

HUBERT WOLANIN
Jagiellonian University in Kraków
hubert.wolanin@uj.edu.pl

TO HEAR THE SOUND OF THE LATIN LANGUAGE: ABOUT ROMAN GRAMMARIANS IN THE CONTEXT OF AN OUTLINE OF THE HISTORY OF LINGUISTICS BY ADAM HEINZ

Keywords: Latin phonetics, Roman grammarians

Abstract

In the context of *An Outline of the history of linguistics* by Adam Heinz, the author mentions and comments upon the views of Roman grammarians (Priscianus, Velius Longus, Flavius Caper, Servius) and other ancient authors (M. F. Quintilianus, A. Gellius) which enable us to learn specific details about the phonic realisation of classical Latin. The statements that are analysed concern the velar allophone of the front nasal /n/ in the position before velar stops, the attenuation of articulation (reduction) of the voiceless velar spirant /h/, the attenuation of the postvocalic nasal /n/ before the fricatives /s/ and /f/ and of the postvocalic /m/ in the word-final position, as well as the lengthened articulation of the intervocalic glide /j/. In the final part of the article the author mentions the testimonies of grammarians which refer to the ways of accentuation of Latin compounds with enclitics and proclitics.

It is a most laudable fact for Professor Adam Heinz, and a rather embarrassing fact for us that the all in all brief, about 50-page chapter of his *Outline of the history of linguistics* (*Dzieje językoznawstwa w zarysie*) from 1978, continues to be the most serious and probably the most comprehensive treatment of the history of linguistics in the antiquity that was published in Polish. In this chapter A. Heinz, with a discipline and precision that were so peculiar to him, indicated both those things that constituted the weakness of ancient linguistics from the perspective of the entire history of linguistics and everything that constituted

its greatest value. At the same time he demonstrated that both the former and the latter determined for many years the subsequent development of thinking about language in our cultural area. The Author put special emphasis upon the pioneering achievements of the Greeks. The Romans, however, were presented by him mainly as the ones who deferred to the authority of the Greek theory, adapting its notional and terminological apparatus for the description of Latin. This does not mean that he completely denied any originality to the Roman science of language. In this respect he strongly emphasised the independent position of Marcus Terentius Varro, who lived in the 1st century B.C., and his completely original concept of parts of speech, inflection and word formation. However, no information concerning potential continuators of the Roman scholar from Reate reached us; even if they did exist, the great grammatical syntheses of Donatus and Priscianus, based on the achievements of the Greeks, prevailed and were preserved until our times. Perhaps the decisive factor of this was a social demand resulting from the historical and political conditions which manifested themselves during the imperial period, especially the period of the late empire: due to the recurrent political and economic crises, religious changes and the changing ethnic structure of the society of the Imperium Romanum, the Latin language and the classical Latin literature became one of the few determinants of the cultural identity of the Romans – a point of reference which gave a feeling of stability in an uncertain world of changing values. Thus Latin became a value that required special care (see e.g. Kaster 1988). In the circles of the intellectual elites, who decided about the form of school education, there was a demand not for experimentators who would pursue their own ways of describing the Latin language and revolutionise the knowledge about this language, but rather for guardians of this precious deposit – guardians who would pass to subsequent generations such knowledge about the Latin language and literature which is reliable, stable and dependable, even if not completely original but adopted from someone else. And in this case the knowledge was not adopted from anyone else but from the Greeks and it was no shame to borrow from them.

As a classical philologist by education, Adam Heinz had a perfect command of both classical languages and he had a great knowledge of both cultures which were associated with these languages. However, it is difficult to resist an impression that the language and the civilisational heritage of the ancient Romans was especially dear to him as someone who was a teacher of the Latin language for many years and an author of an academic textbook for the study of Latin (Heinz 1984). Perhaps it is a good opportunity to reflect upon whether because of the aforementioned secondary character of the Roman linguistic theory it is worth it nowadays to refer to Roman grammarians. And it seems that it is worth it. And probably it is so not only to convince ourselves how they (themselves students of the Greeks) assisted us for many centuries in the description of our own languages, but also to better hear with their assistance the Latin language; or at least to find in their works a confirmation of our conjectures about this layer of the ancient Latin language which is the most elusive for us, i.e. the phonic one. Usually, when we utter Latin

words or read out Latin texts, we employ a specific articulatory convention which, on the one hand, accounts for the changes which occurred in this language in the post-classic period, on the other hand it reflects the phonic features of our own native language. We know from many sources that this convention departs in many points from the real sound of the ancient Latin language. This information is provided e.g. by the analysis of the informal graffiti on Roman or Pompeian walls, which frequently violate the orthographical convention which prevailed at that time and are *de facto* notations of phonetic nature; by the analysis of the way in which the Greeks transcribed Latin words in their alphabet; by the analysis of the sound of borrowings and Latin continuants in various languages, etc. Particular and detailed results of analyses of this kind can be found in studies dedicated to Latin phonetics (Allen 1965; Marouzeau 1955; Traina 1957; Väänänen 1963), however, some facts are most interestingly documented or confirmed just by ancient grammarians.

