

XX.—Final *s* after a Short Vowel in Early Latin

PHILIP W. HARSH

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

The reduction or omission of final *s* after a short vowel and before a consonant is a phenomenon of Early Latin which deserves further study. First, it is so widespread that it offers an opportunity of comparing the usage of the dramatists with that of the common speech and of determining to what extent the practice is forced upon the dramatists by the common speech and to what extent it is a poetic licence to which they resort in adapting the Latin language to Greek meters. The point, then, is of linguistic as well as metrical importance. No satisfactory demonstration of it, or of any similar phenomenon in Plautus and Terence, has ever been achieved, although the evidence on this point seems to be sufficient for such a demonstration. Secondly, it is imperative to determine the correctness of the theory of Lindsay on this point and of his practice in the Oxford edition of Terence of dropping such an *s* almost everywhere unless it is demanded by the meter. This theory and practice has been approved by Laidlaw.¹ Marouzeau in his recent edition of Terence prints final *s* everywhere, even when the meter demands reduction.² But neither Marouzeau nor anyone else has seriously challenged Lindsay on this point.

Let us begin by briefly comparing the usage of the dramatists with that of the early writers of hexameter verse. The demands of hexameters diverge markedly from those of dramatic verse. Cretic words or phrases unreduced are impossible in hexameters but distinctly at a premium in iambic or trochaic verse. Almost the opposite is true of dactylic words. In regard to iambic words, the situation is more complicated. The early dramatists in their conversational meters reduce about three-fourths of all potentially

¹ W. A. Laidlaw, *The Prosody of Terence* (London 1938) 55–58.

² Marouzeau's practice (*Térence*, Paris 1942–1949) is hard on the reader, but has ancient precedent, since final *s* is regularly written in verse even when it does not make position. Cf. *Carm. Epigr.* 248.1 (dedication by L. Mummius), etc., and below, n. 9. School editions, however, do well to omit the *s* when the meter demands reduction. Similar to the practice of Marouzeau is that of Andreas Thierfelder, *P. Terentius Afer: Andria* (Heidelberg 1951).

iambic forms (not final in the line), and the remaining one-fourth are used with great restraint — practices wholly unknown to the Greek poets.³ In the Latin hexameter as in the Greek, however, iambic forms are not avoided; especially in the second and third feet they facilitate a feminine caesura, and nowhere in the hexameter, especially as written by Lucretius, Vergil and later poets, is a pyrrhic at any premium.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the prosody of the hexameter poets diverges markedly from that of the dramatic poets. Thus the vowel of final syllables of cretic words, which is very rarely shortened in the dialogue verse of drama, is occasionally shortened in hexameter verse.⁴ Much more striking is the contrast in the reduction or omission of final *s*. Lucretius shows this phenomenon some forty-nine times. About three-fourths of these instances concern cretic words or endings.⁵ Only two cases of potentially iambic words so reduced are attested by good manuscript tradition.⁶ Complete data for Ennius and Lucilius are not available, but it is obvious from a cursory examination that in those poets also reduction concerns primarily potentially cretic and spondaic forms, although, as we should expect from their freer hexameters, potentially iambic forms are there reduced more frequently than they are in Lucretius.⁷ The practice of Terence is very different, if we

³ P. W. Harsh, *Iambic Words and Regard for Accent in Plautus* (Stanford 1949). An explanation of the systematic reduction of iambic words is here attempted.

⁴ On *virgines* (Ennius, *An.* 101 V), see Franz Skutsch in *ΓΕΡΑΣ Abhandlungen zur indogermanischen Sprachgeschichte* August Fick . . . (Göttingen 1903) 142. See also, Ennius, *An.* 536 V. Cf. F. Marx, *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae* (Leipzig 1904) Index Gram. Met., p. 162, s.v. *correptio*. On Lucilius 60 M, see W. M. Lindsay, *Nonii Marcelli De Con. Doc.* . . . (Leipzig 1903) on Nonius 4.29 M (Lindsay p. 8, line 29). Cf. Lindsay, *Early Latin Verse* 40–45.

⁵ A complete list of forms with *s* omitted in Lucretius is given by Ernout, *RevPhil* 47 (1923) 152.

⁶ Lucretius 4.1268 (*opu' sunt*), 5.1445 (*priu' sunt*). Forms such as *magis*, *cibus*, *quibus* serving in the verse as iambic are not uncommon.

