

GENDER AND DECLENSION VARIATION IN EARLY LATIN

THESIS

SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF

M.A. IN CLASSICS

BY

F.M. MISKELL, B.A.

ProQuest Number: 10107229

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10107229

Published by ProQuest LLC(2016). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is to examine variations of gender and declension in the Early Latin period. The ancient grammarians have amassed a vast number of nouns exhibiting either or both phenomena. It is therefore essential first of all to establish the facts. For this reason, the whole of Early Latin literature down to approximately 80 B.C. has been subjected to a thorough scrutiny. The results of this investigation are presented in Part I in the following order:-

- 1) Words showing gender variation
- 2) Words showing declension variation
- 3) Words showing variation in both of these  
phenomena.

On the basis of this foundation, Part II attempts an explanation of part of the instances as far as this is possible. In it previous work is discussed and also new suggestions are made.

CONTENTS

<u>PREFACE</u>		p. 8
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>		p. 9
 <u>PART I</u>		
 <u>SECTION I GENDER VARIATION</u>		
<u>First Declension</u>		p. 16
<u>Second Declension</u>	m.f.	p. 16
alvus, grossus, pampinus		
lembus.	m.(f.)	p. 18
acinus, baltea, caseus/m, catinus/m, charadrus/ caradrum, clivus, forus/m, frenum, gladius/m, intibus/m, iocus, locus, lupinus/m, millus/melium, mustaceus/m, pilleus/m, porrum, rastrum.	m.n.	p. 19
aevus, clipeus, compitus, modius, mundus, pistillus, sagus, salus, sīnus, sparus, sumbolus, supparus, trulleus, viscus, vulgus.	m.(n.)	p. 34
buxus/m	f.n.	p. 47
humus	f.(m. or n.)	p. 47
asserculum, caelum, calamistrum, candelabrum, castellum, lutum, macellum, patibulum, qualum/quasillum, scutum, transtrum, tributum.	n.(m.)	p. 49
cubitus/m, nasus/m.	Parts of Body m.n.	p. 57

<u>Second Declension</u>	m.(n.)	p. 59
capillus, collus, dorsus, lacertus, pugnus, uterus.		
corium.	n.(m.)	p. 63
<u>Third Declension</u>	m.f.	p. 63
canalis, stirps, torques.		
cardo, culex, finis.	m.(f.)	p. 67
iubar.	m.n.	p. 70
panis, papaver, sal, uter.	m.(n.)	p. 70
ammis, calx, crux, forceps, latex, lens, lux, messis, navis, nubis, pulvis.	f.(m.)	p. 73
hallec.	f.n.	p. 79
<u>Third Declension</u>	n.(f.)	p. 80
sinapi		
	Parts of Body	
clunes, crines, frons.	m.f.	p. 81
guttur.	m.(n.)	p. 83
sanguen.	n.(m.)	p. 84
<u>Fourth Declension</u>	m.(f.)	p. 85
arcus, metus.		
sexus.	m.(n.)	p. 87
	Parts of Body	
artus	m.(n.)	p. 87

<u>Fifth Declension</u>	p. 88
<u>SECTION II DECLENSION VARIATION</u>	
<u>First and Third Declensions</u> arrabo, mataris.	p. 89
<u>First and Fifth Declensions</u> avaritia/es, luxuria/es, maceria/es, materia/es, mura/es, nequitia/es, segnitia/es, luae/e.	p. 90
<u>Second and Third Declensions</u> glutinum/gluten, mantele, moenia, pavus/o, scopus/scopio.	p. 93
<u>Second Declension (Third)</u> aplustra, gener, sequester, torrus, vasum.	p. 95
<u>Third Declension (Second)</u> holus, iuger.	p. 99
<u>Third Declension</u> acceptor, heres, sueres.	p. 100
<u>Third Declension (Second and Fourth)</u> os, -sis. Part of Body	p. 101
<u>Second, Third and Fourth Declensions</u> socer/socrus.	p. 102
<u>Second and Fourth Declensions</u> domus, pedatus, pinus.	p. 103
<u>Second Declension (Fourth)</u> cibus, laurus, sibilus, sonus.	p. 110
<u>Fourth Declension (Second)</u> cornu, fetus, fluctus, gradus, magistratus, ritus, tumultus, versus, veru.	p. 111
<u>Fourth Declension (Third)</u> impetus.	p. 115
<u>Third and Fifth Declensions</u> plebes, spes.	p. 115

Third Declension (Fifth) p. 116  
 fames, quies, boverum, sorderum, nucerum, naverum,  
 regerum, lapiderum.

### SECTION III GENDER AND DECLENSION VARIATION

#### A - Gender Variation Independent of Declension Variation

First and Third Declensions (m.f.n.) p. 119  
 rete.

First, Second and Third Declensions  
 (m.f.) p. 120  
 vesper.

First, Second and Fourth Declensions  
 (m.f.n.) p. 120  
 testa/um/u.

Second and Third Declensions (m.n.) p. 121  
 cancer, pannus, termo/termina, trapetus.

Second and Third Declensions (m.n.) p. 126  
 Parts of Body  
 callum, tergum/s.

Second and Third Declensions (f.n.) p. 126  
 tapete

Second, Third and Fourth Declensions  
 (m.f.n.) p. 127  
 penus

Second and Fourth Declensions (m.f.) p. 130  
 colus.

Second and Fourth Declensions (m.n.) p. 131  
 angiportus/m, fretum, gelus, tonitrus, vultus.

(m.f.n.) p. 135  
 specus.

Third and Fourth Declensions (m.f.n.) p. 137  
 pecus

Trees p. 138  
 cupressus, ficus, murtus.

<u>Third and Fifth Declensions</u>	(m.f.)	p. 140
lapis		
<u>B - Gender and Declension Variation Interdependent</u>		
<u>First and Second Declensions</u>	f.(m.)	p. 141
fluvia, situla.		
charti.	m.(f.)	p. 142
arva, latrina	f.n.	p. 142
lanitia, menda.	f.(n.)	p. 143
balnea, castra, ganeum, labia, ostrea, terricula, armentum, caementum, fulmentum, lamentum, myrtetum, ramentum.	n.(f.)	p. 143
galbeus, spicum	m.f.n.	p. 149
<u>First and Third Declensions</u>	f.n.	p. 150
cepa/e		
<u>SECTION IV MISCELLANEOUS</u>		
dies, nox		p. 152
<u>Animals</u>		p. 155
anguis, canis, grus, palumbes, puer, simia.		
<u>PART II</u>		p. 159
<u>CONCLUSION</u>		p. 190
<u>INDEX</u>		p. 191
<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>		p. 196



PREFACE

The title of this thesis promises a discussion of a fixed period of Latin, but it is impossible, as every student knows, to divide history of any sort into self-contained periods which have nothing to do with those neighbouring. Thus, though the period under discussion has an approximate termination at 80 B.C., which date is chosen to represent the end of Old Latin by Professor Warmington, some account is taken of the phenomena of later times. In general, the authors discussed are Plautus, Terence, Cato and those Early authors of whose works only fragments are extant.

The limits of the subject are also difficult to define. Some words such as "materia/es" show both variant forms within the period. Others, as "aevus/m" appear to use regularly one form in the ante-classical period and another in Classical and later times. There are also words such as "pistillus/m", for which I have not been able to discover the basis for an assumption of variation.

It has been considered the best course to present the evidence separately from any conclusions which may be drawn from it. This work, therefore, falls into two parts. The first consists of presentation and discussion of the evidence, to establish the facts as far as possible; the second offers

some conclusions as to the possible reasons for some of the variations established.

Within Part I the material is grouped according to words showing gender variation, declension variation or variation in both of these phenomena.

Within Part II words are discussed individually in the order in which they appear in Part I.

At this point I should like to thank Dr. Szemerényi for the many constructive (and some destructive!) suggestions he has made.

### INTRODUCTION

Varro, the earliest Roman grammarian whose work survives in any detail, often uses words whose form (especially gender) is disputed<sup>1</sup>. Occasionally he mentions the different forms<sup>2</sup> but no systematic treatment of the subject of gender and declension variation is recorded. The theory that the diminutive shows the gender of its root-word is Varro's<sup>3 4</sup>.

A number of fragments preserved by Gellius are relevant to the present discussion, but again there is no systematic treatment of the subject.

The bulk of our information is drawn from Nonius, Book III, De Indiscretis Generibus and Book VIII De Mutata Declinatione.

For most of the words discussed in Book III he notes all the genders supposed to be in use; sometimes stating which is the more usual<sup>5</sup>. Examples are not always given under each gender mentioned, even when Nonius gives no indication of their respective frequencies<sup>6</sup>. There are times when he quotes an

- 
1. see examples in Collart p.195-6
  2. e.g. gladius/m IX 81, but cf. V 116 - a discussion of the etymology of "gladium"
  3. ap. Pompeium V 164.13
  4. the inconsistencies of Varro's theory and usage noted by Collart (p.197) are not valid
  5. e.g. I 287.17, I 344.36
  6. e.g. I 296.14, I 307.12

ambiguous form to support his assertion of a particular gender<sup>1</sup>. It even happens that when he is discussing other aspects of a word, the gender of the word in the quotation is not the same as it is in the heading<sup>2</sup>.

The work on declensions is considerably shorter and far less systematic. There is no order of discussion<sup>3</sup>. The usual method of quoting is, "A pro B" and seldom is further comment given.

There is a discussion relevant to this subject in Charisius, Book I, Chapter 15, De Extremitatibus Nominum et Diversis Quaestionibus. Charisius bases his studies on various nominative endings. The general method is, "if ending A is present, then facts A, B, etc. follow". This discussion involves endings from which two or more sets of facts can be deduced<sup>4</sup> and words which have two or more endings in the same context<sup>5</sup>. Therefore gender and declension variation is the main subject of this chapter. The system is most impracticable.

Gender is discussed by Priscian in Book V, De Generibus

- 
1. e.g. I 307.15, I 327.16
  2. e.g. III 891.20
  3. e.g. iter - III 774.17f. III 778.3f. III 787.10f.
  4. e.g. I 57.23
  5. e.g. I 61.15

and declension in Book VI, De Nominativo et Genetivo Casu.

His method is that of modern descriptive grammar - he gives the rule then the exceptions. It is the exceptions which are of interest here.

The Grammaticus de Dubiis Nominibus is practically useless.

A very important modern discovery relevant to the present discussion is that of J. Schmidt<sup>1</sup>, who found that the Indo-European collective in "-a" has the same form as the neuter plural. Likewise, the dual in "-oi" had a development in Latin parallel to that of the o-stem masculine nominative plural. A further collective in "-um" is comparable with the o-stem neuter singular. Thus such variations as "locus, loci/a", "frenum, freni" and "vallus/m" are explained.

Upon these discoveries is based Zimmermann's work on gender-variation<sup>2</sup>. Much of his reasoning is sound but he fails in that he stretches the theory of the influence of the collective too far.

- 
1. Die Pluralbildungen der Indogermanischen Neutra  
Weimar 1889
  2. see Schwankungen des Nominalgeschlechts im älteren  
Latein Glotta XIII 1924 224-241

The theory of Meillet<sup>1</sup> that names "des choses ou des abstractions" are neuter has a bearing on τέρμα and "terminus", for "terminus" in Latin is sometimes deified.

Loan-words, particularly from Greek<sup>2</sup>, may be borrowed in nominative or accusative form, which accounts for some variations in the Latin forms. Other variations arise from the difficulty of adapting a foreign word to the Latin declensional system.

The problems of gender and declension variation in individual words have been discussed. Much of the discussion on "dies" has concluded that the original gender is masculine<sup>3</sup>. "Tempestatas" has been suggested by Kretschmer<sup>4</sup> as a basis for an analogical feminine.

The u-stem forms of "domus" are not original<sup>5</sup>, though the formation of the word is still not quite clear.

"Finis" is discussed by Bauer<sup>6</sup>, who finds it a masculine.

- 
1. Linguistique Historique et Linguistique Générale  
Paris 1921
  2. see L.-H. p.261f.
  3. e.g. Zimmermann Das ursprüngliche Geschlecht von  
"dies" Glotta XIII 1924 79f.
  4. Glotta I 1909 331
  5. Wackernagel Synt. II 32, Hofmann Zur Flexion von  
"domus" I.F. XLIX 1931 109-11
  6. Das Geschlecht von "finis" Glotta X 1920 122-8

The feminine originates in the postposition "fini", used with the ablative.

The possibility that "volgus" is a contamination of "\*volgus, -eris" and "\*velgum, -i" is mentioned by L.-H.<sup>1</sup>

Many of the words in the following discussion are mentioned in L.-H.<sup>2</sup> whose work is indispensable to this and every discussion of Latin grammar.

1. p. 368
2. esp. p.367f. p.259f.

PART I



SECTION I  
GENDER VARIATION

Nouns which show gender variation in the Early Latin period have been grouped according to declensions, for it sometimes happens that phonological factors in the combination of stem and ending contribute towards a change of gender. Within each declension those words will be examined first whose original gender is not established beyond reasonable doubt, then generally words whose original gender is masculine, feminine or neuter, in this order. There will also be words which are grouped by other criteria and not by gender alone. Such words are the group of words signifying parts of the body.

First Declension

Within the first declension there seems to be no hesitancy of gender.

Second Declension - Masculine and Feminine

The word "alvus" is feminine in Classical times but in Early authors examples of the masculine gender are found.

Plautus, Pseudolus 823, includes:-

"... in suum alvum".

A passage from Accius<sup>1</sup> is quoted by Nonius (I 284.22):-

---

1. Ann. 7 L. Müller

"Alvus generis feminini ... Masculino Accius ...:  
'ut quam fragilissimus alvus'."

This passage is again quoted by Priscian (II 268.17), who quotes again (II 163.4):-

"Accius<sup>1</sup> tamen masculinum ...:  
'Maia nemus retinens gravido concepit in alvo'."

Nonius, however, (loc. cit.) attributes this passage to an unknown author.

Accius is referred to vaguely by Charisius (I 80.20):-

"Alvum ... feminino ... sed masculino Laberius et Accius frequenter".

The word for an unripe fig is asserted to be feminine by Charisius (I 96.4):-

"Quae (fici) ante maturitatem hae grossi dicuntur feminino genere."

The masculine is quoted by Macrobius (III 20.5):-

"Mattius<sup>2</sup>:  
'in milibus tot [ficorum] non videbitis grossum,'  
et paulo post ait 'sumas ab alio lacte diffluos grossos.'"

This is the only Early attestation of the masculine gender.

The gender cannot be discerned in Cato, De Agricultura 94:-

"Fici uti grossos teneant ... grossi non cadent."

Pliny the Elder several times uses the feminine.

Another agricultural word, "pampinus" shows fluctuation

---

1. Ann L. Müller  
2. fr. 15

between the masculine and feminine genders.

Cato uses the masculine in De Agricultura 33.4, applying to the noun the adjective "teneros" (acc. plu.).

The other two Early examples of the use of "pampinus" in such a way that its gender can be determined are given by Cledonius (V 40.15f.):-

"Hic pampinus Accius<sup>1</sup>...:

'deinde ab iugulo pectus glauco pampino obnoxae  
obtexit;'

haec pampinus Lucilius<sup>2</sup>:

'purpureamque uvam facit albam pampinum habere.'

For the "obnoxae obtexit" of Accius, Ribbeck has accepted Bothe's conjecture of "obnexae obtegunt".

#### Second Declension - Masculine (Feminine)

A word which is masculine on its first and nearly every appearance in Latin is "lembus", which is attested as early as Plautus. Turpilius<sup>3</sup>, however, once uses it in the feminine in a quotation from Nonius (III 856.1f.):-

"Lembus ... Turpilius ...:

'lembi redeuntes domum  
duae ad nos certatim adcelerarunt ratem.'

No comment upon the gender is given.

- 
1. Trag. 257
  2. Inc. 131
  3. 98

Second Declension - Masculine and Neuter

"Acinus" uses a neuter plural. Early examples of this word are found in Cato, De Agricultura 112.2 and 3:-

"Siqua acina corrupta erunt, depurgato."  
 "Tum acina de uvis miscellis decarpito de scopione  
 in ... dolium ..."

Nonius (I 284.14) quotes the use of "acinus" from an author:-

"... obscurae auctoritatis<sup>1</sup>:  
 'pressusque labris unus acinus arebat.'"

Although "baltea" in the plural is found in Early authors, the singular is scarcely attested. The examples of "baltea" are both from Nonius (I 285.14f.):-

"Balteus masculini ... Neutro. ... Accius<sup>2</sup> ...:  
 'actoribus manuleos baltea machaeras'.  
 Livius<sup>3</sup> ...:  
 'auratae vaginae, aurata baltea illis erant'."

The only example of "balteus" in authors within the Early period is a disputed one from Livius Andronicus<sup>3</sup>, given by 42

- 
1. Cn. Matius fr. 17
  2. Didasc. l. 13 L. Müller
  3. fr. 45 Morel

Terentianus Maurus (VI 383.193lf.):-

"Livius ille vetus Graio cognomine suae  
inserir Inoni versus, puto, tale docimen:

...  
'et iam purpureo suras include cothurno,  
balteus et revocet volucres in pectore sinus,'"

These lines are also quoted by Marius Victorinus (VI 68.5f.). The general consensus of modern opinion is that the lines are not as Livius wrote them. Even if they were refashioned from original lines of Livius, there is no guarantee that any given word is a faithful reproduction of the original.

It would seem, therefore, that "balteus" in its vagaries of gender is ill-attested amongst Early authors and that a study of it must fall within a later period than that which is treated now.

The case of "caseus" is different, for both masculine and neuter genders are well-attested. The masculine is more usual and it is this gender which is mainly used in Classical times. Two Early examples may be chosen from the several available. Cato, De Agricultura 88.2 has the plural:-

"... vel carnem vel caseos vel salsamenta quo condas."

In Plautus, Captivi 851, we read:-

"Horaeum, scombrum et trygonem et cetum et mollem  
caseum".

The neuter is attested several times. Cato, De

Agricultura 76, gives instructions on cheese-making and three times uses the neuter gender:-

"Ubi omne caseum bene siccaveris, in mortuarium purum manibus condepsito ..."

"Caseumque per cribrum facito transeat ..."

"Donec omne caseum cum melle abusus eris."

Here it is obvious that Cato is speaking of cheese in bulk.

Further examples are provided by the grammarians, amongst them, Nonius (I 294.9f.):-

Novius<sup>1</sup> ... "Caseus generis masculini ... Caseum neutri.

"pecunia!  
quid bonum breve est?" respondi; "Sardiniense  
caseum!"

Plautus<sup>2</sup> ....: "... cum virgis caseum radi potest'."

Pomponius<sup>3</sup> is quoted by Charisius (I 79.15f.):-

"caseus masculini ... sed Pomponius ...:  
'caseum molle'".

A word which in the Early period is only found in Cato is "catinum", "food-dish". Cato uses the word in De Agricultura 84:-

"Catinum fictile oleo unguito."

The masculine form (which E.-M. and W.-H. both give as the

- 
1. 45
  2. Par. Med. fr. II
  3. 62

more usual) does not occur until Varro. Its continuance is shown by its later appearance in Pliny.

It may be seen, therefore, that there is a variation of gender but it is not possible to discover when this occurs.

A very obscure word which occurs once in Latin is "charadrus/caradrum". Apuleius, Apologia 39, quotes from Ennius<sup>1</sup>:-

"Mytilenae est pecten C(h) aradrumque apud  
Ambraciae sus."

"Carabusque" is read by Colvius (1588) and "charadrusque" by Scaliger (1600).

As this is the only occurrence of the word in Latin, the variation is one of text rather than of gender.

The word "clivus" of which few examples are found in Early authors, shows that it regularly uses the masculine in the singular and the neuter in the plural.

An example of the masculine is found in Terence, Adelphi 575:-

"Clivos deorsum vorsum est".

The only example of the neuter within the Archaic period is from a quotation in Nonius (I 286.30) which includes another doubtful example:-

---

1. Hedyph. 36

"Clivus generis masculini ... Neutri apud Mem<sup>m</sup>ium invenimus, cuius auctoritas dubia est:

Cato<sup>1</sup>...: 'ne ardua nitens fortunae escendere cliva.'  
'loca ardua et cliva depressa.'

The masculine plural does not appear until Horace<sup>2</sup> and the neuter singular only in Inscriptions.

"Forus", "forum", "fori" and "fora" are widely-used forms. "Forum" seems to be the most usual. In the Early period, however, the masculine is several times attested. The singular is found in a discussion in Nonius (I 303.17f.):-

"Forum generis neutri. Masculini Lucilius<sup>3</sup>...:  
'Romanis ludis forus olim ornatu' lucernis'...  
Pomponius<sup>4</sup>...:  
'balnea,  
forus, macellus, fana, portus, porticus.'

Charisius gives his views (I 71.27f.):-

"Forum neutro genere dicimus locum rebus agendis destinatum vel cum commercium significamus; et Lucilius<sup>5</sup>:  
'cum illi fora irant'  
masculine autem tabulata navium, et semper pluraliter, quamvis Gellius<sup>6</sup> fora navium neutraliter dixerit et Lucilius<sup>7</sup> negotiorum forum masculine extulerit ..."

In a very mutilated inscription of the first twenty years

- 
1. Orat. XXX 2
  2. Ep. I 13.10 viribus uteris per clivos
  3. III 63
  4. 37
  5. Inc. 120
  6. fr. 32
  7. III 63, cf. Nonius above



or so of the last century B.C. (C.I.L. I<sup>2</sup> 809) we find:-

"PONE  . FOROS"

The commentator supposes that these are the "fori publici" round the Forum Boarium, to which Livy alludes (XXIX 37).

Although "frenum" is always neuter in the singular, both masculine and neuter forms are attested in the plural, both within the Early period.

M. Duronius, the orator<sup>1</sup>, is attested by Valerius Maximus (II 9.5) as using the masculine plural:-

"Freni sunt iniecti vobis, Quirites, nullo modo perpetiendi ...".

The masculine is also used by Accius as quoted by Nonius (II 478.15) for his use of "ferus":-

"Accius<sup>2</sup>  
'perite in stabuleis frenos inmittens feris'."

Elsewhere, Nonius discusses the word (I 303.11f.):-

"Frenos masculini ... Neutro ... Accius<sup>3</sup>...:  
'frena tesauri equorum accommodant.'"

The textual question has no bearing on "frena".

The Classical masculine gender of "gladius" is known in the earliest period of Latin literature, for it is used by

- 
1. fr. 1
  2. Trag. 416
  3. Trag. 686

Plautus<sup>1</sup>. There is one probable attestation of the neuter by Nonius (I 307.12f.):-

"Gladius masculini. Neutri Lucilius<sup>2</sup>:  
'haerebat mucro gladiumque in pectore totum'".

It is possible that, had Nonius read the next line he may have found a verb to which "gladium ... totum" is the direct object. The sense makes this difficult and it seems that Nonius' information here must be regarded as accurate.

A much more doubtful possibility of a neuter gender occurs in Plautus, Casina 908, where the text is incomplete:-

"Oh, erat maximum;  
\* \* haberet metui: id quaerere cecepi \* \* \*  
dum gladium quaero ne habeat, \* arripio \* \* capulum.  
sed cum cogito, non habuit gladium; nam esset  
frigidus."

"Id" does not necessarily refer to "gladium"<sup>3</sup>. Further, "frigidus" may refer to "gladium" (acc.) in the same line.

The neuter gender would not be at all well attested were it not for several occurrences in Varro. In De Lingua Latina V 116 and VIII 45 and Res Rusticae I 48 he treats the word as a neuter, in IX ~~40~~ <sup>81</sup> he notes that both masculine and neuter genders are used.

To Quintilian's puristic mind, the neuter gender is

- 
1. e.g. Cas. 660 quid eum gladium
  2. Inc. 85
  3. cf. N.-W. I 798

"wrong", as he points out in Institutio Oratoria I 5.16:-

"Gladia qui dixerunt, genere exciderunt."

Surely there is no more certain proof of the existence of the neuter gender!

Three times in Early authors occurs the word for "endive", "intibum/s" and each time it is masculine. All three passages are quoted by Nonius (I 307.31f.):-

"Intiba generis neutri. ... Masculini. Lucilius<sup>1</sup>...:  
 'intubu' praeterea pedibus praetensus equinis.'  
 idem<sup>2</sup>...:  
 'pulmentaria, ut intubus aut aliqua id genus herba.'  
 Pomponius<sup>3</sup>...:  
 edunt libenter [pedibus] <sup>rustici</sup> tristis, atros intibos.'"

The passage from Lucilius XX also occurs in Nonius (I 200.27). Charisius (I 100.26f.) also treats the subject, quoting the passage from Lucilius V, which occurs a third time in the Scholiast on Georgics I 120.<sup>4</sup>

The neuter does not occur until Pliny.

For "iocus" both masculine and neuter forms are attested in the plural. The masculine is attested twice within the period under discussion. Plautus, Stichus 658, has:-

"Quot risiones, quot iocos, quot savia,"

- 
1. V 21
  2. XX 3
  3. 128
  4. III - II 226.5

and Cato<sup>1</sup> is quoted by Macrobius (III 14.9):-

"'Graecos versus agit, iocos dicit, voces demutat..."

There should be a third example of the masculine plural in Early times, according to N.-W.<sup>2</sup>, who find "iocos" in Plautus, Bacchides 519. Both the Oxford and Teubner texts here read "logos". The manuscripts quarrel between "logos" (Ambrosian Palimpsest) and "iocum" (Palatina) though "iocos" does not enter the lists.

