

this theory there is no longer any foundation for the assumption made by several historians that the *μισθὸς ἐκκλησιαστικός* only compensated the Athenian citizens in some measure for loss of working time,<sup>6</sup> and we can reject the view that the poorer citizens even in the fourth century may have been debarred from attending the *ecclesia*. On the other hand, assuming that an *ecclesia* usually did not fill more than part of the day enables us to give a simple explanation of the higher rate for an *ἐκκλησία κυρία*. It is apparent from the *Constitution of Athens* (43. 3–6) that there were more items on the agenda for an *ἐκκλησία κυρία* than for other meetings of the assembly. Such a meeting was probably more time-consuming, and consequently the subvention paid for attendance had to be raised in order to provide full compensation for the working hours lost.

The thesis suggested in this article is based on a study of the scanty sources. I conclude my argument by anticipating an a priori objection which will doubtless be raised against my reconstruction: that it is impossible for six thousand participants, all of whom have the right to speak, to discuss and vote on a dozen decrees within a few hours. My answer is that it *is* possible: it happens in Switzerland today. In a few of the smaller cantons, magistrates are still elected and laws are still passed by the *Landsgemeinde*, which in Glarus, for example, is attended by about five thousand citizens who vote on all proposals by a show of hands. Every citizen is entitled to address the assembly, and the number of items on the agenda is comparable to the description found in the *Constitution of Athens* (43. 3–6). Nevertheless, such meetings last for no more than two to four hours.<sup>7</sup>

MOGENS HERMAN HANSEN  
*University of Copenhagen*

6. G. Glotz and R. Cohen, *Histoire grecque*, vol. 3 (Paris, 1936), p. 16; P. Cloché, *La démocratie athénienne* (Paris, 1951), p. 210; V. Ehrenberg, *The Greek State* (Oxford, 1960), p. 55; C. Mossé, *Les institutions politiques grecques* (Paris, 1967), p. 46; De Laix, *Probouleusis*, p. 176. Cautiously stated by A. H. M. Jones, *Athenian Democracy* (Oxford, 1957), p. 18.

7. W. Stauffacher, *Die Versammlungsdemokratie in Kanton Glarus* (Zurich, 1962), pp. 284–85; H. Ryffel, *Die Schweizerischen Landsgemeinden* (Zurich, 1903), pp. 80–109, 270–324.

For valuable discussions of various problems I should like to thank Dr. A. Bülow-Jacobsen, Prof. J. Christensen, Mr. J. A. Crook, Mr. G. T. Griffith, Dr. C. M. Taisbak, and the anonymous referees of *Classical Philology*.

## A STRUCTURAL AMBIGUITY IN LATIN

In a revealing passage of the *Institutiones grammaticae* (ed. H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, vol. 3, pp. 177–78, §§139–41), Priscian offers observations on the nature of reciprocal conjunction which point up some interesting usages in Latin syntax. He remarks that there are several means of expressing the reciprocal notion (“each other, one another”), giving the following examples:

- (1) Terence *Adelphoe* 827–28: “video amare inter se.”  
“I see them loving each other.”
- (2) Terence *Adelphoe* 271: “age, inepte, quasi nunc non norimus nos inter nos, Ctesipho.”  
“Carry on foolishly, Ctesiphon, as if we don’t now know each other.”
- (3) Vergil *Aeneid* 11. 121: “conversique oculos inter se atque ora tenebant.”  
“They hold their eyes and faces turned on each other.”

In each of these examples, the reciprocal notion is conveyed by the preposition *inter* plus the reflexive pronoun (*se*, etc.).

According to Priscian, another technique of expressing reciprocity is the use of *inter se* together with the adverb *invicem*:

- (4) ego et tu nosmet ipsos *invicem* amamus *inter* nos.  
"You and I, we love each other indeed, each the other between ourselves."
- (5) tu et ille *invicem* amatis *inter* vos.  
"You and he love each the other between you."

