latin poetry, a preconception which ultimately derives from the puristic prescriptions of *urbanitas*, the stylistic canon of oratorical prose in the Ciceronian age.³⁴ This preconception has both caused and been reinforced by a general failure on the part of students of early Latin poetry to recognize dialect glosses for what they are, the tendency being to label them "archaisms" instead. The issue is not simply terminological. Facile applications of the term "archaism" significantly distort our understanding of the method and aesthetics of this poetry.³⁵ Indeed if any preconception regarding the issue is defensible, then it must be that Livius did use the dialect gloss since, as I attempted to show earlier, he was an Alexandrian in spirit and the Alexandrians much favored the dialect gloss in their own poetry. Nevertheless in the discussion to follow I shall avoid *a priori* arguments. In order to control for the possibility that an allegedly dialectal feature may also be native to Latin, I shall review the usage of each example so as to establish its purely "poetic" identity. Thus from the concurrence of these three types of evidence—1) the phenomenon is apparently foreign to Latin, 2) the phenomenon is attested in one or more Italic dialects, 3) the example(s) in Latin are restricted to very specific poetic environments—it will be concluded that the feature in question constitutes a dialect gloss. I now turn to a discussion of five examples.³⁶

³⁴ On this question see especially J. Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*² (Paris 1946) 169-86.

³⁵ I am not suggesting that Livius employs no "archaisms" (meaning native words or features which were no longer in general use even in his own day). Genuine examples of Livian archaisms are: *donicum* (O. 20 W.), *quamde* (O. 24), *+duona+* (O. 46), *fuas* (T. 23), *dusmo* (T. 37). Such archaisms would have been culled from the traditional language of religious *carmina* and legal statutes. For the influence of such language on the stylistic development of early Roman literature see chap. "X" of E. Fraenkel's *Elementi Plautini in Plauto*, rev. ed. of *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Berlin 1922), trans. F. Munari (Florence 1960).

³⁶ Fully assimilated loanwords—e.g., *Camena* (Etruscan), *baltea* (-us) (Etruscan), *carpento* (Gaulish), cf. n. 28 above and Ernout-Meillet s.v.v.—will not be discussed.

insece (O. 1 W.)³⁷

The root-final velar in place of labiovelar in *insece* < **en-sek*^w- is phonologically anomalous in Latin.³⁸ We might have expected to find *inseque* in its place, the form which the pedantic *litterator* (*docens* as opposed to *doctus*) alleges was written by Ennius (A. 326 V.³) in Gellius 18.9 (the source of our Livian fragment)—cf. *insequis: narras, refers* at *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* 5.78,10. It is surely not coincidental that root-final velar has been generalized throughout the inflectional system of the Umbrian cognate of this same verb: *sukatu* (IV 16) “let him proclaim,” *prusikurent* (Va 26, 28) “they will have proclaimed.”³⁹ Thus it would appear that Livius has here translated the Aeolic gloss, ἔννεπε, of the first line of the *Odyssey* with an Umbrian gloss, *insece*. Ennius later reused the gloss in the proem to book 10 of the *Annales*—the only other attestation of the word in Latin.

homones (O. 33 W.)⁴⁰

The peculiarity of the word consists in the predesinential vowel of the stem: -*ō*- instead of -*i*-, a feature which Fraenkel (above, n. 12: cl. 604) called an archaism. But the linguistic history of Latin rules out the possibility that this word is an archaism. A phonological change of *homōnes* to *homines* can-

³⁷ *Virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum*; cf. Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον.

³⁸ Cf. *inquit* < **en-sk*^w-*e-t*, Grk. ἐνισπεῖν and the homophonous root of Lat. *sequor*.

³⁹ R. von Planta, *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte*, vol. I (Strassburg 1892) 338ff.

