FINAL MONOSYLLABLES – WHY ELISION?

KJELL GUSTAFSON

University of Oslo

1. Introduction

It is well known and now generally accepted that Terence relatively often lets an iambic ending verse end with a monosyllable, and that elision[1] is common before such monosyllables. But little work has been done to try to discover why elisions are, as it appears, so frequent in this position. For instance, Lindsay (1922, 112) says, "In the list of these monosyllabic endings of Senarii selected from three plays of Terence it will be noticed how often there is Elision immediately before the monosyllable. This is not unknown in Plautus." But he offers no explanation of this phenomenon for either Terence or Plautus. Similarly, other authors who discuss the final monosyllables usually take the frequent use of elision in front of them for granted.[2]

In this paper I shall look into the question of how frequent monosyllables are at the end of lines (I6, I8, T7)[3] in Plautus and Terence. We shall see that Terence employs monosyllabic verse endings more frequently than Plautus (section 2). We shall then investigate the reasons for why there is so often elision in front of a monosyllabic verse ending (sections 3 and 4). What we find will throw some light on the much debated questions of the quantity of closed syllables with short vowels before a pause, the realization of elisions, and the use of 'liaison' in Latin comedy and in Classical Latin poetry (section 5).

2. Are monosyllables rare at verse end?

2.1 "There are restrictions on elision and monosyllables at verse end"

Lucian Müller (1894, 356) says that elision in the last syllable of the verse seemed 'harsh' to speakers of Latin, and that Plautus used it sparingly and Terence only when it was followed by an interjection or the pronoun *hic*.[4]

Wilhelm Meyer, writing ten years earlier, attacks the problem from a slightly different angle and states that (in Old Latin, and especially Plautus) monosyllables are rare in verse endings, particularly after an elision. He ascribes the higher frequency in Terence to the carelessness ("Nachlässigkeit") of this author.[5]

2.2 Drexler: "Monosyllabic endings are not rare"

Drexler (1935) examines Meyer's claim that monosyllables are rare at the end of lines. He argues that in comparing the number of occurrences in the two kinds of positions (verse final and verse internal) it is necessary to allow for the fact that many monosyllables are less suited to stand at the end of a sentence or clause; and since enjambement is the exception rather than the rule (especially in Plautus), the expected frequency of verse final monosyllables would be low. He proceeds to support these general considerations with statistics. The following is a summary of his tables (the cases of final position include those with enjambement):

Table 1. Occurrences of monosyllables in verse final and comparable verse internal position according to Drexler (1935)

	Final	Internal	
es, est	289	35	= 8.26 : 1
All other forms	185	44	= 4.20 : 1

He takes his statistics to be proof positive that Meyer's claim was wrong. But Drexler's statistics suffer from a serious fault: the numbers for internal position are collected from *four* plays of Plautus (*Mil., Most., Pers., Poen.*), whereas those for verse final position are taken from *all* the comedies of *Plautus and Terence*. Moreover, some of the cases listed as verse final are from the middle of verses (Halbversschluß) (pp. 226 f.); and Terence has many instances of verse final monosyllable in enjambement following a syntactic break; Drexler excludes comparable cases from his collection of verse internal samples, on the grounds that "they are not likely to occur verse finally"!

If one counts the occurrences of word final monosyllables in the

four comedies (why did not Drexler do this?) the table would look like this (Table 2):[6]

Table 2. Occurrences of monosyllables in verse final and comparable verse internal position in four comedies of Plautus

	Final	Internal	
es, est	55	35	= 1.57 : 1
All other forms	33	44	= 0.75 : 1

Since Meyer and Drexler agree that no restriction is laid on forms of *esse*, we shall concentrate on all the other forms in this particular discussion. Drexler has excluded "a great number of cases" from his verse internal figures; if we now exclude from the number of actual occurrences at verse end cases of conjunctions (*et, aut*) and interjections, (*hem, oh*), altogether 5 cases (these are the kind of cases that Drexler has not counted in verse internal position on the grounds that they are unlikely to occur verse finally), the resulting verse end figure, 28, would be comparable to the corresponding figure for internal position, 44 (according to Drexler's criteria); the resulting ratio, 0.64:1, seems to indicate that in Plautus monosyllables *are* rarer verse finally than one would expect comparing them to the number of occurrences verse internally; at least, Drexler's material and argumentation do not prove the opposite.

2.3 *The difference between Plautus and Terence*

In this section I shall show that Terence has a relatively higher number of final monosyllables than Plautus and indicate a reason for this. After that (sections 3 and 4) we can deal with the main problem of this article, which is the question of why there is so often elision in front of these monosyllables.

Terence, in contrast with Plautus, freely allows enjambement and so liberally lets a line end with a word that introduces a sentence; he also frequently has a solitary monosyllable, most often an interjection, at the end of a line. Placing a sentence initial word, interjections in particular, but also to some extent other words which are in some respects detached structurally from the rest of the sentence (e.g. *et,*

aut), at the end of a verse, is an ideal way to gloss over the existence of line ends: the two lines are so to speak glued together while there is still a minor syntactic break coinciding with the break between lines; in this way Terence's dialogue verses resemble everyday speech more closely than do those of Plautus. This I think is the main function of the frequent use of a final interjection (mainly monosyllabic) in Terence;[7] he also has many cases of a stronger enjambement which likewise is in keeping with his desire to make his verse resemble everyday speech.[8,9] To give some idea of the difference between Plautus and Terence in this respect we can contrast the situation in the first 353 lines of *Miles* (5 cases: *est* (4), *res* (1)) with the same number of lines from *Adelphoe*, starting with the Prologue (which has no examples); here there are 20 cases (I exclude cases of aphaeresis of *es*, *est*): *es* (2), *est* (5), *sunt* (2), *et* (1), *aut* (2), *ah* (3), *hem* (4), *hui* (1); of the interjections mentioned here, there is one instance of *hem* in comparable environments (after a short *thesis*)[10] verse internally in the same passage (v. 343: *prŏfer(am)* :: *hĕm* (I8) and one case of *ah* (v. 274: *//pudĕbat* :: *ăh stultĭtiast*), but in this case long vowel is a possibility in *-bat*, and even with short *-a- pudebat* :: *ah* could not stand verse finally as we shall see later.