The neuter plural first appears somewhat later, in Lucretius<sup>3</sup>, and is the usual form by the time of Cicero.

Amongst the numerous examples of the use of the word "locus" can be found plurals in both masculine and neuter forms and also a neuter singular, in addition to the masculine singular. The neuter plural forms are regularly used in this noun with collective sense, as in Cato, De Agricultura 34.2:-

"'Quae loca sicca et non herbosa erunt."

The masculine plural is, again regularly, used when the plural and not the collective sense is intended, as in Plautus, Trinummus 931:-

"'quos locos adisti?' 'nimium mirimodis mirabilis'"

---

1. Orat. XL 5

2. I 813

3. V 1397 tum ioca tum sermo tum dulc@s esse cachinni

- and an enumeration of the places follows.

The neuter singular is found once amongst the *Fragmenta Bobiensia* (VII 542.9):-

"Hoc locum lectum est apud Ennium<sup>1</sup> sed nemo dicit hodie."

Further examples of the masculine will prove interesting.

Naevius<sup>2</sup> is quoted by Nonius (II 506.33) though not for "locos":-

"Naevius ...:  
'vos qui regalis corporis custodias  
agitatis, ite actutum in frundiferos locos".

Although Lindsay gives no variant reading, Ribbeck gives "lucos" from one manuscript, which would make very good sense.

Marmorale's 1950 edition<sup>3</sup> has "locos" and a note to the effect that Early writers, especially Plautus, use "loci" and "loca" indifferently.

A second example is taken from a quotation from Ennius<sup>4</sup> by Cicero in De Divinatione (I 20.40f.):-

"'Nam me visus homo pulcher per amoena salicta  
et ripas raptare locosque novos:'"

Plautus, Pseudolus 595 contains "loci":-

"Hi loci sunt atque hae regiones quae mi ab ero sunt  
demonstratae".

The accusative plural occurs in a quotation from Accius<sup>5</sup> by

- 
1. Inc. 51
  2. Trag. 22
  3. p. 192
  4. Ann. 40
  5. Trag. 530

by Varro, De Lingua Latina (VII 11):-

"'Volcania templa sub ipsis  
collibus, in quos delatus locos'".

Cato uses the masculine plural with two different meanings.

A specialized meaning is found in De Agricultura 157.11:-

"Si mulier ~~esse~~ locos fovebit"

and the ordinary meaning in a passage<sup>1</sup> quoted by Aulus Gellius  
(III 7.1, III 7.17):-

"M. Cato libris originum de Q. Caedicio tribuno  
militum scriptum reliquit. Id profecto est ad hanc ferme  
sententiam:

'Imperator Poenus ... colles locosque idoneos  
prior occupat... (17) Consul ... se in locos tutos atque  
editos subducit.'"

The masculine is also found in a quotation by Nonius  
(I 311.1f.):-

"Loca ... neutri. ... masculini ... Naevius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'convenit, regnum simul atque locos ut haberent.'"

In an historical passage, comparable with that of Cato  
above, Sisenna uses the neuter. The passage is quoted by  
Nonius (III 806.25):-

"Sisenna<sup>3</sup>...:  
idem<sup>4</sup>: 'omnia, quae dicimus, loca statim potitus'.  
'hostis loca superiora potiti'".

- 
1. Orig. IV 7
  2. fr. 47 Morel
  3. fr. 42
  4. fr. 135

"Lupinus" is attested in masculine and neuter genders, both of which Cato uses, the masculine in De Agricultura 96.1:-

"Aquam in qua lupinus deferterit ..."

and the neuter in 34.2:-

"ager rubricosus ... ibi lupinum bonum fiet."

Later, the word is used frequently by Columella, though usually in the genitive or ablative, so that the gender cannot be discerned. One definite example of each case is found - the neuter in II 7.1 in an enumeration of types of grain and the masculine in XI 2.72:-

"Tum etiam lupini haec erit praecipua satio, quem quidam ... deferri putant oportere."

Variation of gender in this word therefore continues after the Early period.

"Millus" and "melium" are both attested once, in such a way that they seem to be alternative forms of the same word. The former is found in Paulus' Epitome of Festus (137.3):-

"Millus collare canum venaticorum, factum ex corio ... Scipio Aemilianus<sup>1</sup> ad populum:  
'vobis' inquit 'reique publicae praesidio erit is, quasi millus cani.'"

The other is used by Varro, Res Rusticae II 9.15:-

"Ne vulnarentur a bestiis, inponuntur his collaria quae vocantur melium, id est cingulum circa collum".

---

1. fr. 15

The question of gender must be left until more is known about the word.

Cato gives directions for making must-cakes in De Agricultura 121:-

"Mustaceos sic facito."

In later times the neuter is found, as in Juvenal, VI 202:-

"ducendi nulla videtur  
causa, nec est quare coenam et mustacea perdas".

These two passages are the only ones in which the gender can be discerned.

The Early examples of the use of "pilleus" are inconclusive as to its gender. The word is only found in Plautus, the passages in which the gender may be recognized being quoted by Nonius (I 325.11):-

"Pilleus generis masculini. Plautus<sup>1</sup>...:  
'pilleum  
quem habuit deripuit eumque ad caelum tollit'  
... neutri. Plautus<sup>2</sup>...:  
'em te obsecro,  
Lyde, pilleum meum, mi sodalis, mea salubritas'".

The only other example of definite masculine gender is not found until Vegetius.

---

1. Dub. et Susp. Fr. II  
2. Corn. Fr. VI



In Latin "porrum" is generally neuter though the regular plural is "porri", "porra" not appearing until very late. However, a masculine singular is attested by Fronto, Ad Caesarem II 6.4:-

"Laberius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'amor tuus tam cito crescit quam porrus".

This information may not be accurate, but there are no certain grounds for mistrusting it.

The neuter singular is not found till Horace and the neuter plural not till the Moretum. The plural, according to the grammarians, is regularly masculine. However, the examples available to us are from late authors, such as Martial and Pliny. There is one disputed passage in the Grammaticus de Dubiis Nominibus (V 588.1):-

"Porrum generis neutri sed Varro 'ponuntur tenues porri.'"

Though the manuscripts offer no problem here, the line has been claimed for Lucilius by Marx<sup>2</sup> on the grounds that the Grammaticus attributes to Varro lines which have been proved to be from other authors.

Examples of the use of this word in the Early period are not, then, conclusive but in any case, the neuter is not attested at that time.

---

1. 133  
2. Commentary on 1370

The regular plural of "rastrum" is "rastri" and the neuter does not appear until the time of Ovid.

Six examples of a definite masculine gender have been found in the Early period. Plautus uses it in Mercator 277:-

"I tu hinc ad villam, atque istos rastros vilico  
pisto ipsi facito ut coram tradas in manum."

In Terence, Heautontimorumenos 88, we find:-

'At istos rastros interea tamen  
adpone"

and in 931:-

"Menedeme, mihi illaec vere ad rastros res redit."

As one would expect, the word is found in Cato. De Agricultura 10.3 has:-

"Rastros quadridentes II"

in an enumeration of implements and in 11.4 there is the same expression. The word occurs in a quotation in Nonius (I 92. 23):-

"Ennius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'rastros dentefabres capsit causa poliendi  
agri.'"

The gender of this word undergoes the same developments as that of "frenum" except that the neuter plural is of later appearance.

---

1. Ann. 319

Second Declension - Masculine (Neuter)

A masculine form "aevus" is attested much earlier than the neuter form. Plautus uses it in Poenulus 1187:-

"Iuppiter qui genus colis <sup>a</sup> celisque hominum, per quem  
vivimus vitalem aevom."

As final "m" before an initial vowel is metrically equivalent to a final vowel before an initial one, perhaps it would not be wise to set too much store by this example. However the masculine is found unequivocally in Lucretius (II 561):-

"... aevum debebunt sparsa per omnem"

and in III 605:-

"non modo non omnem possit durare per aevom".

Catullus (I 6) uses what appears to be a neuter:-

"omne aevum tribus explicare cartis".

A similar expression is used by Virgil, Aeneid IX 609:-

"omne aevom ferro teritur".

In each of these examples "omne" occurs where its final syllable is elided; "omnem" would likewise have its final syllable elided and so is metrically possible. Virgil uses the word frequently, but only in the passage quoted above can the gender be discerned. Other Augustan authors do use a neuter.

As the neuter gender is not attested during the period under discussion, nor directly after it (except by Catullus?)

it is likely that it was not in use, for in a word so widely used it is probable that some indication of an Early variation in gender would have survived.

It is fairly certain that "clipeus" is originally a masculine though the neuter is also frequent.

There are several passages within the Early period in which the gender of "clipeus" is obvious. The masculine singular is found in Plautus, Trinummus 596:-

"Gestandust peregre clupeus, galea, sarcina."

Further passages in which the masculine is used are quoted by the Grammaticus de Dubiis Nominibus (V 574.24f.):-

"Clipeus generis masculini, ut Ennius<sup>1</sup> 'cecidit clipeus' ... et Pomponius<sup>2</sup> generis neutri 'clipeum in medium fixum est'."

Varro (De Lingua Latina VII 93) also quotes the passage from Ennius, but does not concern himself with "clipeus".

"Clipeum" from Pomponius is quoted again by Charisius (I 77.19).

The subject is also discussed by Nonius (I 288.21f.):-

"Clipeus generis masculini ... Neutro ... Licinius<sup>3</sup>:  
 Laberius<sup>4</sup>....: 'in Marte pars magna laevis clipea portant'.  
 'hoc voluit clipeum contra pellem  
 proici.'"

- 
1. Fab. 418
  2. 29
  3. (historian) fr. 23
  4. 83

A more unusual word than the last is "compitus". Within the Early period the gender is observable in one passage only - a quotation by Nonius (I 288.5f.):-

Caecilius<sup>1</sup> "Compita generis neutri ... Masculino ...  
...:  
'ubi adiacentem compitum.'"

The only other Early example of the word appears in Cato, De Agricultura 5.3:-

"Rem divinam nisi Conpitalibus in compito aut in focone faciat."

How W.-H. find a neuter here is puzzling.

The neuter singular is in fact not attested, though the neuter plural is frequent. To assume a neuter singular on the grounds of the existence of a neuter plural is dangerous.

This may be what Varro does in De Lingua Latina VI 43:-

"Sic ... caseus nominatus, ... sic compitum nominatum."

The word is used out of its own context and there is no guarantee that Varro did not use this form merely because it is the neuter which is used in the plural - which was current at that time. It must be remembered that he is quoted as using the masculine form<sup>2</sup>.

- 
1. 226
  2. Non. I 288.5 ... Varro de Scaenicis Originibus lib. III: 'ubi compitus erat aliquis'

The word "modius" shows an aberration from the masculine gender in Cato, De Agricultura 58:-

"Pulmentarium familiae. ... ubi oleae comesae erunt, hallecem et acetum dato. oleum dato in menses uni cuique S.I. salis uni cuique in anno modium satis est."

One need only supply "dare" to destroy the certainty of the neuter gender. Dr. Szemerényi believes that there is no real evidence here for the assumption of a neuter.

Another isolated neuter form is found in the word "mundus". The passage in which it occurs is quoted twice. In Nonius (I 316.13) we find:-

Lucilius<sup>1</sup>...: "Mundus muliebris generis est masculini. Neutri. 'legat uxori mundum omne penumque.'"

A slightly different version is found in Gellius (IV 1.3):-

"Mundum quoque muliebrem Lucilius ... neutro ...: 'legavit quidam uxori mundum omne penumque.'"

In Nonius (I 326.1f.) we find examples of the masculine gender of either "pistillus" or "pastillus":-

"Pistillus masculino Novius<sup>2</sup>...: 'lacrimae cadent.'—  
idem<sup>3</sup> ...: "calet pistillus."  
'testas, patinas, pistillos mihi cantant.'

- 
1. XVI 3  
2. 58  
3. 28

Neutro Munatius:

'pistillum grande est'."

For "Munatius" some manuscripts read "oratus". Lindsay also mentions, without accepting, the variant reading "cadet pastillus". L. Müller (1888) reads "pastillus, etc." throughout the quotation. He attempts to explain the first passage in a note (reading "cadet pastillus"):-

"lamentanti mulieri respondet cavillator, nisi flere desinat, fore ut pastillus, quem formae conservandae causa induxerat ori, madore corruptus, cadat."

In Horace, Satires I 2.27 and repeated in I 4.92, there is the line:-

"Pastillos Rufinus olet, Gargonius hircum."

However, Horace is not recorded as using the phrase "pastillum grande est", so it is unlikely that "oratus" should be read in this passage of Nonius. Further, the passages in Horace definitely have "pastillos" and could have no bearing on a passage dealing with "pistillus". Therefore, if one reads "pistillus, etc." here, one is doubly prevented from reading "oratus". It remains to identify Munatius.

It appears that the only Munatius to write anything which has survived is the L. Munatius Plancus with whom Cicero corresponded and L. Müller would identify him with the Munatius mentioned by Nonius. However, Cicero's correspondent found no

cause, as far as we know, to use the word "pistillum". It is still doubtful, therefore, whether we may ascribe this fragment to him.

It seems fairly obvious that a neuter form "pistillum" does not occur within the Early period. In Plautus, Aulularia 95 "pistillum" is used, but as an accusative with "abstulisse dicito". In the Moretum<sup>1</sup> the masculine gender is found again and in Pliny<sup>2</sup> the gender cannot be ascertained, which shows that the neuter is not even found at a much later date.

If the reading in Nonius should be "pastillus, etc." the gender-variation of the word, which occurs as neuter from Varro<sup>3</sup>, does not concern the Early period.

In the Early Latin period "sagus" is generally used in the masculine. Nonius (I 331.33f.) makes the following remark:-

"Sagum generis neutri ... Masculini Ennius<sup>4</sup>:  
'tergus igitur sagus pinguis opertat.'"

Further passages are quoted by Charisius (I 105.10f.):-

"Sagum neutro genere ... Sed Afranius<sup>5</sup> ...:  
et Ennius<sup>6</sup> 'quia quadrati sunt sagi'  
'sagus caerulus'."

The Afranius fragment is also quoted by the Grammaticus de Dubiis Nominibus (V 591.9).

According to both E.-M. and Lewis and Short, the masculine

- 
1. 112 sed gravior lentos ibat pistillus in orbes
  2. XXXIV 169 in lapideo mortario ... plumbum pistillum  
terere malunt
  3. ap. Charis. I 37.15
  4. Ann. 508
  5. 44
  6. Ann. 509



form is archaic. However, on an examination of the references in Lewis and Short it is found that, with one exception, whenever the neuter gender is recognizable the word is used in the plural and that the metaphorical sense is very common. The exception is Tacitus, Germania 17:-

"Tegumen omnibus sagum fibula, aut, si desit, spina consertum."

Cato, De Agricultura 59, uses a somewhat ambiguous expression:-

"Saga (dato) alternis annis. quotiens cuique tunicam aut sagum dabis, prius veterem accipito."

Are we to suppose that the adjective agrees only with the noun farther from it? The alternative is to acknowledge the use of a neuter plural and masculine singular side by side.

It would appear, therefore, that the neuter singular is barely attested and not at all till Silver Latin.

A masculine form of "salum" "open sea" is remarked upon by Nonius (I 330.24):-

"Salum neutri ... Masculini. Ennius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'undantem salum.'"

Varro, De Lingua Latina V 123, discusses a word "sinum". This occurs later in Columella<sup>2</sup>. The earliest textual evidence is for the masculine, as in Plautus, Curculio 82:-

"... cum vino sinus fertur"

and in Rudens 1319:-

- 
1. Fab. 195
  2. e.g. VII 8.2 sinum lactis (nom.)

"Praeterea sinus, cantharus, ..."

These forms can belong to either the second or the fourth declension. As the later variant is "sinum" it would be strange if they belonged to the fourth<sup>1</sup>.

According to Nonius (I 331.1f.) "sparus" is both masculine and neuter:-

"Spari quod genus est teli, masculino genere, ut est apud Vergilium<sup>2</sup>:

'agrestisque manus armat sparus'

Neutro Lucilius<sup>3</sup>:

'tum spara, tum rumicis.'"

Later, with no comment on the gender, he remarks (III 891.20f.):-

"Sparum telum agreste. Vergilius ...:

'agrestisque manus armat sparus'

Varro<sup>4</sup> ...:

'aut ille cervum qui volabilei currens sparo secutust tragulave traiecit.'

Sisenna<sup>5</sup>....:

'sparis ac lanceis eminus peterent hostis.'"

The only passage above which allows the gender of "sparus" to be determined is the one from Lucilius, which occurs again in Paulus' Epitome of Festus (443.16). This passage is also the only one in which the neuter gender is attested. (W.-H. see the neuter in the passages from Varro and Sisenna quoted above.)

Latin appears to have borrowed a gender-variation from

- 
1. W.-H. give "sinus, -ūs Pl."
  2. Aen. XI 682
  3. Inc. 109
  4. fr. 293
  5. fr. 21

Greek when it borrowed from σύμβολος/v. From the Latin point of view, the masculine gender is mainly used in the Early period, the neuter being doubtfully attested twice. The manuscripts of Plautus, Pseudolus 648 and 1001 vary between "symbolus" and "symbolum", in general favouring the masculine.

The masculine is found frequently in the Early period, particularly in Plautus, but also in Cato.<sup>1</sup>

Several grammarians discuss "supparus". Priscian merely lists it (II 169.6f.):-

"Sciendum tamen, quod vetustissimi in multis, ut diximus, supra dictarum terminationum inveniuntur confudisse genera, nulla significationis differentia coacti, sed sola auctoritate, ut ... 'supparus' περιώμιον et hoc supparum!"

Nonius defines the meaning without mentioning the gender (III 866.8f.):-

"Supparum est linteum femorale usque ad talos pendens ... Novius<sup>2</sup>...:

'"supparum purum, Veliense interim"'. "

In this passage quoted from Novius, Lindsay notes a textual variant "belliense". Ribbeck reads "Melitensem" and N.-W. quote from an edition reading "Viliensem". Whatever the reading, the final syllable would be elided before the following vowel, thus making it impossible to tell whether the "-m" were

---

1. Orat. II ap. Front. I 2.9  
2. 70

original or not.

Festus' remarks are fragmentary in the extreme (406.8f.):-

"  
 . <puellare dicebatu>r vestimen  
 <tun lineum quod et s>ubucula ap  
 <pellabatur. Titinnius<sup>1</sup> i>n Fullonia  
 omne quod  
 sup>parum puni-  
 cat Naevius<sup>2</sup> de  
 <bello Punic>o Et in Nautis<sup>3</sup>  
 estem conse  
 nunc supparos  
 na iam crucem  
 detur puella  
 A fra>nnius ait: 'Puella  
 non sum, supparo si in>duta sum!'"

With such a great amount of the text missing, it is impossible to say with certainty that in the reference to Titinius "omne quod" should be taken with "supparum".

Festus, moreover, discusses the word in its masculine form, as does Paulus (407.6).

Later, the neuter gender is used, but usually in the plural and signifying the sails of a ship.

It is impossible to be certain about the existence of a neuter form of this word in Early times.

The only evidence for the neuter gender of "trull<sup>e</sup>us", "wash-basin" is a passage in Varro, De Lingua Latina V 118:-

- 
1. 35<sup>1</sup>
  2. fr. 9
  3. Com. 64

"Ab eodem (trua) est appellatum Truleum",

Here, the word is used out of its own context.

A passage from Cato, De Agricultura 10.2 has been quoted as an example of the neuter gender<sup>1</sup>. However, the word "trullium" occurs here and "trulleum" in 11.3, in an enumeration of implements, all in the accusative case, and has no distinguishing adjective with it. The probability of its being in fact masculine is emphasized by the occurrence of the masculine in a quotation by Festus (168.20) under "nassiterna":-

"Cato<sup>2</sup>...:  
'quotiens vidi trulleos nassiternas pertusos'".

The masculine occurs again in a quotation by Nonius (I 33.27):-

"Lucilius<sup>3</sup>...  
'truleu' pro stomide huic ingens de naribu' pendet.'" "

There seems, therefore, no basis for the assumption of a neuter gender in the Early period. If Varro's "Truleum" is accepted, the neuter must have been introduced between the time of Cato and Lucilius and that of Varro.

The word "viscus" is not widely used. Its earliest attestation is in the masculine gender, in Plautus, Bacchides 50:-

"Viscus merus vostrast blanditia."

Charisius (I 32.14) probably refers to this:-

- 
1. cf. Lewis and Short
  2. Orat. I
  3. XV 17

"Viscum; sed Plautus 'viscus' dixit."

The Grammaticus de Dubiis Nominibus states (V 593.7f.):-

"Viscus ad capiendum generis masculini, ut illud 'in quercu viscus extat' sed consuetudo viscum quasi neutrum dicit."

The Grammaticus' theory is spoiled by the occurrence of the neuter "ad capiendum" in Pliny XVI 248:-

"Viscum fit ex acinis"

which Lewis and Short quote for the literal meaning.

Another passage in Pliny (XXIV 11) seems to refer to the first:-

"Viscum e robore praecipuum haberi diximus et quo conficeretur modo ... (12) Quidam id ... efficacius fieri putant ..."

It seems that both senses are intended here - the mistletoe being found on the oak-tree and the bird-lime being made from it. In any case the neuter is used.

Virgil uses the neuter gender in the literal meaning in Aeneid VI 205:-

"Quale solet silvis brumali frigore viscum  
fronde virere nova."

The neuter gender seems to have taken charge of both

meanings but one cannot say when.

The Latin word for "the mass of people", "vulgus" is usually neuter but the masculine is found in the Early period.

Nonius discusses the word at some length (I 341.17f.):-

"Vulgus neutro ... Lucilius<sup>1</sup> ...:  
 'dilectum video studiose vulgus habere.'  
 Masculino Sisenna<sup>2</sup>...:  
 'inperitum concitat vulgum.'  
 ... Accius<sup>3</sup>...:  
 'diffidamentem necideret  
 turbat vulgum, evitat, moeros disicit.'  
 idem<sup>4</sup>...:  
 'et nonne Argivos fremere bellum et velle vim  
 vulgum videt?'  
 Varro<sup>5</sup>...:  
 'quem si vulgus secutus esset'".

The first passage quoted from Accius is corrupt but "vulgum" stands firm.

In the three Early examples of the masculine gender, the accusative "vulgum" occurs - which is not necessarily masculine. If, however, in the corrupt passage, there is a masculine adjective, which there appears to be, "vulgum" must be masculine.

In Lucretius several supposedly masculine forms are found, "vulgum" in II 921 and "vulgi" frequently - which are both

- 
1. XIV 5
  2. fr. 48
  3. Trag. 347
  4. Trag. 288
  5. fr. 81

ambiguous as to gender.

The evidence for the masculine in the earliest period rests on a corrupt passage from Accius. The masculine is also very rare in later periods, though the form "vulgum" is frequent.

### Second Declension - Feminine and Neuter

"Buxum" for the more usual "buxus" f. occurs in a passage quoted by Servius on Georgics II 449 (III-I 260.19):-

"Buxum lignum, non arborem ... quamvis Ennius<sup>1</sup>  
 exemplo ...:  
 'longique cupressi stant sectis foliis et tamore  
 corpore buxum'."

Vahlen tentatively reads "rectis" and "amaro".

### Second Declension - Feminine (Masculine or Neuter)

Neuter gender is attributed to "humus" by Priscian (II 269.5f.):-

"humus ... etiam neutrum in -um ... Laevius<sup>2</sup>...:  
 'humum humidum pedibus fodit.'  
 Gracchus<sup>3</sup>...:  
 'mersit sequentis humidum plantis humum.'"

The simplest translation of the first passage would be "he dug the damp ground with his feet". This gives masculine or

- 
1. Ann. 262
  2. fr. 6
  3. Trag. 3



neuter gender for "humum". It is conceivably possible that the translation should rather be "he dug something damp (e.g. stercus?) into the ground with his feet". In this case, "humum" does not show any gender.

The second passage is more difficult. Priscian presumably supposes "humidum humum" to be a nominative, which would make intelligible translation impossible - "the damp ground covered those who were following with shoots". It may be that Priscian is taking an accusative "humidum ... humum" as a neuter, when it could also be masculine. The translation could then be "he (it) covered the damp ground with the shoots (footsteps) of the one following". A further alternative is that "humidum" does not agree with "humum". Such an interpretation would give a translation of approximately "something damp covered the ground with the shoots (less strange than "footsteps") of the one following".

None of these interpretations is really satisfactory. Dr. Szemerényi suggests a further one - that Gracchus, in translating from Greek, may have been mistaken in supposing that the word he translates by "humidum" agrees with the word he translates by "humum".

Priscian contradicts himself somewhat when (II 169.13) he includes "humum" in his list of nouns which were masculine or

feminine in the works of the "vetustissimi".

Although a masculine or neuter gender of "humus" is occasionally attested in later Latin<sup>1</sup>, the Early evidence must be regarded as very doubtful.

### Second Declension - Neuter (Masculine)

One of Cato's technical words comes into discussion under this head. In De Agricultura 12, he writes:-

"In torcularium quae opus sunt ... assercula ubi prela sita sient V."

The word occurs again in 152, without indication of gender:-

"in asserculo alligato".

This passage is supposed by N.-W. to show a neuter gender.

Their two references for the masculine gender - Columella VIII 3.6 "modicis asserculis", XII 52.4 "asserculos inter se distantes" likewise show the masculine gender but once.