⁴⁰ *Topper facit homones ut prius fuerunt* (*homones* L. Müller: *homines* cd.). I accept Müller's emendation for the following reasons. 1) The *homōn*- stem is indisputably attested in archaic poetry—Priscian 2.206, 22 K.: *vetustissimi . . . homo homonis declinaverunt*. Ennius: ‘*Vulturus in silvis miserum mandebat homonem*’ (A. 138 V.³); cf. Probus *Cath.* 10.28 K. and P. ex F. 89.8 L.; 2) Precesural *homines* would be rhythmically unique in Livius, being the only example of a trisyllabic anapest in this position. It is true that Naevius (21 Mor.) attests *homines* in the same position, but Naevius' saturnian technique is at least 40 years later than that of Livius and noticeably more tolerant of resolution—cf. Naevius' precesural *Cereris* (29 Mor.), *populo* (43), and *pariet* (63).

not be paralleled elsewhere in the language. Nor is there any clear morphological proportion which could account for the change analogically. Indeed the reverse is true. If *homo/homōnis* were the Old Latin inflection, we should expect it to have been supported by, and preserved along with, the inflection of formally similar nouns like *tiro*, *leno*, *baro* and *caupo*.⁴¹

The subdivision of Latin n-stems into two declensional types, the one with stem apophony (e.g., *homo*, *virgo*, *nomen*, etc.) and the other without (e.g., *caupo*, *praeco*, *Iuno*, *regio*, etc.), reflects a dichotomy inherited from late Indo-European. The older of the two types is the one with stem apophony, preserved perhaps most clearly in Sanskrit n-stems which show suffixal full grade (or *Dehnstufe*) in the strong cases and zero grade elsewhere: e.g., nom. sg. *rāj-ā(n)*, voc. *rāj-an*, gen. *rāj-ñ-as*, dat. *rāj-ñ-e*, nom. pl. *rāj-an-as*, acc. *rāj-ñ-as*, etc. Vestiges of this ancient pattern are preserved in Lat. *car-o(n)*, gen. *car-n-is* (cf. Grk. *κύ-ων*, gen. *κυ-ν-ός*). But when following an *-m-* in Latin the zero grade suffix generated an anaptyctic vowel which shows up as *-i-* in the historical period: e.g., IE loc sg. **nom-n-i* > Lat. abl. sg. *nom-in-e* (cf. the Skt. loc. byform *nām-n-i*). The second type of n-stem—i.e., the one with normalized suffix with constant vowel timbre—is reflected, for example, in a variety of Greek formations: *ποιμήν -μένος*, *ἄκμων -μονος*, *ἀγκών -ῶνος*, etc. That *homo* has an IE etymology of the first, or apophonic, type is guaranteed by its cognate in Gothic: nom. sg. *guma*, gen. *gumins*, dat. *gumin*, acc. *guman*.⁴² Thus the Latin stem *homin-* is not a late innovation but rather the normal reflex of an Indo-European inheritance.⁴³

⁴¹ If the etymological connection with *humus* (< IE **ghem-*, cf. *χαμαί*) was still perceptible, then the stem in *-ōn-* would have received still further support from productive denominatives like *nebulo* 'foggy witted dolt' and *verbero* 'scapegrace.'

⁴² I.e., *guma* is a normal masculine noun of the so-called 'weak declension.' This inflection, which reflects a proto-Germanic stem apophony of *-o/-e-*, is complemented by the normalized suffix of the feminine n-stems in Gothic: nom. sg. *tuggō*, gen. *tuggōns*, dat. *tuggōn*, acc. *tuggōn*, etc.

⁴³ We do not need a supposed stem in *-ōn-* to account for the *Umlaut* of the root vowel **hemo* > *homo* (cf. *nēmo* < **ne-hemo*) as argued by M. Leumann, *Lat. Laut- und Formenlehre* (Munich 1977) 101. The apophonic suffix would originally have shown o-grade in the maximally unmarked strong cases, on the basis of which the *Umlaut* would have been triggered.