A quick glance at the verse ends in all the comedies of Terence will confirm the impression gained from the material quoted above, namely that he uses a monosyllable at the end of I6, I8, T7 much more frequently than Plautus; in the whole of Terence there are 10 verse internal instances of *hem* that are metrically equivalent to verse final *hem* after elision, and there are 29 instances verse finally; this is an indication that he uses at least some monosyllables more often verse finally than in comparable positions in the middle of a verse.

3. Monosyllabic verse endings: The linguistic environment

3.1 The different categories

In order to investigate the reasons for the apparently high frequency of elision in front of verse final monosyllables it is necessary to single out those monosyllables that can be preceded by an elision, i.e. those that begin with a vowel, and see how different phonological and/or

syntactic environments affect their frequency. If it turns out that there is a strong correlation between certain kinds of linguistic environment and the frequency of verse final monosyllables, it will be reasonable to interpret high frequency as indicating favourable conditions and low frequency as indicating unfavourable conditions. Specifically, we will classify (section 3.2) the monosyllables beginning with a vowel, on the one hand with respect to whether they follow a consonant (other than *-m*) or an elided vowel, and on the other hand with respect to whether they are syntactically closely related to the preceding word or whether a syntactic break or a change of speaker intervenes.[11] In some counter tests (section 3.4) we will (1) check that the ratio we obtain with respect to final monosyllables following a break (preceded by a consonant : preceded by an elided vowel) is not a function of the relative frequency of consonants and vowels at the end of words suited to stand in front of a break (i.e. sentence finally), and (2) see whether the restriction we shall find at the end of lines also applies in metrically equivalent environments verse internally.

The relevant types are these:[12]

I -V̆, CV̆(-), a) closely connected ... *una nox*//
           ... *quippe qui*//
      b) syntactic break ... *nosne? sic*//
           ... *ille :: phy!*//
II -V̆C, V̆(-), a) closely connected ... *amatus est*//
           ... *praeter haec*//
      b) syntactic break (cf. And. 803 ... *Chrȳsis :: hĕm*
         Eun. 889 ... *sĭ patĕr ...? :: quid? ăh*)
III -V̆(C); V̆(-), a) closely connected ... *procede tu huc*//
           ... *ad Bacchidem hanc*//
           ... *omnia haec*//
      b) syntactic break ... *proloqui? aut*//
           ... *omnia. hem*//
           ... *Hegio :: em*//

Type III involves elision, whereas in I and II elision is precluded. We shall be mainly concerned with a comparison of types II and III, i.e. cases of vowel-initial monosyllables; these will normally be preceded by an elision if the previous word ends in a vowel.

3.2 Statistics

I count 285 cases of monosyllabic endings in I6, I8, T7 in Terence[13] (excluding *es, est* with elision, aphaeresis, or haplological loss); of these, 66, or 23.2%, consist of a word beginning with a consonant, so that elision is precluded (type I above); the ones beginning with a vowel (219 cases, or 76.8%) consist of conjunctions, interjections, prepositions, pronouns and pronominal adverbs (*hīc, hinc, huc*), and *es, est*. There are 17 cases of *es* and 76 of *est*. We shall deal briefly with *es, est* below (p. 46), but our main concern will be with all the other vowel initial monosyllables; these can be divided into two groups, those that normally introduce a sentence or a clause or occupy a solitary position (interjections (I) and conjunctions (or 'particles') such as *at, an, ut*, and *et* (*ac*) when it connects two sentences or clauses (C_2)), and those that can readily stand in sentence internal position and thus by our definition (see Note 12) be closely related syntactically to the preceding word (pronouns and pronominal adverbs (Pron), prepositions (Prep), and *et* (*ac, atqu(e)*[14]) connecting two words or phrases (C_1)). Of the latter there are 34 examples in Terence: 26 of them follow an elided vowel, 8 are preceded by a consonant; of the ones that follow an elision, 4 involve a syntactic break with the preceding word (e.g. *Haut.* 209: *consimilia. hoc // scitumst:*; *Ad.* 375: *inepta, ne dicam dolo, atque // absurda*), 22 are closely connected syntactically (e.g. Ad. 969: *si quidem hoc // voltis:*). Of the 8 examples where one of these monosyllables follows a consonant-final word, *none* involve a syntactic break with the preceding word. These facts are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Verse-final vowel-initial words (Pron), prepositions (Prep), and conjunctions that connect words or phrases (C_1)

After elision		After a consonant	
closely related to the preceding word	syntactic break	closely related to the preceding word	syntactic break
22	4	8	0

The conclusion is that monosyllables that verse finally can be used freely in close syntactic connection with the preceding word (but may

also be used after a syntactic break) can be used either after a word ending in a consonant or after an elided vowel; most of the examples involve close connection, but the four examples with a syntactic break all involve elision. But this low number of cases with a break does not allow us to draw the conclusion that cases involving a break *must* be preceded by an elision.

However, if we turn to the monosyllables that normally follow a syntactic break (interjections (I) and those conjunctions that introduce a sentence or connect two sentences (C_2)) we find very different proportions. I count 92 such cases in Terence in I6, I8, T7. There is 1 case of close connection (following a consonant) (see below, p. 52). There are 91 cases of a syntactic break between the monosyllable and the preceding word, and in *all* of these cases there is elision (Table 4).[15]

Table 4. Verse-final vowel-initial monosyllables that are normally sentence initial (or stand on their own) (C_2 and I)

After elision		After a consonant	
closely related to the preceding word	syntactic break	closely related to the preceding word	syntactic break
0	91	1	0

The importance of these last two tables emerges if we combine them as in Table 5.[16]

Table 5. Verse final monosyllables (excluding *es, est*) beginning with a vowel.

	After elision		After a consonant	
	closely related to preceding word	syntactic break	closely related to preceding word	syntactic break
I, C_2	0	91	1	0
Pron, Prep, C_1	22	4	8	0
Total	22	95	9	0

3.3 Conclusions from the statistics

The most important figures are those of the second and fourth columns. On the basis of these we can formulate this rule:

If a line with iambic ending (I6, I8, T7) ends in a monosyllable beginning with a vowel, there can only be a syntactic break in front of the monosyllable if it is preceded by an elision.