⁷ Bailey (*Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura* . . . [Oxford 1947] 1.124) states that there are 94 cases of such reduced *s* in Ennius, of which 60 concern potentially cretic words or endings and 34 spondaic. He seems to ignore iambic words (?? or includes them under cretic words). The present writer has examined the first one hundred complete, undaggered lines of Ennius as they stand in Vahlen's text and found 20 cases of such omitted *s*: 8 concern potentially cretic words, 6 spondaic, and 6 iambic (including one case of *magis*). In these same lines of Ennius, such *s* makes position 16 times, including 3 iambic words.

In the first hundred complete, undaggered lines of Lucilius as they stand in Marx' text, there are 35 cases of reduced *s*, of which 16 concern potentially cretic words or endings, 17 spondaic, and 2 iambic. In the same lines such *s* makes position 15

judge it only by those cases guaranteed by the meter. In the *Andria*, for instance, almost every potentially iambic word ending in a short vowel and *s* is reduced — thirty-two cases — but only three spondaic words (or endings). There is not a single legitimate case of a reduced cretic.⁸

It is obvious from these figures that the practice of the common speech in regard to such final *s* cannot possibly be accurately reflected by both hexameter and dramatic verse, since the pictures given by these two types of verse differ so strikingly. The most plausible assumption, of course, is that neither type of verse accurately reflects the common speech, and that in both types the omission of *s* has been curtailed or extended as the demands of the verse dictate. Fortunately we have data from the inscriptions on this phenomenon. Indeed, it has been carefully studied throughout the whole *Corpus* (as it stood before 1910) by Carola Proskauer.⁹ This study was favorably reviewed by Lindsay (Bursian 167 [1914] 29) and by Stolz (*BPW* 31 [1911] 1104–6). Proskauer (205) concluded that the inherited final *s* was still firmly retained about 600 B.C. in Latin; that between this date and about 200 B.C., final *s* after open *o* was reduced or doublet forms arose in *o* and *os*. One should note that the dropping of *s* after *u* was never a common practice in the language as reflected by the inscriptions. About 200 B.C., final *s*, with the generalization of close *u*, became again firmly established, according to Proskauer, and the common speech did not contain a weak or omitted final *s*, and the disappearance of final *s* in certain Romance languages has no connection with this phenomenon of Early Latin.

times (monosyllables excluded), of which 4 concern anapestic words or endings, 7 spondaic, and 4 iambic.

⁸ Actually Lindsay omits the *s* from four cretic words (or endings) in printing the Oxford text, but the lines scan more naturally with the *s* making position. See below, pp. 276–7, and n. 22.

⁹ Carola Proskauer, *Das auslautende -s auf den lateinischen Inschriften* (Strassburg 1910). Proskauer (187–188) points out that the conclusion to be drawn from the treatment of *-s* in the *tabellae defixionum* is that there can have been no general dropping in the vulgar speech. The same conclusion seems proper from the Pompeian graffiti; see Proskauer 171–172 and E. S. Seelmann, *Die Aussprache des Latein . . .* (Heilbronn 1885) 361–362. Many graffiti have come to light since these studies, but they do not seem to justify any change in this conclusion. Cf. *CIL* 4, Suppl. iii (Berlin 1952). (The omitted final consonant on *CIL* 4.7117, a comparatively early inscription, is assumed to be *m* by the editor; cf. M. Della Corte, *Notizie degli Scavi* 1946, p. 107, no. 208–210.) Certain statistics on the neglect or omission of final *s* in verse inscriptions are given by E. Diehl, *De m finali epigraphica* (*Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Suppl. 25 [1899]) 170–177; 189.

As for the practice in poetry, Proskauer (195) thinks that the poets continued until the early Ciceronian period (cf. Cicero, *Orator* 161) the practice which the popular speech had dropped about 200 B.C. So Sommer, though criticizing Proskauer for going to an extreme in limiting later omissions of *s*, states that the later and sporadic examples of the vulgar disappearance of *s* in inscriptions, such as *valea* (CIL 4.2260) or *maritu* (CIL 8.3613) are to be interpreted only as dialectical.¹⁰