For example, we may learn from them that the front nasal phoneme /n/ before velar consonants was realised in the form of a positional nasal velar allophone [ŋ], as e.g. in words like *uncus* [uŋkus], *tango* [taŋgo], *relinquo* [reliŋkʰo], *lingua* [liŋgʰa], etc. Testimony of this is provided by Priscianus (5th/6th c. A.D.). In the first book of his *Institutio de arte grammatica* (39, 12–21) he commended the early authors because after the manner of the Greeks they wrote the letter *g* instead of *n* before the letters *g* and *c* (which were used to note the velar stops /g/ and /k/). Let us add that before velar stops the Greeks, by employing the letter gamma (γ), regularly noted [ŋ], i.e. the positional velar allophone of the front /n/, written by employing the letter ν, e.g. *παγγενέτης* [pangenetes] ‘father of all’ vs. *πανάρχων* [panarkʰon] ‘ruler of all’; *ἐγγράφειν* [engrafein] ‘to inscribe’, *ἐγκαθιέναι* [eŋkatʰienai] ‘to send in’, *ἐγγεῖν* [eŋkʰein] ‘to pour in’ vs. *ἐναριθμεῖν* [enarithmein] ‘to reckon in’, *ἐνελαύνειν* [enelaunein] ‘to drive in’. Therefore Priscianus writes the following:

Priscianus, *Institutio de arte grammatica* 1, 39, 12–14: *Sequente g vel c, pro ea (scil. n) g scribunt Graeci et quidam tamen vetustissimi auctores Romanorum euphoniae causa bene hoc facientes, ut ‘Agchises’, ‘agceps’, ‘aggulus’, ‘aggens’.*

“Before *g* or *c*, instead of it (i.e. instead of the letter *n*), the letter *g* is written by the Greeks and some of the ancient Roman authors to render the sound correctly, and they are right to do so, as e.g. in the words *Agchises* (= *Anchises* ‘Anchises’), *agceps* (= *anceps* ‘double’), *aggulus* (= *angulus* ‘angle’), *aggens* (= *angens* ‘choking, stifling’).”

In the subsequent part of his argument Priscianus mentions the lost work by M.T. Varro (1st c. B.C.) “On the origin of the Latin language” (*De origine linguae Latinae*). According to Priscianus’s account, Varro mentioned there the existence of the sound “agma” in Latin, which does not possess a separate letter, and it sounds the same in Greek and Latin; Varro is also said to have written that in words where this sound occurs, the Greeks wrote a double *g* (i.e. the double letter gamma), whereas the Romans wrote *n* and *g* – except for Actius, the poet and philologist from the 2nd/1st c. B.C., who is also said to have postulated the introduction of the Greek orthographical convention with the usage of the double *g*:

Priscianus, *Institutio de arte grammatica* 1, 39, 14–21: *Quod ostendit Varro in primo de origine linguae Latinae his verbis: [...] quinta vicesima est littera, quam vocant agma, cuius forma nulla est et vox communis est Graecis et Latinis, ut his verbis: 'aggulus', 'aggens', 'agguilla', 'iggerunt'. In eiusmodi Graeci et Accius noster bina g scribunt, alii n et g, quod in hoc veritatem videre facile non est. Similiter 'agceps', 'agcora'.*

“Varro wrote about this in the first (book of the work) on the origins of the Latin language in the following way: the twenty-fifth sound is the so-called agma, which does not have a (separate) letter, and its sound is the same for the Greeks and the Romans, as e.g. in the following words: *aggulus* (‘angle’), *aggens* (‘choking’), *agguilla* (‘eel’), *iggerunt* (‘they heap on sth’). In (words) of this kind, the Greeks and our Actius write a double g, others *n* and *g*, (and the Greeks and Actius write a double *g*) because in that (notation, i.e. with *n* and *g*) it is not easy to discern the truth (about the sound of these words); in a similar manner (they write) *agceps* (‘double’) and *agcora* (‘anchor’).”