The word occurs elsewhere only in glosses.

It is obvious that the neuter is the earlier gender and that the masculine is not attested in the Early period.

"Caelum" is mainly used in the neuter. Nonius notes use of the masculine (I 289.2f.):-

"Caelum neutro. Masculino

1. Apul. Met. I 13.48 parvo ... humo and Eccl. Latin

Lucretius<sup>1</sup>:  
 'quis pariter caelos omnis convertere et omnis  
 ignibus aetheriis terras suffeire feracis?'

Varro Rerum Divinarum VI, deum significans, non partem mundi:  
 'sic pater magnus, mater magna his sunt Caelus,  
 Tellus.'  
 Ennius<sup>2</sup>.  
 'fertis Romani quamquam caelu' profundus.'  
 idem<sup>3</sup>:  
 'Saturno  
 quem Caelus genuit.'"

The last two passages occur again in Charisius (I 72.12f.)  
 though he may have quoted Nonius rather than Ennius himself.

A further passage is quoted by Lactantius (I 14.1):-

"Ennius<sup>4</sup>... 'initio' inquit 'primus in terris  
 imperium summum Caelus habuit.'"

This passage is also quoted in the Epitome.

In some of the passages above the masculine is obviously a  
 personification. Even in the Lucretius passage there is some  
 idea of personification in that "caelos" are to be controlled  
 and ruled. N.-W. maintain that the masculine singular is  
 only used for the name of a god and quote Nonius. This surely  
 cannot apply to Nonius' first Ennius reference.

There is, then, in Early Latin one example of the masculine  
 which is not a personification.

- 
1. II 1097
  2. Ann. 546
  3. Ann. 27
  4. Sat. 60

"Calamistrum" is neuter in Plautus, Curculio 577:-

"At ita me volsellae, pecten, speculum, calamistrum  
meum".

This passage is quoted in part by Charisius (I 80.14) who also quotes Cicero<sup>1</sup> as using the masculine. Cicero is writing about the ornaments of rhetoric and the use seems to be echoed in Tacitus<sup>2</sup>, who writes of "calamistros Maecenatis" in reference to his florid style.

The masculine is not attested again. Its occurrence above is later than the period under discussion.

An isolated Early example of "candelabrum" in the masculine gender is quoted by Nonius (I 297.12f.):-

....: "Candelabrum generis neutri ... Masculini. Caecilius<sup>3</sup>

'memini ibi candelabrum ligneum ardentem'".

It may be that "ardentem" is in agreement with some other word, such as "candelam" - which is more likely to burn than the candle-stick. Even the "ligneum" might agree with a word which has not been preserved, for it does not seem very sensible to make a candle-stick of wood. If it were certain

- 
1. Or. XXIII 78
  2. De Orat. 26
  3. III

that Caecilius was remembering a blazing wooden candle-stick, "candelabrum" would have to be masculine, but as this is not certain, the gender is still in doubt.

The masculine gender occurs much later, in Petronius<sup>1</sup>.

"Castrum" has a diminutive "castellum" which appears to be attested in the masculine gender in the Sententia Menuciorum<sup>2</sup>:-

"INCASTELVM QVEI · VOCITATVST ALIANVS."

However, if one takes note of the familiar type of assimilation in Latin exemplified by the phrase "Thebae quod caput Boeotiae est" it is possible to take "QVEI" with "ALIANVS" and not with "CASTELVM"<sup>3</sup>.

The fact that Procopius in the sixth century A.D. uses καστέλλους can have no bearing on the present discussion.

"Lutum" is generally neuter. One example of the masculine from an Early author is quoted by Nonius (I 313.14f.):-

"Lutum gerere neutro ... Masculino Claudius<sup>4</sup>...:  
'pluvia imbri lutus erat multus'."

The regular neuter is also used by Early authors, being found for example, in Plautus<sup>5</sup>.

- 
1. 75.10 hic candelabrus
  2. C.I.L. I2 584.17
  3. The suggestion of Dr. Szemerényi
  4. Claud. Quad. fr. 94
  5. Most. 1167 lutum ~~pendens~~ Rud. 96 hoc ... lutum

For the neuter "macellum" the masculine is once found in the Early period. Nonius quotes Pomponius<sup>1</sup> for the masculine of "forus" (I 304.20):-

"balnea,  
forus, macellus, fana, portus, porticus".

There is another possible example of the masculine gender in Martial, X 96.9:-

"Hic pretiosa fames conturbatorque macellus."

W.-H. accept this as a masculine noun, while N.-W. reject it as being derived from "macer" - an adjective.

One's views on the matter must be decided by "conturbator" which occurs only once again (except in Mediaeval Latin) - in Martial VII 27.10:-

"Ad dominum redeas, noster te non capit ignis,  
conturbator aper: vilius esurio."

Here "conturbator" seems to be used as an adjective - which makes it possible that "macellus" in the previous Martial passage is a noun.

Even if Martial uses the masculine, it is doubtful whether it can have any bearing on the Pomponius passage.

Nonius discusses "patibulum" (I 327.13):-

"Patibulum genere neutro. Masculini Licinus  
Rerum Romanarum lib. XXI:  
'deligat ad patibulos, deligantur et circum-  
feruntur, cruci defiguntur'.

---

1. 37

Plautus<sup>1</sup>:

'patibulum ferat per urbem deinde adfigatur cruci'".

Though the manuscripts read "adfigat", a scholar "in Nonii ed. Basiliensi" emends to "adfigatur". Whichever reading one accepts, "patibulum" is still an accusative as the direct object of "ferat" and does not in this context indicate its gender.

This leaves, as evidence for the masculine, the passage from Licinus (who has become Varro in Lewis and Short, though the indices to Varro show no use of the word "patibulum").

A neuter plural, in the meaning of "vine-props" is found in Cato, De Agricultura 26:-

"Funis, patibula, fibulas iubeto ... condi."

Cato many times uses the word "qualum" and its diminutive "quasillum", a "basket" or "wine-strainer".

The masculine gender of "qualus" is used in a discussion of propagation in 52.1:-

"In aullas aut in qualos pertusos propagari oportet"

and:-

"Eum qualum--in arbore[m] relinquito."

The neuter is found in enumerations of implements in 11.5:-

"Corbular Amerinas XX, quala sataria vel alveos  
XL",

in 23.1:-

"Ad vindemiam ... vasa laventum<sup>f</sup>, corbulae sarciantur,

---

1. Carb. fr. II

picentur, dolia ... picentur ... quala parentur, sarciantur."

and in 68:-

"Ubi vindemia facta erit ... fiscinas, corbular, quala ... reponito."

"Quasillum" is also used in propagation, as stated in 133.3:-

"In arboribus radices uti capiant, calicem pertusum sumito tibi aut quasillum: per eum ramulum transserito; eum quasillum terra impleto."

There is no masculine plural of this word in this chapter.

Of "qualum" it is the masculine form which survives<sup>1</sup>, but in the meaning of "wine-strainer" or the like. The reading of a passage in Columella<sup>2</sup> which is quoted for having the neuter form<sup>3</sup> is disputed and Lundström reads "sintque illa mundissima" and not "quala mundissima".

On the other hand, the diminutive survives in the neuter form<sup>4</sup>, in the meaning of "wool-basket".

An isolated Early occurrence of "scutus" is quoted by Nonius (I 335.12):-

"Scutum generis neutri. Masculini. Turpilius<sup>5</sup>...: 'quia non minus res hominem quam scutus tegit.'"

The main manuscript gives "secutus".

The neuter is well-known in this period.

- 
1. Col. IX 15.12 saligneus qualus VIII 3.4. vimineos qualos
  2. VII 3.8
  3. cf. N.W. I 803
  4. Cic. Phil. III 4.10 inter quasilla
  5. 40



There is one very doubtful example of the masculine gender of "transtrum" "rowing-bench", which occurs in Nonius' discussion of "fervit" (III 808.27):-

"Naeuius<sup>1</sup>....:  
'late longeque Thraces nostros fervere.'"

Here Bothe (1834) has emended "Thraces" for "trans".

"Transtros" is an emendation of Ribbeck's. Klotz does not accept Ribbeck's emendation, on semantic grounds:-

"'transtros' Ribbeck de aedibus regiis igne consumptis accipiens, sed 'longe lateque' parum quadrat ad hanc sententiam."

In fact, "longe lateque" would apply far better to Thracians.

Although "tributum" is generally neuter, its only occurrences in Early Latin seem to be in the masculine gender.

Plautus used this in Epidicus 227 and 8:-

"At tributus quom imperatus est, negant pendi potis.  
Illis quibus tributus maior penditur pendi potest."

Geppert (1865) suspects these two lines and Fränkel<sup>2</sup> believes that Plautus has added 223-35 to the Greek original.

Nonius also quotes the masculine (I 339.9):-

"Tributum neutro. Masculine Cato<sup>3</sup>....:  
'ne praedia in lubricum derigerentur, cum tributus exigereetur.'"

Further, the masculine is found in the Lex Repetundinarum<sup>4</sup>:-

- 
1. Trag. 49
  2. Plaut. im Plautus p.135
  3. Orig. Inc. fr. 1
  4. C.I.L. I<sup>2</sup> 583.64, 66

11  
B

"Tributus factus erit."

Gellius, XIII 21. (20) 19 states:-

"... et 'hic tributus', quod 'tributum' nos dicimus, a plerisque veterum dicta sunt."

### Second Declension - Parts of Body

#### Masculine and Neuter

The gender of "cubitus/um" "elbow" or "cubit" is very unstable. There are three passages from Early authors in which it can be discerned. Plautus uses the singular in Captivi 796:-

"Nam meus est ballista pugnus, cubitus catapultast  
mihi."

The plural occurs in Stichus 311:-

"... Experiar fores an cubiti ac pedes plus valeant."

In both of these passages, the meaning is "elbow". The meaning "cubit" appears in a quotation in Nonius (I 296.14f.):-

"Cubitus masculini generis. Neutri. Lucilius<sup>1</sup>....:  
'Lysippi Iuppiter ista  
transibit quadraginta cubita altu' Tarento.'"

An examination of the references in the Thesaurus will confirm that there is a distinction of meaning and gender which is more or less maintained in Latin.

For "elbow" the masculine is used by Ovid<sup>2</sup> and Celsus, who, naturally, uses the word often. It is not used for "cubit"

---

1. XVI 10

2. Met. XIV 501 cubitusque levis sinuatur in alas

until the Vulgate, though the neuter in this meaning is found in Vitruvius<sup>1</sup> as well as in Livy<sup>2</sup> and Pliny<sup>3</sup>.

The neuter is used once for "elbow" by Pliny<sup>4</sup> but in juxtaposition with "genua", a situation suitable for the working of analogy.

There is variation also in one of the Latin words for "nose", "nasus/m".

In the Early period the neuter is used exclusively, as in Plautus, Amphitruo 444:-

"Sura, pes, statura, tonsus, oculi, nasum vel labra",

Curculio 110c:-

"Canem esse hanc quidem magis par fuit: sagax nasum  
habet",

Menaechmi 168:-

"Nam ex istoc loco spurcatur nasum odore inutili"

and in Miles Gloriosus 1256:-

"Nam odore nasum sentiat, si intus sit."

Lucilius also uses it several times and is quoted by

- 
1. III 1.2 pes vero altitudinis corporis sextae,  
cubitum quartae
  2. e.g. XXXVII 41.6 cuspides circa temonem ab iugo  
decem cubita exstantis velut cornua habebant
  3. e.g. VII 22 multos ibi quina cubita constat longi-  
tudine excedere
  4. XI 249 homini genua et cubita contraria

Nonius (I 317.3):-

"Nasus masculini. Neutri. Lucilius<sup>1</sup>...:  
 'queis oculi non sunt neque nasum et qualia Tsunt'  
 idem<sup>2</sup>...:  
 'nasum rectiu' huic homini est suraene pedesne?"

There are also two doubtful examples in Lucilius<sup>3</sup> but the word is sufficiently well attested without requiring resort to these.

#### Masculine (Neuter)

"Capillus" is nearly always masculine but Nonius quotes a neuter (I 291.18f.):-

"Capillus masculini ... Neutri. Plautus<sup>4</sup>...:  
 '... vide, capillum satin compositumst comode?"

The manuscripts of Plautus read "capillus" and "compositust". Lindsay (Oxford Classical Text) follows Nonius but Sonnenschein finds and explains Nonius' mistake - "satin" must come at the beginning of a question, therefore "capillum" is not part of the question (but accusative after "vide") and need not be neuter. He quotes 282:-

"Agedum, contempla aurum et pallam, satin haec (me)  
 deceat, Scapha."

Accordingly, Sonnenschein reads "capillum", "satin" and

- 
1. VII 16
  2. XXII 7
  3. Magis Susp. VI, VII
  4. Most. 254

"compositust".

"Capillus", therefore, does not occur in the neuter gender in spite of the statement of Nonius.

In Early authors, only the masculine of "collus" is found. The examples are numerous. Among them are Plautus, Amphitruo 445:-

"Malae, mentum, barba, collus, totus."

and Captivi 902:-

"Di immortales iam ut ego collos praetruncabo  
tegoribus!"

The first attestation of the neuter plural is in Catullus<sup>1</sup> and of the neuter singular, in Cicero<sup>2</sup>.

Once during the Early period the form "dorsus" is attested, by Nonius (I 298.5):-

"Dorsum neutri ... masculini. Plautus<sup>3</sup>...:  
'timeo quid rerum gesserim: ita dorsu' totu'  
prurit!"

Here the Ambrosian Palimpsest reads "dorsum totum".

In none of the several other passages in Plautus in which the word is used can the gender be discerned, but the masculine

- 
1. LXIV 38 mollescunt colla iuvenis
  2. Brutus 313 procerum et tenue collum
  3. Mil. 397

is used again by Caesar<sup>1</sup>.

The neuter is not definitely attested until later, in such authors as Quintus Curtius<sup>2</sup>.

"Lacertus" is discussed by Nonius (I 310.37):-

"Lacerti generis masculini. Neutri. Accius<sup>3</sup>...:  
 'concoquit  
 partem vapore flammae, tribuit in focos  
 veribus lacerta.'"

This appears to be the only use of the word in Early authors. The neuter does not occur again.

"Pugnum" is quoted by the Grammaticus de Dubiis Nominibus (V 587.12):-

"Pugnum Plautus<sup>4</sup> genere neutro ...:  
 'mihi haec balista pugnum est'".

The manuscripts of Plautus read "meus est ballista pugnum". Lindsay reads:-

"Nam meumst ballista pugnum, cubitus catapaltast  
 mihi."

In a note on the line he quotes the Grammaticus' words, but reads "hoc" for "haec" (which reading is not found in Keil).

These words, he suggests, may have been what Plautus wrote and

1. B.G. VII 44.3 dorsum esse eius iugi prope aequum, sed hunc silvestrem (O.C.T.)
2. III 4.7 per hoc dorsum
3. Trag. 222
4. Capt. 796

have been changed in a later recension to "meus est ... pugnus". The spelling "meust" for "meumst" may have been mistaken for "meus est", thus leading to the form "pugnus".

This seems possible, but the change from "mihi haec (or 'hoc')" to "meust" is one which needs a good deal of explanation. Lindsay is the only modern scholar to recognize the form "pugnum" and it does seem that it would be better to regard it as an error of the Grammaticus.

A syncopated form of "uterus" is attested by Nonius (I 276.11):-

"Uter pro uterus. Caecilius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'nunc uter  
crescit'".

Nonius also discusses the gender of the word (I 341.27f.):-

"Uterus masculino ... Neutro Plautus<sup>2</sup>...:  
'perii, mea nutrix! obsecro! uterum dolet!'  
Turpilius<sup>3</sup>...:  
'disperii misera! uterum cruciatur mihi!'  
Afranius<sup>4</sup>...:  
'consedid uterum'".

The neuter recurs once in later Latin<sup>5</sup>.

- 
1. 94
  2. Aul. 691
  3. 179
  4. 345
  5. Apul. Apol. 85.571 o infelix uterum tuum

Neuter (Masculine)

Early authors use both masculine and neuter forms of "corium". The neuter is more usual but the masculine is attested in Plautus, Poenulus 139:-

"Tris facile corios contrivisti bubulos."

This is also quoted by Nonius (I 293.16) for the masculine.

This gender is noted by Festus (53.1):-

"Corius ... masculino ... Plautus<sup>1</sup>:

'iam tibi tuis meritis crassus corius redditus est.'"

The masculine recurs in Varro<sup>2</sup> but never replaces the neuter.

Third Declension - Masculine and Feminine

Cato uses "canalis" as a feminine in De Agricultura 18.6:-

"Aram ubi facies, pedes V fundamenta alta facito, lata P. VI, aram et canalem rutundam facito latam P. IIIIS, ceterum pavimentum totum P. II facito."

The feminine is definite as far as the reading is concerned, but the meaning is puzzling. These directions form part of the instructions for building a wine-press. It may be that the "aram et canalem" should be considered as a whole, the "canalem" being an appendage of the "aram". If so, the feminine adjectives would agree with "aram".

---

1. Inc. Fr. V

2. Sat. Men. 135 ap. Non. I 292.16 corius ulmum tuu' depavit



In 18.2 "canalis" is used again:-

"Pavimentum binis vasis cum canalibus duabus".

The manuscripts read "duobus" but Keil has emended on the strength of the feminine quoted above.

Varro<sup>1</sup> uses the feminine three times, the masculine not at all. The masculine is not attested until the Augustan Age.

In the Early period, "stirps" uses only the masculine in its literal sense, both masculine and feminine genders in its metaphorical sense.

For the masculine gender of the word used in the literal sense there is an example in Cato, De Agricultura 40.2:-

"Stirpem praecisum circumligato."

The feminine is first attested by Cicero, who uses it many times.

For the metaphorical sense there are examples of the masculine quoted by Nonius (I 336.28f.):-

"Stirpem generis feminini ... Masculino Ennius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'nomine Pyrrhus uti memorant, a stirpe supremo.'  
Pacuvius<sup>3</sup>...:

'dubito ...  
... quod primordium capissam ad stirpem exquir-  
rendum.'"

- 
1. R.R. III 5.2 per canales angustas III 7.8 in canalibus quas III 11.2 perpetua canalis
  2. Ann. 178
  3. 51

The Ennius passage is also quoted by Festus (364.4, 412.22).

Charisius also notes the masculine (I 109.24f.):-

Pacuvius<sup>1</sup>: "... etiam in significatione sobolis masculino ...  
'qui stirpem occidit meum.'

Beda (VII 291.18f.) seems to copy Charisius.

Festus' discussion of "stirps" is largely lost, but he does seem to quote several examples of the masculine gender. Apart from the Ennius passage quoted above, one further quotation is relevant (412.20):-

"vius<sup>2</sup>. 'O Strymon \* \* \*  
'Graio stirpe exo \* \* \*"

The feminine occurs in passages not quoted expressly for this usage.

Nonius (III 688.3) quotes:-

"Accius<sup>3</sup>...:  
'ab draconis stirpe armata exortus'".

The other quotations occur in Nonius also, (III 749.31f.):-

"Accius<sup>4</sup>...:  
'... stirpe cum inclyta Cadmeide'  
"Accius<sup>5</sup>...:  
'... nobilitas late ex stirpe praeclara evagat'".

As Nonius is not concerned with "stirps" he may have

- 
1. 421
  2. Livius 41 Klotz
  3. Trag. 596
  4. Trag. 235
  5. Trag. 643

automatically given it the gender current in his own time, though one cannot disregard his testimony on mere suspicion.

The feminine is seen once more in a quotation by Macrobius (VI 5.15):-

"Laberius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'licentiam et libidinem ut tollam petis  
togatae stirpis.'"

In later times both genders are used for the literal meaning, only the feminine for the metaphorical meaning.

"Torques" is frequently attested in both masculine and feminine genders in Classical times. Both genders occur in the Early period and are attested by Nonius (I 338.31f.):-

"Torquem generis masculini. Lucilius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'conventus pulcher. braciae, saga fulgere; torques  
†datis magni.'  
... Feminini ... Claudius Quadrigarius<sup>3</sup>...:  
'... torquem detraxit, eamque sanguinolentam sibi  
in collum inponit.'"

The passage from Lucilius is quoted again by Nonius (IV 814.23), without "†datis". L. Müller emends in both passages to "induti magni". Gellius (IX 13.18) quotes the passage from Claudius Quadrigarius.

- 
1. 42
  2. XI 1
  3. fr. 10 b.

There is a further example of the feminine, attested by Charisius (I 145.19f.):-

"Hic et haec torques ... Laevius<sup>1</sup>...:  
 'collum marmoreum torques gemmata coronat.'"

The only instance of the use of "torques" in Plautus is in Asinaria 696:-

"Circumda torquem e bracchiis".

The gender cannot be discerned, except, apparently, by W.-H. who maintain that it is feminine in Plautus.

### Third Declension - Masculine (Feminine)

The feminine of "cardo" is attested twice. Nonius discusses the word (I 297.15f.):-

"Cardo generis masculini ... Feminino Gracchus<sup>2</sup>...:  
 'sonat impulsa  
 regia cardo.'"

DePrius (1593) emends to "inpulsu", which Ribbeck accepts.

Priscian also discusses the word (II 206.10):-

"'Hic cardo' ... tamen ... feminino ... Gracchus<sup>3</sup>...:  
 'O grata cardo'".

The regular masculine is also attested in the Early period<sup>4</sup>.

- 
1. fr. 1 (Naevii Cypria Ilias)
  2. 2 (tragedian)
  3. 1 (tragedian)
  4. e.g. Pl. Curc. 94 muttit cardo? est lepidus

Once Plautus appears to use the feminine of "culex", in Casina 239:-

"Eho tu nihili, cana culex!"

Some manuscripts read "nihil hic anaculix".

Plautus uses "culices" as a term of abuse in Curculio 500.

The evidence for the feminine gender cannot be taken seriously as, not only is the reading doubtful, but if a feminine were used, it would probably merely be coined to cause additional laughter and would not attest a morphological variant.

The feminine gender of "finis" appears to be well-attested in the Early period. The word is discussed by Nonius (I 301.5f.):-

"Finem masculino ... Feminino ... Accius<sup>1</sup>...:  
 'neque ulla interea finis curarum datur.'...  
 Caelius<sup>2</sup>...  
 'at aliquam huic bello finem facere'  
 Cassius Hemina<sup>3</sup>...:  
 'qua fine omnis res atque omnis artis humanitus  
 [quae] aguntur?'  
 ... Sisenna<sup>4</sup>...:  
 'et prope mediam ad finem ripae pervenerant.'"

Nonius again quotes the passage from Cassius Hemina in III 827.17 where the manuscripts read "quare fini". "Qua fini" is

- 
1. Trag. 577
  2. fr. 38 (historian)
  3. fr. 35
  4. fr. 59

much more likely.

The feminine is also used by Cato, De Agricultura 149.1:-

"Qua lege pabulum ... venire oporteat. qua vendas  
fini ~~(s)~~ dicito."

Lucretius almost always uses the feminine gender.

The "feminine" in the passages from Cato and Sisenna has been shown to be a postposition, used with the ablative<sup>1</sup>. This also applies to the passage from Cassius Hemina.

The masculine is also attested in the Early period, by Plautus, Trinummus 2:-

"Sequor: sed finem fore quem dicam nescio."

It also occurs in a quotation in Priscian (II 231.17):-

"Caecilius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'... duc me ad patrios fines'".

According to the Thesaurus, the masculine is used in a passage quoted by Probus<sup>3</sup> on Virgil, Bucolics and Georgics:-

"Cato<sup>4</sup>...:  
'... In eorum agro, fluvii sunt sex, septimus  
finem Rheginum atque Taurinum dispescit'".

It is possible that "Rheginum" and "Taurinum" are genitive plurals and so it is better not to include this passage as a definite example of the masculine.

- 
1. Bauer, Das Geschlecht von "finis" Glotta X 1920  
122-8 cf. L.-H. 535
  2. 100
  3. III-II 326.9f.
  4. Orig. III 1

Third Declension - Masculine and Neuter.

"Iubar" is used twice in the Early period in such a way that its gender is discernible. Priscian discusses the gender (II 170.6f.):-

Ennius<sup>1</sup>....: "'Iubar' quoque tam masculinum quam neutrum ...  
'interea fugit albus iubar Hyperionis cursum'".

The neuter occurs in a quotation by Varro, De Lingua Latina VI 6:-

"Ennius<sup>2</sup>:-  
'Aiax, lumen iubare in caelo cerno?'"

"Iubare" is Spengel's emendation for the manuscript "iubarne" or "iubarve". Both Ribbeck and Vahlen retain the manuscript "iubarne" and, though each reads the line in a slightly different manner, both have "iubar" as an accusative after "cerno". The passage is quoted again, De Lingua Latina VI 81 and VII 76.

Although the neuter is the more widely used gender in Latin the masculine is attested again in the Aetna<sup>3</sup>.

Third Declension - Masculine (Neuter)

Nonius quotes a neuter form of "panis" (I 322.10):-

"Panis ... masculino ... Neutro Plautus<sup>4</sup>....:

---

1. Ann. 557
2. Fab. 19
3. 332 surgat iubar aureus
4. Cure. 367

'haec sunt ventris stabilimenta, pane et assa  
bubula.'

It can be pointed out that "pane" above is merely a phonological variant, comparable with "magis/mage".<sup>1</sup>

This passage is the only one in Plautus in which the nominative singular occurs. The genitive singular is found in Trinummus 254:-

"Raptores panis et peni"

where the variant "pane" would be confusing.