It is clear from this evidence that both hexameter and dramatic poets are adapting a popular usage, or, perhaps more properly, what was once a popular usage, each to the exigencies of their own metrics. There is no indication whatever in the inscriptions, of course, that one type of word was more subject to the loss of final *s* than another, specifically, no evidence that the loss was more frequent on dissyllables (as one might suspect from the dramatists and as Laidlaw does suspect¹¹) or on cretic words (as one might suspect from the hexameter poets). Each class of poets apply the phenomenon obviously to those words which are intractable in their own type of verse. The fact that the dropping of *s* after *u* was never a dominant practice of the language according to the inscriptions suggests that the poets in this frequent usage were deliberately adapting an archaic (properly *-o'*) rather than a current usage, since the doublet forms common in the spoken language were properly in *o* or in *us* and not in *u* or *us*, as in the poets.¹²

Now it is a distinct step forward in our understanding of dramatic verse to prove that the authors were not forced by popular usage into their practice of dropping *s* after a short vowel as they do, but were deliberately and radically adapting their language to the exigencies of their verse.¹³

Many scholars have attempted to determine the precise relation between the dramatists' use of iambic shortening and popular

¹⁰ Ferdinand Sommer, *Handbuch der lat. Laut- und Formenlehre*²⁻³ (Heidelberg 1914) 305.

¹¹ Laidlaw (see note 1, above), 58. It may very well be true, however, that in the common speech such words as *satis* and *prius* were normally reduced, and such words as these constitute a large percentage of the iambic words in question. For instance in the *Andria*, of the 32 iambic words reduced, there are 10 cases of *satis* and 6 of *prius*.

¹² Cf. Proskauer (see note 9, above), 31. See also note 24, below.

¹³ The present writer (see p. 106 of work cited in n. 3 above) earlier concluded from a study of iambic words that Plautus regularized and extended what were in the colloquial speech merely occasional usages. This hypothesis seems now substantiated for the use of *s*.

usage. Here the evidence is less extensive than in regard to final *s*. What indications we have, however, suggest that here, too, we are dealing with a deliberate manipulation and adaptation of popular usage. It is unnecessary to repeat the conventional instances of iambic shortening from the language itself as set forth by Lindsay and others. We do wish here to point out that iambic shortening occurs occasionally in the dramatists in a manner that is patently impossible in popular speech. A fundamental principle of dramatic verse is that the interior of the dialogue line is treated in certain respects as the interior of a sentence and the end of the line as the end of a sentence regardless of the grammatical construction of the line.¹⁴ Thus, a word of iambic form immediately after a change of speaker is not infrequent in the first or in the sixth foot of senarii; but very rarely occurs in any interior foot. The grammatical construction — that is, the beginning of a sentence — is not the determining factor, but position in the metrical line. So with elision: in the interior of a line it may occur over a full grammatical stop and even over a change of speakers. Iambic shortening also may so occur.¹⁵ But neither elision nor iambic shortening could possibly so operate in the popular speech. In both these instances, therefore, we again see the dramatist extending the phenomena and making of them purely poetic licences in order to adapt the language to the exigencies of the verse.

But are we correct in assuming that final *s* was reduced or omitted only where the meter guarantees the usage? Lindsay did not think so. In his *Early Latin Verse* (126), Lindsay says: "Although Plautus *allowed* a Spondee in the 'even' feet of the Senarius, we may be sure that he *preferred* an Iambus; and if this Iambus could be got by the faint pronunciation of -*s* (the current pronunciation, no mere poetical licence), why should he (a Comedian) have hesitated to use it, especially in the dearth of short finals at his time . . . ?" He further says (126) that "we see Ennius and Lucilius dropping -*s*, of any and every kind, for the mere convenience of the metre," and he (133) thinks that "the present practice of suppressing -*s* only at the ends of lines hangs a mill-

¹⁴ ". . . dem altlateinischen Sceniker gilt lautlich Versende wie Satzende . . ." Franz Skutsch, *Plautinisches und Romanisches. Studien zur plautinischen Prosodie* (Leipzig 1892) 57. Cf. Hans Drexler, *Plautinische Akzentstudien* (Breslau 1932-1933), Registerband, 33, s.v. *Vers*.

¹⁵ See Drexler (see note 14, above), 33 note 2.

stone about the neck of Plautus' tripping verses." He concludes that editors should always print preconsonantal *-u'* and *-i'* unless the meter postulates a long syllable, except before a final cretic word in senarii and before a pause (134).¹⁶ Such was his opinion in 1922, and in 1926 he so printed the Oxford edition of Terence, except that he there occasionally omits the final *s* even before a cretic word (*An.* 801) or sequence (*An.* 802) at the end of senarii, and sometimes even before a pause.