We have seen (Note 15) that one-third of all the examples in the second column involve one-speaker elisions, i.e. the two words of which the first ends in an elided vowel are spoken by the same character (speaker). Thus the rule applies irrespective of whether there is a change of speaker or not.

The statistics could be made more impressive if we added the cases of *es, est* following a consonant: in all 93 examples of this the two words are closely connected,[17] i.e. they would be added to the third column, still leaving the fourth column with no examples.

It is thus possible to say at the end of lines:

si laudabit haec // illius formam	(*Eun.* 443)
non omnia haec//	(*And.* 790)
firmavit fidem :: hem//	(*And.* 462)

but not e.g. **fidem firmavit :: hem //*.

So Terence does not allow a final monosyllable to be preceded by a word ending in a consonant except when the two words are connected syntactically. On the other hand, elision in this position is quite acceptable when there is a syntactic break (both when a vowel and when a consonant precedes the elided vowel),

e.g. *Ad.* 326 *familia :: hem//*
  Ad. 320 *Geta :: hem//*

Even *muta cum liquida* can stand in front of the elided vowel,

e.g. *Ad.* 55 *institerit patrem aut//*

And it is apparent from some of the examples already quoted that a change of speaker is no hindrance, indeed, it is a favourite device of Terence's to end a line with a monosyllable (most often an interjec-

tion) spoken by a new character and involving elision in the previous word; I count 63 such cases in Terence (see Note 15 and p. 46).

The situation can be summed up like this:

> a line ending ... *vendite* :: *hem*// would be perfectly acceptable, but *... *vendit* :: *hem*// would be unacceptable. What can be the reason for this restriction?

3.4 Counter tests

It is at this point necessary to establish that the proportions we have discussed for monosyllables following a syntactic break (95 (after elision) : 0 (after consonant)) are specific for verse end and not imposed by, say, the phonemic structure of the words in the language that are suited to stand in the position immediately in front of a final monosyllable beginning with a vowel, or for instance by a general prohibition in verse against an interjection being preceded by a word ending in a consonant. In order to achieve this we can do some counter tests.

1. I have noted the sentence final words in two different passages of Terence, of comparable length (*Ad.* 81–140 and *Eun.* 232–291) and counted how many of these words in each passage would be able to fill the position(s) in front of a monosyllable beginning with a vowel at the end of I6, I8, T7, and a) undergo elision, and b) not be subject to elision (because they end in a consonant) (Table 6).

Table 6. Verse internal, sentence final words that could stand in front of a final vowel-initial monosyllable, in 120 verses of Terence.

	Ad.	*Eun.*	Total
a) would undergo elision (... **V**,)	21	16	37
b) not subject to elision (... -**VC**,)	13	18	31
Total	34	34	68

This shows that the numbers of words that might have stood in front of a final monosyllable beginning with a vowel and following a syntactic break, and requiring elision and not being able to undergo elision, respectively, are roughly equal.

2. I have examined in the whole of Terence the verse internal occurrences of three monosyllabic interjections beginning with a vowel to see if there are occurrences of the kind that are not found verse finally. The occurrences of this type are:

ah:	*Eun.* 889	... *patèr* ...? :: *quid? àh volêt*
	Ad. 274	//*pudèbat* :: *àh, stultìtiast*
hem	*Ad.* 467	//*vitiàvit* :: *hèm* :: *manĕ*
	Ad. 559	//*ùsque occìdit* :: *hèm quid*
	And. 803	//*itan Chrỳsis? hèm* :: *nos*
oh	*Ad.* 768	*trìstis?* :: *òh scelŭs*//

In verse interior position there are 4 instances of *ah*, 10 of *hem* and one of *oh* filling an *arsis* and following an elision preceded by a short syllable filling a *thesis*; so for these three interjections, all of which occur verse finally (19, 29, and 6 times respectively), there are 15 examples corresponding to the cases that freely occur verse finally, whereas there are, as we have just seen, 6 examples of what does not occur at verse end.[18] In other words, it is not the collocation of a vowel-initial monosyllable (in *arsis*) following a syllable ending in -V̆C, that is prohibited.

4. Discussion

4.1 Monosyllabic verse endings: 'elision' across change of speaker

There are in Terence 63 instances of a vowel-initial monosyllable verse finally after a change of speaker, all involving elision, and it is vital to our investigation to discuss how 'elision' was realized in such cases, and to see what happens to the syllable boundaries at the end of the word affected by elision. (Terence has two cases of a consonant-initial monosyllable verse finally after a change of speaker (*And.* 450: ... *mene?* :: *te.*// and *Ad.* 412: ... *ille* :: *phy!*//); these examples show that what is required at a change of speaker in this position is not simply that there should be an elision.)

The problem of elision across a change of speaker can theoretically be solved in the following three ways, the third of which may seem at

first less obvious than the others, but is worth considering in the light of the data presented here.

1. The first speaker, by a convention, did not speak his final vowel, so that he would say *vendit* instead of *vendite* when (he knew that) the next speaker would begin with a vowel. But such pronunciations would in many cases render the spoken text unintelligible to the audience; for instance, it is difficult to see how at *Hec.* 527 (*hem taces? ex qu(i)?* :: *istuc*) a pronunciation [ɛkskʷ] by the first speaker could have conveyed the intended meaning; in particular, in ordinary speech *ex qui?* must have had a distinctive intonation contour on the vowel of *qui* which must have been accented; if this vowel was elided completely the correct intonational and accentual pattern of the question must have been lost. In any case, both in this example and in many others, this explanation would entail pronunciations involving utterance-final consonants and consonant clusters which are prohibited in that position in Latin. The best that can be said about such a practice is that it would be a rather odd convention, and (using an argument *ex silentio*) it is strange that no mention of such an artificiality should have come down to us amid all the other bits of information about the pronunciation of Latin – if such a convention was practised regularly or even sporadically. Since more reasonable explanations are at hand (2. and 3. below) it seems preferable to assume that one of them is the correct one.

2. The second speaker started pronouncing his first vowel as soon as the first speaker started pronouncing his last vowel; one can well imagine this being the normal case without any greater impairment of intelligibility to the audience than what was caused by ordinary elisions. Soubiran (1966, 478) claims that this is the *only* possibility.