As far as Latin evidence shows, "papaver" must at first be a masculine, although comparative studies may show it to be otherwise.

The masculine occurs in Plautus, Trinummus 410:-

"Quam si tu obicias formicis papaverem."

This passage is quoted for the masculine by Charisius (I 83. 26f.) who adds:-

"Cato<sup>2</sup>...:  
'papaver Gallicanus'  
et Varro<sup>3</sup>...:  
'infriasse papaverem'".

The passages from Varro and Plautus are also found in Nonius (I 325.7f.).

The neuter does not occur until the time of Catullus.

- 
1. The view of Dr. Szemerényi.
  2. Orig. II 12
  3. Admirandis 10



"Sal" is usually masculine but several times shows the neuter gender.

Priscian discusses the gender (II 171.8f.):-

'Hic' et 'hoc sal' ... Afranius<sup>1</sup>...:  
 'ut, quicquid loquitur, sal merum est.'  
 ... Ennius<sup>2</sup> ...:  
 'caeruleum spumat sale conferta rate pulsum  
 per mare.'

Gellius (II 26.21) quotes this passage but reads "mare" for "sale" after "spumat". Gellius comments on "caeruleum ... mare". As "mare" occurs in the previous line - quoted by Gellius and not by Priscian - there could be an example of dittography here, as the two words are metrically equivalent and semantically similar. "Sale" is preferable.

Probus again quotes a neuter (IV 209.21f.):-

"Sal ... Afranius<sup>3</sup>...:  
 'meum sal si bene visum mihi'  
 genere neutro."

Nonius notes the same phenomenon (I 330.11f.):-

"Salis genere masculino ... Neutro Varro:  
 'in commentario veteri Fabi Pictoris legi<sup>4</sup>:  
 "muries fit ex sale, quod sale sordidum ... est"."

"Sale" occurs in Cato, De Agricultura 145.3:-

"Accedet oleum et sale suae <sup>4</sup> ~~is~~ sioni quod satis siet".

- 
1. 30
  2. Ann. 385
  3. 205
  4. fr. 2

It is just possible that "oleum" and "sale" are genitive plurals here.

"Sale", neuter, recurs in 162.1:-

"In fundo dolii ... sale sternito".

The only known example of the neuter plural of "uter, utris", "skin" or "wine-skin" is quoted by Nonius (I 344.36):-

"Utres .. masculini ... Neutri. Lucilius<sup>1</sup>:  
'Andronis flacci teget utria'".

L. Müller emends the manuscripts' "andronius".

This seems to be the only occurrence of the word in Early Latin.

#### Third Declension - Feminine (Masculine)

In Early Latin the feminine of "amnis" is the usual, if not the only, gender. It is impossible to know definitely whether "liquidum" should be taken with "amnem"<sup>2</sup> in Festus 374.36, which is purported to be a quotation from Naevius<sup>3</sup>.

The feminine occurs in the text of Plautus, Mercator 859:-

"Neque mihi ulla obsistet amnis".

Nonius gives several examples (I 282.31f.):-

"Amnem masculino ... Feminino ... Naevius<sup>4</sup>...."

1. Inc. 91
2. cf. Thes. 1946.48
3. fr. 61
4. Trag. 39

... Accius<sup>1</sup>...: 'sed quasi amnis t̄cis rapit,'  
 idem<sup>2</sup>...: 'atque acervos alta in amni corpore explevi hostico.'  
 'apud abundantem antiquam amnem'".

The adjective in the Naevis passage has been supplied by Bücheler (1897) as "cita" and by Ribbeck as "celeris".

A further example from the Carmina Marciani<sup>3</sup> is quoted by Livy XXV 12.5:-

"Amnem, Troiugena, fuge Cannam".

This expression for "Cannae" is not found again.

"Amnem" in a passage from an unknown tragedian<sup>4</sup> in Cicero, Tusculans I 5.10 quoted by Nonius (II 645.30) is an unnecessary emendation of Bücheler's for "aquam".

After the Early period the feminine is again attested by Varro<sup>5</sup> and the masculine appears from Cicero onwards.

The masculine gender of "calx" "lime" is found in the Early period beside the feminine, but only in the expression "calce harenato". This can be seen in Cato, De Agricultura 18.7:-

"Caementis minutis et calce harenato ... struito ...

1. Trag. 323
2. Trag. 297
3. fr. 1
4. Trag. Inc. 111
5. R.R. III 5.9 confluit altera amnis

de ... calce harenato primum corium facito ... eo calcem cribro suberetam indito".

Charisius (I 92.32f.) writes:-

"Calx ... feminini ... sed et Lucilius<sup>1</sup>... masculino".

The word occurs in the Lex Parieti Faciundo<sup>2</sup> (18 ):-

"CALCE HARENATO LITA POLITAQVE ET CALCE VDA DEALBATA RECTE FACITO."

The Thesaurus refers to Nonius (I 293.18f.) for an example of the masculine from Plautus<sup>3</sup>. The meaning here, however, is "heel" and in any case, Plautus' manuscripts give the feminine.

"Calce harenato" is not found elsewhere.

A masculine form of "cruce" is quoted by Festus (136.12):-

"'Malo cruce' ... Gracchus<sup>4</sup>... idem<sup>5</sup>...:  
'... dignus fuit, qui malo cruce periret'".

The meaning here could be "die an unpleasant death on the cross.

The expression occurs again in Nonius (I 287.10f.):-

"Cruce generis feminini ... Masculini. Ennius<sup>6</sup>...:  
'malo crucei, fatur, uti des,  
Iuppiter!'"

The usual view is that (manuscript) "cruce" is dative.

"Crucei" above in Lindsay's emendation, though other editors

- 
1. XIV fr. VIII
  2. C.I.L. I<sup>2</sup> 157
  3. Poen. 908 prius disperibit faxo quam unam calcem civerit
  4. fr. 36 (orator)
  5. fr. 38
  6. Ann. 360

retain "cruce". With "cruce" as dative, "malo" could be an ablative of attendant circumstances and not in agreement with "cruce".

If "malo cruce" were a current expression in Plautus' time, one wonders why he did not make use of it.

"Forceps" is attested in the feminine by Priscian (II 168. 14f.):-

"Masculina ... 'forceps' ... feminino ... Novius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'signare oportet frontem calida forcipe'".

In later Latin it is attested again by Ovid<sup>2</sup>.

No masculine form is attested in the Early period, though Vitruvius<sup>3</sup> uses it later.

The poetic word "latex" soon lost its feminine gender. This is only attested by Priscian (II 169.14):-

"Accius<sup>4</sup>:  
'non calida latice lautus'"

in a passage stating that the earliest authors for no apparent reason use more than one gender in some nouns.

The usual feminine gender of "lens" occurs as early as

- 
1. 42
  2. Met. XII 277 forcipe curva
  3. X 2.2 ferrei forfices
  4. Trag. 666

Cato<sup>1</sup>.

There is only one example of the masculine, quoted by Nonius (I 309.2f.):-

"Lentem ... feminino ... Masculino Titinius<sup>2</sup>:  
'... lenti calido, elvella, rapula'".

It appears that "lux" is mainly masculine in the Early period. However, a closer examination will show that the "masculine" is only found in such locative phrases as "cum primo luci". Plautus uses these frequently, but when the gender can be discerned in other cases, it is feminine, as in Amphitruo 547:-

"Ut mortalis inlucescat luce clara et candida."

The "masculine" is only found in Early authors, because the locative did not, in general, survive.

In Early Latin there is one doubtful occurrence of the masculine gender in the word "messis", quoted by Nonius (I 315.34):-

"Messem generis feminini. Masculino Lucilius<sup>3</sup>...:  
'potius quam non magno messe, non proba vindemia.'"

There are substantial textual variations. "Non magno messe" is Mercer's (1583) emendation for "non magnum esse". The Editio

- 
1. De Ag. 116 lentim ... perfricato ... integra serva-
  2. 163 bitur
  3. XXVII 47

Princeps (1511) reads "non magnum messem" which is accepted by Müller, who also reads "probam vindemiam" after Iunius (C.16) for manuscript "proba vindemedia" or "probavi indemedia". Marx and Warmington follow Mercer's emendation.

With such a doubtful tradition it is difficult to accept this passage as evidence for the masculine gender. If the text were properly established, it might be possible to decide whether Nonius is right or not, but this cannot be done with the text in its present state.

Amongst the peculiar forms on the Columna Rostrata<sup>1</sup> (12), which refers to Duillius, Consul in 266 B.C., is the following:-

"TRIRESMOSQVE NAVEIS".

There are several forms on this Inscription which cannot be justified from the third century. Its authenticity is rejected by modern scholars<sup>2</sup>.

Another isolated occurrence of a masculine gender has some doubt attached to it. "Nubis" appears to be masculine in Plautus, Mercator 879:-

"Non me ex advorso vides  
nubis ater imberque instat. Aspice non ad  
sinisteram"

There is difficulty in supposing that "nubis" is masculine if the whole passage is corrupt. Dr. Szemerényi suggests that

- 
1. C.I.L. I<sup>2</sup> 25.
  2. Wackernagel, Niedermann

"nobis" could be read and "que" deleted, which would be metrically possible because of the freedom with which the Greek rules were treated. Alternatively, he suggests the retention of "nubis" with the deletion of "que" which may have been added through failure to take "ater" with "imber".<sup>1</sup>

The case for the masculine of "nubis" is not satisfactory.

The earliest Latin gender of "pulvis" appears to be the feminine. Nonius discusses this (I 320.8f.):-

"Pulvis generis masculini ... Feminini. Ennius<sup>2</sup>...:  
 'iamque fere pulvis ad caelum vasta videtur.'  
 idem<sup>3</sup>...:  
 '[iamque fere] pulvis fulva volat.'"

The feminine also occurs in a passage (not quoted for this) in Nonius I 302.30:-

"Ennius<sup>4</sup>:  
 'crassa pulvis oritur'".

There is no other example of Early Latin usage where the gender can be discovered. The feminine recurs in later poetry<sup>5</sup>.

### Third Declension - Feminine and Neuter

"Hallec" or "hallex" "fish-sauce" is used in both feminine and neuter genders throughout Latin.

The feminine is read in Cato, De Agricultura 58:-

- 
1. for e.g.s of "ater" with "imber" see Virg. G. I 236,  
 323 imbribus atris Stat. Theb. III 122 atris ...
  2. Ann. 282 imbres
  3. Ann. 315
  4. Fab. 382
  5. e.g. Prop. II 13.35 horrida pulvis

See.



"Hallecem et acetum dato".

Nonius quotes the neuter (I 172.3):-

"Hallec, genere neutro. Plautus<sup>1</sup>...:  
'qui mi olera cruda ponunt, allec duint.'"

Third Declension - Neuter (Feminine)

*of "sinapi"*

The usual neuter<sub>a</sub> is attested in the Early period<sup>2</sup>.

The form in Plautus, Pseudolus 817 is disputed:-

"Teritur sinapis scelera, quae illis qui terunt  
prius quam triverunt oculi ut extillent facit."

The Ambrosian Palimpsest has "sinapim", "scelera" and "quae".

Servius, on Aeneid IX 484<sup>3</sup>, has "teritur sinapis scelera".

Charisius, I 63.5, reads, "teritur sinapi" but in I 144.10:-

"Sinapis Plautus ...:  
'teritur sinapis scelera, quod ...'"

with manuscript variation "scelerata".

Priscian (II 205.1f.) quotes for "haec sinapis" and for "quas" or "quod" reads "cum", which is also found in Plautine manuscripts (not the Palimpsest).

Probus (IV 8.16, IV 26.29) and Marius Plotius Sacerdos (VI 473.14), without quoting, state that the feminine is used here.

The "-s" of "sinapis" may be inserted by dittography before the "s-" of "scelera". Some lack of clarity here is shown by the reading "celera" of some Plautine manuscripts.

- 
1. Aul. fr. V
  2. Enn. Sat. 12 triste ... sinapi ap. Macr. VI 5.5,  
Serv. on Georg. I 75 III - I 151.15
  3. II - II 352.15

Third Declension - Parts of Body

Masculine and Feminine

Both these genders of "clunes" are attested in Latin. The masculine is attested in Paulus' Epitome of Festus (54.4):-

"Clunes masculine. Plautus<sup>1</sup>:  
'quasi lupus ab armis valeo, clunes infractos fero.'"

Nonius also quotes this passage (I 289.35).

Charisius attests the feminine (I 101.4f.):-

"Clunes feminin<sup>o</sup> ... Laberium<sup>2</sup>...:  
'vix sustineo clunes \* '  
... Scaevola<sup>3</sup>:  
'lassas clunes'".

There are several variations of the text, but it seems that a feminine gender is intended. Ribbeck attributes both quoted passages to Laberius, although the Grammaticus de Dubiis Nominibus (V 575.24) quotes "lassas clunes" from Scaevola. The relevant words from the Laberius passage are missing and so the feminine from the Early period must remain doubtful, as Scaevola is later.

In the earliest passage in which it is possible to determine its gender, "crines" is feminine. Plautus, Mostellaria 226 reads:-

- 
1. Agroecus
  2. 7
  3. fr. 2 Morel

"Soli gerundum censeo morem et capiundas crines."

"Capiundas" is the reading of one good manuscript (B<sup>1</sup>) and is quoted by Nonius (I 298.23f.) for the feminine. Nonius adds:-

"Atta<sup>1</sup>...:

'praeterea fusus resoluta crine capillus.'

The feminine does not survive the Early period. The masculine is also attested<sup>2</sup>.

The masculine of "frons" is frequently used in the Early period.

Nonius discusses the gender (I 301.26f.):-

"Frontem feminino ... Masculino Titinius<sup>3</sup>...:

'quasi hermaphroditus fimbriatum frontem gestas  
†feminino.'

Pacuvius<sup>4</sup>:

'voce suppressa, minato fronte, vultu turbido.'

Cato<sup>5</sup>...:

'una depugnatio est fronte longo, quadrato exercitu.'

Caecilius<sup>6</sup>...:

'nam hi sunt inimici pessimi fronte hilaro, corde  
tristi ...'

Plautus<sup>7</sup>:

'... nam coloratum frontem habet, petilis ...'

The Caecilius passage is quoted by Gellius (XV 9.1), who quotes further (XV 9.5):-

- 
1. p. 42 Morel
  2. Acc. Trag. 255, Pac. 19 ap. Serv. A XII 605  
(II-II 627.3f.)
  3. 112
  4. 382
  5. De R.M. fr. 10
  6. 79
  7. Plocinus

"Cato<sup>1</sup>...:  
'... signis conlatis, aequo fronte, peditatu ...  
pugnativimus.'  
Recto quoque fronte idem Cato in ... eodem<sup>2</sup>".

Cato is again quoted by Festus (364.1):-

"'Recto fronte ceteros sequi si novit.' Cato<sup>3</sup>..."

Plautus uses the masculine in Miles Gloriosus 201:-

"Quem ad modum adstitit severo fronte curans".

This is the reading of the Ambrosian Palimpsest, while other manuscripts read "severa".

The feminine is found but once in an Early author - Plautus, Rudens 318:-

"Tortis superciliis, contracta fronte".

#### Masculine (Neuter)

Such passages of Early Latin as allow the gender of "guttur" to be discovered show that it is masculine, as in Plautus, Trinummus 1014:-

"... postquam thermopotasti gutturem".

The masculine "guttur" occurs twice more in Plautus<sup>4</sup>.

Nonius discusses the gender (I 305.14f.):-

- 
1. Orig. V 13
  2. Orig. V 14
  3. Orat. I 25
  4. Aul. 304 Mil. 835

"Guttur neutri ... Masculino ... Lucilius<sup>1</sup>:  
 'et ventrem et gutturem eundem.'  
 Naevius<sup>2</sup>: 'ingurgitavit usque ad imum gutturem'".

Nonius also quotes Varro<sup>3</sup> for the masculine.

The neuter is not recognizable as such before the Augustan Age.

### Neuter (Masculine)

Both "sanguen" and "sanguis"<sup>4</sup> are frequent in Early authors.

Nonius discusses them (I 331.6f.):-

"Sanguis masculino ... Neutro Ennius<sup>5</sup>....:  
 '... pergunt lavere sanguen sanguine.'  
 ... Accius<sup>6</sup>....:  
 '...  
 sanguine sanguen miscere suo.'  
 idem<sup>7</sup>....:  
 '...  
 lue patrum hostili fuso sanguen sanguine.'  
 Cicero<sup>8</sup>....:  
 "'non fugiat timido sanguen'".

The last passage is quoted again by Cicero, De Oratore III 58. 218 and by Priscian (II 250.14), who quotes further:-

- 
1. Inc. 84
  2. Com. 135
  3. Sat. 237
  4. e.g. Pl. Merc. 550 sanguis integer
  5. Fab. 202
  6. Trag. 83
  7. Trag. (Praet.) 4
  8. De Fin. V 11.31 - the quotation is from Enn. Fab. 26

"(Ennius)<sup>1</sup>...:  
 '... O sanguen dis oriundum'."

Lactantius (I 15.31) also quotes this passage. The other Ennius passage recurs in Nonius III 747.23 and 810.7.

Ennius is quoted again by Festus (482.6 and P.F. 483.3):-

"Ennius<sup>2</sup>...:  
 'Ajax; misso sanguine tepido ...'".

Hermann unnecessarily emends to "sanguis".

Charisius states (I 90.20):-

"Sanguis masculino ... sed Cato<sup>3</sup>...:  
 'sanguen demittatur'."

Cato is also quoted by Gellius (III 7.19):-

"... ipsius Catonis verbis<sup>4</sup>...:  
 '... sanguen eius defluxerat'".

#### Fourth Declension - Masculine (Feminine)

One doubtful example of the feminine of "arcus" occurs in Priscian (II 259.2f.):-

"'Arcus' ... etiam feminini ... Ennius<sup>5</sup>...:  
 'arcus aspiciunt, mortalibus quae perhibentur'."

The general opinion among scholars is that the "arcus" refers to Iris and is therefore not a grammatical feminine. L. Müller

- 
1. Ann. 113
  2. Fab. 20
  3. Orat. LX
  4. Orig. IV 7 p. 19 1. 11
  5. Ann. 409

goes so far as to supply "iris" after "perhibetur" ("perhibetur" is read in some manuscripts). This would introduce the further possibility that "quae" is assimilated from the masculine of "arcus" to the feminine of "iris".

According to Servius on Aeneid V 610<sup>1</sup>, Catullus and others use "arcus" feminine for Iris, while Virgil uses the masculine.

The gender of "metus" is discussed by Nonius (I 315.7f.):-

"Metus masculino. Feminino Naevius<sup>2</sup>:  
'magnae metus tumultus pectora possidit.'

Ennius<sup>3</sup>:

'nec metus ulla tenet, freti virtute quiescunt.'

Some manuscripts omit "feminino"; all read "magni". In the second passage, "ulla" is metrically equivalent to "ullu'", for which it may have been substituted, particularly if "feminino" is an interpolation.

The feminine is quoted by Festus (110.16):-

"Metus feminine ... Ennius<sup>4</sup>:  
'vivam an moriar nulla in me est metus.'

Festus quotes "nulla metus" again (364.5).

If a woman speaks these words, the translation could be,

- 
1. I-II 637.6f.
  2. fr. 53 Morel
  3. Ann. 549
  4. Fab. 407

"there is fear in me that I shall live or die in insignificance."

The feminine does not occur again in Latin, nor in the masculine unknown in the Early period<sup>1</sup>.

#### Fourth Declension - Masculine (Neuter)

An exception to the general usage of "secus" as a neuter and "sexus" as a masculine seems to occur in Plautus Rudens 107:-

"Virile sexus numquam ullum habui."

It has been seen before (c.f. panis/-e) that Plautus uses the phonetic variants "-is/-e" and this passage is probably another example of it<sup>2</sup> rather than a variation of the gender of "sexus".

#### Fourth Declension - Parts of Body

##### Masculine (Neuter)

Plautus, Menaechmi 855, uses "artua":-

"... ut ego huius membra atque ossa atque artua  
comminuam."

Priscian (II 262.6) and Nonius (I 281.10) both quote the passage.

Other occurrences of the word in the Early period do not allow its gender to be discerned.

- 
1. e.g. Pl. Mil. 1233 iste metus
  2. Leo cf. note in O.C.T. 'virile' scriptum videtur  
pro genetivo 'virilis'



Fifth Declension

No fifth declension word varies in gender within its own declension.

SECTION II

DECLENSION VARIATION

In this section the declensions will be discussed mainly in pairs. That is to say, instead of taking the second declension and discussing all variant forms of words belonging to it, all variations between the second and third declensions will be considered, then those between the second and fourth and so on.

First and Third Declensions

"Arrabo" is frequently used in Early Latin. A form "arra" is quoted by Gellius (XVII 2.21):-

"'Arrabo' ... 'arra' quoque veteres saepe dixerint et complurimo Laberius<sup>1</sup>."

This form is not found again until Pliny<sup>2</sup>, though Varro<sup>3</sup> uses "arrabo".

Third-declension forms of "mataris", a Gaulish javelin, occur in Early Latin. Nonius quotes them (III 892.7f.):-

"Materae ... Sisenna<sup>4</sup>...:  
'Galli materibus ~~†~~ sani lanceis confligunt'.  
— idem<sup>5</sup>...:"

- 
1. 152
  2. XXXIII 28 arra velocior
  3. L.L. V 175 ~~Dos~~, Dos, Arrabo, merces
  4. fr. 29
  5. fr. 71

'alii materibus aut lanceis tamen medium perturbant agmen'."

The first-declension form occurs in Caesar<sup>1</sup>.

### First and Fifth Declensions

Variation in form between nouns of the first and fifth declensions is so wide and so well-known a phenomenon that no attempt will be made here to discuss the whole of the evidence, but the position may be summarized.

The main point to be noted is that the fluctuation between the two declensions is at least as old as the earliest period of extant Latin literature. More than a dozen well-attested words can be quoted to illustrate this.

Nearly all these words (with the exception of "muries") are derivatives whose root-word is obvious. This means that they began to be used at a time when their root-words had evolved to approximately the form which they kept throughout the history of Latin proper. This comparatively late entry probably means that there were two forms of declension which could accommodate them equally well.

The fluctuation in forms does not show a tendency towards elimination of one of the forms, as is often seen in words of

---

1. B.G. I 26.3 mataras ac tragulas

unstable gender or declension, but new words which enter the group also partake of the declension-variation<sup>1</sup>, which thus appears to have become a feature of the group.

Within the individual cases there is a certain pattern of usage. The nominative singular, obviously, is used freely in both declensions, likewise the accusative and ablative. Fifth-declension genitives are rare and use the phonetic variant "-i<sup>i</sup>" for Classical "-ei". The dative is exclusively first declension. In the plural all cases follow the first declension.

The examples below are some which N.-W. do not include:-

avaritia/-es

Gellius X 13.4:-

"Claudi<sup>2</sup>... verba ...:  
'... neglegentia ... an avaritia an calamitate'".

C.I.L. I<sup>2</sup> 1221

"(N)VLLA IN AVARITIE  
CESSIT"

luxuria/-es

Terence, Heautontimorumenos 945:-

"Ut eius animam, qui nunc luxuria et lascivia  
Diffluit, retundam".

- 
1. e.g. Cic. Off. I 29.102 propter pigritiam  
Livy XLIV 42.9 pigritiam ad sequendum fecit
  2. Claud. Quad. fr. 89

maceria/-es

Nonius I 206.18:-

"Maceriae. Sisenna<sup>1</sup>...:  
'post villarum macerias'".

materia/-es

Cato, De Agricultura 111:-

"Facito de materia hederacia".

Cato, De Agricultura 39.1:-

"Materie querneae vivisicca alligato."

muria/-es

Cato, De Agricultura 105.2:-

"Ubi muria facta erit".

nequitia/-es

Nonius I 235.36:-

"Prodigitas ... Lucilius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'nequitia occupat hos, petulantia prodigitasque.'"

segnitia/-es

Terence, Andria 206:-

"... nihil locist segnitiae".

luae/-e<sup>3</sup>

C.I.L. I<sup>2</sup> 2:-

- 
1. fr. 24
  2. VI 4
  3. N.W. give "lue" three times (I 301)

"NEVELVAERVE"  
 "NEVELVERVE" (bis)

### Second and Third Declensions

#### Words whose original declension is not clear

"Glutino" is found in a quotation by Nonius (III 789.29):-

"Glutino pro glutine. Lucilius<sup>1</sup>...:  
 'praeterito tepido glutinator glutino.'"

The word is not found again within the earliest period and on its next appearance, has a third-declension form<sup>2</sup>. The second-declension forms appear later<sup>3</sup>.

Although the word is rarely attested, the declension-variation appears to exist throughout Latin.

Servius<sup>4</sup> comments on "mantelia" in Virgil, Georgics IV 376:-

"Mantelia quibus manus tergunt. ... huius singulare  
 'mantelum'. Plautus<sup>5</sup>...:  
 'nec his sycophantiis nec fucis ullum mantelum  
 obviam est.'

Lucilius<sup>6</sup> autem mantela dicit mappas:  
 'mantela merumque'."

Modern scholarship<sup>7</sup> recognizes that Servius has confused

- 
1. XXVIII 41
  2. Lucr. VI 1069 glutine ... taurino
  3. e.g. Pliny XVI 226 quaedam ... insociabilia glutino
  4. III-I 348.19
  5. Capt. 520
  6. V 32
  7. cf. E.-M., W.-H.

two words, "mantelum (-le, -lium)" and "mantellum", which latter means "cloak" and is the word used by Plautus.