Compare also:

- (6) Livy 33. 6. 12: "cum *inter se* innexi rami vinculum *invicem* praebeant"  
"Since the interwoven branches bind each other together"
- (7) Livy 9. 43. 17: "*invicem inter se* gratantes"  
"Congratulating each other"

Finally, Priscian gives examples of the following type, in which *invicem* plus the reflexive pronoun is used alone, without *inter*:

- (8) ego et tu nostri *invicem* miseremur.  
"You and I, we have compassion for each other."
- (9) tu et ille *invicem* vobis indulgetis.  
"You and he, you gratify each other."
- (10) iste et ille *invicem se* potiuntur.  
"This one and that one, they are masters of each other."

Compare also:

- (11) Manilius 2. 275: "linea . . . inque vicem extremis iungit se finibus ipsa."  
"Indeed the line joins up with itself at the very ends."
- (12) Tac. *Agr.* 6 *init.*: "vixerunt mira concordia, per mutuam caritatem et *invicem se* anteponendo."  
"They lived in extraordinary harmony, through mutual affection, with each holding [the interests of] the other more important."

Priscian notes that, without *invicem*, sentences like (8)–(12) would be ambiguous with respect to the reflexive or reciprocal interpretations (for example, sentence [8] could mean "You and I have compassion for ourselves" or "You and I have compassion for each other"). Thus, in addition to his fundamental purpose of describing the Latin usage in relation to the Greek reciprocal pronoun ἀλλήλο-, Priscian is pointing out and attempting to account for the potential ambiguity in sentences such as (8)–(12). To illustrate this ambiguity, he gives the following sentence, where *se* is used alone:

- (13) iste et ille *se* amant.  
"This one and that one love each other."  
"This one and that one love themselves."

Compare also:<sup>1</sup>

- (14) Livy 6. 28. 1: "nam cum esset Praenestinis nuntiatum . . . patres ac plebem in semet ipsos versos . . ."

1. Examples with *se* alone are infrequent, since the *se* is usually modified by *ipsi* or some other intensifier.

"For when it was announced to the Praenestini . . . that patricians and plebeians had turned against each other . . ."

(15) Caesar *BG* 2. 19. 6: "ipsi sese confirmaverant."

"They had encouraged each other."

Using Priscian's example (13) as an illustration, we see that two rules of Latin syntax, that of conjunction reduction (which takes the sentence "iste amat illum et ille amat istum" and reduces it to "iste et ille amant illum et istum"), and that of reflexivization (which replaces the object pronouns *illum et istum* by *se*), have intersected to produce a structurally ambiguous sentence type. This ambiguity, like most ambiguities, was usually resolved in the various instances in which it occurred by the surrounding context. But when it was not obvious that context would make explicit whether the intended meaning was reflexive or reciprocal, Latin, lacking a reciprocal pronoun like the Greek ἀλλήλο- made use of several syntactic devices.<sup>2</sup> The first, and probably the oldest, was the use of the prepositional phrase *inter se*, as illustrated in examples (1)–(3). This construction is found most frequently among the earlier writers, and it appears to be the fundamental means of expressing reciprocity in Latin. In addition, we find a multiple, hyper-characterized construction which utilizes both *inter se* and *invicem*, as in examples (4)–(7). Here the adverb *invicem*, which in its original sense meant "in place of" (cf. *vice versa*, *mutua vice*, *in vicem*, all of which deal with changing place), shows a semantic evolution whereby the original meaning "in place of" develops the meaning "by turns, alternately"—compare A. Ernout–A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*<sup>4</sup> (Paris, 1959), pp. 1059–60, s. v.<sup>3</sup> It is this meaning which we find when *invicem* is used alongside *inter se* in redundant constructions such as (4)–(7).