Turning to the Italic dialects one discovers that both types of n-stems are preserved, although, significantly, the apophonic type is considerably more restricted than in Latin. Only two inherited classes of apophonic n-stems are preserved (or at least attested) in Italic: 1) neuter nouns in *-men-*: e.g., Umbr. *nome* (= Lat. *nomen*), gen. *nom-n-er*, dat. *nom-n-e*, etc. and Oscan *teremenniu*⁴⁴ 'boundaries' (a nom. pl. form, cf. Lat. *flumina*), dat. pl. *terem-n-iss*; 2) archaic "irregular" nouns: Umbr. *karu* (= Lat. *caro*), dat. sg. *kar-n-e*, and Oscan gen. sg. *car-n-eis*.⁴⁵ On the other hand a fairly large number of nouns with generalized *-ōn-* stems are attested in Italic: e.g., Osc. dat. sg. *sverr-un-ei*, an agent noun derived from IE **swer-* 'speak'; Paelig. gen. pl. *sem-un-u* (cf. Latin *Semo*); Umbr. acc. sg. *abr-un-u*, acc. pl. *abr-on-s* 'boars' (< **apr-ōn-*, cf. Lat. *aper*).⁴⁶ Furthermore it happens that both Oscan and Umbrian preserve the cognate of Latin *homo*. And in both dialects the stem appears with *-ō-* (or its reflex) as the predesinential vowel: Umbr. *hom-on-us* (= Lat. *hominibus*) Vb 10, 15; Osc. *hum-un-s* (= Lat. *homines*) Vetter 6.9 (the "Vibia curse"). Surely this fact cannot be a mere coincidence. Instead it seems clear that Livius' *homones* was an Italic gloss which was reused a generation later by Ennius. Outside of the three grammarians' notices cited in n. 40, the stem does not appear again in Latin.

Monetas (O. 30W.)⁴⁷

This a-stem genitive ending has traditionally been considered an archaism.⁴⁸ There is no doubt, of course, that the ending is archaic in the sense that it preserves an Indo-

⁴⁴ I take the spelling of the ending to reflect a palatalization of the stem-final /n/ before the high vowel *-ū* < /**ā*/.

⁴⁵ Oscan and Umbrian share a third and innovatory type of n-stem which corresponds to the Latin formant in *-io/-iōnis*: i.e., the type in **-ions/in-* (see R. von Planta, *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte*, vol. II [Strassburg 1897] 64 ff.).

⁴⁶ Varro, *LL* 5.97: *Porcus, quod Sabini + apruno porco por+, inde porcus*. More examples of normalized n-stems at von Planta, *Grammatik*, II, p. 61ff.

⁴⁷ *Nam divina Monetas filia docuit*; cf. *escas* (O 14 W.) and *Latonas* (O. 27 W.).

⁴⁸ Cf. n. 12 above.

European inheritance. Latin, however, abandoned this ending in favor of $-\bar{a}\bar{i}$ (later $> -ae$) which was formed on the model of the corresponding o-stem ending in $-\bar{r}$. The new ending was better integrated into the Latin declensional system than the inherited one, and it quickly and completely supplanted the latter. The surrounding Italic dialects did not possess the o-stem ending in $-\bar{r}$ nor, consequently, did they participate in the a-stem innovation. Instead they preserve and uniformly attest the inherited ending $-\bar{a}s$: e.g., Umbr. *fiklas* (IIa 41), Paelig. *Perseponas* (Vetter 213.5), Marruc. *Jovias* (Vetter 218.7), Osc. *vereias* (Vetter 173.1). The point at issue here is whether these Livian examples of $-\bar{a}s$ are truly native archaisms and were so perceived. A quick review of the evidence for this ending in Latin will suggest instead that they are dialect glosses which merely happen to be archaic from the point of view of comparative linguistics.