There is no question that this “agma” is exactly the positional velar allophone of the front /n/. It is worth to make an *en passant* remark that the mentioning also of the form *agceps* in the series of example of words with “agma”, and the attestation of the existence of such of its orthographic variants, at the same time confirms the fact which is known elsewhere that the velar articulation of the phoneme written with the letter *c* happened also before front vowels; otherwise the postulation of such spelling (instead of standard *anceps*) would be nonsensical. It is also striking that in Latin grammarians the term *littera* could mean both a letter and a sound; in case of necessity, if there was a special requirement to distinguish between these two semantic spheres, the expressions *forma litterae* ‘a letter, a form of a letter’ on the one hand, and *vox litterae* (sometimes also *vis litterae*) ‘sound’ on the other, were used, as in the aforementioned passage.

As regards this allophone, we also have yet another most interesting testimony at our disposal. It is provided by Aulus Gellius who lived in the 2nd c. A.D. In one of his essays which are collected in the work entitled *Noctes Atticae*, the author mentions a passage from *Grammatical notes* by Publius Nigidius Figulus, a grammarian who lived during the times of Cicero and Caesar. The passage concerns this allophone and is as follows:

A. Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 19, 14, 7: *Inter litteram n et g est alia vis, ut in nomine anguis et angari et anchorae et increpat et incurrit et ingenuus. In omnibus his non verum n, sed adulterinum ponitur. Nam n non esse lingua iudicio est; nam si ea littera esset, lingua palatum tangeret.*

“Between the letter *n* and *g* a different sound occurs, as e.g. in the word *anguis* (‘snake’), *angari* (‘messenger, courier’ (Pers.)), *anchorae* (‘anchors’), *increpat* (‘he reproves’), *incurrit* (‘he attacks’) and *ingenuus* (‘free-born’). All of these (words) feature not a true *n*, but an apparent one. The fact that there is no true *n* there is proven by the tongue, for if that sound would be present there, the tongue would touch the palate.”

Therefore, in contradistinction to Varro, Nigidius did not call this allophone “agma” but characterised it as *n adulterinum* – ‘apparent, spurious n’, literally: ‘adulterous,

bastard, illegitimate *n'* – and he corroborated his judgement by saying that if the sound were a “true *n*”, i.e. a front /n/, during the articulation the tongue would touch the palate.

The development of the consonant /n/ before the fricatives /s/ and /f/ was also peculiar. In this position, probably already in the archaic period, the sound began to lose its consonantal character, leaving a remnant in the form of nasalisation and a compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel, e.g. in the words *consul*, *confero*, *mensis*, *infero*, *insula*. In colloquial speech this nasality disappeared, which is indicated at least by the continuants of specific words in Romance languages (cf. e.g. It. *il mese* (← Lat. *mensem*), *la isola* (← Lat. *insulam*), but it is also confirmed by the testimonies of the ancients themselves. For example, the grammarian Velius Longus (1st/2nd c. AD), whose work was recently edited and commented (Di Napoli 2011), and Marcus Fabius Quintilianus (1st c. A.D.) wrote inter alia the following:

Velius Longus, *De orthographia* 79, 1–2: *Cicero [...] foresia et Megalesia et hortesia sine n littera libenter dicebat.*

“Cicero eagerly pronounced *foresia* (= *forensia* ‘clothes worn at public occasions’), *Megalesia* (= *Megalensia* ‘the festival held in honour of the goddess Cybele), *hortesia* (= *hortensia* ‘vegetables’) without the sound *n*.”

M. F. Quintilianus, *Institutio oratoria* 1, 7, 29: *‘Consules’ exempta n littera legimus.*

“We read the word *consules* (‘consuls’) omitting the letter *n*”.

In the official orthography the notation of *n* in this position partially survived and partially was restored, on the one hand presumably to preserve the analogy in the context of inflection (e.g. in *amans* ‘loving’ under the influence of the forms of oblique cases of this participle, i.e. *amantis*, *amante*, etc., in *tonsus* ‘shaved’ under the influence of *tondeo* ‘to shave’), on the other hand, due to the awareness of the word-formative structure of specific words (e.g. *con-stare*, *in-super*). Therefore the notation of the letter *n* in appropriate words, and perhaps also the appropriate nasal articulation, became one of the determinants of education, whereas an inept imitation of spelling (and perhaps also of the pronunciation) of educated people led to a series of mistakes, testimony of which is provided by both the Pompeian graffiti and the admonitions of grammarians, e.g.:

Flavius Caper (2nd c. AD), *De orthographia* 95, 8–9: *omnia adverbia numeri sine n scribenda sunt, ut milies, centies, decies; quotiens, totiens per n scribenda sunt.*

“All numeral adverbs should be written without the letter *n*, as e.g. *milies* ‘a thousand times’, *centies* ‘a hundred times’, *decies* ‘ten times’; (whereas the words) *quotiens* ‘whenever’, *totiens* ‘that number of times’ should be written with the letter *n*.”