Now this is very radical theory and practice. First of all, we protest, the evidence does not indicate that final *s* was faintly pronounced in Plautus' day, much less in the time of Terence, or that this was ever the dominant practice except after short *o*. Lindsay in the days when he was refuting the theory of Leo (which called for the elision of the vowel as well as the dropping of the *s*) had welcomed the evidence of Proskauer,¹⁷ and though he cites this work in his bibliography, he seems to have forgotten its evidence.

Lindsay's sweeping statement about Ennius and Lucilius is misleading. We have already seen how the hexameter poets omit or retain final *s* in a manner quite different from that of the dramatic poets, and how each class of poets adapt the phenomenon to the demands of their own particular meters. They are far from indiscriminate. Indeed, such a sweeping statement as that of Lindsay is suspicious in and of itself. Similar sweeping statements are often made concerning Plautus' use of elision, and from a casual reading of Plautus, one might conclude that elision is used with no restraint. But this is not so. Plautus is far from indiscriminate in his use of elision.¹⁸ So with all his other usages.

¹⁶ With Lindsay, this regard for pauses is a fundamental consideration. In general, he does not take into sufficient consideration the principle enunciated above concerning the interior of the dialogue line in the dramatists. His regard for pauses is quite sound, of course, for normal prose speech; but it is likely to be deceptive not only in dramatic but even in hexameter verse. It is obvious from the following line of Ennius, for instance, that the status of final *s* in this line is determined not in accordance with "pauses" or any other phonetic consideration but by purely metrical convenience:

Mercurius, Iovis, Neptunus, Vulcanus, Apollo (*An.* 63 V)

So in Lucilius, reduction occurs before punctuation (13, 44, 92 Marx) and final *s* makes position where no punctuation occurs (94, 97, etc.).

Lindsay suppresses *s* before *que* (e.g., *An.* 161); this the dactylic poets never do (Louis Havet, "L's latin caduc" (*Études romanes dédiées à Gaston Paris* [Paris 1891] 322)). Cf. *Bac.* 193.

¹⁷ Cf. Lindsay, Bursian 167 (1914) 29.

¹⁸ Cf. Wilhelm Lieben, *De Verborum Iambicorum apud Plautum Synaloephis* (Marburg 1915) 65.

Archaic forms are employed for "metrical" convenience, but only with restraint and discrimination. One immediately becomes skeptical, therefore, when Lindsay dashes into Terence and strikes almost every final *s* after a short vowel and before a consonant unless it is guaranteed by the meter. It is not characteristic of the dramatists to employ such usages without restraint.

We turn now to Lindsay's claim that an iambus was preferred in the even feet of senarii. If by this word "preferred" Lindsay means that in the best of all possible worlds, Plautus would have chosen an iambus in the even feet, then this is an allegation which can never be proved or disproved. But if he means that the even feet are usually iambic, that is something which can readily be determined. There is no necessity of examining all the senarii of Early Latin. We are not here interested in rare phenomena or in fine distinctions. A hundred verses chosen at random will serve our purpose. Since we are considering Lindsay's text of Terence, let us take the first hundred lines of the *Andria*, omitting the prologue, since prologues are often highly stylized.

In the first hundred lines of the *Andria*, the second foot is iambic 36 times (of which one is the gift of Lindsay), spondaic 45 times, dactylic 15, anapestic 2, tribrachic 2.¹⁹ The third foot of the same lines is iambic 19 times (two the gift of Lindsay), spondaic 56 times, dactylic 13, anapestic 9, tribrachic 3. The fourth foot is essentially the same as the second: half the lines are spondaic and only a third are iambic or tribrachic. These figures obviously give no support for Lindsay's rash assumption that an iambic second or fourth foot is preferred, and as for the third foot they indicate that any editor would be reckless indeed to change a spondaic foot here to an iambic one, as Lindsay regularly does when he can by omitting *s*. Indeed, in some twenty-three of these hundred lines, both the second and third feet are spondaic, whereas in only eight lines are both iambic, and two of these eight are the result of Lindsay's omitting *s*. Of these twenty-three lines, five have four spondaic feet in succession (*An.* 30, 49 [?], 75, 83, 103*).

