extremely rare for a string player to need a new tuning peg.

Stanford justly regards νέῳ (407) as difficult and cites the emendations νόῳ (Agar), ἑῷ (Tyrrell), and νέην (Düntzer).[2]

νόῳ suggests that some kind of deliberation or careful judgment is involved, but ῥηϊδίως (407) and ἄτερ σπουδῆς (409) show that the stringing is done quite automatically; it is second nature to the performer.

ἑῷ is an unattractive alternative: since it adds practically nothing, its sole merit is that it fits the meter. It is, of course, not un-Homeric.

νέην makes good sense. It tempts one to wonder whether νέῳ is actually an instance of hypallage. A parallel is provided by "δεῦρο δὴ

ὄρσο, γρηῢ παλαιγενές, ἥ τε γυναικῶν / δμῳάων σκοπός ἐσσι κατὰ μέγαρ᾽ ἡμετεράων."[3] Here ἡμετεράων is linked grammatically with γυναικῶν but probably belongs in sense with its neighbor μέγαρα.

Actually, however, I believe that νέῳ goes perfectly well with κόλλοπι if its true sense is understood. The peg is "new," not to the instrument but to the string. In other words, by a slight extension of the normal meaning, νέῳ should here be translated "unfamiliar," a meaning common in the tragedians, as Liddell and Scott point out. Every violinist knows that the chief difficulty with a newly fitted string is that it tends to slip out of tune until it is adequately stretched by the (at first) unfamiliar peg around which it is wound.

D. S. BARRETT

UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND

2. W. B. Stanford, The "Odyssey" of Homer (London, 1948), II, 369.

3. Odyssey 22. 395–96.

NAEVIUS' WIFE

The main purpose of this Note is to correct a thrice-repeated error in RE and suggest the deletion of an unwarranted entry. The point at issue is the family relationship between Publius Quinctius and Sextus Naevius, the parties in the lawsuit in course of which Cicero delivered the Pro Quinctio. In section 16 of his speech Cicero says: "nam P. Quincti consobrinam habet in matrimonio Naevius et ex ea liberos."

It will be remembered that Naevius had been in partnership with P. Quinctius' brother Gaius, now deceased. The author of the RE article on Gaius Quinctius (RE, XXIV [1963], col. 998, s.v. "Quinctius" [6]) states that Naevius was married to "the daughter of a sister (name unknown) of Quinctius," i.e., to a niece of Gaius (and Publius). In the article on Publius Quinctius (ibid., col. 1006, s.v. "Quinctius" [16]), which is by the same writer, the same relationship is maintained, Naevius being described as the husband of Publius Quinctius' "sister's daughter," i.e., "niece." Since this presupposes the existence of a sister of the Quinctii, an entry is made for her, by the same writer (ibid., col. 1104, s.v. "Quinctius"

[58]), where she appears as "(Quinctia?)" and is described as having a daughter who was married to Naevius.

There is no reason to suppose that consobrina ever bore the specific, delimited meaning "one's sister's daughter," "one's niece,"[1] and as this alone would have justified the prosopography given above, the latter should be abandoned. As there is no other evidence that Publius or Gaius Quinctius had a sister, the "(Quinctia?)" entry in RE should be deleted.

The evidence for the meaning of consobrinus and consobrina, including the relationship of these terms to sobrinus and sobrina, is collected in TLL and in the Vocabularium iurisprudentiae Romanae. It is not entirely clear and consistent evidence, and TLL gives no absolute pronouncement or prosopographical analysis. What emerges, however, is that on the whole the words consobrini and consobrinae were used, and understood by etymology, to mean in the first instance the "children of sisters" (i.e., my consobrinus is the child of my maternal aunt). This may be called the strict usage. Alternatively—or more

1. Ausonius at Parentalia 20. 2 addresses his wife's sister's son as consobrine, but no one would claim that the word denoted this relationship to the exclusion of others.

likely as a first extension of the strict usage—
consobrini could be the children respectively
of a sister and a brother (i.e., my *consobrinus*
may be the child of my maternal uncle or
paternal aunt). By further loosening, and in
common parlance, the words came to be
used of any first cousins. There is no positive
evidence in republican literature for any
wider extension than this, or for applying
the term *consobrini* to any relatives who are
not of the same generation.[2] Editors and
translators of the *Pro Quinctio* have in general
correctly taken *consobrinam* to mean "cousin."