Appendix Probi (an anonymous supplement to the *Grammar* by Probus, ca. 4th c. post Christum natum): *Hercules non Herculens, occasio non occansio, ansa non asa, mensa non mesa.*

“*Hercules* not *Herculens*; *occasio* (‘occasion’) not *occansio*; *ansa* (‘handle’) not *asa*; *mensa* (‘table’) not *mesa*.”

Yet, the bilabial nasal phoneme /m/ manifested tendency to an attenuation of articulation and probably to nasalisation of the preceding vowel in the postvocalic word-final position, therefore usually in the accusative forms such as *fabulam*, *amicum*, *noctem*, especially before the vocalic onset of the subsequent word. This is indirectly confirmed by classical Latin poetry, whose well-established metrical patterns imply the elision of both word-final vowels and word-final *-am*, *-um* or *-em* before the vocalic onset of the subsequent word, e.g.

Katullus, *Carmina* 58, 1: *Od(i) et amo. Quar(e) id faciam, fortasse requiris.*

“I hate and I love. Perhaps you want to know how I do so.”

Horatius, *Carmina* 3, 20, 1: *Exegi monument(um) aere perennius.*

“I erected a monument which is more permanent than bronze.”

Also some ancient grammarians emphasise the attenuation of the articulation of the consonant /m/ in this context, as well as its different sound:

M. F. Quintilianus, *Institutio oratoria* 9, 4, 40: *Atqui eadem illa littera (scil. m), quotiens ultima est et vocalem verbi sequentis ita contingit, ut in eam transire possit, etiam si scribitur, tamen parum exprimitur, ut ‘multum ille’ et ‘quantum erat’, adeo ut paene cuiusdam novae litterae sonum reddat. Neque enim eximitur, sed obscuratur, et tantum in hoc aliqua inter duas vocales velut nota est, ne ipsae coeant.*

“On the other hand, the same sound (i.e. *m*), whenever it is found at the end of a word and when it meets the vowel of the subsequent word in such a way that it would pass into it, although it is written, it is, however, weakly pronounced, as for example (in the expressions) *multum ille* and *quantum erat*, to such an extent that it almost sounds like some new sound. For it does not disappear completely, but it is darkened and due to this fact it constitutes merely some sort of a (border) sign between two vowels to avoid their coming together.”

Whereas Velius Longus speaks about the complete reduction of this sound:

Velius Longus, *De orthographia* 54, 5–6: *Nam ita sane se habet non numquam forma enuntiandi, ut litterae in ipsa scriptione positae non audiantur enuntiatae. Sic enim cum dicitur ‘illum ego’ et ‘omnium optimum’, ‘illum’ et ‘omnium’ aequae m terminat, nec tamen in enuntiatione apparet.*

“For actually sometimes we deal with such a form of pronouncing (of words) that (some) letters, although they are written, are not heard, because they were not pronounced. Therefore when the expressions *illum ego* and *omnium optimum* are pronounced, the words *illum* and *omnium* end in the same way with the letter *m*, but this letter does not appear in the pronunciation.”

Despite this peculiar (lack of) articulation, the second century B.C. saw the establishment of the official orthographical convention which stipulated the notation of the word-final /m/ by the letter *m*, which was probably accompanied by a school recommendation to articulate this phoneme more fully. However, in colloquial speech, especially the one used by lesser-educated strata of society, these recommendations

were not likely to meet with a considerable response. Testimony of this is furnished by the instructions contained in the already-mentioned *Appendix Probi*:

Appendix Probi: olim non oli; pridem non pride; idem non ide.

“*olim* (‘once (upon a time)’) not *oli*; *pridem* (‘earlier’) not *pride*; *idem* (‘the same’) not *ide*.”

Testimony of this is also furnished by various informal inscriptional monuments, e.g. the so-called *defixionum tabellae*, i.e. small tablets with incantations, curses and charms addressed to *inferi* divinities, which were written or ordered from “specialists” by those motley crew who were everything but kind people. Such tables were found in various parts of the Graeco-Roman world:

Defixionum tabellae (A. Audollent, Paris 1904), nr 228 (Carthago, 2nd c. post *Christum natum*):

Commendo tibi Iulia Faustilla, Marii filia.

(according to the official orthography: *Commendo tibi Iuliam Faustillam, Marii filiam.*)

“I commit to you Julia Faustilla, the daughter of Marius”.