The evidence for a Latin genitive in $-\bar{a}s$ is confined almost exclusively to old epic poetry.⁴⁹ In addition to the three Livian

⁴⁹ Most of the evidence is collected by F. Neue, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*³, rev. C. Wagener, vol. I (Leipzig 1902) 9-24. Note, however, that Charisius (1.18, 8 K.) cites *aulas* not as an attested example (so taken by Neue-Wagener, p. 10) but as a hypothetical one: *Dicunt quidam veteres in prima declinatione solitos nomina genetivo casu per as proferre, item dativo per i, veluti haec aula huius aulas huic aulai; item inde perseverasse 'pater familias,' item adhuc morem esse poetis in dativo casu, ut 'aulai medio' Vergilius, 'terrai frugiferai' Ennius in Annalibus.* This same passage is quoted in the *Excerpta ex Charisii Arte Grammatica* (538, 24 K.) with an interpolated addition of two more hypothetical examples (*terras* and *aquas*) which Neue-Wagener again mistake for genuine attestations. Charisius' reference to *Maias* (107.11 K.) also appears to involve a hypothetical example (*antiqui . . . nominativo singulari s litteram adiciebant ut facerent genitivum: haec familia huius familias, haec Maia huius Maias . . .*), although, if it actually was attested in old literature, this theonym was most likely culled from epic poetry (Livius?). Neue-Wagener do not cite *Coira* (v.1.1. *Coerae, Cofra, Cofrai, Cotra, Coera*) from a now lost clay dish (*CIL* I² 442 = XI.6708, 4) which has sometimes been seen as a reflex of **Coira(s)*—so taken by F. Stolz and J. Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*⁴ (Munich 1910) 202 and A. Ernout, *Recueil de textes latins archaïques* (Paris 1947) 51. This is one of a collection of similar votive inscriptions which all take the form of THEONYM (gen. case) followed by POCOLO (M). Except in this one example, wherever the name is an a-stem noun, the ending is invariably in -AI: e.g., ACETIAI, BELOLAI, FORTUNAI, LAVERNAI, MENERVAI, VESTAI (*CIL* I² 439, 441, 443, 446, 447, 452). If the reading COIRA is correct—and that seems doubtful in light of the variant apographs—then the ending more likely reflects an engraver's omission of -I rather than -S.

examples we have *fortunas* and *Terras* from Naevius (19, 20 Mor.) and *vias* from Ennius (A. 153 V.).⁵⁰ Poetic, but not epic, is *Alcumenas* (unless this is intended to be a Greek genitive) in the highly artificial second (acrostic) argument to the *Amphitruo*. The *-ās* ending here saves the author of the argument from the necessity of eliding the word or rewriting his line. Elsewhere in the same argument (1.4) the normal Latin ending *-ae* is employed.

Apart from these seven examples we have only one certain attestation of the ending in Latin.⁵¹ That of course is the word *familias* in the phrases *pater familias* and *mater familias*. The plural of these phrases (e.g., *patres familias*, *patrum familias*—Cic. *Verr.* 3.51, 20; *matres familias*, *matribus familias*—Plaut. *Stich.* 1, 41) reveals that *familias* has been lexicalized as an indeclinable complement in Latin. The lexicalization of *familias* is at least as old as Plautus and most probably a much older and preliterary phenomenon. In other words, *familias* is not synchronically “genitive” at all;⁵² and

⁵⁰ All six examples are known to us only from a single passage (198, 11ff. K.) of Priscian. The distribution of the examples (one from Ennius, two from the much shorter poem of Naevius) and their relative abundance suggests that the list is exhaustive—at least as far as Priscian could tell.

⁵¹ *Quartas* (CIL IX.2398) from Samnite Allifae is very likely influenced by the local Oscan dialect. *Cornelias* (CIL X.8071, 38) from Pompeii is also in all probability a patois form—perhaps the influence is Oscan, but more likely Greek. *Devas Corniscas* (CIL I.2814 = VI.96) are dat. plur.—see A. Ernout, “Le parler de preneste d’après les inscriptions,” *MSL* 13 (1905/6) 324.