From the meaning "by turns, alternately," *invicem* undergoes still another semantic shift, in this case to the meaning of reciprocity itself, which is typically carried by *inter*. This development is illustrated by examples (8)–(12), where *invicem* occurs with the reflexive pronoun alone. This stage is most likely a co-existing alternative with the next stage, where *invicem* takes on the meaning "each other, one another" (cf. *TLL*, 7.2:176 [II]). *Invicem* adopts this meaning from the reflexive pronouns, especially *se*, with which it was so frequently associated and with which it frequently occurred. Thus, from its repeated collocation with *se*, *invicem* actually takes on the meaning of *se* itself.<sup>4</sup> Once *invicem* has arrived at this stage of expanding its meaning, even the reflexive pronoun can be eliminated as unnecessary and redundant, as for example:

(17) Lucan 7. 177: "inque vicem voltus mirantur."

"And they wonder at each other's faces."

2. I will not deal in this paper with the familiar Latin *alter alterum* construction, since it has no bearing on what follows. Cf. R. Kühner–C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, vol. 2.1<sup>2</sup> (Hannover, 1912), p. 616.

3. This meaning of alternation is clearly illustrated by Quint. 1. 3. 11: "[puer] positus invicem . . . quaestiunculis aemulantur" ("boys compete by posing trifling questions to each other"); and by Tac. *Ann.* 13. 38. 1: "commeantibus invicem nuntiis" ("with messengers alternately coming and going").

4. This is a fairly productive process of semantic change in language. A similar example from English would be the *auto* of *automobile*, "self-moving," which has now taken on the meaning of car itself.

- (18) Pliny *Epist.* 7. 20. 7: "ut invicem ardentius diligamus"  
 "That we should love each other still more warmly"  
 (19) Quintilian 9. 4. 129: "homines, manibus invicem apprehensis, gradum firmant."  
 "Men, having linked hands with each other, steady their steps."

In (17)–(19), the reciprocal interpretation of *invicem* ("each other") and not the sequential one ("by turns, alternately") is fully apparent, since it is clear that the action in each sentence is simultaneous for every agent involved.

Schematically, then, I would represent the derivation of this reciprocal complex as follows:

Stage I	<i>se</i>
Stage II	<i>inter se</i>
Stage III	<i>inter se invicem</i>
Stage IV	<i>invicem se</i>
Stage V	<i>invicem</i>

It is important to note that this schematization does not assume a chronological progression and should not be considered a reconstruction. These stages may be best viewed as representing stylistic options rather than a diachronic chain. In other words, there was probably no time at which any of these options would have been ungrammatical once *invicem* came to be used to disambiguate reciprocals and reflexives. This semantic and syntactic development is motivated entirely by the need to distinguish more easily the reciprocal from the reflexive interpretation of sentences like Priscian's "iste et ille se amant," and as such is a dynamic example of Latin's well-known intolerance for ambiguity and lack of clarity. That Priscian recognized this ambiguity as a linguistic problem and attempted to deal with it at all is a credit to his independence and creativity. Those who would berate him as a mere translator of Apollonius would do well to look at the entire *Institutiones*. There is a wealth of valuable insight in it.

PHILIP BALDI

*The Pennsylvania State University*

## TWO RUSTIC NOTES

### 1. VARRO *Rust.* 1. 5. 4 AND THE STRUCTURE OF SCROFA'S DISCOURSE

Scrofa, the principal speaker of the first half of Book 1 of Varro's *De re rustica*, is a lecturer of method: he first outlines his subject and then, at the beginning and conclusion of each part and section, reminds his audience of his progress and of what is to come. His outline (1. 5. 3–4) is as follows (there are four "parts," each of which has two "sections"):<sup>1</sup>

- I. cognitio fundi (discussed in chaps. 6–16)
  - A. quae ad solum pertinent terrae (6–10, 14–15)
  - B. quae ad villas et stabula (11–13)

1. "Parts" and "sections" (and later "subsections") are my terms of convenience. In such outlines (*divisio, dividere*), Varro uses *pars*, *genus*, and *species* loosely, often interchangeably: see M. Fuhrmann, *Das systematische Lehrbuch* (Göttingen, 1960), pp. 72–74. Cf. the first sentence of 1. 5. 4, with Heinrich Keil's convincing emendation, "de his quattuor generalibus partibus singulae minimum in binas dividuntur species" (for "de his quattuor generibus singulae . . ."). References