Apart from the correct usage of the letters *n* and *m* and the correct articulation of words in which these letters should be noted, the determinant of *sermo urbanus*, i.e. the language of the educated people, was also the articulation (in appropriate words) of the voiceless laryngeal spirant /h/ and its appropriate notation by the letter *h*. The low frequency of this phoneme,¹ which resulted in its inconsiderable functional effectiveness, and its insignificant phonetic and articulatory distinctness caused it to manifest instability. This instability manifested itself in the marked tendency to reduction and disappearance, which was visible already since the archaic period, when this phoneme was either no longer articulated at all or it was limited to a weak aspiration.² Quintilian in the 1st c. A.D. wrote:

¹ Its origin is usually associated with the development of the aspirated stop consonant /gh/, inherited from the Proto-Indo-European language community. In the word-initial position the sound underwent a transformation in Latin into a weak laryngeal spirant /h/; hence the presence of this phoneme in words such as *habere*, *heres*, *hortus*, *hostis*. In the medial position the Proto-Indo-European /gh/ was probably transformed into /g/, which means that apart from the originally word-initial sound the Latin language lacked a /h/ which would be directly derived from the Indo-European community. Therefore the medial /h/ occurred in this language only as the initial sound of the second component of compounds such as *co-hors*, *ni-hil* (← **ne-hilum*), *per-hibeo*, *de-hinc*, and also in an exiguous number of lexemes (*veho*, *traho*, *mihi*) which are likely to constitute borrowings from other Italic dialects. Moreover, the word-initial, prevocalic /h-/ was noted in a certain group of words of foreign, usually Greek, origin (*haeresis*, *hebdomada*, *hilarus*, *hora*, *histrion*), in a group of words with an expressive function (*heu(s)*, *hem*, *hinnio*, *hio*) and in words with an obscure or unreliable etymology (*haereo*, *harena*, *haruspex*, *harundo*, *haud*, *hebes*, *herba*, *hircus*, *honor*). In the word-final, postvocalic position it appeared only in interjections such as *ah*, *eh*.

² In this respect we may refer to lexemes such as *nemo* (← **ne-hemo*), *debeo* (← **de-hibeo* ← **de-habeo*), which prove that in the preliterary period the articulation of the intervocalic /-h-/ was weak to such an extent that it did not prevent the contraction of the surrounding vowels.

M. F. Quintilianus, *Institutio oratoria* 1, 5, 20: *Parcissime ea (scil. adspiratione) veteres usi etiam in vocalibus, cum 'aedos' 'ircos' que dicebant.*

“Our ancestors seldom used aspiration even before vowels, for they said *aedi* (instead of *haedi* – ‘young goats’), *irci* (instead of *hirci* – ‘he-goats’).”

In the intellectual circles of Rome around the middle of the 2nd century *ante Christum natum* there was the development of a philhellenist trend, accompanied by a tendency to restore /h/ in speech and in writing. This tendency was inspired by the functioning of aspiration in Greek, thus in a language which enjoyed great prestige in the milieu of the intellectual elites. At that time the correct usage of /h/ became one of the determinants of high culture and an attribute of educated people. Testimony of this is furnished by words of the aforementioned grammarian from the beginning of the 1st century B.C. Nigidius Figulus, quoted by Gellius in his *Noctes Atticae*:

A. Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 13, 6, 3: *Rusticus fit sermo, si adspires perperam.*

“Speech becomes rustic when you use aspiration incorrectly.”

However, Gellius himself, who lived in the 2nd century A.D., was well aware of the artificiality of the restitution of the spirant which happened three centuries earlier, so as he was also aware of the fact that in many cases the introduction of aspirated articulation had no rational, historical grounds. In one of his essays he wrote the following words:

A. Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 2, 3, 1–4: *'H' litteram (sive illam spiritum magis quam litteram dici oportet) inserebant eam veteres nostri plerisque vocibus verborum firmandis roborandisque, ut sonus earum esset viridior vegetiorque; atque id videntur fecisse studio et exemplo linguae Atticae. [...] Sic 'ahenum', sic 'vehemens', sic 'incohare', sic 'helluari', sic 'halucinari', sic 'honera', sic 'honustum' dixerunt. In his enim verbis omnibus litterae seu spiritus istius nulla ratio visa est, nisi ut firmitas et vigor vocis quasi quibusdam nervis additis intenderetur.*

“The sound *h* (or perhaps it should be called aspiration rather than a sound) was added by our ancestors (to words) to strengthen and support the pronunciation of many words, so that their sound would be more fresh and vigorous. And it seems that they did so due to their love of the Greek language and after the manner of this language. So they pronounced *ahenum* (‘a bronze vessel’), *vehemens* (‘vehement’), *incohare* (‘to start’), *helluari* (‘to spend immoderately on eating and other luxuries’), *halucinari* (‘to wander in mind’), *honera* (‘burdens’), *honustum* (‘burdened’). For in all of these words it is difficult to see any reason for that sound, or aspiration, except to increase the force and vigour of the sound as if by adding some sort of muscles.”