Where, then, Lindsay might well ask, is the iambic rhythm in such lines? That is a question which has often been asked before

¹⁹ In these scansiones, ambiguous verb forms in *-t* have been considered long; cf. Laidlaw (see note 1, above), 59-63. *An.* 52 and 87 are here omitted (corrupt). The second foot of *An.* 54 had been counted as iambic, though the present writer prefers the scansion of Kauer, in which it is dactylic. The prologue is here excluded.

and has been answered to the satisfaction of some but not others. Lindsay's primary error is his failure clearly to face this great problem and come to a decision concerning it before he theorizes about the improvement of the rhythm by the omission of *s*. Suffice it here to say that the indiscriminate omission of final *s* rescues only a very few of these lines that lack purely quantitative rhythm — only one line (*An.* 111) in the first hundred lines of the *Andria*. There remain a considerable number of lines in which purely quantitative succession is not adequate to maintain the rhythm. The fundamental nature of the Latin verse obviously differs from that of the Greek trimeter. The indiscriminate omission of *s*, we venture to suggest, may do definite harm to some of the Latin lines. Laidlaw finds the following line "intolerably spondaic" and approves Lindsay's omitting four finals in one line²⁰:

magnu' rubicundu' crispu' crassu' caesius (*Hec.* 440, sen.)

As for the spondaic nature of the line, that is easily paralleled, as by the five lines (in the first hundred) cited from the *Andria*. In the *Rudens* (83–88) Sceparnio opens the action with six senarii, every one of which has four or five spondees (but almost perfect coincidence of ictus and accent). In *Hecyra* 440, the present writer would prefer the spondees to the rhythm that results after the four omissions. Actually, the anapest in the second foot (which makes acceptable rhythm even in Greek comedy) makes the line acceptable in Latin, whereas a dactyl such as *magnu' ru-* is rough and should not be foisted on the text.²¹ As for Plautus' "tripping verses," we should remember that the dramatists were very careful to see that their verses did not trip too much, as Luchs' Law and other features of the verse clearly indicate. Admiring Lindsay as all students of Early Latin must, we nevertheless conclude that he nodded on this point: to omit final *s* indiscriminately is intolerably to mutilate the text.

In the *Andria* of Terence almost every instance of a potentially iambic form (not final) ending in a short vowel and *s* is reduced — thirty-two cases according to Lindsay's scansion.²² But with

²⁰ Cf. Laidlaw, 57.

²¹ Cf. Laidlaw, 36–37.

²² My own figures here have been checked with the data of Kauer (*P. Terentius Afer: Andria* [Bielefeld and Leipzig 1930], *Kommentar*, p. 141). I have not included forms of *eius*, etc. (scansion usually ambiguous), as Kauer does, and have omitted from

other types of words, the story is very different: only twice in iambic octonarii (599, 619) is a potentially spondaic word so reduced, both times before an initial *s*,²³ and once in cretic tetrameter (631*). Except iambic cases, therefore, only three instances of such omission are guaranteed by the meter. But Lindsay omits *s* in some additional one hundred and twenty cases of words not iambic; that is, for every legitimate instance, he adds forty instances. Surely this is madness, reminiscent of the ablative in *d* and other desperate efforts at rewriting the texts of the early dramatists. Although the reduction of words not iambic is rare before any consonant except *s* (in the cases guaranteed by the meter), Lindsay freely omits final *s* before any consonant.²⁴

this count *opu'* *An.* 490, since the meter does not guarantee this case, and Kauer here prints *opus*. Forms such as *opust* are not included.

An instance in which such an iambic form is not reduced is found in *An.* 393 in a cretic phrase. Other possible exceptions are *An.* 54, where Lindsay does not reduce but Kauer does, and *An.* 134, where reduction probably does not take place, but being in an anapestic phrase (*quid agis*), there is no ictus on the final of the iambic word, so that, according to the theory of the present writer, there is no need for reduction.

One or two examples may have escaped me in the *Andria*, but the systematic reduction of such forms is expected from Plautine usage. My monograph (see note 3, above) pp. 109–144, lists all cases of iambic words with clash in 5665 lines of Plautus; not many are words of this type.

In the longer iambic lines, of course, the diaeresis is considered a "final" position.

