

LIVY 34. 7. 4

sed in purpura quae teritur absumitur, iniustam quidem, sed aliquam tamen causam tenacitatis video; in auro vero, in quo praeter manus pretium (Mog.; *manui pretium*, B; *manupretium*, Bekker) nihil intertrimenti fit, quae malignitas est?

Manus pretium means "Lohn für den Goldarbeiter" (W-M). But could the wages of the goldsmith be naturally described as *intertrimentum*, loss through wastage, the sense required by the context, corresponding to *teritur absumitur* in the case of *purpura*? I believe not, and suggest that we have here a corruption of phonological origin. Livy, I suspect, used the accusative of the good Ciceronian noun *pressus* (cf. Aug. C.D. 21. 4), a natural combination with *manus* in view of the frequent association of that word with *verba premendi* (TLL s. v. p. 379 end); but through the influence of assibilation of the kind seen in *Fidensus* for *Fidentius* (CIL VIII 21638) and the other instance quoted in, e.g., Kieckers, *Hist. lat. Gramm.* § 96. 1. 5d; Schuchardt, *Vokalismus* 1. 152, this was taken for *pretium* because of this word's liability to assibilation (O. Fr. *pris*, It. *prezzo*).

Valerius' point in this passage is that a gold ornament suffers no such wastage as cloth, even if, in course of time, it, too, *tenuatur habendo* (Lucr. 1. 132), like the hands of statues that are worn down *salutantur tactu* (id. ib. 317; cf. Cic. Verr. iv 94, Ovid A.I. 473).