"Mantela" as an Early variant for "mantele" or "mantelium" remains. These other forms are not attested in the Early period.

"Munia (moenia)" and "munera" both exist in Latin literature from the earliest times.

The former is attested in Plautus, Stichus 695:-

"... tamen efficitur pro opibus nostra moenia."

and in Trinummus 687:-

"... tua qui toleres moenia".

Another passage is quoted by Festus (128.25f.):-

"Moenia, muri ... etiam officia. Plautus<sup>1</sup>...:  
'prohibentque moenia alia, unde ego fungar mea.'"

It also occurs in a corrupt passage in Nonius (III 760.17f.):-

"Paciscunt. Naeivius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'id quoque paciscunt, moenia sin quae  
Lutatium reconciliant'".

"Pavus" is attested by Charisius (I 98.4):-

"Pavos et pavo. ... Ennius<sup>3</sup>...:  
'memini me fieri pavum'."

- 
1. Nerv. fr. II
  2. fr. 50
  3. Ann. 15

This seems to be a favourite line of Donatus, for he quotes it three times<sup>1</sup> - on Terence, Andria II 5.18, Adelphi I 2.26 and Phormio I 2.24.

Both "scopus" and "scopio" are used by the Roman writers on agriculture. Varro favours the former and Columella the latter.

The word occurs in Cato, De Agricultura 112.3:-

"Acina de uvis miscellis decarpito de scopione in idem dolium."

This is Keil's interpretation of the manuscript "de scopio" with "de scopione" in the margin of the archetype. In his Commentary (ad loc.) he states:-

"'Scopum' vel 'scopionem' in uvis dici illud ex quo acina haerent ... itaque 'de scopione' ex margine codicis recepi".

This does not seem a sufficiently strong argument for the preference of "scopione" and the form of the word in Cato must remain in doubt.

#### Second-Declension words with Third-Declension variants.

The circumstances of the use of "aplustra/-ia" are similar to those of "scopus/scopio" above. Cicero<sup>2</sup> uses one

- 
1. I 149.15 II 28.18 II 370.23
  2. Arat. fr. XXV fluitantia ... aplustra ap. Prisc.  
III 351.3



form and Manilius the other<sup>1</sup>.

In The Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum occurs this entry (II 18.33):-

"Aplustra πτερον . πλοίουως . εννιος<sup>2</sup>"

Philoxenus has it thus (Gl. Lat. II 148):-

"Ap- -lustra: πτέρον πλοίου, ως "Εννιος"

Paulus' Epitome of Festus comments (9.10):-

"Aplustria navium ornamenta".

Although there is no mention of Ennius here, Lindsay (Gl. Lat. IV 103) takes the passage to be a commentary on a passage in Ennius.

As the Glosses, which do mention Ennius, give "aplustra" and Festus, who does not, gives "aplustria", the evidence seems to point to "aplustra" being the form used by Ennius, if he did use the word at all.

An isolated instance of a third-declension dative/ablative plural of "gener" is noted by Nonius (III 783.29f.):-

"Generibus pro generis. Accius<sup>3</sup>...:  
'qui ducat cum te socerum viderit,  
generibus tantam esse impietatem?'"

It has been suggested<sup>4</sup> that "generibus" may in fact be

- 
1. I 694 aplustria summa
  2. Ann. 602
  3. Trag. 64
  4. by Dr. Szemerényi

from "genus" and have been misunderstood by Nonius on account of "socerum" in the line above.

Of the two methods of declining "sequester" the o-stem is used in Early Latin. This gives way to the consonant-stem before the time of Cicero.

Several grammarians comment upon the declension of this word but will not be quoted here, as the texts themselves provide sufficient evidence.

Plautus uses the word in Mercator 737:-

"... sequestro mihi datast",

in Rudens 1004:-

"... nisi das sequestrum aut arbitrum"

and in Rudens 1018:-

"Aut ad arbitrum reditur, aut sequestro ponitur."

"Torris" which later poets use for "torch" has only second-declension forms in the Early period. Servius<sup>1</sup>, on Virgil's Aeneid XII 298, notes this:-

"Torris ... illud Ennii<sup>2</sup> et Pacuvii<sup>3</sup> penitus de usu recessit, ut 'hic torrus, huius torri' decamus."

Something more concrete is given by Nonius (I 22.23f.):-

- 
1. II-II 604.29
  2. Inc. 27
  3. Inc. LVI

"Torrus ... Accius<sup>1</sup>....:  
 idem<sup>2</sup>....: '... hic torrus quem amburi vides.'  
 '... ubi torrus esset interfectus flammeus.'"

Although the consonant-stem "vas" appears in the Early period, "vasum" is far more frequent.

Without resorting to grammarians' quotations, several instances can be found in Early Latin.

Plautus, Truculentus 53,4, reads:-

"Aut empta ancilla aut aliquod vasum argenteum  
 aut vasum ahenum".

Cato finds occasion to use the word several times in De Agricultura. In 66.1 he advises against the use of "vaso aheneo" for olive-oil. To ward off sickness from cattle, a curious mixture should be given to them in "vaso ligneo" (70.2) and should be given likewise (71) if the cattle do become ill. Another patent remedy should be heated in "vase aheneo" (122).

The textual situation is briefly this - in 66 and 71 "vase" has been emended and copied as "vaso" but in 70 and 122 "vase" still stands. Keil believes that "vase" was rightly emended, considers "vase" an example of omitted correction and so reads "vaso" in all passages. Götz, however, reads "vase" in the last.

- 
1. Trag. 439
  2. Trag. 452

Third-Declension words with Second-Declension variants

Occasional plural o-stem forms are found for "holus".

Cato uses one in De Agricultura 149.2:-

"Holeris, asparagis, lignis, aqua".

Nonius notes another (III 787.23):-

"Holerorum pro holerum. Lucilius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'tintinnabulum abest hinc suspiculique holerorum'".

Nonius, I 294.18 is corrupt:-

"Collus ... Lucilius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'† caldais seme  
ac bene plena † iiasolorum atque anseri' collus.'"

Müller prefers the emendation "plena vasa olerorum" while Marx emends:-

"calda siem ac bene plena, si olorum atque anseris  
collus."

The whole passage is too conjectural to furnish any evidence for "olerorum".

The usual consonant-stem declension is in use in the Early period.

The consonant-stem of "iugera" in the singular is probably attested in Plautus, Menaechmi 913:-

"Non potest haec res ellebori iugere optinerier."

- 
1. XV 31
  2. VII 27

Manuscripts are divided between this and "iungere", which Lindsay prefers (possibly an ablative of "iungus" - ζεύγος). Brix-Neumeyer read "unguine" which is found in one manuscript.

"Iugere" would appear to make the best sense here. Ernout points out that "iungus" is not elsewhere attested and that "elleborum" was not administered in the form of an unguent.

The plural sometimes still shows the consonant-stem<sup>1</sup>.

The o-stem plural is attested by Charisius (I 134.4):-

"Cato<sup>2</sup>:  
'his iugeris<sup>3</sup>'".

### Third Declension

"Accipiter" is first read in Lucretius<sup>3</sup> but a variant "accepter" occurs in glosses and in Charisius (I 98.9):-

"'Accipiter' ... Lucilius<sup>4</sup> autem:  
'... exta acceptoris et unguis.'"

Beda (VII 264.33) echoes Charisius.

"Heres" is usually declined as a dental-stem in Early Latin but Nonius notes a different form (III 781.29):-

"Herem, pro heredem. Naevius<sup>5</sup> ...:  
'... ego te herem faciam.'"

The form does not occur elsewhere.

- 
1. e.g. Varro R.R. III 12.1 iugeribus multis
  2. Inc. fr. 46
  3. e.g. V 1079 accipitres atque ossifragae
  4. Inc. 123
  5. con. 58

Festus, under "spetile" quotes (444.32f.):-

"Plautus<sup>1</sup>....:

'ego pernam, sumen, sueres, spectile, glandia.'

Heraeus<sup>2</sup> retains "sueres" of Festus' manuscripts, deeming Turnebus' conjecture of "sueris" unnecessary. "Sueris" is the form quoted by N.-W.<sup>3</sup>

A Third-Declension word with Second- and Fourth-Declension

Variants.

The usual third-declension forms of "os, ossis" are attested in Plautus<sup>4</sup>. Priscian quotes other forms (II 254.6f.):-

Pacuvius<sup>5</sup>....: "Quidam . / 'hoc ossu' et 'hoc ossum' ... *hanc*

'ossuum inhumatum aestuosam *ossuum*

aulam.'

Accius<sup>6</sup>....:

'fraxinus fissa ferox, infensa infinditur ossis.' *u*

In the first passage, many of the manuscripts read "ossum".

Charisius also quotes (I 55.7):-

"'Hoc os', quamvis Gellius<sup>7</sup>....:

'calvariaequae eius ipsum ossum expurgarunt'".

This fragment is quoted again in I 139.2.

"Ossua" is attested in C.I.L. I 1010:-

"OSSVA HEIC".

- 
1. Carb. fr. I
  2. A.L.L.G. XIV 1905 p.124-5 Sueris
  3. I 279
  4. e.g. Mil. 30 per ... os
  5. 102
  6. Ann. Inc. 8 L. Müller
  7. fr. 26

Second, Third and Fourth Declensions

Exceptions to the general rule that "socrus" is a feminine u-stem and "socer" or uncontracted "socerus" is a masculine o-stem occur in Early Latin.

Cicero, in Tusculans III 12.26 quotes:-

"... Pelope natus, qui quondam a socru  
Oenomao rege ...".<sup>1</sup>

Most manuscripts read "socero" but some have "socro"; "socru" is Bentley's emendation.

The word is discussed by Priscian (II 233.7f.):-

"'Hic' et 'haec socrus' ... Accius ...:  
'... praemia arrepta a socru  
\* \* \* \* possedit suo.'"

The majority of manuscripts read "socro", one has been altered to "socru". "Socro", as pointed out by Dr. Szemerényi, is probably a syncopated form of "socero". In this case, the grammarians have been mistaken in assuming a fourth-declension form.

Nonius also discusses the word (I 330.21f.):-

"Socrus et masculino ... Naevius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'desine socru tuo, fratri patrueli meo.'"

*to be corrected  
years*

The manuscripts read "socri" which Quicherat (1872) has emended. A probable source for "socri" is "fratri patrueli", which could

- 
1. Enn. Fab. 357 or Inc. Trag. 108
  2. Com. 66

well induce a copying error. It cannot, therefore, be considered as evidence for a third-declension form. There is no manuscript authority for "socru" or "socro" here.

### Second and Fourth Declensions

#### Words whose original gender is not clear

"Domus" hesitates between the second and fourth declensions from the earliest period.

The vocative "domus" is attested several times. It occurs in a quotation in Cicero, Tusculans III 19.44:-

"O pater, O patria, O Priami domus!"<sup>1</sup>

This quotation is also found in De Oratore III 26.102 and 58.217.

Again Cicero quotes, in De Officiis I 39.139:-

"O domus antiqua!"

The vocative also occurs in Nonius under "festiviter" (III 820.13):-

"Novius<sup>2</sup>...

"O domus parata pulchrae familiae festiviter!"

The passages in Early Latin in which "domi" is read or interpreted as a locative are fairly numerous.

It occurs in Plautus, Amphitruo 187:-

- 
1. Fab. 92
  2. 40

*Handwritten notes:*  
 The  
 Seneca?



"... ut salvi poteremur domi".

The manuscripts of Plautus read "domum" but Nonius quotes this passage for "domi" as a genitive (III 799.4). The accusative with "potior" is not unknown in the Early period<sup>1</sup>, though it does not survive into the Classical period, though the genitive is used. It is possible, therefore, that Nonius may have read from a text in which the unfamiliar "domum" had been altered to "domi".

There is another example in Amphitruo 503:-

"Quid istuc est, mi vir, negoti, quod tu tam subito  
 abeas?' 'Edepol haud quod tui me neque domi dis-  
domo
 taedeat.'"

The usual interpretation of the passage is that "domi" is parallel to "tui" in being dependent upon "distaedeat", but the possibility of its being a locative is not completely ruled out. "Taedet" is used absolutely in Terence, Eunuchus 464:-

"Vide, et me taedet."

As "distaedet" appears to be merely a comic coinage for the simple verb, presumably it, too, could be used absolutely.

Some scholars<sup>2</sup> have seen a genitive in Casina 662:-

"Insectatur omnis domi per aedis."

- 
1. Naev., Acc., Turp., Pac. ap. Non. III 772.23f.
  2. cf. N.-W. I 774

The words are ambiguous and could as well mean "through all the rooms at home" as "through all the rooms of the house". Lodge includes this passage under the locative.

In *Trinummus* 841:-

"Pol, quamquam domi cupio, opperiar"

is the reading of the Ambrosian Palimpsest, while other manuscripts have "domum". Donatus<sup>1</sup> quotes this line for "domi", genitive. Plautus uses the finite tenses of "cupio" with an accusative many times, with a genitive only here and possibly in *Miles Gloriosus* 964:-

"Qui ingenuis satis responsare nequeas quae cupiunt  
tui"

where "tui" is an emendation of Scioppius for "-que cupit uti" or "capiti uti". This genitive is not found again until the time of Apuleius<sup>2</sup>.

A passage comparable with that quoted above is *Bacchides* 278:-

"... in navem conscendimus  
domi cupientes."

"Domi" is the emendation of Ritschl (who compares *Trin.* 841) for the universal tradition "domum". Although Plautus does not elsewhere use the participle with the accusative, the

- 
1. see below, *Ter. Eun.*
  2. *Flor.* 14 adeoque eius cupiebatur

tradition is unanimous and as ἅπαξ λεγόμενα do occur in his works, the manuscript reading here should bear more weight than an editor's emendation.

"Domi" stands in all manuscripts of Trinummus 1027:-

"... non fugitivust hic homo; commeminit domi."

For Plautus this genitive is unusual for he uses the accusative in the other passages in which "commemini" has an object.

Terence uses "domi" as a locative frequently, as a genitive once, in Eunuchus 815:-

"... domi focique fac vicissim ut memineris."

Donatus<sup>1</sup> comments on "domi" genitive, quoting Trinummus 841 and:-

"Caecilius<sup>2</sup>:  
'decora domi'".

"Decora" is the emendation of Stephanus (1536) for "decoram". An examination of the context of this passage might reveal "domi" as a locative, and so it cannot be accepted as definite evidence for the genitive.

Out of this formidable list of possible examples of "domi" as a genitive only two (Trin. 1027, Eun. 815) have no difficulties or ambiguities of text or meaning. Cicero and Caesar avoid the genitive altogether.

---

1. I 448.6  
2. 284

The dative singular is rare. An o-stem dative occurs in a prayer in Cato, De Agricultura 134.2:-

"Uti sies volens propitius mihi liberisque meis domo familiaeque meae."

Similar petitions occur, again in 134.2, in 139 and in 141.2.

This dative occurs once in Horace<sup>1</sup>.

A u-stem dative occurs in a quotation in Charisius (I 284.19):-

"... te tutamen fore sperarat familiae domuique column'".<sup>2</sup>

Cicero also avoids the dative.

The o-stem regularly provides the ablative singular in Early Latin, though the u-stem appears once, in Plautus, Miles Gloriosus 126:-

"[Ait sese Athenas fugere] ex hac domu.]" *ex hunc*

This line is suspected<sup>3</sup>.

The only other case of "domus" which shows forms from both stems within the Early period is the accusative plural. More usually it is taken from the o-stem, as in Plautus, Poenulus 814:-

"Domos abeamus nostras".

Gellius (XIV 1.34) quotes:-

- 
1. Ep. I 10.13 ponendaeque domo
  2. Com. Inc. 53
  3. Abraham St. Pl. 198

"Accianum<sup>1</sup> illud:

'... suas ut auro locupletent domus.'

In Nonius (I 135.8) this passage has "domos", which is also read in two later manuscripts of Gellius. Neither author comments on the form.

"Domus" occurs in another quotation from Gellius (XVII 2.5):-

"'Domus' inquit 'suas quemque ire iubet'".<sup>2</sup>

Nonius in quoting this passage (I 162.8) refers it to Coelius.

This accusative is not found again in Early Latin.

"Pedatus" occurs in Plautus, Cistellaria 526:-

"... nisi pedatu tertio omnis [ef]flicero".

Nonius discusses the word (I 89.18f.):-

"Pedato ... pro repetitu ... Cato<sup>3</sup>...:

idem<sup>4</sup>....: 'igitur tertio pedato bellum nobis facere'

'tertio autem pedato item ex fenore discordia  
excrecebat.'

"Pedatu" has been conjectured in both of these passages.

In Charisius "pedatu" is quoted (I 215.20):-

"Pedatu Cato<sup>5</sup>...:

- 
1. Trag. 170
  2. Claud. Quad. fr. 23
  3. Orig. I 27
  4. Orat. VI 2
  5. Inc. fr. 1

'in his duobus bellis ... alteras primo pedatu et secundo'".

Variation of declension in "pinus" is attested from the earliest period of extant Latin literature.

A second-declension form is used by Cato, De Agricultura 28.1:-

"Vites, pinos, cupressos cum sermes".

"Pinos" occurs in a quotation by Gellius (XIII 21.13):-

"Ennius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'capitibus nutantis pinos'"

and in one by Nonius, under "fulgere" (III 814.20):-

"Accius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'... in Parnaso inter pinos tripudiantem'".

Fourth-declension forms are found in Macrobius (VI 2.27):-

"Ennius<sup>3</sup>...:  
'pinus proceras pervortunt'"

and in Nonius under "fera vite" (I 162.19):-

"Sisenna<sup>4</sup>...:  
'... partim lauro et arbuto ac multa pinu ac myrtetis abundant.'"

Peter, without commenting on it, reads "pino", for which there is no textual evidence.

- 
1. Ann. 490
  2. Trag. 249
  3. Ann. 190
  4. fr. 60

Second-Declension words with Fourth-Declension variants

Plautus, Captivi 826:-

"Tantus ventri commeatus meo adest in portu cibus"  
is quoted for a genitive "cibus" by Priscian (II 259.1).  
"Cibus" is better understood as in apposition to "commeatus".

Plautus, Mercator 677 reads:-

"Da sane hanc virgam lauri."

A further attestation of the second-declension form occurs  
in Nonius, under "fera vite" (I 162.19):-

"Sisenna<sup>1</sup>...:  
'partim fera vite, partim lauro ... abundant.'"

Fourth-declension forms are not found until the time of  
Catullus.

A fourth-declension form of "sibilus" is quoted by Priscian  
(II 264.4):-

"'Hic sibilus huius sibilus' ... Sisenna<sup>2</sup>... 'procul  
sibilu significare ... coepit.'"

Many manuscripts read "sibilus". Haplography may have occurred  
(cf. significare). Priscian may not be justified in assuming  
a fourth-declension form, which is otherwise unknown.

Nonius quotes (III 789.23f.):-

"Sonu ... pro ... sono ... Sisenna<sup>3</sup>...:  
'postquam sonu signorum proelium ... commissum est.'"

---

1. fr. 60  
3. fr. 26

2. fr. 131

Under "molimentum", Nonius includes the following quotation (I 206.2):-

"Sisenna<sup>1</sup>...:

'... magno cum molimento ac perpetuo sonu procedunt.'

As "sonu" is an emendation (of Roth, 1842, for "sona") it cannot be accepted as evidence.

Fourth-declension forms do not occur again until Late Latin.

#### Fourth-Declension words with Second-Declension variants

The well-known analogical genitive singular (e.g. senati) will not be discussed.

Although "cornu" often uses a form "cornum" from Lucretius onwards, in the Early period it only occurs in a disputed passage - Terence, Eunuchus 775:-

"... in sinistrum cornum".

The manuscripts are about evenly divided between "cornum" and "cornu".

"Fetis" is noted by Nonius (III 785.4):-

"Fetis, pro fetibus. Accius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'ubi sanctu' Cithaeron  
frondet viridantibu' fetis.'"

If "viridans" were used substantivally, "fetis" would be an adjective.

Second-declension forms of the noun "fetus" do not occur in Classical or Silver Latin.

- 
1. fr. 72
  2. Trag. 244



The u-stem declension of "fluctus" is well-known in Early Latin, though Nonius quotes some second-declension forms (III 784.10f.):-

"Flucti, pro fluctus. Accius<sup>1</sup>...:  
 'flucti cruoris volverentur ...'  
 idem<sup>2</sup>...:  
 'flucti inmisericordes ...'  
 Pacuvius<sup>3</sup>...:  
 'flucti flaccescunt'".

This form does not occur again until very late.

An o-stem form of "gradus" is found in Inscriptions, Late Latin and in a disputed passage in Nonius (I 261.13) under "tetinerit":-

"Pacuvius<sup>4</sup>...:  
 'sub iudicio quae omnes Graios tetinerim.'"

"Graios" is Mercer's (1582) emendation for "grados". Vossius (end C17) emends to "gradus". "Graios" certainly seems to be *the* most logical reading.

The Columna Rostrata<sup>5</sup> 3 has:-

" XIMOSQVE MACISTR/TOS"

which Sommer<sup>6</sup> dismisses as an error in restoration.

- 
1. Trag. 633
  2. Trag. 33
  3. 77
  4. 172
  5. C.I.L. I<sup>2</sup> 25
  6. 404

The o-stem declension of "magistratus" does not occur until very late.

Under "involare" Nonius quotes (I 47.1):-

"Lucilius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'inde canino ricto oculisque  
involem.'"

"Ricto" is Lindsay's emendation for "rito". The Editio Princeps (1470) has "ritu". Marx compares "canino ritu" with κυνηδόν of Sophocles and Aristophanes<sup>2</sup>.

"Rito" is otherwise unknown in Latin literature but "ritu" is attested in Plautus<sup>3</sup>.

For "rictus" both second and fourth declension forms are attested.

Plautus, Bacchides 1120 reads:-

"Quis sonitu ac tumultu tanto ...".

A variant "tumulto" is mentioned in the Apparatus Criticus of Ussing's (1875) edition. This is given by N.-W. but disregarded by the standard editions.

Priscian discusses "versus" (II 258.7f.):-

"'Versi' quoque pro 'versus' Laberius<sup>4</sup>...:"

- 
1. XXX 100
  2. e.g. Nub. 491 κυνηδόν τήν σοφίαν σιτήσομαι
  3. Men. 395 cantherino ritu
  4. 55

'versorum non numerum'.  
 Valerius in Phormione<sup>1</sup>:  
 'quid hic cum tragicis versis ... facis?'  
 Laevius<sup>2</sup>....: 'omnes sunt dehis syllabis  
 versi.'"

Some manuscripts give "Terentius" for "Valerius" but the line is not found in Terence's works as we have them.

Plautus often uses the u-stem.

The u-stem for "veru" is also used by Plautus, though an o-stem seems also to be attested.

Rudens 1302 has:-

"[Namquidem hoc venenatu(m)st verum; ita ...]"

This line is suspected by some editors. In any case, "veru" is here metrically equivalent.

In Rudens 1304:-

"Verum extergatur"

occurs. "Verum" is again metrically equivalent to "veru" and may not, therefore, be genuine.

"Verum" occurs again in Truculentus 628:-

"Sed verum (me) sinedum petere".

"Verum" here probably stands for "veru me" and Leo has added "me".

---

1. p. 367 Com.  
 2. fr. 30

The evidence for "verum" is not convincing.

#### Fourth-Declension words with Third-Declension variants

The ablative "impete" for "impetu" is well-known in Lucretius and seems to occur in the works of Laevius, who is discussed by Gellius (XIX 7. esp. 8):-

"... quodque 'magno impete' pro 'impetu'".<sup>1</sup>

The fourth-declension forms are known in the Early period and are used, especially in the accusative singular, by Plautus.

#### Third and Fifth Declensions

Before the time of Cicero, "plebes" shows no unambiguous third-declension form. A dative "plebi" occurs in a quotation in St. Jerome, LX 14 (Loeb Ed.):-

"Ennius:  
'plebes (ait) in hoc regio antistat loco: licet  
lacrimare plebi, regi honeste non licet.'"

"Regi" may be read for "regio" in the first line. "Plebi" here may be influenced by "regi" or may stand for "plebei" and so may not be considered as evidence for a third-declension form.

For the fifth-declension, the Lex Agraria<sup>1</sup> attests forms such as:-

"PLEBEIVE·S·(scito)"

---

1. fr. 9
2. C.I.L. I<sup>2</sup> 585

Although Ennius uses the familiar declension of "spes" in the ablative "spe", Festus states (446.13f.):-

"Speres ... Ennius<sup>1</sup>...:  
 et<sup>2</sup>...: 'et simul effugit speres ita funditu' nostras.'  
 'spero, si speres quicquam prodesse potis sunt.'"

This declension is also quoted from the early Classical period, by Nonius (I 252.23f.):-

"Sperem veteres spem dixerunt ... Varro<sup>3</sup>...:  
 idem<sup>4</sup>...: 'ita sublimis speribus'  
 '... aviditatem speribus lactet suis.'"

Varro may have used this declension independently or in imitation of Ennius.

### Third-Declension words with Fifth-Declension variants

A third-declension dative of "fames" is used in Plautus, Stichus 150:-

"... ego refero meae matri Fami."

This is the only form of the dative known to Latin.