3. The second speaker started his initial vowel *after* the first speaker had begun uttering his final vowel; this would create the auditory impression of two successive vowels. If the first of these two vowels was pronounced with less energy ('stress') than the second, which is likely since a word final vowel is most often unstressed (except e.g. in a stressed monosyllable) and an initial

vowel often had primary or secondary stress, the result would be auditorily not very different from a 'true' (one-speaker) elision (or synaloephe); the most likely realization of 'real' elisions is rising diphthongs (or in the case of elisions involving vowels of the same quality 'rising monophthongs'), i.e. the later part of the diphthong (or monophthong) is pronounced with greater energy than the earlier part. The quantity of such a diphthong or monophthong depends on the quantity of the later part. This explains why in Latin metrics an elision of the type $-\breve{V}, + \breve{V}-$ always results in a short syllable (i.e. -; $\breve{V}$-). Allen is mistaken in claiming (1973, 144) that a diphthong necessarily involves long ('heavy') quantity; it is doubtful whether this always holds true even for falling diphthongs; it certainly does not for rising ones. And there is no reason to assume that two identical vowels would be treated differently: [spi:ra:mɛnt̪aanimaɛ] is a plausible phonetic representation of *spiramenta animae*.[19]

It does not affect the main argument of this paper, however, whether we choose explanation no. 2 or 3. The relevant point about these is that they both involve a different syllabification of the word before the change of speaker to what is involved when there is no elision:

<p align="center">ven - dĭ - te   vs.   ven - dĭt</p>

In the former, *-te* belongs to the final syllable of the verse, and *-di-* fills the penultimate position; in the latter, the speaker would necessarily end with a consonant the syllable filling the penultimate position. In other words, the syllable that fills the penultimate position of the verse is open and closed, respectively; in both cases, of course, the vowel of that syllable is short.

The basic metrical requirement for the penultimate position in the verses under consideration is that it should be filled with *one short syllable*. It is quite clear that an open syllable containing a short vowel fulfils this requirement, i.e. it counts as a short syllable, also when it is followed immediately by a change of speaker (cf. the examples quoted above, p. 48).

On the other hand, it is a matter of controversy whether a closed word-final syllable containing a short vowel is metrically long or short when followed by a pause. Allen (1973, 130 f.) offers strong arguments

for the view that such syllables were long ('heavy').[20] In the cases we are discussing it is difficult to see that there can be any other reason for the different treatment than the difference of syllabification; in other words, a closed syllable before a pause cannot fill a short position in a verse.

4.2 The realization of one-speaker elisions and the question of liaison

That this is the correct interpretation becomes clear when we look at the instances of a verse final monosyllable spoken by the same speaker as the word in front. In these cases there arises the question whether there is a syntactic break between the two words, or not. As we have seen (pp. 44–46), when there is a syntactic break, i.e. the two words are not closely related syntactically, the same prohibition applies as at change of speaker, i.e. the word in front of a verse-final vowel-initial monosyllable cannot end in a consonant; on the other hand, if the two words are more closely related syntactically a consonantal ending is quite normal.

This means that the question of 'liaison' vs. 'non-liaison' (whether a word final consonant is pronounced as beginning ('releasing') the first syllable of a following vowel-initial word, or not) is related to the question of the use of elision across a syntactic break. 'Elision' vs. 'hiatus' and 'liaison' vs. 'non-liaison' are parallel relationships in that the first member of each pair has an affinity to a strong degree of 'cohesion', whereas the second member of each pair is related to a weak degree of cohesion. It will become clear from our discussion later (section 4.3.2) that a stronger degree of cohesion may be necessary to condition liaison than that necessary for elision to take place.

It is usually stated that for the purposes of Latin metrics a word final consonant does not make position if the following word in the same line begins with a vowel: -VC, V- counts metrically in the same way as -V, CV-, i.e. the syllable boundary goes in front of such a consonant, or put differently, there is regularly liaison within a line in Latin poetry.[21] There are two conclusions we can draw about this from the statistics offered in this paper:

4

1. In Old Latin dialogue verse, liaison takes place between words that are closely related syntactically, but it does not take place if there is a syntactic break – and of course it cannot have taken place in reality across a change of speaker when the words were performed (by two speakers).

2. A word-final closed syllable with a short vowel, followed by a physical pause or a (strong) syntactic break could not count metrically as a short syllable; this means that in a system which classifies syllables as either long ('heavy') or short ('light'), such syllables will have to be classified as long ('heavy').

As was mentioned above (p. 45) there is only one instance where one of the monosyllables that normally follow a break comes after a word ending in a consonant; the example is Phorm. 1002:

//pro fratre :: mi vir, non mihi narras :: at ... :: quid "at"?//

As we see, *at* does not here perform its function of a conjunction, but has been transformed into a noun-like word functioning as the object of an understood 'verb of saying' (= *quid dicis: "at"?*), in other words, *quid* and *"at"* belong to the same sentence and there is no syntactic break between them. We are now in a position to see why this is possible, whereas a line ending: ... *quid?* :: *at* // or ... *quid? at* // could not occur.

4.3 Parallels to the conclusions drawn above
4.3.1 Parallels to the question of liaison from Greek metrics and recent phonetic research

Tichy (1981, 28 f.) shows that in Homer *muta cum liquida* at the *beginning* of a word is treated in the same way as word internally, i.e. it makes position, if the two words in question are closely connected, but not if a pause or a 'real' word boundary intervenes. The rule is only applicable in *thesis* ('biceps'), and Tichy quotes the following: τὸ πρίν (,–,²,) Π 208 and *alib.*, μή με πρίν (,²,–,²,) T 306 etc. (close connection); τέρπετο, πρίν (,²∪∪,²,) T 313, εἵλετο, κρινάμενος (,²∪∪,²∪∪²,) Λ 697 etc. (syntactic break).