⁵² That *familias* did not necessarily strike the Roman ear as genitive is suggested by the argument of Sisenna as reported by Charisius (107.14 K.): *sed emendatius . . . familiae* [i.e., rather than *familias*] *dicimus. Quod ne celebraretur Sisenna effecit. Ait enim eum qui diceret pater familiae etiam pluraliter dicere debere patres familiarum et matres familiarum. Quod quoniam erat durum et longe iucundius patrum familias sonabat, etiam pater familias ut diceretur consuetudo conprobavit* (cf. Varro, *LL* 8.73; Probus 211.27 K.). The point seems to be that the rationalized genitive of *pater familiae* would be subject to pluralization as *familiarum*, which was evidently a solecism (*erat durum*). Consequently the indeclinable form in *-as* which, in not being transparently “genitive,” did not embody a potential for pluralization, continued to be sanctioned by custom. Charisius goes on to argue that Sisenna’s point is not valid: *nec enim necesse est pluralem numerum rei adiunctae adhibere. Nam familia est ut plebs, et posset pater familiae dici ut tribunus plebis . . .* The problem with this and the other alleged parallels which follow is that the dependent genitive in such phrases is not logically subject to pluralization—i.e., there may be many tribunes, but there is only one *plebs*, a fact which makes the *tribunus plebis* different from the *pater familias*.

its indeclinable ending would not necessarily have been perceived as "archaic" by a Plautine or Livian audience any more than, say, the old objective genitive ending, which appears in English "toward-s" (as opposed to "toward"), is perceived by us as an archaism. But even if *familias*, despite its lexicalization as an indeclinable complement, was perceived as a quasi genitive, its aberrant form is more likely to have raised dialectal associations than archaic ones. I infer this from the fact that the word itself is probably not native to Latin and certainly was viewed as foreign by no less a scholar than Verrius Flaccus (P. ex F. 77, 11 L): *Famuli origo ab Oscis dependet, apud quos servus 'famel' nominabatur, unde et 'familia' vocata*. This testimony is corroborated by numerous Italic attestations of the word-family—e.g., Paelig. *famel* (= Lat. *famulus*; Vetter 209), Osc. *famelo* (= Lat. *familia*; Vetter 2.22).

It would seem, then, that there is no reliable evidence in Latin for the gen. ending in *-ās* outside of old poetry. Of the seven examples which we possess six are certifiably epic glosses—a seventh (*Maias*), if genuine, probably is also an epic gloss—and the remaining one (*Alcumenas*) is a nonce word. If the ending were truly an archaism, and was felt to be such by Livius and his audience of the period, then we should expect to find examples of *-ās* at least sporadically preserved in archaic or archaizing inscriptions.⁵³ But such is not the case: e.g., *Duelonai* (from the strongly archaizing *Epistula Consulum de Bacchanalibus*—*CIL* I² 581), *Voltaī* (from a third c. bronze plate found at Falerii—*CIL* I² 364), and the third c. votive inscriptions quoted in n. 49 above. This fact should lead us to conclude, I believe, that the epic examples of *-ās* are literary dialect glosses (cf. Greek epic *-οιο* or *-αο* or *-έων* or Hesiodic *-ᾶν*) created in a tradition which Livius is responsible for establishing.

ocrim (T. 32 W.)⁵⁴

The only attestations of this word in Latin are these four

⁵³ As we do, for example, with the genuinely archaic case-form *-abus* found in Livian *dextrabus* (O. 46 W.): this ending is widely attested in Old Latin inscriptions.