Fifth-declension genitives are quoted by Gellius (IX 14.10f.):-

"'Fames fami' ... Cato<sup>5</sup>...:"

- 
1. Ann. 128
  2. Ann. 429
  3. fr. 1
  4. fr. 350
  5. Orat XXXVII 1

Lucilius<sup>1</sup>...: '... mulieres extrudebantur fami causa.'  
'rugosum atque fami plenum.'

The ablative is in "-e" or "-ē".

"Quies", though a "-ti" stem in Early Latin has other forms, which are quoted by Priscian (II 242.10f.):-

Afranius<sup>2</sup>...:  
Laevidius<sup>3</sup>...: '... non potitur nunc quie.'  
'... suavi quie dicantur.'

Although this declension does not survive in the simple noun, it is the usual one of the compound "requies".

Some nouns are reputed to have used in the Early period strange genitive plural forms which have sometimes been identified as fifth-declension forms<sup>4</sup>.

Cato, De Agricultura 62 reads:-

"Boverum, mulorum, asinorum".

In Plautus, Poenulus 314, we find:-

"... pleni oculi sorderum qui erant iam splendent".

"Sorderum" is the reading of the Ambrosian Palimpsest for "sorderunt" of other manuscripts.

This "fifth-declension" form does not survive.

- 
1. XII 6
  2. 77
  3. fr. 15
  4. cf. L.-H. 279

Charisius states (I 54.23f.):-

"... navium... invenimus tamen... 'nucerum' ...  
Coelius<sup>1</sup>..., Lucilius<sup>2</sup> 'naverum', Gellius<sup>3</sup> vero 'regerum' et  
'lapiderum'".

The word which Lucilius is supposed to have used is not decipherable.

All these forms are unknown elsewhere - Ritschl's emendation "nucerum" for "rerum" in Plautus, Truculentus 307, is not accepted.

1. fr. 27
2. Dub. Fr. V
3. fr. 31

SECTION IIIGENDER AND DECLENSION VARIATIONA - GENDER VARIATION INDEPENDENT OF DECLENSION VARIATION

Words which show independent variations of both gender and declension do not fall into groups for classification as easily as do those which show only one of these phenomena. As far as possible, the previous system of grouping will be followed.

First and Third Declensions - Masculine, Feminine and Neuter

Plautus is quoted by Priscian (II 332.14f.):-

"Quod (rete) etiam masculino ...:  
 'non vides proferre me uvidum retem sine squamoso  
 pecu?'<sup>1</sup>  
 idem<sup>2</sup>...:  
 'ubi demisi retem atque hamum'  
 ... etiam feminino ... idem<sup>3</sup>...:  
 '...  
 nam nunc et operam ludos facit et retiam'".

In the first of these passages Plautus' manuscripts read "rete", as do Nonius (I 233.33) and Charisius (I 141.12) who quote the line.

The manuscripts read "rete" again in the second passage

- 
1. Pl. Rud. 942
  2. Pl. Rud. 984
  3. Pl. Rud. 900



and "retia" in the third.

"Retia", feminine, does not occur until Ecclesiastical Latin. Varro<sup>1</sup> uses "retam".

### First, Second and Third Declensions - Masculine and Feminine

In addition to the many passages listed by N.-W.<sup>2</sup>, Plautus, Rudens 1208 includes the phrase "ad vesperum".

Plautus uses the feminine in Curculio 4:-

"Sive media nox est sive est prima vespera".

Nonius notes (I 343.25):-

"Vespera feminini ...  
'... vespera oriente ...'".<sup>3</sup>

Both genders continue in use.

In Plautus, Miles Gloriosus 995 occurs:-

"... qui de vesperi vivat suo".

Similarly, in Rudens 101 is read:-

"Si tu de illarum cenaturus vesperi es".

Although "vesperi" as a locative occurs in Plautus, it seems that the form quoted above must be an ablative.

### First, Second and Fourth Declensions - Masculine, Feminine and

#### Neuter

As well as the usual "testa" and "testum", Cato uses

- 
1. e.g. R.R. III 5.14 sub retem
  2. I 855 and 6
  3. Atta 24

"testu" - in De Agricultura 74:-

"Coquitoque sub testu"

and 75:-

"Sub testu coquito".

Charisius discusses the form (I 145.23f.):-

"Testu ut genu ... Mummius<sup>1</sup>...:

Afranius<sup>2</sup>: '... videre in testu quantum sit caput,'

'indignum vero dici solet testu'."

"Testu" is again found in Ovid,<sup>3</sup> though there are variant readings, "textu", "texta", "testo", "testa", "tecto".

### Second and Third Declensions - Masculine and Neuter

The earliest Latin evidence for "cancer" shows the third declension.

Cato says of cabbage in De Agricultura 157.3:-

"Vulnera putida canceresque purgabit."

Priscian discusses the word (II 232.14f.):-

"'Cancer cancri', ... neutrum etiam ... Claudius<sup>4</sup>...:-  
'... ne ad cancer pervenerit.'"

The next author to use the word in such a way that its gender can be seen is Lucretius (V 617):-

- 
1. 2
  2. 420
  3. Fast. II 645, V 510
  4. fr. 49

*Dec 1914*

"Quo pacto (sol) aestivis e partibus aegocerotis  
brumalis adeat flexus atque inde revertens  
canceris ut vertat metas ad solstitialis".

This is Bailey's reading, following the manuscripts. Lachmann earlier emended to "cancris se". Bailey points out that "revertens" is intransitive and that the third declension of "cancer" is used by Cato. He therefore prefers "vertat" as intransitive and retains "canceris".

Third-declension forms are not attested again until the time of Arnobius.

"Pannus" has a neuter form, which is noted by Nonius (I 322.17f.):-

"Pannus ... masculini. Neutro Novius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'... pannum positum in purpura est.'"

Irregularity of declension is noted by Nonius (III 785.34):-

"Pannibus pro pannis. Pomponius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'... erepsti primitur de pannibus.'"

This passage also occurs in I 227.22 and III 814.29.

Charisius states (I 54.19):-

"Ennius<sup>3</sup>... 'pannibus'".

- 
1. 86
  2. 70
  3. Var. 30

"Pannus" is also attested in Early Latin<sup>1</sup>.

For "terminus", which appears in the earliest Latin writers, Festus quotes "termo" (498.1):-

"Termonem Ennius<sup>2</sup>...:  
 '... redditus termo est'  
 et<sup>3</sup>...:  
 '... prius quam iam finibus termo.'"

According to Varro, De Lingua Latina V 21, Accius<sup>4</sup> uses "termen". The plural of this is found in the Sententia Minuciorum<sup>5</sup> (8):-

"IBI TERMINA STANT DVO"

These forms apparently do not survive.

"Trapetum" occurs in Columella but in Early Latin the masculine only is used. Both second- and third-declension forms are used by Cato, the second-declension form in De Agricultura 3.5:-

"Trapetos bonos",

in 12:-

"Trapetos V"

and in 18.5:-

- 
1. Titin. 139 ap. Non. III 860.17 pannos ... fetidos
  2. Ann. 479
  3. Ann. 480
  4. Trag. 698
  5. C.I.L. I<sup>2</sup> 584

"Ubi trapeti stent";

the third-declension form in 18.2:-

"IIII trapetibus locum".

Second and Third Declensions - Parts of Body - Masculine and

Neuter

"Callum", attested in this form in the Early period,<sup>1</sup> occurs in a disputed form in a quotation in Nonius, under "praecisum et omasum" (I 220.1f.):-

"Naeuius<sup>2</sup>...:

'praecisum, omasum, pernam, callos, Tglifis,  
glandia.'"

The manuscripts give "gallus". Bentinus (1526) emends to "callum", Mercer (1583) to "callus". This latter emendation would mean that either all the words are nominative ("pernam" would then have to be emended) or that "callus" is a third-declension neuter. Lindsay suggests that perhaps "perna, callus" should be read. Onions (1895) emends to "callos".

It seems unnecessary to emend "pernam" if the text is satisfactory. "Callum" is recommended by the neuter in Plautus, "callus" and "callos" by their close resemblance to the manuscript form. In further support of "callos" is the variation in

- 
1. Pl. Pers. 305 magis calleo quam aprugnum callum  
callet
  2. Com. 65

gender of "corium". For both second- and third-declension neuter forms of the same word one can compare "tergum/tergus". The connection with "corium" is probably closer.

It would seem, therefore, that there is a strong case for a masculine second-declension form of "callus" in Early Latin and that a third-declension neuter is not impossible, even though the evidence is based on an emendation.

Besides "tergum" and "tergus", neuter, "tergus", masculine is found in Early Latin. Nonius quotes (I 337.16f.):-

"Tergum neutro ... Masculino Plautus<sup>1</sup>...:  
'habeo, opinor, familiarem tergum'".

The manuscripts of Plautus give "familiare" but modern editors accept Nonius' version.

"Tegoribus" is used by Plautus. Pseudolus 198 reads:-

"... carnaria tria gravida tegoribus oneri".

In Captivi 915:-

"... praetruncavit tribus tegoribus glandia"

only the Ambrosian Palimpsest reads "tegoribus" but, as Dr. Szemerényi points out, this reading is confirmed by the metre.

"Tegoribus" has been emended by Turnebus in Captivi 902:-

"... collos praetruncabo tegoribus".

---

1. As. 319

Second and Third Declensions - Feminine and Neuter

Though the context does not indicate so, "tappetia" must be a neuter plural in Plautus, Pseudolus 147:-

"... Alexandrina beluata tonsilia tappetia"

and in Stichus 378:-

"... Babylonica et peristroma, tonsilia et tappetia."

The neuter singular is quoted by Nonius (I 339.5):-

"Tapete generis neutri. Turpilius<sup>1</sup> et Caecilius<sup>2</sup>:  
'glabrum tapete'".

Turpilius<sup>1</sup> is again quoted for this use by Nonius (III 870.16) and probably by Festus, who states (470.12f.):-

"Tappete ex Graeco sum \* \* \*  
tae Ennius<sup>3</sup> cum ait: 't \* \* (Turpi-)<sup>4</sup>  
lius in Demetrio: 'lec \* \* \* \*  
veterem. Sic tappet \* \* \* \*"

One cannot tell whether "-tae" is part of "tapetae". "Tapetae" would not accord with Festus' "Tappete".

"Tapeta" is quoted by Sergius (IV 542.5):-

"... apud Luciliu<sup>5</sup>...:  
'erant et equorum, inaurata tapeta'".

This passage also occurs in Probus (IV 130.1). It is attributed to Livius also<sup>6</sup> because some manuscripts read "apud

- 
1. ~~37~~ 217
  2. 285
  3. Inc. 38
  4. 37
  5. Fals. 14
  6. fr. 44

livium".

"Tapetes" occurs in a quotation in Gellius (XX 9.1):-

"Delectari ... figmentis verborum novis Cn. Matii<sup>1</sup>....:  
'iam tonsiles tapetes ebrii fuco'".

Second, Third and Fourth Declensions - Masculine, Feminine and  
Neuter

Several forms of "penus" occur in Early Latin:

Plautus, Pseudolus 220, has:-

"... omne huc penus adfertur".

In Trinummus 254 occurs:-

"Raptores panis et peni."

Priscian discusses the word (II 170.13f.):-

"'Hic' et 'haec' et 'hoc penus' et 'hoc penum' -

Plautus<sup>2</sup>....:

'... nisi mihi annuus penus ... congeratur'  
... Lucilius<sup>3</sup>:

'magna penus parvo spatio consumpta ...'  
Plautus<sup>4</sup>....:

'dicam seni curet sibi aliud penus.'  
Caesar Strabo<sup>5</sup>....:

'... Messalas domo deflagrata penore volebamus  
privare.'

Afranius<sup>6</sup>....:

'... intra penum  
erile-,'

- 
1. fr. 13
  2. Ps. 178
  3. Inc. 89
  4. Capt. 920
  5. fr. 14
  6. 329



The form of "penus" in the Pseudolus passage agrees with that of Plautus' text, but the Captivi passage differs in that the Ambrosian Palimpsest probably reads:-

"Dicam ut sibi penum alibi adornet",  
while other manuscripts read, "penum aliud ornet". Ernout accepts the former reading, Lindsay (O.C.T.), "penum aliud [ad]ornet".

Most of these passages are quoted again in II 260.17f.

Terence, Eunuchus 310 includes:-

"... penum omnem congerebam".

Some manuscripts give "omne". Donatus<sup>1</sup> comments:-

"Et hoc penus et hic penus et haec penus veteres dixerunt. Ergo et 'omne' et 'omnem' legitur."

Priscian (II 163.15) quotes the line, reading "omnem".

Nonius also discusses the subject (I 324.30f.):-

"Penus generis feminini. Lucilius<sup>2</sup>...  
Masculini. Pomponius<sup>3</sup> Dogali:  
'unum penem, quei omnem ceterum alium praerberem penum.'

Novius<sup>4</sup> Dotata:

'neum in penum conponam satius est.'

The text has been emended in several ways. N.-W.<sup>5</sup> retain

- 
1. I 336.11
  2. Inc. 89, cf. Prisc. above
  3. 41a
  4. 16a
  5. I 846

"penum", "quae", "aliam" and "meam" of the manuscripts and, to explain the resulting confusion they re-write the passage:-

"Pomponius Togatis oder Dotali:  
 'vinum penumque omnem.'  
 Novius Dotata:  
 'ceterum alium (oder aliam) praeberem penum.'  
 Atta:  
 'meum (oder meam) in penum componam satius est.'"

As they emend the two later feminines in any case, there seems no need for the extravagant conjecture of a third quotation. Lindsay's solution, with the exception, perhaps, of "unum penem", is far simpler, fits the text and meaning better and seems satisfactory.

Further quotations occur in Servius<sup>1</sup>, on Virgil, Aeneid I 703:-

"Penus ... masculino ... Plautus<sup>2</sup>... feminino  
 Lucilius<sup>3</sup>...:  
 'uxori legata penus'"

and in Charisius (I 140.11):-

"Penu Pomponius<sup>4:5</sup>  
 '\*\*\* e careo tam pulchra penu'.  
 Penus peni, si femininum".

The same passage is quoted by Cledonius (V 40.11f.):-

"Haec penus Pomponius:

---

1. I - I 197.9f.
2. Ps. 178
3. XVI 5
4. Keil's supplements
5. 183

'... caream tam pulchra peno.'  
Haec penus huius penus, hic penus huius peni".

On the strength of "penu" in Charisius, Keil believes that Cledonius also intended this form. Both grammarians are inconsistent, as neither quotes the declension which fits the form of Pomponius' "penus" in their respective manuscripts. The knowledge that Cicero<sup>1</sup> and Horace<sup>2</sup> use the fourth-declension forms, and that second-declension feminines are rare encourages a preference for "penu".

Of all the various forms attested, the neuter "penum/s" seems to be the least certain. In Pseudolus 228 "omne" could be a phonetic variant of "omnis" (cf. "pane/is"). The text of Captivi 920 is very confused. In Eunuchus 310, the best manuscripts read "omnem" so that Donatus may be noting a textual, not a morphological, variation. "Penum erile-" in Priscian's text appears to have something missing. Ribbeck emends to "erile penum", Leo to "penum erilem".

#### Second and Fourth Declensions - Masculine and Feminine

Early Latin contributes a little to the vexed question of "colus".

"Cum tua colu" occurs in a quotation from Opimius in

- 
1. N.D. II 27.68 a penu
  2. Ep. I 16.72 portet frumenta penusque

Cicero, De Oratore II 68.277.

Priscian quotes, for "scicidistis" (II 517.3):-

"Afranius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'... vestras scicidistis colus.'"

A very fragmentary inscription<sup>2</sup> reads:-

"MA CA  
S COLI"

which Bücheler conjecturally supplements "fusus coli".

The evidence above provides only a beginning for a discussion of the gender- and declension-variation, which belongs to a later period.

#### Second and Fourth Declensions - Masculine and Neuter

"Angiportum", a second-declension neuter is the usual form of this word in Early Latin, though other forms occur.

Terence, Phormio 891 reads:-

"... in angiportum hoc proximum".

Some manuscripts read "hunc", which is the form occurring in the line as quoted in Priscian's discussion of the word (II 262.22).

This is the only passage from Early authors where the masculine may be attested. It appears later in Cicero<sup>3</sup>.

- 
1. 227
  2. C.I.L. I<sup>2</sup> 1930
  3. Div. I 32.69 vias omnis angiportusque constraverat

The fourth declension is attested in Plautus, Cistellaria 124:-

"... ex angiportu"

and perhaps in Mostellaria 1046:-

"Ostium quod in angiporto est"

where this is the reading of the Ambrosian Palimpsest against "angiportu" of the other manuscripts.

The fourth-declension forms do not show their gender but are probably masculine (cf. Cicero<sup>1</sup>).

"Fretum" is used in Early Latin. Other forms are discussed by Nonius (I 302.23f.):-

"Fretum neutri ... Masculini ... Naevius<sup>2</sup>:  
'dubii faventem per fretum...'

Ennius<sup>3</sup>:

'... omnem pervolat caeli fretum.'

Lucilius<sup>4</sup>:

'serena caeli numina et salsi fretus.'"

"Salsi fretus" is attributed to Porcus Licinus<sup>5</sup> by Charisius.

Varro, De Lingua Latina VII 22, quotes:-

"Pacui<sup>6</sup>:

'liqui in Aegeo fretu'

- 
1. Div. I 32.69 vias omnis angiportusque constraverat
  2. Trag. 53
  3. Fab. 382
  4. Inc. 176
  5. fr. 5
  6. 420

dictum fretum ab similitudine ferventis aquae".

Manuscript "fretum" is emended by Spengel to "fretu", by Laetus (1471) to "freto", which is more in accord with Varro's own "fretum".

"Gelus" a fourth-declension masculine is frequently attested in Early Latin.

Cato uses the nominative in De Agricultura 40.4:-

"Ne gelus noceat".

The word is discussed by Nonius (I 306.32f.):-

"Gelu neutri ... Livius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'praestatur virtuti laus, set gelu multo ocus  
vento tabescit.'  
Masculini. Afranius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'... silicis cum findat gelus?'  
Accius<sup>3</sup>...:  
'tum profusus flamine hiberno gelus.'  
Cato<sup>4</sup>...:  
'... gelum crassum excidunt, eum ... auferunt.'"

The passage from Accius is included in Priscian's discussion (II 211.9).

The u-stem declension is attested once above, the o-stem declension not until Lucretius<sup>5</sup>, which makes it probable that the other forms above belong to the u-stem declension.

- 
1. Trag. 16
  2. 106
  3. Trag. 390
  4. Orig. II 30
  5. e.g. VI 530 vis magna geli

There are several ways of emending and translating the passage from Livius. "Vento" is the reading of one manuscript "venio" of several. Bücheler has emended to "verno". If one accepts this emendation, as Warmington does, "gelu" must be construed as an ablative with "verno". Warmington translates:-

"To virtue praise is offered,  
but quicker far it melts than ice of spring."

If one reads "vento", two translations are possible - "but it (virtue) melts away much more quickly than frost in the wind" or "but frost melts away much more quickly in the wind". Of these two, the first fits better with the first part of the quotation, but "vento" must signify a warm wind. The second fits better with Nonius' words. A neuter, "gelu" is not elsewhere attested before Ovid<sup>1</sup>. On account of this, the likely meaning of the passage and Nonius' fallibility, "gelu" is better taken as the ablative - masculine or neuter - than the neuter nominative.

Fourth-declension forms of "tonitrus" are attested by Nonius, under "sonere" (III 812.9):-

"Accius ...  
'sed quid tonitru turbida torvo -  
concuissa repente aequora caeli'"

---

1. Nux 106 solve geluve

and by Cicero, De Oratore III 39.157

"... caelum tonitru contremittit".<sup>1</sup>

Priscian (II 210.15) mentions "tonitru" and "tonitrum", for which he quotes (II 212.1):-

"Accius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'... inter tonitra'".

This is Keil's version. The manuscripts only read "tonitr\*" or "tonit\*x". On each of these respectively has been written "tonitrua" and "tonitru".

The evidence for the second-declension neuter plural rests on an emendation alone. The second-declension neuter does not occur until Pliny.

"Vulta" is quoted by Nonius (I 341.10f.):-

"Vultus masculino ... Neutro ... Ennius<sup>3</sup>:  
'... vostraque vulta.'"

"Vulta" occurs again in Lucretius<sup>4</sup>.

#### Second and Fourth Declensions - Masculine, Feminine and Neuter

Nonius discusses "specus" (I 329.25f.):-

"Specus genere masculino ... Ennius<sup>5</sup>...:  
'inferum vastos specus.'

- 
1. Pac. 413
  2. Trag. 480
  3. Ann. 464
  4. IV 1213 vulta parentum
  5. Fab. 193



Feminino Ennius<sup>1</sup>....:

Pacuvius<sup>2</sup>....: 'concava sub monti late specus intu' patebat.'

'... advenio montem Oetam in scruposam specum.'"

Nonius' manuscripts give "montis", those of Priscian and Festus (see below) give "monte".

The two later passages are quoted by Priscian (II 260.3f.) who adds:-

"'Hoc specum' et 'haec specula'. Cato<sup>3</sup>:  
'specula prosita quo aqua de via abiret.'"

Festus quotes Ennius and (462.20):-

"Pacuvius<sup>4</sup>....:  
'est ibi sub eo saxo penitus strata harena ingens  
specus.'"

Dr. Szemerényi suggests that possibly "concava sub montis" should be read in the Ennius passage, making "concava" neuter plural. This is supported by "montis" of Nonius and Vahlen (comm. ad loc.) suggests "montem" - which would give an accusative after "sub".

In the second Pacuvius passage, "strata" might agree with "harena".

"Specula" in Cato is probably a neuter plural<sup>5</sup>.

- 
1. Ann. 440
  2. 252
  3. Inc. 9
  4. 99
  5. see N.-W. I 851

It does not seem that the feminine in the first Pacuvius passage can be explained away.

Nonius attests (III 783.24):-

"Specis, pro specubus. Accius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'... altis clausere specis.'"

### Third and Fourth Declensions - Masculine, Feminine and Neuter

Classical "pecus, -oris" and "pecus, -udis" are outnumbered in Early Latin by u-stem forms.

The u-stem is neuter in the plural, as in Plautus, Mercator 509:-

"Nec pecua ruri pascere",

Cato, De Agricultura 141.3:-

"Pecuaque salva servassis"

and in numerous other passages.

A genitive plural is attested by Priscian (II 270.10):-

"Hostius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'saepe greges pecuum'".

Under "Pecua et pecuda" (I 234.5f.) Nonius quotes:-

"Accius<sup>3</sup>...:  
'... pavore pecuda in tumulis deserunt'  
... Caecilius<sup>4</sup>...:  
'et homini et pecudibus omnibus.'

- 
1. Trag. 64
  2. fr. 2
  3. Trag. 409
  4. 93

Sisenna<sup>1</sup>...: '... pecuda locis trepidare compluribus.'

For the universal tradition "pecudibus", Spengel (1829) emends to "pecubus".

### Trees

Only second-declension forms of "cupressus" are attested before Catullus and Varro, though both masculine and feminine forms are found.

Cato uses the word several times - in the feminine in De Agricultura 151.2:-

"Semen cupressi Tarentinae".

Gellius (XIII 21.(20)13) notes the masculine:-

"Ennius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'... rectosque cupressos.'

Servius<sup>3</sup>, on Georgics II 449, quotes:-

"Ille (Ennius)<sup>4</sup>...:  
'longique cupressi'".

These are the only examples of the masculine in Latin.

In "ficus" there seems to be no distinction in form to correspond with the distinction in meaning of "tree" and

- 
1. fr. 76
  2. Ann. 490
  3. II-I 260.21
  4. Ann. 262

"fruit", as can be seen in Cato, De Agricultura 94:-

"Fici scabrae non fient et multo feraciores erunt."

and 99:-

"Fici aridae si voles ut(i) integrae sint, in vas fictile condito."

The unusual masculine is attested in 42:-

"De eo fico"

and is quoted by Nonius (I 227.21) under "primitus":-

"Lucilius<sup>1</sup>....:

'sicuti cum primos ficos propola recentis  
protulit et pretio ingenti dat primitu' paucos.'"

In II 429.10 the passage is quoted again and the manuscripts read "primus". "Paucos" in both passages still attests the masculine of "ficos".

Priscian (II 204.4) quotes, for "cepe":-

"Novius<sup>2</sup>....:

'oleas, cepe, ficus!'"

A few manuscripts read "ficos". The fourth-declension of the word in the sense of the "fruit" is attested in Horace.

Cato uses "murtum" in De Agricultura.

In 8.2:-

"Bulbos Megaricos, murtum coniugulum et album et nigrum, loream Delphicam ... haec facite ut serantur."

---

1. V 28

2. 18

and in 133.2:-

"Laurum ... Delphicam ... murtum coniugulum et murtum album et nigrum ... haec omnia ... propagari ... oportebit."

the gender is masculine or neuter and the meaning must be that of the "tree" rather than of the "wood".

For the fruit, he uses "murta" in 125:-

"Murtam nigram arfacito in umbra. ubi iam passa erit, servato ad vindemiam, in urnam musti contundito murtae semodium".

No other forms are found in the earliest writers.

### Third and Fifth Declensions - Masculine and Feminine

The "fifth-declension" form "lapiderum" has already been discussed. "Lapis" shows other variations.

Priscian quotes (II 250.9f.):-

"Hic lapis huius lapidis" ... etiam 'huius lapis' ... Ennius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'... ferroque lapique'".