Cooper and Sorensen (1981), and Cooper and Paccia-Cooper (1980) have investigated how a strong syntactic boundary prevents

('blocks') certain prosodic effects related to word boundaries that normally occur when the syntactic boundary is weaker or non-existent; Cooper and Sorensen p. 148: "The results show that this lowering effect [lowering of the fundamental frequency in a word following a contrastively stressed word (in English)] can be blocked at the boundary between two major clauses ... The blocking effect appears to reflect a constraint on the speaker's ability to "look" ahead and program prosodic information for an upcoming clause."[22] The occurrence of such blocking may be dependent upon the rate of speech, Cooper and Sorensen, p. 157 (referring to Cooper and Paccia-Cooper): "Apparently, the speaker can enlarge the domain for coding prosodic information in cases of fast rates of speech, in particular, suggesting that a stronger syntactic boundary would be required to trigger blocking at fast rates than at normal rates."

Also there must be a border area where the speaker can choose which of two possibilities to use, cf. Tichy, p. 30 (regarding irregularities:) "Doch hat auch die metrisch bedingte Übertragung der in der echten Wortfuge regulären Behandlung auf Konnexe, in denen normalerweise die Wortinlautsbehandlung eingetreten wäre, ihren sprachlichen Grund; denn sofern zwei Wörter nicht durch Pausa getrennt oder in Akzenteinheit verbunden sind, steht es zumeist im Ermessen des Sprechers, ob er die Wortgrenze hervorheben oder beide Wörter als phonetische Einheit behandeln will (z.B. wäre in *οὐδ' ὅ γε πρίν ... ἀπώσει A* 97 an Stelle der echten Wortfuge wohl auch Konnex möglich gewesen)."

4.3.2 Parallels to the questions of elision and liaison from modern languages

As regards one-speaker elisions in front of a final monosyllable, we have seen that it does not make any difference whether there is a syntactic break or not; in both cases elision is as normal before the last syllable of the verse as it is verse internally. It may seem paradoxical when I claim that the word boundary is more strictly adhered to in front of a break than when the two words are in a closer relation if the first word ends in a consonant, and at the same time assert that elision is quite normal across a sense-break. But two vowels in contact across a strong syntactic boundary are commonly pronounced with-

4*

out a break in phonation, i.e. the vocal cords vibrate continuously across such a boundary; this can readily be observed in many modern languages. The presence of a syntactic boundary may be signalled by other prosodic means, such as lengthening of the last accented syllable before the break, and, very commonly, by the intonational pattern. Even when the last syllable before the break ends in a voiced consonant the phonation may carry across a strong syntactic boundary, but in these cases, too, the consonant is less likely to change its function from syllable final ('arresting') to syllable initial ('releasing') than when the words belong more closely together.

Modern Italian is one language where vowels either side of a word juncture are treated in a way similar to how it is likely that they were pronounced in Latin, both in ordinary speech and in the reading of poetry. Two vowels across word juncture are normally spoken without a break in the phonation; one of them, usually the first (but not always, e.g. if the first is stressed and the second is not) may be 'weakened' and sometimes disappear; it may at times be difficult to judge whether the result is two syllables or one, but often it clearly is a diphthong; whether this diphthong is rising, falling, or 'floating' depends largely on the relative stress/intensity of the constituent vowels. In any case, in poetry, on the level of composition, two such vowels belong to one and the same syllable (and an intervocalic consonant in front of them 'releases' that syllable). And it is interesting that a strong syntactic break may occur between the two vowels (one of which may be a diphthong), and a monosyllabic word consisting solely of a vowel or a diphthong may come between the two vowels; Elwert (1968, 30 f.), among other examples, quotes these (each verse counts 11 syllables):[23]

E in van l'Inferno vi s'oppose, e in vano   (Tasso, G(erusalemme)
                                                L(iberata) I, 1, 5)
Tre dolci e cari nomi hai in te raccolti   (Petrarch,
                                                Canzoniere, 366, 46)
Presa Antiochia, e morto il re suo padre   (GL III, 12, 8)
Fermossi; e lui, di pauroso, audace   (GL III, 27, 1)

We may also quote French as illustrating some of these points. After discussing how sometimes an e caduc is not pronounced in modern

recitation of French poetry, before a pause, or word internally in accordance with the actual modern pronunciation of words like 'sout*e*nir' 'enn*e*mie', or word finally if the last remaining vowel of the word is long (lengthened), e.g. 'accus*e*', 'mêm*e*', Elwert goes on to say (1961, 54): "Andererseits sei darauf aufmerksam gemacht, daß mitunter ein -*e* in pausa vor Vokal gesprochen wird. Die auf Grund der französischen Aussprachegewohnheiten sich einstellende Verschleifung vermeidet, daß ein solches *e* prosodischen Wert erhält." But also when such a word-final -*e* is not spoken, a single consonant in front of it may release the syllable following the -*e caduc*, e.g. Corneille, *Le Cid* 237 (quoted by Elwert p. 44):

<blockquote>ô rage! ô désespoir! ô vieillesse ennemie!</blockquote>

But it is *possible* to read such a line with a physical break between 'rage' and 'ô', which in French will not affect the prosody of the line, but it does mean that 'rage' will be a closed syllable.

In French poetry liaison regularly takes place within a line even between words that are not joined in this way in ordinary speech (all provided the first word ends in a silent consonant that can be pronounced in liaison); but at a syntactic break, especially if this coincides with the caesura, the liaison may not take place, leaving a hiatus (Elwert, 1961, 57). This is a parallel to the situation in Roman comedy described above where two words belonging closely together are spoken with liaison, but a word followed by a syntactic break is treated as if followed by a physical pause.