One of the effects of this artificial, fashion-induced process of expansion of this spirant included the endless discussions of grammarians concerning the validity

We may also refer to forms such as *diribeo* (← **dis-habeo*), which indicate that the /h/ which followed /s/ was not an obstacle for the process of rhotacism (i.e. the transformation of /s/ into /r/), to which process /s/ was subject in the intervocalic position. About the status of the phoneme /h/ in Latin see also Porzio Gernia (1974).

or otherwise of the pronunciation and notation of this sound in specific words. The discussion, on the one hand, brought about the existence of orthographical variants which overrode the notation of the etymologically motivated /h/, as e.g. *anser* (instead of **hanser*), *er* (instead of **her*), on the other hand, there also emerged variants with an *h* which is not etymologically motivated, as e.g. *humerus*, *humor*, *humidus*. Moreover, the body of inscriptions confirms the existence of orthographical variation of the following kind: *hasta/asta*, *hortus/ortus*, *harena/arena*, *harundo/arundo*, *hora/ora*, *haruspex/aruspex*, etc.

Whereas in the natural, living, spoken language, especially of the less educated strata of the society, probably already in the 1st c. A.D. this phoneme ceased to be articulated. Testimony of this is furnished by numerous informal inscriptions from this period, as e.g. the graffiti on Pompeian walls, in which we find the following spelling: *Oratia* (= *Horatia*), *ic* (= *hic*), *abeto* (= *habeto*), *omo* (= *homo*), which reflect the phonetic realia of colloquial Latin at that time. However, in school education the spelling and the pronunciation of the phoneme /h/ was maintained until the end of the antiquity, a fact which is indicated at least by the words of St. Augustine. By mentioning in the “Confessions” (*Confessiones* 1, 18) his school years, St. Augustine remarks that it was a lesser sin to hate a man, thus violating the divine laws, than to pronounce the word *homo* without aspiration, thus violating grammatical rules. The *Appendix Probi* also abounds in instructions such as *hostiae non ostiae*, *adhuc non aduc*. In this situation we should not be surprised by finding on Pompeian walls the hypercorrect spelling *hire* (= *ire*), *holim* (= *olim*), *havet* (= *avet*), which is a result of wrong application of school orthographical rules. We also know about the existence of various pseudointellectuals who perceived the employment of aspiration as a simple token of high culture of elocution and thus abused the spirant, becoming objects of general derision. This mannerism, which was manifested by a certain Arrius, about whom we learn nowhere else, was ruthlessly derided by the poet Catullus in the 1st c. B.C. in his famous *Carmen* 84.

The ancient Roman grammarians also attest the variation of the pronunciation of the consonantal palatal glide /i/, which in the word-initial position before a vowel was characterised by short articulation (short quantity), as e.g. in words such as *iam*, *iubet* or *iacet*, whereas in the word-medial position, in the intervocalic position, it had the status of a long consonant, as e.g. in words such as *aio*, *maior* or *Troia*. Priscianus writes about this in the following way:

Priscianus, *Institutio de arte grammatica* 1, 18: et ‘i’ quidem modo pro simplici modo pro duplici accipitur consonante; pro simplici, quando ab eo incipit syllaba in principio dictionis posita subsequente vocali in eadem syllaba, ut ‘Iuno’, ‘Iuppiter’, pro duplici autem, quando in medio dictionis ab eo incipit syllaba post vocalem ante se positam subsequente quoque vocali in eadem syllaba, ut ‘maius’, ‘peius’, ‘eius’, in quo loco antiqui solebant geminare eandem ‘i’ litteram et ‘maius’, ‘peius’, ‘eius’ scribere.

“The letter *i* is interpreted as the one which either represents a single or a double consonant; a single consonant, when it opens the initial syllable of a word, and when it is followed by a vowel which belongs to the same syllable, as e.g. (in words such as) *Iuno*, *Iuppiter*; a double consonant, when in the middle of the word this sound opens

the syllable after the vowel located before it and when this sound is also followed by a vowel which belongs to the same syllable, as e.g. (in words such as) *maius*, *peius*, *eius*, in which place our ancestors frequently geminated the letter *i* and they wrote *maiius*, *peiius*, *eiius*.”