The passage is quoted again in II 281.8.

Nonius remarks (I 311.10f.):-

"Lapides et feminino ... aput Ennium<sup>2</sup>:  
'tanto sublatae sunt agmine tunc lapides.'"

Neither of these phenomena is further attested and the usual gender and declension are freely used in the Early Period.

- 
1. Ann. 398
  2. Ann. 553

B - GENDER-VARIATION AND DECLENSION - VARIATION INTERDEPENDENT

Words discussed in this section are mainly those varying between the first and second declensions. Although masculine a-stems and feminine o-stems exist, they are not such as to play a significant part in the variation discussed. Therefore it is generally assumed for present purposes that an o-stem, in order to become feminine, must take a-stem forms and an a-stem, in order to become masculine or neuter, must take o-stem forms.

First and Second DeclensionsFeminine (Masculine)

"Fluvia" is quoted by Nonius (I 304.3f.):-

"Fluvius masculini ... Feminini. Sisenna<sup>1</sup>:  
'... inter duas fluvias ...'  
idem<sup>2</sup>....  
'transgressus fluviam, quae ... pertinebat'."

Manuscripts read "fluviu~~m~~" though "quae" is undisputed.

"Fluvia" occurs incidentally in I 103.23:-

"Accius<sup>3</sup>....  
'...  
scatebra fluviae radit rupem.'"

"Situla" is attested by Plautus. In Cato, De Agricultura

- 
1. fr. 53
  2. fr. 54
  3. Trag. 505

10.2 and 11.3, occurs:-

"Situlum aquarium I"

in the accusative case.

Later, Vitruvius<sup>1</sup> uses the masculine.

#### Masculine (Feminine)

An isolated example of "charti" is found in Nonius (I 288.17):-

"Chartam generis feminini. Masculini Lucilius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'... ubi nunc Socratici charti?'"

#### Feminine and Neuter

Classical "arvum" is found as early as the time of Livius Andronicus. The feminine is quoted by Nonius (I 283.29f.):-

"Arva neutri ... Feminino Naevius<sup>3</sup>...:  
'i quaque incedunt, omnis arvas opterunt.'  
Pacuvius<sup>4</sup>: 'postquam calamitas plures annos arvas calvitur.'"

Bergk<sup>5</sup> emends to "complures".

Classical "latrina" is used by Early writers. Nonius discusses the word (I 312.7f.):-

"Latrina genere feminino ... Lucilius<sup>5</sup>

- 
1. X 4.4 habens situlos pendentes
  2. XXVII 46
  3. Trag. 19
  4. 396
  5. XI 26

'qui in latrina languet.'  
 Neutro Laberius<sup>1</sup>...:  
 'sequere in latrinum'  
 ... Lucilius<sup>2</sup>...:  
 'hoc tu apte credis quemquam latrina petisse?'"

### Feminine (Neuter)

For Classical "lanitium", "lanitia" is quoted by Nonius  
 (I 313.17f.):-

"Lanitium genere neutro ... Feminine. Laberius<sup>3</sup>...:  
 '... e lanitia Attica an pecore ex hirto'".

Similarly, "menda" is attested long before "mendum".

Nonius discusses the word (I 315.2f.):-

"Mendum neutro ... Feminino ... Lucilius<sup>4</sup>:  
 '... mendae  
 omnibus in rebus fiunt'".

The feminine does not occur again in the Early period but  
 is attested later, especially by Ovid.

### Neuter (Feminine)

Feminine plurals of "balneum" are numerous in the Early  
 period. One example is Plautus, Rudens 383:-

"Qui it lavatum  
 in balineas."

In Nonius (I 304.20), under "forum" occurs:-

- 
1. 36
  2. VI 29
  3. 67
  4. Inc. 87



"Pomponius<sup>1</sup>...:

'balnea,  
forus, macellus, fana, portus, porticus.'"

"Balnea" could be feminine singular or neuter plural. The Roman habit is to use the word in the neuter plural, which it probably is here. Mercer (1583) emends to "balneae".

Nonius states (I 295.34):-

"Castra ... neutri. Feminini. Accius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'"castra haec vestra est."'"

This could be a misunderstanding of Nonius and could be construed rather "haec est vestra castra" when "est" would have nothing to do with "castra".<sup>3</sup>

"Ganeum" is attested, for example, in Plautus, Asinaria 1007:-

"... ire adsuetum esse in ganeum"

and in Terence, Adelphi 359:-

"... Credo abductum in ganeum."

It is not to be found in the passage quoted by N.-W.<sup>4</sup> from Festus (26.18), under "aleonem":-

"Naevius<sup>5</sup>:

- 
1. 37
  2. Praet. 16
  3. suggested by Dr. Szemerényi
  4. I 822
  5. Com. 118

'pessimorum pessime, audax, ganeo, lustro, aleo.'" "Ganeo" is here a nominative singular, parallel with "lustro" and "aleo".

"Ganea" is not attested until the time of Cicero.

Feminine plural forms of "labia" are frequent in the Early period. An example can be seen in Plautus, Stichus 723:-

"... refer ad labeas tibias".

In a passage in Nonius (I 327.20):-

"Rictus ... Titinius<sup>1</sup>:  
'exporge frontem; habeat semper facito rictus'"

Ribbeck emends to "labea" ("labeat" occurs in the line as quoted in Nonius III 730.1) and reads:-

"Labea semper facito rictu rideat".

The text seems satisfactory without emendation and "labia" as a feminine singular does not occur till much later.

Nonius discusses "ostrea" (I 318.3f.):-

"Ostrea generis feminini. Lucilius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'ostrea nulla fuit...'  
Turpilius<sup>3</sup>...:  
'... coge inoras ostreas.'  
... Afranius<sup>4</sup>...:  
'conchas, echinos, ostreas marinas.'

- 
1. 172  
2. III 25  
3. 23  
4. 142

... Neutri. Lucilius<sup>1</sup>....:  
 '... si ostrea cerno.'  
 ... idem<sup>2</sup>....:  
 '... dabis ostrea milibu' nummum  
 empta?'"

Plautus uses the feminine in Rudens 297:-

"Echinos, lopadas, ostrias ..."

The neuter occurs in Gellius (XX 8.4):-

"Lucilium<sup>3</sup>... meministis dicere:  
 'luna alit ostrea et implet echinos ...'".

"Terricula" as a neuter is quoted by Nonius (I 337.27f.):-

"Terriculae generis feminini. Neutri. Accius<sup>4</sup>....:  
 'ubi nunc terricula tua sunt?'  
 idem<sup>5</sup>....:  
 '... istaec tu aufer terricula ...'"

The feminine occurs in Lactantius (I 22.13):-

"Lucilius<sup>6</sup>....:  
 'terrículas Lamias, Fauni quas Pompilique  
 instituere Numae ...'"

Dr. Szemerényi suggests that "terrículas" may be an adjective.

This cannot apply to Nonius (II 559.28):-

"Afranius<sup>7</sup>....:  
 '... pertimuidis cassam terriculam adversari.'"

- 
1. IX 8
  2. XIII 8
  3. Inc. 46
  4. Trag. 324
  5. Trag. 623
  6. XV 5
  7. 270

Several nouns in "-mentum" occur in the feminine in the Early period, though later the neuter re-asserts itself.

"Armenta", used mainly in the plural, has a feminine form in Nonius (I 280.20f.):-

"Armenta genere neutro ... Feminino" Ennius<sup>1</sup>:  
 'ipsius ad armentas eosdem'  
 Pacuvius<sup>2</sup>:  
 'tu pascere  
 cornifrontes soles armentas.'

The neuter is read from Lucretius onwards.

Cato several times uses "caementum" in the ablative plural. The use of the feminine is noted by Nonius (I 289.29f.):-

"Caementa neutri ... Feminini. Ennius<sup>3</sup>:  
 'labat; labuntur saxa, caementae cadunt.'

"Caementae" is the emendation of Iunius (1565) for "caementa". The emendation is demanded by Nonius' statement and by the metre.

The feminine of "fulmentum" is attested by Cato, De Agricultura 14.1, where "fulmentas" are amongst the requisites he lists for building a house.

Nonius discusses the word (I 304.26f.):-

- 
1. Ann. 598
  2. 349
  3. Fab. 383

"Fulmentum neutro ... Feminino Lucilius<sup>1</sup>...:  
 'fulmentas †eis atque aeneis subducere.'  
 et<sup>2</sup>...:  
 '... fulmentas quattuor addit.'  
 Plautus<sup>3</sup>...:  
 'fulmentas iubeam subponi soccis.'"

The text of Plautus reads "suppingi".

One example of the feminine of "lamentum" is preserved by Nonius (I 192.27):-

"Lamentas pro lamentationes. Pacuvius<sup>4</sup>...:  
 'lamentas, fletus facere'".

Priscian quotes a feminine of "myrtetum" (I123.26f.):-

"'Myrtetum' - quamvis feminino genere Plautus<sup>5</sup>...:  
 'nescio qui servus e myrteta †prosiluit - '".

The passage occurs in Porphyrio's Commentary on Horace, Odes I 38.7:-

"Plautus in Vidularia myrtum et feminino ... sic:  
 'e myrteta prosiluit'  
 et:  
 'haec myrtus Veneris est.'  
 haec myrtus et haec myrteta †nomen significat."

A tenth-century manuscript reads "per myrteta", wherefore Ernout suspects "myrteta", feminine, as an error of Priscian. Porphyrio is confusing in that he discusses "myrtus" but quotes

- 
1. XXVIII 33
  2. IV 29
  3. Trin. 720
  4. 175
  5. Vid. Fr. VIII

"myrteta", which does seem to be a feminine also.

Plautus uses a feminine of "ramentum" in Bacchides 513:-

"Verum quam illa umquam de mea pecunia  
ramenta fiat plumea propensior"

and in 519b

"[... quam illa umquam meis opulentiis  
ramenta fiat gravior aut propensior]".

The Ambrosian Palimpsest does not include the latter passage, which is suspected of being a dittography of the former one.

The feminine is also attested in Rudens 1016:-

"... ramenta fiet fortunatior".

The neuter occurs in Bacchides 680:-

"... patri omne cum ramento reddidi."

### Masculine, Feminine and Neuter

Under "ruscum" Festus quotes (320.20):-

"Cato<sup>1</sup>....:  
'mulieres opertae auro purpuraque; arsinea, rete,  
diadema, coronas aureas, ruscea ... galbeos, lineas, pelles'".

Various emendations have been made to "galbeos" and "lineas" but there seems no reason why they should not both stand.

Very much later "galbeo",<sup>2</sup> ablative is attested, otherwise the word does not occur except in glosses<sup>3</sup>.

- 
1. Orig. VII 8
  2. Suet. Galba 3
  3. "galbeum" Paul. Fest. 85.12 "galbeae" Gloss. Ps. Ploc.  
Gl. L. IV 55.10

Cato uses "spica" in De Agricultura 70.1:-

"Spicas III".

Festus quotes a masculine (446.9f.):-

"Spicum masculine ... Versus est antiquus<sup>1</sup>:  
'... unumquemque spicum collegit.'"

How "antiquus" the line is, one cannot tell.

Cicero<sup>2</sup> uses the neuter. Dr. Szemerényi points out that the diminutive, "spiculum", is neuter.

#### First and Third Declensions - Feminine and Neuter

"Cepa/-e" is discussed by Priscian (II 203.13f.):-

"'Hoc cepe' ... 'hae cepae harum cepearum' quamvis ... Naevius<sup>3</sup>...:

Lucilius<sup>4</sup>...: '... qui primum holitor cepam protulit.'

frequentior ... 'lippus edenda acri adsidue ceparius cepa.'  
... 'hoc cepe' ... Naevius<sup>5</sup>...:

Novius<sup>6</sup>...: '... cepe edundo ...'

'oleas, cepe, ficus.'"

Nonius also discusses it (I 295.1f.):-

"Cepe generis neutri. Lucilius<sup>7</sup>...:  
'flebile cepe ...'

idem<sup>8</sup>...:

- 
1. Com. Inc. 68
  2. N.D. II 42.10 (poet.) spicum inlustre
  3. Com. 19
  4. V 23
  5. Com. 18
  6. 18
  7. V 22
  8. XVI 9

'... qui cepe serebat.'

One more quotation occurs in Macrobius (VI 5.5):-

"Tristis pro amaro ... Ennius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'neque triste quaeritat sinapi  
neque caepe maestum.'"

Both forms reappear in later Latin.

1. Sat. 12



SECTION IVMISCELLANEOUSdies, nox

A full treatment of these two words is beyond the scope of the present discussion.

It can be seen from the table given in the Thesaurus that the masculine gender of "dies" is far more frequent than the feminine. Plautus uses the masculine over a hundred times and the feminine ten times.

A declension variation is attested by Nonius (I 140.20f.):-

"Diu pro die ... Titinius<sup>1</sup>....:  
 'nec noctu nec diu ...'  
 Plautus<sup>2</sup>....:  
 'noctuque et diu ...'  
 idem<sup>3</sup>....:  
 'nec noctu nec diu ...'."

The Casina passage agrees with Plautus' text. The Aulularia fragment occurs only here.

Charisius quotes (I 207.18):-

"Titinius<sup>4</sup>....:  
 'noctu diusque'".

"Sub diu" is perhaps attested by Plautus, Mostellaria 765:-

- 
1. 27
  2. Cas. 823
  3. Aul. Fr. IV
  4. 13

"Sub sudo columine ..."

"Sub sudo" is Studemund's interpretation of the Ambrosian Palimpsest's "subs \* \* o ". Other important manuscripts read "sub diu" and yet others, "sub divo".

Nonius, under "gelu" includes (I 306.37):-

"Afranius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'... intempesta noctu, sub † divo,  
aperto capite'".

"Divo" is the tradition. Emendations include "diu" of Bücheler.

The evidence for the form is, then, very doubtful. Were it not for the fact that "diu" and "divus" as well as "dius" are from the same stem, "sub diu" could be dismissed. However, in the circumstances the above passages must be counted as at least possible attestations.

"Noctu" is used substantivally several times in Plautus:-  
Miles Gloriosus 381:-

"... somnium quod noctu hac somniavi."

Trinummus 869:-

"... mi adveniēti hac noctu agitandumst vigilias."

Amphitruo 731:-

"Te heri me vidisse, qui hac noctu in portum advecti sumus".

---

1. 105

Amphitruo 272:-

"... hac noctu Nocturnum \* obdormisse ebrium".

Amphitruo 404:-

"Nonne hac noctu nostra navis ...".

Amphitruo 412:-

"Nam noctu hac soluta est navis nostra ...".

In addition, the usage is found in Nonius (I 75.20) under "bidentes":-

"Laberius ...:  
'visus hac noctu bidenti  
propter viam facere'"

where "noctu" is Quicherat's (1872) emendation for the universal tradition "nocte";

Macrobius (I 4.17f.):-

"Ennius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'qua Galli furtim noctu summa areis adorti  
moenia concubia vigilesque repente cruentant.'  
quo in loco animadvertendum est non solum quod 'noctu concubia',  
sed quod etiam 'qua noctu' dixerit. ... dixit<sup>3</sup>:  
'hac noctu filo pendeat Etruria tota.'

Claudius<sup>4</sup>...:  
'senatus autem de nocte convenire, noctu multa  
domum dimitti.'"

As Professor Skutsch points out<sup>5</sup>, "qua" need not be taken with

- 
1. 69
  2. Ann. 164
  3. Ann. 152
  4. fr. 45
  5. Noctu Glotta XXXII 1953 p.310

"noctu" though "concupia" should.

In the passage from Afranius quoted above (for "sub diu") "intempesta noctu" occurs.

### Animals

Nonius discusses "anguis" (I 281.12f.):-

"Anguis masculino ... Naeuius:<sup>1</sup>  
 'alte iubatos angues ...'  
 Lucilius<sup>2</sup>...:  
 '... anguisque volucris ac pinnatos ...'  
 ... feminino Plautus<sup>3</sup>...:  
 'devolant angues iubatae in conpluvium duo.'

One manuscript reads "duae", presumably influenced by "iubatae". The manuscripts of Plautus give "iuvati" and "maximi" in the next line. Servius, on Virgil, Aeneid II 206<sup>4</sup>, quotes "angues iubati".

It is difficult to see whence Nonius reads "iubatae".

Cicero, Academica II 38.09, discussing visions, quotes Ennius<sup>5</sup>:-

"'caerulea incinctae angui incedunt ...'".

It is the Furies who are described. The manuscripts give "cerulee", which is interpreted by Plasberg as "caeruleae" and

- 
1. Trag. 10
  2. XXVI 34
  3. Amph. 1108
  4. I - I 255.3
  5. Fab. 30

emended by Vahlen to "caerulea". "Caeruleus" is usually the epithet of the snakes rather than of the Furies. Columna (1590) emends manuscript "igni" to "angui" and reads "caeruleo". "Caerulea" is preferable.

For the feminine of "anguis", Cicero, De Natura Deorum I 36.101, should be noted:-

"Velut ibes maximam vim serpentium conficiunt ... avertunt pestem ab Aegypto, cum volucris anguis ex vastitate Libyae vento Africo invectas interficiunt atque consumunt; ex quo fit, ut illae nec morsu vivae noceant nec odore mortuae."

Tacitus also uses the feminine.

"Canis" (or "canes") is found several times in both masculine and feminine genders in Early Latin. An unusual phrase occurs in Plautus, Menaechmi 838:-

"... ab laeva rabiosa femina adservat canis".

"Grus" is discussed by Nonius (I 307.16f.):-

"Grues genere feminino ... Lucilius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'longior hic quam grus, grue tota cum volat olim.'  
Masculino Laberius<sup>2</sup>...:  
'... hunc gruem Baliaricum an esse hominem putas?'"

A true masculine is not attested here, for, although

"Baliaricum" grammatically agrees with "gruem", they both refer to "hunc (sc. "hominem")".

---

1. IV 32  
2. 47

"Palumbes" is several times found in Early Latin, both without any distinguishing adjective and with a masculine one.

Cato, De Agricultura 90, uses the expression "palumbum recentem". Keil points out in his Commentary that "recens" is used of animals which have lately borne young. This shows tenacity to the common gender in preference to the masculine and feminine.

"Puer" is discussed by Charisius (I 84.5f.):-

"Puer et in feminino sexu ... in Odyssea<sup>1</sup>...:  
'mea puer, quid verbi ex tuo ore audio?'  
et in Nelei carmine<sup>2</sup>:  
'eaque prisco saucia puer filia sumam;'  
ubi tamen Varro cum a puera putat dictum, sed Aelius Stilo ...  
contra."

Priscian also discusses it (II 231.1f.):-

"'Puera' dicebant antiquissimi ... Livius<sup>1</sup>...:  
'mea puera, quid verbi ex tuo ore supera fugit?'  
'haec puer' vetustissimi ... Livius<sup>3</sup>...:  
'sancta puer Saturni filia regina.'  
Naevius<sup>4</sup>...:  
'prima incedit Cereris Proserpina puer.'"

The original in the passage quoted by both grammarians is  
Odyssey I 64:-

"Τέκνον ἔμὸν, ποῖόν σε ἔπος φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων;"

---

1. fr. 3
2. 5
3. fr. 14
4. fr. 29

which supports Priscian's version against that of Charisius.

Charisius himself is uncertain about the form in his second quotation.

For the original of "sancta puer, etc." Warmington gives Odyssey IV 513 ... σώσε δὲ πότνια Ἥρη.

There is no confusion of the gender of "puer" in Plautus.

Another illustration of the confusion in Latin between sex and gender is found in Plautus, Mercator 234f.:-

"Ea simia ...,  
 ...  
 dicit capram quam dederam servandam sibi  
 suae uxoris dotem ambedisse oppido."

"Simia" does not refer to a person, as it does sometimes in Plautus, but to an animal about which the speaker has dreamed.

"Simia" used of a person is masculine.

PART II



### Names of Parts of the Body

These have been grouped together in various places in Part I because it was felt that their semantic affinity has some bearing on their frequent variations of gender or declension. Ernout<sup>1</sup> notes that in particular, words indicating neighbouring parts often interchange gender and declension.

### Trees

These have been grouped together, when practicable, in the same way as the names of the parts of the body. Most of them show some variation of gender or declension, probably on account of their having feminine o-stem forms. This "irregularity" is smoothed out in either of two ways - the feminine o-stem becomes a masculine o-stem or a feminine u-stem. Such a frequently-used word as "manus" makes a feminine u-stem more familiar than a feminine o-stem.

Once one name of a tree shows variation, it is obvious that others of similar form will follow it. Names of trees will not be discussed individually.

### alvus (p.16)

If, as is probable, "alvus" is closely connected with

- 
1. Les noms des Parties du Corps en Latin Latomus X  
1951 p.3-12, esp. p.11

αύλος<sup>1</sup>, it is the feminine gender which needs to be explained. Sommer<sup>2</sup> tentatively suggests "hira" as an analogical model. This word is only attested once in Early Latin<sup>3</sup>, then not again until the time of Macrobius; both "venter" and "uterus" (masculines) are frequent. It seems that some firmer basis for analogy would be needed to draw this o-stem into the unusual feminine gender.

pampinus (p.17)

The fact that the Greek word ἄμπελος, comparable in meaning, is feminine may have some bearing on the occurrence of the feminine in Latin. Or, as the word is probably borrowed from a non-Indo-European language<sup>4</sup>, the feminine may be original and the masculine due to the influence of the majority of Latin o-stems.

lembus (p.18)

It is fairly obvious that "navis" induces the feminine gender of "lembus".<sup>5</sup>

acinus (p.19)

Zimmermann includes this word amongst those which have a

- 
1. See E.-M., W.-H., L.-H. 111
  2. p.334
  3. Pl. Curc. 238 hiraе omnes dolent
  4. See E.-M.
  5. cf. W.-H., Sommer 334

collective in "-a"<sup>1</sup>. This collective is also used for the plural when a collective sense is not intended, as in Cato, De Agricultura 112.3.

caseus/m (p.20)

This masculine word uses the collective in "-om", according to Zimmermann<sup>2</sup>. This theory is borne out by Early Latin evidence.

charadrus/caradrum (p.22)

Vahlen takes this word to be a nominative and the name of a fish. Professor Skutsch<sup>3</sup> explains that it is an accusative after "apud", has no aspirate and means the "Channel" of Ambracia or a town there. These points have been noted previously by various editors and Professor Skutsch collects them and demonstrates their importance. He would read the line according to Salmasius:-

"Mitylenae est pecten caradrumque apud Ambraciai."

Professor Skutsch also believes that the word is masculine.

clivus (p.22)

This word shows a collective in "-a"<sup>4</sup>

- 
1. Schwankungen des Nominalgeschlechts im älteren Latein  
Glotta XIII 1924 224-41 (esp. p.224)
  2. op. cit. p.234
  3. Enniana II C.Q. XLII 1948 p.94-101 esp. p.99
  4. Zimmermann op. cit. p.228

forus/m (p.23)

Though the difference in gender may have generally coincided with a difference in meaning, as Charisius maintains,<sup>1</sup> the original difference is one of singular, plural or collective sense<sup>2</sup>. The word uses both collective forms and Zimmermann suggests that the more rare "-um" is due to the early borrowing from μάκελλον, kindred in meaning.

frenum (p.24)

The "masculine" plural of this word is a survival of the dual in "-oi",<sup>3</sup> which, being identical in form with the Latin masculine plural, was interpreted as this. The neuter plural is secondary and built on the neuter singular.

gladius/m (p.24)

E.-M. and W.-H. all suppose the neuter to be a secondary analogical formation built on such words as "scutum" and "telum". It is suggested by Dr. Szemerényi that the word may be borrowed from κλάδιον, in which case the neuter would be the original Latin gender. In support of this view are the borrowings "guberno" from κυβερνάω and "buxus" from βύξος, showing voicing

- 
1. I 71.27f.
  2. see Zimmermann op. cit. p.232
  3. Schmidt p.6 cf. Sommer p.335

of an initial voiceless plosive. Against it is the fact that κλάδιον is not attested until the fourth century A.D. Perhaps "ensis" could provide a starting-point for the masculine of "gladium".

iocus (p.26)

Better than Sommer's improbable suggestion that "ioca" is a "rhyme-formation" after "loca"<sup>1</sup> is Zimmermann's theory that it uses a collective in "-a".<sup>2</sup> This "neuter" is used by Cicero to the exclusion of the masculine plural and must therefore to some extent lose its collective sense.

locus (p.27f.)

As is now well-known, the word uses both collective and plural forms. The collective is the basis for the rare neuter singular. Some exceptions to the usual rule are satisfactorily explained by Zimmermann<sup>3</sup>. These occur in the passages from Naevius (Trag. 22), Ennius (Ann. 40), Plautus (Ps. 595) and Accius (Trag. 530).

In the passage from Cato, De Agricultura 157.11, the meaning of "locos" is a technical one taken over from a similar meaning of τόποι, in which case one would expect the gender of

- 
1. p.335
  2. op. cit. p.229
  3. op. cit. p.230-1

the Greek word.

With regard to the passage from the Origines I should think that it is impossible for any but the collective sense to be indicated when the ground occupied by an army is referred to. Further, in a passage of similar content, Sisenna uses the neuter - Nonius III 806.25:-

"Nominativus (!) pro ablativo. Sisenna<sup>1</sup>...:  
'hostis loca superiora potiti.'"

It is obvious that the spheres of meaning of "loci" and "loca" do overlap to some extent, but as it seems more likely that Cato's story is being told in Gellius' words and not his own, the irregularity of usage would belong to a much later date.