5. Conclusions and implications

The material that I have presented in this paper suggests that the quantity of a word final syllable of the type -V̆C, was long ('heavy') in front of a physical pause or a syntactic break (at least in Old Latin); we have seen that if the syntactic bond is stronger such a syllable is scanned as short, i.e. liaison takes place. Thus we have here a new piece of evidence in support of the view of Allen (1973, 130 f.) that pre-pausal -V̆C, involved 'heavy' quantity. We need to ask ourselves, however, whether Roman poets were obliged to follow this rule. The answer is obviously: No. In Classical poetry the rule is that liaison also takes place across a syntactic break. This is to be explained as

being due to an artificial cohesion within the line, see Allen (1973, 205, in a discussion of the same phenomenon in Greek). Hill (1974, 224) claims that in a passage like Verg. *Aen.* 4.71–73:

> pastor agens telis liquitque volatile ferrum
> nescius: illa fuga silvas saltusque peragrat
> Dictaeos.

there ought to be a pause after *nescius*, and that the view defended above would entail a choice "between an unmetrical reading and an absurd liaison". But since Hill introduces the presence of a pause as an argument to show that pre-pausal -V̆C, involved light quantity, he must also show how it is reasonable to assume that an initial consonant after the pause entails heavy quantity of a syllable of the type -V̆C, *before* the pause, whereas this lengthening does not (normally) occur if the pause is followed by an initial vowel. If light quantity of -V̆C, was the norm in the spoken language before a pause, then it must be a metrical convention that it is scanned as long if a consonant follows immediately after the pause; if this is the case one would expect to find occasional 'lapses' in Latin poetry: to my knowledge, there is not a single instance of this: -V̆C,, pause, ,C- always makes position. On the other hand, if -V̆C, before a pause was pronounced with heavy quantity in the spoken language, then short scansion when a vowel follows after a pause must be a convention, and if so, we would expect to find 'lapses', i.e. -V̆C, scanned as long before a pause, even if a vowel follows, and that is exactly what we find: there are 54 examples in Vergil (*Ecl., Georg., Aen.*) alone (Kent, 1948, 303).

The evidence, then, from Classical poetry is that syntactic boundaries were largely disregarded in the composition of metrical lines; it is beyond the scope of this article to discuss the question of how -V̆C,, pause, ,V- was realized in actual performance. The point of this paper is to show that Terence composed his lines in accordance with the quantities of the spoken language in these cases.

There is no reason to assume that the same prosodic rules did not apply verse internally as in front of a verse final monosyllable.[24] If so, we may have to re-scan some of the lines of Terence and Plautus; for instance, Kauer–Lindsay (1926) indicates the scansion of *Ad.* 388 thus:

prospicere :: quid? istaec iam penes vos psaltriast?

(i.e.: ,–ŭυυ,ŭ,υ–,–́,υ–́,–,–́υ–́,). We may have to choose between:

prospicere :: quid? istaec iam penes vos psaltriast?

(i.e.: ,–ŭυυ,–́,–́,–,ŭυ,–,–́υ–́,), and Phillimore's suggestion: *quid istaec? iam* (i.e.: ,ŭ,υ–,–́, : no syntactic break between *quid* and *istaec* and consequently liaison and operation of the rule of Iambic Shortening). Similarly, at *Ad.* 702, instead of: *quid? ill(e) ubist Milēsiŭs?*// we may have to read: *quid? ill(e) ubist Milēsiŭs.* And in Eun. 986//*hem quid? amat an*://–,–,υυ,– may be the correct scansion instead of //–,υ,υυ,–.

It must be mentioned here that Plautus respects the rule as given for Terence, but as noted above, he more rarely lets a line end with a monosyllable (except forms of *esse*), so the statistical material for him is not very great. It should also be mentioned that there are five examples in Terence of a final vowel-initial monosyllable in other metres that end in υ–//; they all follow an elision and are therefore in accordance with the rule we have established (there is one case of close connection and four of a syntactic break, one of which involves a change of speaker).[25]

Marouzeau (1934, 51) interestingly points out that a final monosyllabic interjection or conjunction after an elided vowel could easily be lost in the manuscript tradition without leaving a metrical gap; it may therefore well be that Terence actually had more examples than have come down to us. But a monosyllable after a final consonant cannot be lost without metrical consequences, so it is very unlikely that any such examples have been lost during the transmission of the texts.

The findings presented in this article are an example of how it is possible to reach conclusions about the pronunciation of a dead language such as Latin through a combined use of the methods of traditional Classical philology and modern phonetic research. If the conclusions I have reached are accepted it means that we are now in a position to say that pre-pausal -V̆C, in Latin constituted a long syllable (long by position); this ties up with Allen's claim (1973, 64 f.) that what constitutes long ('heavy') quantity when a syllable is long by position, is the fact that the syllable is *closed* (or *'arrested'*).

We have now formulated the reasons for the rule given above (p.

46); we see that what is required is not primarily that there should be elision in front of the monosyllable, but that the word in front must not end in a consonant. It is conceivable that there could be a hiatus (Plautus has three examples of a hiatus (including two involving a word ending in -*m*) when there is no syntactic break).[26] So the rule can now be formulated thus:

If in a dialogue verse ending with an iambic sequence of syllables the last word is a monosyllable, the word in front of it can only end in a consonant if the two words are not separated by a syntactic break or a change of speaker.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NOTES

1. I use the term 'elision' in a neutral sense, i.e. with the meaning of "metrical loss of the first of two vowels that come in contact across a word boundary", without committing myself for the moment as to the phonetic realization (complete loss or 'synaloephe'?).

2. See e.g. Vahlen (1900, e.g. pp. 3 f.); Marouzeau (1934, 50 ("Comme le monosyllable est d'ordinaire à initiale vocalique et précédé d'un mot à finale élidée ...")); Descroix (1935, 272 ("... Térence élide généralement ... sur ce monosyllable la finale du polysyllabe antérieur")); Laidlaw (1938, 49) gives a vague attempt at an explanation: "In the above citations [giving among them examples of line final monosyllables] there is usually an elision in the last foot of the senarius, which we must suppose Terence to have regarded as improving the final rhythm".

3. The following signs and abbreviations are used in this paper:
   V   indicates (any) vowel
   C   indicates (any) consonant
   ,   indicates word boundary (e.g. -C, = "word ending in a consonant", ,V(-), = "monosyllabic word beginning with a vowel (with or without following segments)"
   ;   indicates word boundary with elision
   // indicates beginning or end of line
   :: indicates change of speaker
   I6 indicates iambic senarius
   I8 indicates iambic octonarius

T7 indicates trochaic septenarius
( ) indicates elided segments in quotations of Latin texts.
Referring to word classes:
C₁   means   conjunction(s) connecting two words or phrases
C₂   means   conjunction(s) (or 'particle(s)') introducing a sentence or connecting
                  two sentences or clauses (or finite verbs)
I   means   interjection(s)
Prep means   preposition(s)
Pron means   pronoun(s) (and/or pronomial adverb(s)).

