

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."<sup>7</sup>

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,<sup>1</sup> 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,<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> Malmberg has also suggested that the drive toward the open syllable was as characteristic of Latin as modern Spanish.<sup>4</sup>

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 Variophones 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* (Syra-cuse, 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-Mariojeanu, "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 Golopenția-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. "Gémiation, 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).

taken from Latin prose selections chosen at random. The sources are Caesar *Commentarii de bello Gallico* 7. 80; Cicero *Epistulae ad familiares* 4. 3, first par.; Seneca *Epistulae ad Lucilium* 7. 1; Tacitus *Annales* 1. 1 and 6. 16; Livy 1. 25, first 129 words; Pliny the Younger *Epistulae* 6. 16; Petronius *Satyricon* 76. 1; and Augustine *Confessions* 11, first par.

Given the rules of permissible consonant clusters, sixteen different types of syllables were possible in Latin:<sup>5</sup> CV, V, CCV, CVC, CCVC, VC, VCC, CVCC, CCVCC, VCCC, CVCCC, CCVCCC, CCCV, CCCVC, CCCVCC, and CCCVCCC. The more complex types were rarer than the simpler ones, and the types with three consonant clusters did

not occur at all in the texts sampled except for one occurrence of CCCVC. The type CCVCC did not appear either although it is not hard to think of words having this structure, e.g., *trāns*. A larger sample would undoubtedly reveal an occasional example of the more complex syllables but they would still be statistically insignificant, and CCCVCCC would probably never turn up.

In classifying syllables, all diphthongs were included as examples of V, *QU* and *GU* were placed with C, and geminates were considered as CC.<sup>6</sup> Thus, for example, *poenās* is composed of CV and CVC, *quinque* of CVC and CV and *annus* of CV and CVC. The findings appear in the following table:

AUTHOR	NO. OF WORDS	NO. OF SYLLABLES	CV	V	CCV	CVC	CCVC	VC	VCC	CVCC	CCVC
Caesar	184	473	198	46	14	136	5	49	8	17	
Cicero	194	486	223	39	14	121	5	70	2	12	
Seneca	92	203	88	17	8	61	4	19	2	4	
Tacitus	225	655	319	57	28	163	9	64	3	11	1
Livy	129	336	137	19	18	93	6	52	2	9	
Pliny	101	273	118	21	9	90	2	25	4	4	
Petronius	139	311	159	20	7	83	1	36	1	4	
Augustine	125	263	106	31	11	71	2	34	6	2	
TOTAL	1189	3000	1348	250	109	818	34	349	28	63	1

The percentages of each syllable type out of the total are the following:

CV	V	CCV	CVC	CCVC	VC	VCC	CVCC	CCVC
44.9	8.3	3.6	27.2	1.1	11.6	0.9	2.1	(less than 0.1)

We can see that open syllables are by far the predominating types, making 56.7% of the total. If we include with the open syllables the syllables ending in *-m* in word final position, 176 more syllables would be added to the open types, making 62.7% in all. This figure is not far from that found by Navarro Tomás for modern Spanish, 68.22%. It can be concluded then that the present-day preference for open syllables in the Romance languages is an inheritance from Latin. The tendency to simplify or even eliminate con-

sonant clusters in postvocalic position as Latin developed toward Romance was undoubtedly influenced by this preponderance of open syllables. It is to be hoped that further studies based on larger samples, like the recent study of polysyllabic words in Rumanian,<sup>7</sup> will give more detailed information on the structure of the syllable in different positions in the word.

PAUL M. LLOYD

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

5. A. A. Hill, *Introduction to Linguistic Structures* (New York, 1958), pp. 445-46, and W. Brandenstein, *Kurze Phonologie des Lateinischen*, a supplement to F. Altheim, *Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache* (Frankfurt am Main, 1951), pp. 489 ff.

6. Medial consonant clusters are divided according to the rules set forth in Max Niedermann, *Précis de phonétique*

*historique du latin*, rev. ed. (Paris, 1931), pp. 232-35. Intervocalic *-t-*, being a geminate, is considered as an example of CC (R. G. Kent, *The Sounds of Latin* 3 [Baltimore, 1945], p. 41).

7. Alexandra Roceric-Alexandrescu, "La structure phonologique des mots polysyllabiques," *Cahiers de linguistique théorique et appliquée*, IV (1967), 199-215.