⁵⁴ *Sed qui sunt hi qui ascendunt altum ocrim?* cf. *ocri* (T. 30 W.), *ocres* (T. 33, 35 W.).

fragments of Livius, perhaps all of them from the same play. The four examples are collected in a single passage of Festus (192.1ff. L.) who glosses the word as *mons confragosus* and attributes this information to the *Liber Glossematorum* of Ateius. Outside of Latin, however, the word or a derivative of it are several times attested in central Italic: 1) it frequently appears in the Iguvine Tables where it refers to the "Fisian Mount" (e.g., in the formula: *ocri-per fisiu*);⁵⁵ 2) it is found as an element of Latinized place-names in Umbria (e.g., *Ocriculum* "Mountain City," *Interocrea* "In-the-Heights"); and 3) it is employed in a "Marrucinian" public decree from Chieti (Vetter 218.6)—*ocres* "citadel." Thus it appears that Livius has here experimented with an Umbrian or, perhaps, Sabine gloss which was eschewed by later tragedians as a barbarism.

perbitat (T. 28 W.)⁵⁶

The Livian fragment comes from Nonius (225 L.) who quotes it to illustrate his gloss: *perbitere, perire*. In the same passage Nonius quotes three other examples of the word from fragments of: 1) Pacuvius' *Periboea*, 2) Ennius' *Hecuba*, and 3) Titinius' *Fullonia*. Two further examples of the verb are known from Plautus: *Pseud.* 778 and *Rud.* 495—cf. P. ex. F. 235 L. At first sight the presence of this word in Plautus and Titinius might be taken to invalidate the thesis that the word is a gloss associated with "serious" poetry, specifically tragedy. But a closer examination of the texts in question reveals that the word has a strongly tragic coloring.

The Ennius fragment (*Scaenica* 211-12 V.³) reads as follows:

set numquam scripstitis, qui parentem aut hospitem
necasset, quo quis cruciatu (*Iunius*: quos . . . cruciatus
cdd) perbiteret.

It will be seen that *perbiteret* fills the final dipody of the *senarius*, the metrical slot which H. Haffter has called: "der

⁵⁵ J. W. Poultney, *The Bronze Tables of Iguvium* (Baltimore 1959), Index, s.v. *ocar/ukar*.

⁵⁶ *Ego puerum interead ancillae subdam lactantem meae / ne fame perbitat.*

beliebte Platz der altertümlichen Formen.⁵⁷ The same holds true for the two Plautine *senarii* in which this word appears:

interminatust . . .

eum cras cruciatu maxumo perbitere.

(*Pseud.* 776-78)

utinam . . .

malo cruciatu in Sicilia perbiteres.

(*Rud.* 494-95)

Plautus here seems to be invoking that *iocosa sollemnitas* which forms such a distinctive element of his comic style. Indeed the verbal similarity of the Plautine passages to the Ennian fragment suggests that he may even be parodying Ennius. In either case, however, Plautus uses this word for an effect conditioned by its poetic (tragedic) aura, and not because it is a word “normal” to comic idiom. The Titinius fragment (17 Ribb.) which Nonius quotes also positions this gloss at the end of a *senarius*: . . . *iam pridem egressa aut perbiteres*. Titinius may be here, as often elsewhere, imitating Plautine vocabulary (see below), or he may simply be resorting to a “traditional” word to fill this metrically exigent position. Thus it appears that Livius’ *perbitat* was a poetic word which attained some popularity as a gloss in tragedy, was parodied by Plautus, and was later reused in a stylized context by Titinius.

In addition to *perbito* six other compound verbs in *-bito* are attested for a total of eleven examples: *abito* (3 times), *adbito* (1), *imbito* (1), *interbito* (1), *praeterbito* (2), *rebito* (3). All eleven of these examples come from Plautus. Over half of them (six) are found in recitative *septenarii* or *cantica*—i.e., the highly rhetorical passages which are characterized by Plautus’ most extravagant language.⁵⁸ Of the remaining examples, the

⁵⁷ *Untersuchungen zur allateinischen Dichtersprache* (Berlin 1934) 115. Haffter’s study demonstrated that the verse-endings of comic *senarii* tend to be characterized by quasi-formulaic elements of tragedic diction—e.g., the archaisms *fuas* and *duim/duis*.