The error in *RE* evidently arose through
a misunderstanding of Münzer's article on
Naevius at *RE*, XVI: 2 (1935), col. 1560, *s.v.*
"Naevius" (6), to which reference is made
in the article on Gaius Quinctius. Münzer
quotes verbatim from *Pro Quinctio* 16 and
says that Naevius married a "Geschwister-
tochter" of Publius Quinctius. He certainly
meant (though his statement is superficially
ambiguous) that P. Quinctius and Naevius'
wife were in the relationship of "Gesch-
wisterkinder," i.e., first cousins. The form of
his expression, however, left the door open
for someone to suppose that by "Gesch-
wistertochter" he meant "niece," and this is
what has happened.

Can we, in the *Pro Quinctio*, be more
specific than "first cousin"? That is, can we
say with what degree of strictness Cicero
uses the word? Apart from the *Pro Quinctio*
passage he uses *consobrinus* or *consobrina*
ten times, referring altogether to six individual
relationships and in one instance to the
relationship in general. The relationships are as
follows (we may ignore the complications
which arise where children are adopted or
where parents are married more than once):
(1) Cicero himself/C. Visellius Varro and his
brother(s) (*Prov. cons.* 40, *De orat.* 2. 1. 2,
Brut. 264). Here the usage of *consobrinus* is

strict, that is, it means "child of maternal
aunt." (2) A. Aurius Melinus/Cluentia (*Pro
Cluent.* 11). The usage is again strict. Else-
where Cicero's usage of the term is either
looser or uncertain, viz.: (3) Q. Ligarius/son
of T. Brocchus (*Pro Lig.* 11). Here *consobrinus*
means "child of maternal uncle"[3] and
reversely "child of paternal aunt." (4) D.
Junius Brutus Albinus/Servius (*Fam* 11.7. 1).
There is good reason to believe that Servius
here is Servius Sulpicius Rufus, son of the
jurist.[4] On this supposition his mother's
brother was D. Brutus' adoptive father, so that
consobrinus would have the same meaning as
in (3) above. (5) L. Calpurnius Piso Caeso-
ninus[5]/C. Cornelius Cethegus[6] (*Post red. in
sen.* 10, *De dom.* 62). Here we cannot tell
whether the usage is strict or loose, except
that the sense "child of paternal uncle" is
prima facie to be excluded as the cousins
have different *gentilicia*. (6) C. Coelius
Caldus/M'. Curius (*Fam.* 2. 19. 2). The same
applies as in (5) above. The other occurrence
of *consobrinus* in Cicero is at *De off.* 1. 54,
where the usage is almost certainly loose, the
reference being apparently to first cousins
without restriction.

Elsewhere in republican literature *conso-
brinus* and *consobrina* occur four times,
referring to four individual relationships,
viz.: (1) *Consobrini* as the title of a play by
Afranius. Here apparently the usage was
strict (see Nonius 557. 15). (2) Atticus/Anicia
(Nep. *Att.* 2. 1). Here the usage is loose but
excludes "child of paternal uncle." (3)
Laches/Phania in Terence's *Hecyra* (459).
Terence gives no indication of whether the
usage is strict or loose. The scholia *ad loc.*
in Donatus take *consobrinus* as *always*
meaning "child of maternal uncle" and
reversely" child of paternal aunt," but it
would probably be pressing the evidence too
far to infer that this is definitely the mean-

2. Imperial and Late Latin practice needs separate ex-
amination. A usage like that of Ausonius (see n. 1) is quite
unattested for the Republic.

3. The word *avunculus*, which settles this relationship,
regularly means "maternal uncle." The only place noted in
TLL and the *Oxf. Lat. Dict.* where it may be taken to mean
"maternal aunt's husband" is Sen. *Cons. ad Helv.* 19. 4
(add perhaps 2. 4). Some think this to be the meaning at
Cic. *Corn.* 2. 6 in Ascon. (= 62. 9a Stangl) and Tac. *Ann.*
3. 35 and 4. 26. If such is the meaning at Cic. *Pro Lig.* 11,

then Cicero is there again using the word *consobrinus* in its
strict sense. It should be noted that imperial usage also
allowed *avunculus* to mean "maternal great-uncle" in suitable
contexts.

4. See Münzer at *RE*, IV A (1931), col. 861, *s.v.* "Sul-
picius" (96), and *Adelsparteien*, p. 405, with stemma p. 407.

5. *RE*, III (1897), col. 1387, *s.v.* "Calpurnius" (90)
(Münzer).