4. "Sed iam transeamus ad elisionem in ultima versus syllaba evenientem, quae quam
   dura sit visa omnino Latinis, inde apparet quod nec Plautus eam adhibuit sine
   cautione et Terentius ita tantum, ut sequeretur aut interiectio aut pronomen *hic.* a
   qua norma quae differunt, emendando sunt tollenda, scribendumquest in Andria
   [950] 'dos Pamphilest', ...".

5. "einzelne einsilbige Wörter oder Wörter mit elidierten Silben wurden im Zeilen-
   oder Caesurschluss nur unter grossen Beschränkungen zugelassen." (1884, 44 f.) –
   "Mit vorangehender Elision findet sich bei Plautus im jambischen Zeilenschluss oft
   est, selten ein zweisilbiges und fast nie ein einsilbiges Wort. – Bei Terenz sind die
   Fälle ein wenig mehr." (p. 47).

6. It is worth noting that if we divide Drexler's figures for verse final position in *all* the
   plays by 5.78 which equals the total number of I6, I8, T7 in all the plays of Plautus
   and Terence (c. 22700) divided by the number in *Mil., Most., Pers.,* and *Poen.* (c.
   3925), we arrive at almost the same numbers: *es, est*: 50; all other forms: 32.

7. Cf. Descroix (1935) and Marouzeau (1934 and 1935) for similar views regarding the
   function of the final monosyllables.

8. Terence's skill in making his comedies 'realistic', both linguistically and on the level
   of the composition of the plot and in the characterization of his persons, is stressed
   by Haffter (1953).

9. One may quote as a parallel to this the high frequency of verse final monosyllables
   in the Satires of Horace (see Kießling–Heinze, 1961, p. XLII; Nilsson, 1952, 114
   ff.), and the fact that these poems contain a considerably higher proportion of
   verses with enjambement than Classical hexameters of a higher stylistic level (see
   Nilsson, pp. 142 ff., esp. 144); as is well known, the Satires are deliberately less
   'poetic', i.e. more colloquial and 'prosaic', on many levels (grammar, rhythm,
   lexicon, contents) than 'higher' forms of poetry like the Aeneid and the
   Metamorphoses of Ovid. Nilsson sees (p. 118) two main functions in the use of final
   monosyllables: 1: to make the verse more 'prosaic' (usually achieved in combi-
   nation with enjambement); 2: to give emphasis to the monosyllable. This latter
   function is achieved (according to Nilsson) because a monosyllable is *unexpected* in
   this position. This may also well be an explanation to the use of some of the verse-
   final monosyllabic interjections in Terence, especially if they are solitary, i.e. not
   joined with what follows in the next line. It should be noted, however, that the
   rhythmic effect of a verse-final monosyllable will be different in the hexameter
   (where it fills the *weak* position of the last foot) and I6, I8, T7 (where it fills a *strong*
   position); thus it is difficult to see how a simple rhythmic explanation alone could
   account for the parallelism.

10. I use the terms *'arsis'* and *'thesis'* in the sense of 'strong' and 'weak' position of a
    foot, respectively.

11. Fabia (1893) makes an investigation resembling this procedure. He counts the cases
    of final monosyllables *not* preceded by elision in the I6 of Terence and divides them
    into different syntactic categories, but he does not distinguish between those

monosyllables that can be preceded by an elision and those that cannot, i.e. those beginning with a vowel and a consonant, respectively. The only conclusion he makes relevant to our question, is that in the majority of cases there is a syntactic bond between a monosyllable that does not follow an elision and the word in front.

12. For the sake of simplicity of the statistics I have employed simple criteria for deciding whether there is a syntactic break or a close connection:

   A. Syntactic break in front of a final monosyllable occurs:

      1. at a change of speaker

      2. if the monosyllable and the preceding word belong to two different sentences or clauses

      3. if the preceding word is a vocative or (the end of) a parenthesis

   B. Close connection occurs in all other cases (i.e. the two words belong to the same clause or sentence and the first of the two is not a vocative and is not parenthetic in relation to the second).

   I have counted *et* and other conjunctions as 'close' when they connect two infinitives, and as 'break' when they connect two finite verb forms. Any other reasonable sets of criteria for distinguishing the two categories will not seriously affect the main figures of my statistics.

13. I have used the edition of Kauer–Lindsay (1926) throughout; any discrepancies in other editions are not likely to affect the statistics significantly.

14. There are in *Ad.* two cases of verse final *atque* standing in 'synaphea' with the following (vowel-initial) line and therefore scanned as a monosyllable.

15. In these statistics I have not distinguished between a syntactic break between words spoken by the same speaker and cases involving a change of speaker; there are about twice as many cases of a change of speaker as of a one-speaker elision (63 : 32).

16. The instances of vowel-initial verse-final monosyllables (except *es, est*) in Terence are (*italicized numbers* indicate a change of speaker):

   1. Elision: Close connection:

      C_1: *And.* 560; *Haut.* 521; *Eun.* 873, 926; *Phorm.* 57; *Ad.* 38, 465.

      Pron: *And.* 790; *Haut.* 585; *Eun.* 470, 636, 1054; *Phorm.* 130, 322, 423, 521; *Hec.* 719; *Ad.* 969.

      Prep: *Eun.* 631, 859, 1076; *Phorm.* 661.

   2. Elision: Syntactic break:

      I: *And.* 248, 306, 351, *359*, 420, 462, *469*, 590, 592, *785*, 859, 872, *928*, 969, exitus alter suppositicius 3; *Haut.* 313, 340, 397, 439, *480*, 517, 606, 654, 757, 906, 913, 1010; *Eun.* 208, 223, *236*, *237*, 381, 407, 669, 680, 805, 962, 977, 1052, 1072; *Phorm.* 51, *52*, 193, 198, *210*, 286, 325, *387*, 474, 490, *548*, 809, 817, 857, *858*, 881, 954; *Hec.* 205, *283*, 630, 697, 721, 743; *Ad.* 112, *216*, 224, 260, 309, 320, 326, 329, 371, 411, 487, 488.

      C_1: *Ad.* 375, *392*.

      C_2: *And.* 51, 226, *256*, 838, *848*, 893; *Haut.* *61*, *71*, *595*; *Eun.* *349*, *362*; *Hec.* 203, *579*, 877; *Ad.* 35, 55.