The tendency to use the geminated letter *i* to notate the long intervocalic glide /ī/ is also mentioned by Quintilian:

M. F. Quintilianus, *Institutio oratoria* 1, 4, 11: *Sciat etiam Ciceroni placuisse ‘aiio’ ‘Maiiam’que geminata ‘i’ scribere.*

“Let him (the boy who studies with a grammarian) also know that Cicero considered it correct to use the spelling *aiio* and *Maiia* with a geminated letter *i*.”

and Velius Longus:

Velius Longus, *De orthographia* 54, 16–17: *Cicero [...] et ‘Aiiacem’ et ‘Maiiam’ per duo ‘i’ scribenda existimavit.*

“Cicero considered that the words *Aiiax* and *Maiia* should be spelt with a double *i*.”

However, in the official orthography there was established the convention of notating the long intervocalic /ī/ with the use of a single letter *i*, which was probably a result of the fact that there was no distinctive opposition between long and short intervocalic /i/,³ therefore the usage of a double letter would be unnecessary (redundant). The only exception in this respect is constituted by compound words, formed by adding a prefix to the stem which begins with a word-initial (therefore short) /i/. Such formations include *biuugus* (*bi-* + *iugus* – ‘(a chariot) drawn by a pair of horses’) and *quadriiugus* (*quadri-* + *iugus*), in which the syllables *bi-* and *-ri-*, containing a short vowel, remain light (short),⁴ which proves that the consonantal /ī/ that follows them retained short quantity; perhaps a similar conclusion may be also referred to such formations as *diiudico*, *trāiectus*, *ēiaculo*, *prōiectus*, etc., whereas an unambiguous interpretation is impossible in this case due to the fact that in these words the syllable which precedes /ī/ contains a long vowel, as a result of which this syllable *eo ipso* is a heavy one.

Ancient texts also provide information concerning the question of word stress. Of considerable interest are the accounts referring to word-forms whose way of accentuation departed from the general rules which were valid in this matter. Such word units included inter alia the singular vocatives of proper names of the second declension with the stem in short /-i-/ preceded by a light syllable. Examples include proper names such as *Valerius* or *Vergilius*, whose vocative forms were *Valeri*, *Vergili* (respectively), and due to the lightness of the syllables *-le-* and *-gi-*, the stress

³ In Latin the short intervocalic /ī/ disappeared already in the preliterary period which brought about the contraction of vowels, e.g. **treies* → **trees* → *trēs* (cf. Skt. *trāyas*, Gr. *τρεις*). Therefore the length of the intervocalic /ī/ was a redundant feature.

⁴ This is indicated by the fact that in classical Latin poetry these syllables occupy the places which are assigned to light syllables in metrical patterns; cf. e.g. Vergilius, *Aeneis* 10, 399: *Tum Pallas biuugis fugientem Rhoetea praeter / traicit.*

should fall on the preterpenultimate syllable – thus *Váleri*, *Vérgili*. However, in his contention with Publius Nigidius Figulus about the question of the accentuation of the vocative of the name *Valerius*, Aulus Gellius concludes:

A. Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 13, 26, 2: *Si quis nunc, Valerium appellans, in casu vocandi [...] acuerit primam, non aberit quin rideatur.*

“If anyone nowadays, calling to a Valerius, puts the stress on the first syllable of the vocative form, he will not avoid derision.”

What results from this is that by analogy to the other inflectional forms, in which the syllable *-le-* was accented occupying the preterpenultimate position in the word (*Valérius*, *Valério*, *Valérium*), it retained the stress also in the vocative case, hence *Valéri*.

Whereas the grammarian Servius, who lived in the 4th century, provides information about the rules of accentuating words to which enclitic conjunctions or particles *-que*, *-ve*, *-ne*, *-ce* were added. Generally speaking, in structures of this kind the place where the stress was put was adapted to the final limit of the entire consonance; thus if the penultimate syllable of such a consonance was heavy, it received stress e.g. *populúsque*, *vidésne*, *trepidántve*, etc., whereas in structures in which the enclitic was preceded by a light syllable, as e.g. *Musaque*, *liminaque*, *bonaque*, *utraque*, *pleraque*, the general rules of accentuation required to stress the preterpenultimate syllable, hence *Músaque*, *limínaque*, *bónaque*, *útraque*, *pléraqe*. However, in the commentary to the *Aeneid* by the aforementioned grammarian we may read the following words:

Servius (Maurus Honoratus), *In Vergilii Aeneidos Libros* 10, 668: *particulae, ut 'que, ne, ve, ce', quotiens iunguntur aliis partibus, ante se accentum faciunt, qualislibet sit syllaba quae praecedat, sive brevis sive longa, ut 'Musaque, huiusve, illucce, tantone'.*

“Particles such as *que*, *ne*, *ve*, *ce*, whenever they are combined with other words, cause the stress to fall (directly) before them, regardless of the syllable which precedes them (i.e. regardless of) whether it is short (= light) or long (= heavy), as e.g. (in words such as) *musaque*, *huiusve*, *illucce*, *tantone*.”