²³ Maurenbrecher (*Hiatus und Verschleifung im Allen Latein* [Leipzig 1899] 95–96) says that there are 31 cases in Plautus where final *s* must not make position (in the sixth foot of senarii or the corresponding position of trochaic septenarii), of which 22 occur before an initial *s*. This type alone, he continues, survives in the later dramatic poets, with 18 examples in Terence (and in addition, *Adel.* 839, *tempu' fert*). Maurenbrecher seems to include only these two types of verse, and he does not guarantee that his figures are absolutely complete (p. 96, n. 3). Nevertheless, these figures give us some indication of the rarity of this phenomenon in Plautus and Terence: the meter demands the omission of *s* only rarely, except in iambic words. (These do not figure, of course, in the type which Maurenbrecher is here considering. Iambic words, of course, are subject to iambic shortening, but when the iambic word reduced ends in a short vowel and *s* before a consonant, most scholars [but not Maurenbrecher] normally assume that the *s* is dropped rather than that iambic shortening occurs, especially since spondaic words, such as *usus*, are occasionally so reduced.)

²⁴ The strong tendency of the dramatists to drop final *s* only before an initial *s* (except in iambic words, for which Maurenbrecher [102] appears to prefer iambic shortening) cannot be a phonetic phenomenon, according to Maurenbrecher (96), but arises only by analogy. Cf. Stowasser *WS* 27 (1905) 227. The dramatic practice, which is very different from the epic, must be *metrisch-prosodisch*, according to Maurenbrecher (96); the restitution of final *s* begins, according to him (102), with Plautus, and is completed with the other dramatic poets, whose practice reflects the actual speech in contrast to the archaic speech of the epic.

The systematic reduction of *s* which Lindsay undertakes produces some strange results. Thus, *Andria* 663:

quis homo istuc? :: Davo'. . . : Davos? :: interturbat. . . .

Is it likely that in colloquial speech analogy allowed such variation as this? Again, Lindsay omits the final *s* from the personal endings, such as *inludati*' (*An.* 758) and *tolli*' (*An.* 776). Although this type can be paralleled in the dramatists (*occidisti*' *me*, *Bac.* 313), and in the wretched verses of the "Sortes Praenestinae" (*Carm. Epigr.* 331),²⁵ still we may well doubt whether doublet forms arose in such cases as these in the common speech. Analogy had already added the final *s* to the second plural active and to the second singular passive. Where such forms with omitted *s* are guaranteed by the meter, they are of course to be retained. But they are few in respectable verse, where, it seems likely, they are poetic licences, and they should never be foisted on the text, especially in such large numbers. Furthermore, it seems incredible that doublet forms could have been as common as Lindsay assumes without becoming generalized, and so used before a vowel (as they are in inscriptions), and so elided, as Leo claimed. That is, does not Lindsay's practice lead logically to Leo's theory, which Lindsay violently and rightly opposed?²⁶

In some lines of the *Andria* Lindsay omits *s* even though normal scansion suggests that it should be retained to make position. Both Kauer and Sturtevant in their school editions scan the following lines with *s* making position:

num quid nam ampliu' tibi cū illa fūit, Charine? :: ah[a], Pamphile
(325, troch. sept.)
ipsu' sibi esse iniuriu' videatur, neque id iniuria (377, troch. sept., fourth
foot)
ipsu' mihi Davo', qui intumust eōrum consiliis, dixit (576, iamb. sept.,
first foot)
:: unde egreditur? :: meō praesidio atque hospiti'. :: quid illud
malist? (843, troch. sept.)
:: cum tuō gnato una. :: anne est intu' Pamphilu'? crucior miser!
(851, troch. sept., sixth foot)

The origin of the omission or reduction of final *s*, however, is disputed; cf. Leumann in Stolz-Schmalz, *Lat. Gram.*⁵ 176.

²⁵ On the extreme licences of popular verse, see Edouard Galletier, *Étude sur la poésie funéraire romaine d'après les inscriptions* (Paris 1922) 291.

²⁶ Lindsay, *Bursian* 130 (1906) 185–194.