      Pron: *And.* 530; *Haut.* 209.

   3. After consonant (close connection):

      C_2: *Phorm.* 1002.

      Pron: *And.* 468, 741; *Eun.* 443, 465, 530; *Ad.* 453, 673, 847.

17. One reason for omitting *es, est* is that one ought otherwise for the sake of completeness to include cases of *es, est* following a vowel. But one would have to decide in each of these cases whether the loss of vowel involved is to be classified as elision or aphaeresis (the cases with aphaeresis bear no direct relevance to the

arguments here propounded). It seems better therefore to exclude cases with *es, est* from the statistics altogether, just mentioning, as was done above, that the cases following a consonant confirm the rule that is observed on the basis of other monosyllables. – It should be noted, however, that there are verse final examples of *es, est* occurring after a syntactic break, but they *all* follow a vowel (and therefore do not contradict the rule we have established). Soubiran is probably right (1966, 178) in asserting that elision rather than aphaeresis took place in such cases.

18. In three of these cases (*quid, Chrysis, tristis*) there is no question of an originally long vowel being retained, so at any rate these three, but most likely all six examples can be quoted.

19. I do not wish to commit myself here regarding the phonetic realization of *ae* in Latin.

20. In referring to syllabic quantity I use the terms 'short' and 'long' as synonyms with 'light' and 'heavy', respectively.

21. See e.g. Crusius (1963, 6).

22. Cooper and Paccia-Cooper (1980, 150–160) give interesting evidence of the effect of syntactic boundaries of different degrees of strength on the absence or presence of 'flapping' of a word final alveolar stop in American English; this provides a parallel to our problem inasmuch as one of the realizations ([t], [d]) is associated with the position in front of a pause or a (strong) syntactic break, whereas the other, 'flapping', occurs word internally or when the syntactic relation between two words is closer (subject to certain prosodic requirements). They show that *pause* is *not* an influencing factor in the cases where 'flapping' occurs in their experiments.

23. The parallel between modern Italian and Latin as regards vowels in contact across word boundaries, on the level of performance, is stressed by Pasquali (1968, 138): "Noi siamo foneticamente privilegiati rispetto a tutti, credo, gli altri popoli europei per questo riguardo, che a noi è naturale, congenita la sinalefe: noi sappiamo legare. Noi pronunciamo spontaneamente *conticuere omnes intentique ora tenebant* senza saltare vocali, eppure facendo tornare il numero delle sillabe".

24. This was tacitly implied in the formulation of conclusions no. 1 and 2 above (p. 52).

25. The cases are: Close connection: *And.* 629 (cret. tetram. acat.). Syntactic break: *And.* 252 (iamb. dim. acat.), *And.* 628 (cret. tetram. acat.), *And.* 635 (cret. tetram. contract.); change of speaker: *Phorm.* 195 (iamb. tetram. acat.).

26. *Epid.* 50, *Men.* 513, *Rud.* 455.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Allen, W. S. (1973): *Accent and Rhythm*, Cambridge.

Cooper, W. E. and Paccia-Cooper, J. (1980): *Syntax and Speech*, Cambr., Mass.

Cooper, W. E. and Sorensen, J. M. (1981): *Fundamental Frequency in Sentence Production*, New York.

Crusius, F. (1963): *Römische Metrik*. Neu bearbeitet von H. Rubenbauer, München.

Descroix, J. (1935): "Les monosyllabes à la fin du trimètre iambique", *REL* 13, pp. 271–273.

Drexler, H. (1935): "Einsilbige Wörter am Vers-Schluß und Synaloephe im letzten Fuß iambisch ausgehender Verse bei Plautus und Terenz", *Glotta* 23, pp. 225–247.

Elwert, W. Th. (1961): *Französische Metrik*, München.

Elwert, W. Th. (1968): *Italienische Metrik*, München.

Fabia, Ph. (1893): "Sur la fin monosyllabique du sénaire chez Térence", *RPh* 17, pp. 29–32.

Haffter, H. (1953): "Terenz und seine künstlerische Eigenart", *MH* 10, pp. 1–20 and 73–102.

Hill, D. E. (1974): "Quaestio Prosodiae", *Glotta* 52, pp. 218–231.

Kauer–Lindsay (1926): *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae*. Recc. R. Kauer, W. M. Lindsay, Oxford.

Kent, R. G. (1948): "A Problem of Latin Prosody", *Mélanges ... offerts à J. Marouzeau*, Paris.

Kießling–Heinze (1961): *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Satiren*, erkl. von A. Kießling. Achte Aufl. erneuert v. R. Heinze. Mit einem Nachwort u. bibliogr. Nachträgen v. E. Burck, Berlin.

Laidlaw, W. A. (1938): *The Prosody of Terence. A Relational Study*, London.

Lindsay, W. M. (1922): *Early Latin Verse*, Oxford.

Marouzeau, J. (1934): "Notes de critique térentienne, II: Monosyllabes finaux", *REL* 12, pp. 50–51.

Marouzeau, J. (1935): "Note additionnelle" (to Descroix (1935)), *REL* 13, p. 273.

Meyer, W. (1884): "Über die Beobachtung des Wortaccentes in der altlateinischen Poesie", *Abh. d. I. Cl. d. k. bayer. Ak. d. Wiss.* 17, Abth. I.

Müller, L. (1894): *De re metrica poetarum latinorum praeter Plautum et Terentium*, ²Petersb. and Leipzig.

Nilsson, N.-O. (1952): *Metrische Stildifferenzen in den Satiren des Horaz*, Uppsala.

Pasquali, G. (1968): *Pagine stravaganti*, Firenze (Ch. XI, pp. 134–140: "Latino francese, latino italiano e latino latino" = *Pegasus*, December, 1929).

Soubiran, J. (1966): *L'élision dans la poésie latine*, Paris.

Tichy, E. (1981): "Hom. ἀνδροτῆτα und die Vorgeschichte des daktylischen Hexameters", *Glotta* 59, pp. 28–67.

Vahlen, J. (1900): "Über die Versschlüsse in den Komödien des Terentius", *Abh. Akad. Wiss. Berlin*, pp. 3–60 (= *Gesammelte Philol. Schriften* II, Lpz. 1923, 537–598).