So, we are dealing here with a generalisation of the rule of stressing the penultimate syllable unto all of the lexical forms which occur with enclitics. In this context some researchers (see e.g. Bernardi 1970: 38–43) speak about the existence of a peculiar rule of stressing enclitics (i.e. always on the penultimate syllable, regardless of its quantity), and the individuality of this rule, i.e. its distinctness from the general rules of accentuation, is supposed to be seen as a manifestation of the awareness of the agglutinative nature of enclitic combinations, i.e. the awareness of the semantic autonomy of both of its constituent elements. On the other hand, we must not rule out the possibility that such forms as *bonaque*, *utraque*, *pleraque* were stressed on the penultimate syllable (thus *bonáque*, *utráque*, *pleráque*) under the influence of the analogy to the regularly paroxytonic forms *bonúsque*, *utérque*, *plerúsque*.

Priscianus, in turn, attests the proclitic nature of the first elements of compounds which arose through the combination of verbal stems and the forms of the verbs *facio* or *fio*:

Priscianus, *Institutio de arte grammatica* 8, 35: *Si vero 'facio' verbo vel 'fio' integris manentibus aliud verbum infinitum ante ea componatur, non solum significationes et coniugationes integras eis servamus, sed etiam accentus, ut 'calefácio, calefácis, calefácit', 'tepefácio, tepefácis, tepefácit', in secunda enim et tertia persona paenultimas acuimus, quamvis sunt breves. Similiter 'calefío, calefís, calefit', 'tepefío, tepefís, tepefit' finales servant accentus in secunda et tertia persona, quos habent in simplicibus.*

“If to the full forms of the verbs *facio* or *fio* one adds another incomplete (i.e. desinence-less) verb at the front, then we retain not only the meanings and the mode of inflection of the former ones, but also their stress, as e.g. in (words such as) *calefácio, calefácis, calefácit* or *tepefácio, tepefácis, tepefácit*, for in the forms of the second and third persons we put the stress on the penultimate syllables although they are short. Similarly, such words as *calefío, calefís, calefit* and *tepefío, tepefís, tepefit* in the forms of the second and third person retain the stress on the final syllable, therefore on that syllable which receives stress when these verbs occur independently (i.e. not as elements of compounds).”

Therefore according to Priscianus, the stress never shifted forward beyond the second element of the compound, if that element was constituted by verbs *fio* or *facio*, and thus also the final syllable of such a *compositum* received stress, e.g. *calefís, calefit*, as well as the penultimate light (short) syllable, e.g. *calefácis, calefácit*. In the context of this argument the grammarian used the lexemes *calefacio, tepefacio* as well as *calefío* and *tepefío* as examples. However, the generalised nature of the rule here presented (*si vero 'facio' verbo vel 'fio' integris manentibus aliud verbum infinitum ante ea componatur*) allows it to refer also to such compound words as *arefacio/arefío, assuefacio, commonefacio/commonefío, madefacio/madefío, mansuefacio/mansuefío*, and also *satisfacio/satisfío*.

Of course, the examples presented in this paper do not constitute a complete list of opinions of Roman grammarians referring to the phonic aspects of ancient Latin. However, even this incomplete overview enables us, as it seems, to hear the sound of Latin better and thus to provide an affirmative answer to the aforementioned question about the legitimacy of consulting the works by Roman grammarians, which they bequeathed to us as their legacy.

Bibliography

- Allen W.S. 1965. *Vox Latina. A guide to the pronunciation of Classical Latin*. Cambridge.
 Bernardi Perini G. 1970. *L'accento latino: cenni teorici e norme pratiche*. [3rd edition]. Bologna.
 Di Napoli M. 2011. *Velii Longi De orthographia: introduzione, traduzione e commento*. Hildesheim.
 Heinz A. 1978. *Dzieje językoznawstwa w zarysie*. Warszawa.
 Heinz A. 1984. *Język łaciński*. [9th edition]. Kraków.

- Kaster R.A. 1988. *Guardians of language: the grammarian and society in late Antiquity*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
- Marouzeau J. 1955. *La prononciation du latin*. [4th edition]. Paris.
- Porzio Gernia M.L. 1974. Vicende storiche e strutturali dell'aspirazione latina. – *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 59: 56–102.
- Traina A. 1957. *L'alfabeto e la pronuncia del latino*. Bologna.
- Väänänen V. 1963. *Introduction au latin vulgaire*. Paris.