⁵⁸ E.g., the mock solemn: *ad fores auscultate atque adservate aedis, Inequis adventor gravior abaetat quam adveniat* (*Truc.* 95-96); or the lead-up to a delayed punch-line: TY. *solus te solum volo, / Hegio*. HE. *istinc loquere, si quid vis, procul. tamen audiam.* / TY. *namque edepol si adbites proprius, os denasabit tibi/mordicus* (*Capt.* 602-5). The other loci are: *Epid.* 145, 304; *Most.* 1096; *Rud.* 777.

three attestations of *rebito* come from a single play, the *Capitivi*. All three appear in conditional protases which are verbally reminiscent of each other and are tied together by a shared function in the plot of the play.⁵⁹ Clearly Plautus is playing with the word, making a joke that turns on its strangeness and periodic reappearance in structurally identical contexts. Two examples of *praeterbito* complete this family of compound verbs. Although both of the lines in which *praeterbito* appears (*Epid.*, 437, *Poen.* 1163) are *senarii*, the surrounding language and the dramatic contexts of each are markedly rhetorical.⁶⁰ In other words, even these two examples reveal the word as a "marked" form, a gloss, and not a free variant of *praeterire*.

The simplex of all these verbs is *baeto* (*būto*) which Nonius (108 L.) glosses as *ire* (cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, Index, s.v. *baeto*). Nonius quotes three examples of the word: two from tragedies by Pacuvius, and the third from a Menippean satire of Varro. In addition, the word is used four times by Plautus—always in *cantica* or *recitative* (*Curc.* 141; *Merc.* 465; *Mil.* 997; *Pseud.* 254). Here again the distribution of attestations reveals the verb to be a gloss associated with old tragedy and the more extravagant language of Plautus. Precisely because it was a gloss did Varro resurrect it into the fantastic idiom of Menippean composition.

So far as we can judge, Livius inaugurated the use of this group of tragic glosses which contain the root-verb, *baeto*. Neither the simplex nor any compound form of the verb appears in epigraphic Latin, nor indeed in any literary context other than those discussed above.⁶¹ Yet the root **baet-* is independently attested in two Italic dialects: Osc. *baiteis* (Vetter 161) "you are going"; Umbr. (*h*) *ebetrafe* (VIa 12, VIb 13) "to

⁵⁹ *Capt.* 378-81 (Tyndarus to Philocrates): *convenit . . . si non rebites huc, ut viginti minas/dem pro te*; 409 (Tyndarus to himself): *et mea opera, si hinc rebito, faciam ut faciat facilius*; 747 (Tyndarus to Hegio): *at unum hoc quaeso, si huc rebitet Philocrates*.

⁶⁰ In the *Epidicus*, the *miles* is making a pompous threat. Hanno, in the *Poenulus*, is word-playing on Agorastocles' question while concluding the climactic *sponsio* scene.

⁶¹ Ernout (*Éléments*—n. 24 above—p. 117) cites *adbito* from Lucilius (393 Warmington). But *adbitere* is actually Schneider's emendation of an obviously corrupt *abbire* in Velius Longus (7.62, 18 K.). Marx's emendation, *abbibere*, which is accepted by Warmington, fits the context of the Velius passage much better (cf. *ebibit* at 7.63, 5).

the exits''—a postpositional phrase incorporating the agent noun **e-bait-ra*. Taken with the distribution of the Latin attestations, this Italic evidence suggests that the root-verb is a dialect gloss which was imported by Livius into Latin. The extraordinarily high incidence of this gloss in Plautus is perhaps an Umbrianism—i.e., a reflection of his native dialect.