These lines offer no evidence against Lindsay's theory; they simply indicate how free his practice was.²⁷ The last instance illustrates his willingness to omit *s* in the fourth foot of trochaic septenarii, though there is no evidence in either Greek or Latin that a trochaic foot here was preferred. In the first fifty lines of Menander's tetrameters (*Perik.* 77–127, 97 omitted), spondaic words occur ten times in the fourth foot and bacchiac words thirteen times; in more than half these lines the fourth foot is spondaic. Similarly, Lindsay omits the *s* in the second/third position in senarii (which corresponds to the fourth foot in trochaic septenarii; *An.* 104, 115, etc.), though this too is a favorite position for spondaic and bacchiac words in both Greek and Latin.

Let us now glance at the cases where final *s* is needed for position and so retained even in Lindsay's text. From the following statement of Laidlaw, one would expect only a few cases in all of Terence: "On the other hand, Terence adheres to Plautine usage in retaining final *s* at a pause and at the diaeresis. Other examples are very few. . ."²⁸ Laidlaw then cites only two cases as examples (*Eun.* 688 and 776). But in addition to the five cases cited above where Lindsay does not print *s* but normal scansion requires it, only two of which are at pauses, many cases can be cited from the *Andria* alone not at pauses or at the diaeresis.²⁹

²⁷ These lines can be scanned as Lindsay has printed them, but the scansion with *s* seems much more natural. Thus in *An.* 576, the line should begin with a spondee and an anapest, good rhythm even in Greek, and not with a tortured dactyl (*ipsu' mi-*). The proper criterion here is not whether a parallel can be cited for the scansion of Lindsay's text, but whether Lindsay's text or the traditional text is in accordance with Terence's predominant usage, and here the answer is obvious: the traditional text scans smoothly and is in accordance with Terence's predominant usage. Again before the final "iambic metron" in either senarii or trochaic septenarii, a long syllable seems more natural than a short (under the ictus). Thus Laidlaw (*The Prosody of Terence*, 109) says: "The tribrach is commonest in the first and fifth foot of the trochaic septenarius. It is infrequent in the sixth foot. . . ." Finally, it is significant that Kauer in his school edition, though in general using the Oxford text edited by himself and Lindsay (Kauer, *op. cit.* [see note 22], Text p. VI, n. 1), refuses to follow Lindsay in these wild scansions.

The name *Pamphilus* should be scanned in *An.* 851 as it has been in 88, since it stands in the same position (before a final "iambic metron") in both.

²⁸ Laidlaw (see note 1, above), 58.

²⁹ *Andria* 37, 99, 303, 330, 370, 401, 507, 536* (?), 556, 567, 628, 636, 677, 731, 798, 887, 923, 925, 926, 967. Monosyllables are excluded, including *quis*. Lindsay thought that the *s* was never dropped from *is*, *quis*, *bis* (Bursian 130 [1906], 186).

Also excluded, of course, are words originally ending in *ss*, such as *miles*; so are words like *Chrysis*.

Except iambic words (which are undoubtedly reduced systematically, though the nature of the reduction is not absolutely sure), final *s* makes position far more frequently than it fails to do so if we consider only those cases which are guaranteed by the meter. The statement of Laidlaw is misleading.

In summary, if final *s* is omitted after a short vowel and before a consonant in the dramatists only where the meter demands reduction, then the practice of the dramatists shows marked divergence from the practice of the dactylic poets, and both show some divergence from the phenomenon in popular speech. Each type of poet applies the practice primarily to those words which are intractable in his own meter, whereas no discrimination with regard to type of word (with the possible exception of monosyllables, such as *is*, unreduced, and of a very few dissyllables, such as *satīs*, reduced) was shown in the popular speech. The poets not only adapt the phenomenon to the exigencies of their meters, but also extend it in time apparently long after it has ceased to have wide currency in the popular speech. In this instance, then, we can observe the development of a poetic licence. There is some evidence that elision and iambic shortening, also, are similar adaptations and in part extensions of popular usage. In all these phenomena we appear to be dealing not with popular usages forced upon the poet, but with adaptations and extensions of popular usage designed to facilitate adapting the Latin language to Greek meters.

Lindsay's extension of the omission of final *s* indiscriminately to all words violates the principle of discrimination invariably shown by the dramatists in regard to all methods of reducing words. It violates also the known facts by assuming that the dominant practice of colloquial speech in Terence's day was to omit such final *s*, and it assumes a mass of doublet forms current in popular use contrary to plausibility. It pretends to improve the rhythm in a manner that is open to grave question. For these reasons, editors would do well not to follow his precedent in regard to the omission of final *s*.