6. *RE*, IV (1900), col. 1278, *s.v.* "Cornelius" (89) (Münzer).

ing here. (4) Vercingetorix/Vercassivellaunus (Caes. *BG* 7. 76. 4). Caesar gives no indication of whether the usage is strict or loose.

It may be significant that, leaving aside the generalizing plural of the *De officiis* passage, neither Cicero nor any other republican writer has been proved to use the word for the child of a paternal uncle. This may be due to a sense of the feminine element in *consobrinus*, plus the ready availability of other ways of indicating cousinship through a *patruus*. On the other hand our lack of instances may be merely accidental, for in the second century of the Christian era Gaius, who knew both old literature and contemporary practice, was quite familiar with *consobrinus* in this sense (Gai. *Inst.* 3. 10). On the whole it seems hazardous to particularize Publius Quinctius' *consobrina* beyond saying that she was beyond reasonable doubt his first cousin, more probably on the mother's side than the father's, and if on the father's side, more probably the child of a paternal aunt than of a paternal uncle.

A residual question is whether she stood in the same relationship to Gaius Quinctius, who was probably the elder of the two Quinctii. A case could be made out for supposing that the latter were only half brothers.

"If," it could be argued, "Cicero could have excused Gaius, on the grounds of kinship with Naevius, for entering a rash partnership with him, he would probably have done so. But in fact he does not mention *adfinitas* between C. Quinctius and Naevius either when giving the history of their relationship or elsewhere; and he does not say *Quinctiorum*, as one might have expected, when he mentions the *adfinitas* with his client (§ 16). So it is more probable than not that Naevius' wife was *not* the cousin of C. Quinctius." [7]

This argument lacks cogency for two reasons: (1) Naevius' marriage to the *consobrina* may just as easily have followed as preceded the inception of the partnership, and in that case could obviously not be used to help account for it, and (2) the fact that, at the time of speaking, Gaius Quinctius is dead explains quite sufficiently why Cicero, speaking in the present tense, refers to Naevius' wife as the cousin of Publius Quinctius only and not *Quinctiorum*. In the absence therefore of good reason to the contrary, we should regard the Quinctii as brothers-german and Naevius' wife as cousin to both.

CHARLES GARTON
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO

7. Dr. Ernst Badian has pointed out to me the possibility of this line of argument. I have benefited by a discussion with him of the problem as a whole.

A NOTE ON LATIN SYLLABLE STRUCTURE

Although phoneme frequency in Latin has been studied,[1] the equally important problem of the structure of the syllable has not been touched on except in passing. Spanish and Rumanian syllable structure has received more attention,[2] and Bertil Malmberg has drawn far-reaching conclusions about the dynamic tendencies of the Spanish phonologi-

cal system on the basis of his studies of the Spanish syllable.[3] Malmberg has also suggested that the drive toward the open syllable was as characteristic of Latin as modern Spanish.[4]

The present study of the frequency of occurrence of different syllable types in Latin is based on a count of 3,000 running syllables

1. G. K. Zipf and F. M. Rogers, "Phonemes and Variphones in Four Present-Day Romance Languages and Classical Latin from the Viewpoint of Dynamic Philology," *Archives néerlandaises de phonétique expérimentale*, XV (1939), 110–47.

2. T. Navarro Tomás, *Estudios de fonología española* (Syracuse, N.Y., 1946), pp. 46–53; P. M. Lloyd and R. D. Schnitzer, "A Statistical Study of the Structure of the Spanish Syllable," *Linguistics*, No. 37 (1968); Matilda Caragiu-Marioţeanu, "Structure de la syllabe en aroumain," *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, IX (1964), 269–84; Maria Mărdărescu, "La fréquence des syllabes ouvertes et des syllabes fermées dans la

langue roumaine littéraire," *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, IX (1964), 615–20; Sanda Golopenţia-Eretescu, "La structure phonologique des monosyllabes roumains," *Cahiers de linguistique théorique et appliquée*, III (1966).

3. "La structure syllabique de l'espagnol," *Boletim de Filologia*, IX (1949), 99–120 (reprinted, in Spanish, in *Estudios de fonética hispánica* [Madrid, 1965]), 3–28.

4. "Gémination, force et structure syllabique en latin et en roman," in *Études romanes dédiées à Andreas Blinkenberg* (Copenhagen, 1963), pp. 106–12 (reprinted in *Estudios de fonética hispánica*, pp. 127–35).