* * *

These five examples and perhaps others⁶² provide evidence that Livius did indeed import dialect glosses into the poetic idiom he was crafting virtually *ex nihilo*. It is interesting that the range of features comprises phonological differences (as in *insece*), inflectional differences (as in the stem of *homōnes* or the ending of *Monetas*), and lexical differences (as in *ocrim* and *-bitat*). All three kinds of dialectalisms are also found in Greek poetry (e.g., Homeric *πóλις*, *ἐκόμισσα* or *ἄμμες*, *ἄναξ*). Thus in imbuing his poetic idiom with a tincture of such features Livius was responding to both the precepts of Hellenistic literary theory and the example of his native Greek literature.

Four of the glosses which were discussed above continued to be used in poetry for a generation or more, but all of them were eventually abandoned as being what Quintilian called: *ab ultimis et iam oblitteratis repetita temporibus*.⁶³ Yet there is evidence that later Romans were not unaware of the existence of dialect glosses in the poetry of the archaic period. For example in the book which Varro devotes to discussion of the language of old poetry (*L.L.* 7) dialectal origin is often attrib-

⁶² E.g., *amploctens* (*O.* 19 W.), an apophonic variant of *amplectens*, contains a root vowel which Ernout-Meillet call "obscur" (*Dictionnaire*⁴, p. 514, s.v. *plecto*). Manu Leumann (*Lat. Laut- und Formenlehre* [Munich 1977] 47) is more specific: "Eine Vokalstufe *plok* wie in gr. *πλόκαμος* neben *πλέκω* ist im Verbum unverständlich; aber ein Lautwandel *e > o* is hier auch unwahrscheinlich." A primary present stem with *o*-grade is indeed an anomaly in Latin, but not in Umbrian where the phenomenon is not infrequent—e.g., *SUKATU* 'let him proclaim,' the obscure verb *holtu*, and perhaps *purdovitu* 'let him present.' This comparative evidence suggests that Livius' *amploctens* may be an Umbrianism.

⁶³ . . . *qualia sunt 'topper' et 'antegerio' et 'exanclare' et 'prosapia' et Saliorum carmina vix sacerdotibus suis satis intellecta* (1.6, 40). *Topper* and *exanclare* are attested in Livius. Quintilian admonishes that such words are so outmoded that to reuse them is an offensive affectation.

uted to individual words: e.g., Ennius' *cascus* is called "Sabine" (section 28); his *subulo* is "Etruscan" (35); his *catus* is "Sabine" (46); Naevius' *asta* is said to be "Oscan" (54); *crepusculum* in Plautus is "Sabine" (77), and so forth. We can discern a similar judgement in Verrius Flaccus (through Festus) who identifies, for example, Ennius' *tongent* as "'Umbrian'" (cf. Varro, *L.L.* 7.67, where the same gloss is called "Greek"), and so forth. Sometimes dialect glosses may have been overused to the point of barbarism. At any rate that seems to be the substance behind Titinius' criticism of playwrights who wrote "in Oscan and Volscian."⁶⁴ And it may be at the root of Cicero's judgement (*Brut.* 258) that the poets Caecilius and Pacuvius wrote bad Latin in contrast with the pure and pristine language of the orators Laelius and Scipio. If such excesses occurred, however, I would suggest that they were not the result of unintended *rusticitas*, but that rather they were conscious stylistic experiments which failed to please the changed tastes of a later audience.⁶⁵

GEORGE A. SHEETS

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

⁶⁴ Fr. 104 Ribb.: *qui Obsce et Volsce fabulantur: nam Latine nesciunt.*

⁶⁵ "The essential problem was that the analogy to Greek conditions introduced by Livius was a false one: Oscan, Umbrian, etc. do *not* stand in the same relation to Latin as Aeolic and Ionic to Attic: they are different languages, not related dialects of a single language, and therefore words borrowed from them could not take root once the criterion of *Latinitas* was adopted"—A. R. Dyck in a letter to me dated 19 Feb. 1980. My thanks to him and to Profs. J. P. Hershbell, J. F. Miller, and W. N. Nichipor for criticising an earlier draft of this paper. My thanks also to the University of Minnesota for a single quarter leave to research and write the study.