#### lupinus/m (p.30)

Although relevant evidence for this word is sparse, it seems to point to a collective use (in "-um") here also. Dr. Szemerényi suggests alternatively that "lupinum" could be a back-formation on "lupina". However, it is not certain that the neuter or collective plural is used.

#### mustaceus/m (p.31)

Whether derived from "mustus"<sup>2</sup> or "mustax",<sup>3</sup> the word seems

- 
1. fr. 135
  2. E.-M.
  3. L.-H. p.206

to be an adjective, not a noun, as E.-M. state. Dr. Szemerényi suggests that use with "libum" would account for the neuter gender and possibly use with "panis" for the masculine.

pilleus/m (p.31)

The latest theory about this word is that the co-existence of masculine and neuter genders point to adjectival origin of the word<sup>1</sup>. "Pilleus" would be from "\*galerus pilleus", a "felten" cap and "pilleum" from the substantivized neuter, "das Filzene". Brück points out that it cannot be from "galerum \*pilleum" as "galerum" is not attested until the time of Fronto.

porrum (p.32)

Dr. Szemerényi shows that this is a Mediterranean loan-word adapted to the existing linguistic pattern of Latin<sup>2</sup>. In this case the original gender cannot be known without a knowledge of the lending language. The regular masculine plural and the use of "porrus" by Laberius (which is not noted by N.-W.) would seem to point to an original masculine. A possible model for an analogical neuter singular may be found in "cepe", which

- 
1. Brück Capillus und pilus I.F. LXIII 1958 p.228-40
  2. Greek τάρων - θάμβρος-θεάομαι Glotta XXXIII 1954  
p.238-66 esp. p. 261f.

is not used in the plural. This may also account for the retention of the masculine plural.

The forms would be more difficult to explain if an original neuter gender were assumed.

rastrum (p.33)

The "masculine" plural of this neuter word is another survival of the dual in "-oi".<sup>1</sup>

The masculine singular and neuter plural are secondary.

clipeus (p.35)

The neuter forms of this word show the analogical influence of "scutum".<sup>2</sup>

compitus (p.36)

As the earliest attestations of this word are for the masculine singular and as the neuter is used in the plural, it seems likely that the "neuter" plural is a collective and that the neuter singular is formed on this. The meaning of the word (cf. "clivus", "locus") also lends itself to this interpretation.

mundus (p.37)

The suggestion that the neuter in <sup>e</sup>this passage given is

- 
1. see Schmidt, also Sommer p.335
  2. L.-H. p.368



influenced by "penum"<sup>1</sup> cannot stand, for there is nothing to prove that "penum" here is neuter.

sagus (p.39)

If the word derives in some way from Gallic "\*sagon" or "\*sogon"<sup>2</sup>, the Latinized "sagum", likely to be an accusative, could be interpreted as a masculine or neuter. The frequent use of the neuter plural in the metaphorical sense may be significant, for it could mean that a difference in gender had become associated with a distinction in meaning. The metaphorical meaning would be well expressed by the neuter because of their likeness to the collective in both form and meaning.

salus, -i (p.40)

Although the masculine is attested but once it is the original gender, as the word is borrowed from σάλος<sup>3</sup>, a masculine. The influence of "mare" soon brings about the change to the neuter<sup>4</sup>.

sparus (p.41)

This is derived from σπάρος<sup>5</sup>, therefore the masculine is

- 
1. W.-H.
  2. Pokorny Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie XX p.516
  3. Ernout, Aspects p.48
  4. E.-M.
  5. W.-H.

the original gender in Latin. Several synonyms are neuter - "telum", "iaculum", "venabulum" - and any of these might form a basis for the neuter of "sparus".

vulgus (p.46)

According to Zimmermann<sup>1</sup> "volgus" is an original masculine o-stem. A neuter collective in "-us" developed. The "collective" theory is stretched to breaking point here. More reasonable is the suggestion of L.-H.<sup>2</sup> that "volgus" could be a contamination of "\*volgus, -eris" and "\*velgum, -i".

buxus/m (p.47)

Ingeniously, Zimmermann<sup>3</sup> notes the use of box as an ornamental shrub. He therefore takes "buxum" to be a collective with the meaning of "copse".

As did many loan-words, πύξος probably came to Latin in its accusative form, which could then be interpreted as masculine (or feminine in the case of names of trees) or neuter.

caelum (p.49)

The existence of a masculine form of this word used in the meaning of a god is probably enough to account for the masculine

- 
1. op. cit. p.238-40
  2. p. 368
  3. op. cit. p.233-4

of the word used in its literal sense.

macellum (p.53)

The unusual masculine of this word has been attributed to the influence of "forus".<sup>1</sup>

qualum/quasillum (p.54)

Dr. Szemerényi suggests "corbis" as a possible model for an analogical masculine of this word.

scutum (p.55)

The masculine must be analogical, formed on such models as "clipeus".<sup>2</sup>

cubitus/m (p.57)

Although connection of "cubitus/m" with κύβιτον is certain, there is some discussion as to which is the borrowed form. As Latin borrowed from βραχίων, Dr. Szemerényi believes that it likewise borrowed from κύβιτον. If this is so, then the neuter is the original gender in Latin. A distinction in meaning may be significant with the regard to the gender-variation.

"Lacertus" and "armus" could influence "cubitum" in the meaning of "elbow" while having no effect on the meaning of "cubit".

- 
1. W.-H.
  2. L.-H. p.368

Only Celsus and Nonius are quoted by Lewis and Short for the use of the masculine.

nasus/m (p.58)

By comparison with "nas, naris" it can be seen that "nasum" is a collective<sup>1</sup>. To explain the existence of both consonant- and o-stems, Dr. Szemerényi points out that the consonant-stem accusative of the Oscan dialects is in "-om", which, if borrowed into Latin, might be interpreted as, or adapted to, an o-stem. Further, the word could be interpreted as a masculine or neuter, which would add to the confusion brought about by the existence of a collective form.

collus (p.60)

Two explanations for the neuter are suggested by Sommer<sup>2</sup>. One is that the neuter singular is formed on the collective "colla", the other that it is due to analogical influence of "iugulum". The second of these is preferable, as "colla" is not attested in the Early period, while both "collos" and "iugulum" are.

dorsus (p.60)

As suggested by W.-H., "tergum" may well provide a basis

- 
1. see Zimmermann op. cit. p.234-5
  2. p. 335 cf. also E.-M.

for the form "dorsum".

lacertus (p.61)

The unique neuter plural could be a collective<sup>1</sup> or it might be accounted for by the influence of "bracchia".

canalis (p.63)

One might suggest "fistula" as a model for an analogical feminine.

cardo (p.67)

In both the passages quoted, "cardo" is used for "door". Both "porta" and "fores" are feminine and Dr. Szemerényi suggests that they might influence "cardo" in these passages.

finis (p.68)

The feminine gender has its origin in the postposition "fini"<sup>2</sup>, which, used with the ablative, was very soon both interpreted and used as a feminine noun.

papaver (p.71)

"Cadaver", the only Latin word which is comparable in form, though not in meaning, may have influenced "papaver".

- 
1. W.-H.
  2. Bauer op. cit.

sal (p.72)

The usual explanation<sup>1</sup> for the neuter of the word in its meaning of "sea" is analogical influence of "mare". This gender could well spread to the literal meaning of "sal", though it has been seen<sup>2</sup> that sometimes a distinction of meaning is associated with a difference in gender. Ernout<sup>3</sup> suggests influence from "animal/animale".

amnis (p.73)

If the Early Latin evidence that "amnis" is feminine shows the true state of affairs, "fluvius", which is attested very early, provides a probable model for an analogical masculine<sup>4</sup>.

calx (p. 74)

χάλιξ, from which "calx" is borrowed<sup>5</sup>, uses both masculine and feminine genders. Hence the variation in Latin. The masculine seems to have become restricted in Latin to the expression "calce harenato".

latex (p. 76)

The early appearance of the masculine gender is due to the

- 
1. cf. E.-M., W.-H.
  2. cf. cubitus/m etc.
  3. Aspects p.108
  4. L.-H. p.368
  5. W.-H. L.-H. p.98

strong influence of the masculine gender of the majority of words in "-ex". This is suggested by Dr. Szemerényi.

clunes (p.01)

"Nates", whose meaning is similar, is feminine and Dr. Szemerényi suggests that it may influence "clunes" if this is originally masculine. Although the feminine is doubtful in Early Latin, it is attested later<sup>1</sup>.

crines (p.01)

"Capillus" is a possible model for an analogical masculine<sup>2</sup>. If one accepts this, one must accept that the earliest Latin evidence does show the original gender.

guttur (p.03)

As far as can be seen from the Latin evidence, "guttur" is originally masculine and it is therefore the neuter which needs explanation, not the masculine<sup>3</sup>. W.-H. suggest that the masculine may be analogically formed on "collus" and "iugulus". It seems more in accord with the evidence to suggest that it is the neuter which is based on "iugulum" - more usual than "iugulus" - or even on "collum", which is attested before "guttur", neuter.

- 
1. Hor. Sat. I 2.09 pulchrae clunes
  2. W.-H.
  3. cf. W.-H.

sanguen (p.84)

According to Postgate<sup>1</sup> "sanguen" is a masculine which has been attracted into the neuter by the neuters in "-en", as also "pollen". Once "sanguen" had become neuter, the accusative "sanguinem" needed a masculine nominative which was formed as "\*sanguin-s" which became "sanguis". The "i" was shortened by influence of "anguis".

A similar, but simpler explanation is offered by Dr. Szemerényi. It is that "sanguen" is a neuter and that "\*sanguins > sanguīs" is re-formed on the oblique stem "sanguin-".

"Sanguen" as a masculine needs more valid explanation than Postgate gives, for there is no evidence that "pollen" was ever masculine.

artus, -ūs (p.87)

As E.-M. have shown, the neuter in the passage quoted is due to influence of "membra" and "ossa" in the context.

arrabo (p.89)

This non-Indo-European loan-word is sometimes shortened in popular speech.<sup>2</sup>

- 
1. Adnotanda in Latin Prosody C.Q. XI 1917 p.169-178  
esp. p. 178
  2. E.-M.



mataris (p.89)

It appears that the Gallic form of this word fitted equally well (or badly) into the Latin first and third declensions. The variation probably indicates that the word did not become fully Latinized.

glutinum/gluten (p.93)

"Glutina", the plural, would be common to both these forms, but as it is not attested, it could hardly have influenced the singular. Variation of gender is seen in neuter words in "-mentum" and "-men" and it is possible that it spread to this neuter word of comparable, though not closely similar, formation.

mantele (p.93)

Perhaps Servius was not the only Latin speaker to be confused about this word and it may have been because of the confusion of Early "mantelum" with "mantellum" that a different form - "mantele" - was produced.

moenia (p.94)

In this word, as in "nasus/m" and "nas", can be seen the co-existence of two derivatives of the same stem. The homonymy of the form "moenia" with the word for "walls" probably led to the preference of the other form.

pavus/o (p.94)

Dr. Szemerényi suggests that "pavon" may be a different form of adaptation of τᾶως, namely "ῥανῶς, pavōm".

aplustra (p.95)

If, as seems likely, this derives from ἄφλαστον<sup>1</sup>, the earliest Latin form would be confirmed as "aplustra".

gener (p.96)

Even if "generibus" is from this word, on the analogy of "parentes",<sup>2</sup> or possibly "pater",<sup>3</sup> the form could not survive because of the homonymous dative/ablative plural of "genus".

vasum (p.98)

The latest theory about this word is that of Dr. Szemerényi<sup>4</sup>. He believes that the original Latin form is "vason", from an early "Vulgar" form of which, "vaso<sup>m</sup>", derives the consonant-stem declension. He shows that the Umbrian forms are borrowed from Illyrian.

iuger (p.99)

This word is mainly used in the plural and as both second-

- 
1. E.-M.
  2. W.-H.
  3. Dr. Szemerényi
  4. Indo-European Mediae Aspiratae A.L. V 1953 p.1-27

declension consonant-stem neuters have a common plural form, this led to the movement of "iuger" from the third to the second declension<sup>1</sup>. The s-stem can be seen in such words as "iumenta" from "<sup>x</sup>iouxmenta".<sup>2</sup>

heres (p.100)

"Herem" is probably to be explained as a back-formation on the nominative "heres" after the "-d-" of the stem was lost in the nominative<sup>3</sup>.

sueres (p.101)

This used to be taken as a variant form of the declension of "sus".<sup>4</sup> Heraeus<sup>5</sup> has shown that both tradition and sense require that it should rather be a separate word, meaning a part of the pig.

os, -sis (p.101)

The form "ossum" is to be explained as a back-formation on "ossa", as Dr. Szemerényi believes. He also suggests that "ossis" in the passage from Accius may be a genitive singular. The form in the Pacuvius passage he believes to be genitive plural.

- 
1. L.-H. p.259
  2. L.-H. p.160
  3. the view of Dr. Szemerényi
  4. N.-W. I 279 E.-M. W.-H.
  5. Sueris A.L.L.G. XIV 1905 p.124-5

domus (p.103f.)

Much has been written about this word but still its formation is not quite clear.

Most modern opinion agrees that the u-stem is not inherited, though E.-M. derive the declension-variation of Latin from an old difference between an o-stem and a u-stem.

There is almost universal agreement that the feminine gender is not original, though Wackernagel is followed by Hofmann<sup>1</sup> in admitting the possibility of derivation from an inherited feminine stem " dem-/dom-".

As far as Latin literary evidence shows, the o-stem forms are earlier. The genitive and dative singulars are rare at first and there seems to be some significance in the fact that Cicero avoids both. When they do come into more frequent use, it is the secondary u-stem forms which they take. It may be that the original stem did not use the genitive and dative singulars and that these sounded strange to the Romans and were therefore avoided even as late as the time of Cicero.

sonus (p.111)

As "sonitus" is a u-stem, it may possibly have influenced the simple "sonus".

---

1. Zur Flexion von "domus" I.F. XLIX 1931 p.109-11

fluctus (p,112)

It seems obvious that the second-declension forms are analogical, though it is difficult to find a model for them.

versus (p. 113)

A possible model for the analogical second-declension forms is the past participle of "verto".

impetus (p.115)

The third-declension ablative may be formed on "praepete"<sup>1</sup> or on "impetibus".<sup>2</sup> The former view is preferable, for it is almost exclusively the ablative singular "impete" which is used. Were it formed on "impetibus" one would expect third-declension forms in the other cases as well.

spes (p.116)

If "spes" is a root-word and the "-s-" belongs to the stem, the usual declension "spei" is explained<sup>3</sup> as built analogically on "res, rei". L.-H.<sup>4</sup> do not agree that "sperare" is evidence for an s-stem but state that this is formed on "spes" as "iurare" is on "ius", and that "speres" is formed after the verb.

- 
1. E.-M. W.-H.
  2. L.-H. p.200, 261
  3. by E.-M.
  4. p.246

fames (p.116)

As "-ēi" is sometimes monophthongized, it is possible that the third-declension dative "fami" arose from a monophthongization of a fifth-declension form. The genitive "fami" for "\*famēi" shows this phenomenon.

quies (p.117)

This is an original ti-stem, therefore it seems probable that "quie" is formed on the nominative in a similar way to "herem" on "heres".

boverum (p.117)

More convincing than Sommer's derivation of this from "\*bovisom"<sup>1</sup> is L.-H.'s theory that it is analogically formed on "dierum" and "rerum".<sup>2</sup>

sorderum (p.117)nucerum (p.118)naverum (p.118)regerum (p.118)lapiderum (p.118)

The authenticity of these strange forms is not contested.

- 
1. p.384
  2. p.280

Their only explanation must be the one given above for "boverum"  
- analogical formation on the model of fifth-declension words.

vesper (p.120)

As "vesper" is borrowed from ἑσπερος its masculine and feminine genders are immediately explained. E.-M. suggest that the third-declension forms are built on the nominative of "vesper" after such forms as "cancer, -cri/ceris" and "pauper, -eris".

testa/um/u (p.120)

Both this and "testum" are past-participial forms, from "textus".<sup>1</sup> It is difficult to find an analogical basis for "testu".

Zimmermann<sup>2</sup> takes the less likely view that "testu" is original and "testa" a collective. For "testu" and "testum" he compares "cornu/m" etc.

cancer (p.121)

Early Latin prefers an o-stem declension for words in "-er" (cf. "sequester"), therefore the third-declension forms of "cancer" may have seemed strange and have been drawn into the

---

1. Dr. Szemerényi  
2. op. cit. p.224-8

second declension by the majority of words in "-er".

termo/termina (p.123)

As the Latin words are borrowed from the Greek *τέρμα* and *τέρμων*, it would appear that "termo" and "termen, termina" are the original Latin forms and that "terminus" preserves the gender of the one and the declension of the other. L.-H. derive "terminus" from "termina" on the model of "locus" and "loca",<sup>1</sup> while Meillet-Vendryes<sup>2</sup> derive it from "termo". The former theory is preferable. Meillet<sup>3</sup> points out that the disappearance of "termen" and the survival of "terminus" are due to the Roman deification of "Terminus".

tergum/s (p.125)

If the masculine form does exist, it could be a re-interpretation of "tergus", neuter, or formed on the analogy of "dorsus/m".

"Tegoribus" is usually interpreted as having lost its first "-r-" through dissimilation, perhaps helped by the popular connection with "tego" mentioned by Varro<sup>4</sup>.

Of the two neuter forms "tergus" is more recent, -

- 
1. p.242
  2. Grammaire Comparée 2nd Ed. 1953 p.543
  3. Linguistique Historique et L.G. 227-9
  4. L.L. V 10



re-formed on "pectus" according to E.-M. They also suggest that a collective "terga" is the basis of both "tergum" and "tergus".

tapete (p.126)

Greek forms can explain all the attested Latin forms of this Greek loan-word<sup>1</sup>. The accusative singular τάρητα is the basis for the Latin second-declension neuter plural, also the first-declension feminine (if this is attested). The diminutive τάρητια (n. plu.) is the basis for the Latin third-declension neuter plural, then neuter singular. The masculine plural τάρητες would form the basis for the Latin third-declension masculine singular.

penus (p.127f.)

According to Zimmermann<sup>2</sup> the inherited form of "penus" is an o-stem masculine. "Penus, -oris" he then explains as a collective, which could not remain as a neuter o-stem and so became an s-stem. "Penus, -us/i", feminine, is not satisfactorily explained. "Penum" would be another collective - but as has been seen, the evidence for this form is not entirely convincing.

- 
1. E.-M.
  2. op. cit. p.238

Zimmermann takes "penusque" in Horace as a neuter.

angiportus/m (p.131)

If the second member of this compound is "portus, -ūs",<sup>1</sup> the u-stem forms must be original. Pisani<sup>2</sup> prefers "portum", an o-stem neuter. If this theory is accepted, "portus, -ūs" immediately presents itself as an analogical model for the transformation of "angiportum" to a masculine u-stem.

fretum (p.132)

W.-H. suggest that the masculine is due to "aestus".

gelus (p.133)

Modern reference works give "gelu" as the original form. L.-H. suggest a connection with "algus" to account for the masculine. From the Latin evidence, it would seem that "gelus" is known much earlier. If this is a true indication of the facts, it would mean that the change of "gelu" to "gelus" is pre-literary and that a reverse change occurs later. The frequency of the ablative case may have a bearing on such a change.

vultus (p.135)

For "vulta" Dr. Szemerényi suggests the possible influence

- 
1. L.-H. p.237
  2. Angiportus, -um; ἀμιχθαλόεις I.F. LIV 1936 38-40

of "ora".

pecus (p.137)

The conclusions of Zimmermann<sup>1</sup> are that as well as the original u-stem, two collective forms are used - "pecua" and "pecus". This latter cannot remain as a neuter u-stem, hence the s-stem declension.

A feminine is used to denote the numerical superiority of female beasts in the herd. The d-stem is probably acquired for this use on the analogy of "quadrupes".<sup>2</sup>

"Pecuda" is a contamination of neuter and d-stem forms.

lapis (p.140)

"Lapi" is comparable with "herem" and "quie".<sup>3</sup> Nonius<sup>4</sup> says that the feminine is "ad Homeri similitudinem", which is possible if Ennius is using a Greek source.

fluvia (p.141)

If this is an original feminine adjective (sc. "aqua")<sup>5</sup>, the masculine must be explained. It cannot be built on "amnis" for this is feminine until the time of Cicero, whereas "fluvius",

- 
1. op. cit. p.236-8
  2. cf. L.-H. p.249
  3. cf. Sommer p.357
  4. I 311.13
  5. L.-H. p.208

masculine, is attested by Plautus. L.-H.<sup>1</sup> give "pluvius" as a model. It seems that the three words undergo similar developments.

charti (p.142)

This is an isolated attempt to preserve the gender of the Greek<sup>2</sup>.

Feminine and Neuter words of the First and Second Declensions

(p.142f.)

Many of these show the influence of the collective in "-a", which, being identical in form with the feminine singular, was sometimes interpreted as such. Zimmermann<sup>3</sup> includes under nouns showing influence of the collective in "-a" "armentum", "arva", "caementum", "fulmentum", "labia". "Ramentum" and "myrtetum" might be added to this list, though the feminine of the latter is doubted.

Confusion with the feminine singular also occurs in neuter words which are mainly used in the plural, such as, "balnea", "ostrea", "terricula" and possibly "lamentum". "Latrina" also uses both feminine singular and neuter plural forms.

- 
1. L.-H. p.208
  2. E.-M.
  3. op. cit. p.225-6

lanitia (p.143)

L.-H. suggest that "lanitia" is formed on the analogy of "mollitia", for which they compare "mollem e lanitia" from the passage quoted in Part I.

menda (p.143)

A possible dialectal collective in "-ae" is mentioned by L.-H.<sup>1</sup>

spicum (p.150)

In this word also, Zimmermann<sup>2</sup> would see the use of a neuter singular and a collective in "-a". This explains the neuter and feminine forms, but takes no account of the masculine. This could be re-formed on the neuter accusative but a good reason would be needed to explain why.

dies, nox (p.152f.)

It is now generally agreed that the original gender of "dies" is masculine. Dr. Szemerényi suggests that "nox" helps to bring about the feminine gender, Kretschmer<sup>3</sup> that "tempesta" exerts an influence.

- 
1. p.367
  2. op. cit. p.227
  3. Glotta I 1909 331

The form "diu" is derived from the locative "\*dyew-i",<sup>1</sup> and is from the same stem as "die".

No "-u-" is attested in the word "nox" and the frequent use of "noctu" with "diu" points to the fact that "noctu" is analogically built on "diu".

The subject of "noctu" is discussed fully by Professor Skutsch<sup>2</sup>, who finds that "noctu" for "nocte" is used by Plautus only in the temporal/adverbial expression "hac nocte/u". "Noctu" is used when the idea of "at night" is stressed and when the present night is being referred to.

Professor Skutsch shows that this distinction soon disappears and expressions like Ennius' "concupia noctu" occur. Claudius Quadrigarius uses "noctu multa" after such models. In the Afranius passage, "intempesta noctu" is affected by "sub diu".

puer (p.157)

If in fact "puer" is used as a feminine, Dr. Szemerényi believes it must be in imitation of the Greek usage of  $\mu\alpha\iota\varsigma$  in both genders.

- 
1. Dr. Szemerényi The Formation of the Time-adjectives in the Classical Languages - to be published in Glotta
  2. Noctu Glotta XXXII 1953 p.307-10

## CONCLUSION

It has been seen that there is a good deal of evidence for variation of gender and declension in Early Latin, most of which must be considered valid. In the case of authors whose work survives, the main difficulty in judging the evidence is textual. Ambiguity of meaning and form is another difficulty - one which sometimes proved too great for the grammarians and others, from whom fragments of non-extant authors are collected. In some cases their mistakes are obvious and have been pointed out before, in others they have escaped the notice of scholars. Sometimes the evidence quoted by the grammarians is not sufficient for us to judge its validity and the question must remain open.

It is clear that gender and declension variation was a feature of Latin since even before the earliest literary period.

Phonetic factors have some influence in the phenomenon of gender and declension variation - mainly in the variation between neuter and feminine in the second and first declensions, but most of the theories advanced for the reasons for variation show that analogy is its main cause. This provides more evidence for the strength of analogy as a major factor in linguistic development.

INDEX

- acceptor 100  
 acinus/m 19 II 161  
 aevus 34  
 alvus 16 II 160  
 amnis 73 II 173  
 angiportus/m 131 II 185  
 anguis 155  
 aplustra 95 II 177  
 arcus 85  
 armentum 147 II 187  
 arrabo 89 II 175  
 artus, -ūs 87 II 175  
 arva 142 II 187  
 asserculum 49  
 avaritia/es 91  
 balnea 143 II 187  
 baltea 19  
 boverum 117 II 181  
 buxus/m 47 II 169  
 caelum 49 II 169  
 caementum 147 II 187  
 calamistrum 51  
 callum 124  
 calx 74 II 173  
 canalis 63 II 172  
 cancer 121 II 182  
 candelabrum 51  
 canis 156  
 capillus 59  
 cardo 67 II 172  
 caseus/m 20 II 162  
 castellum 52  
 castra 144  
 catinus/m 21  
 cepa/e 150  
 charadrus/caradrum 22 II 162  
 charti 142 II 187  
 cibus 110  
 clipeus 35 II 167  
 clivus 22 II 162  
 clunes 81 II 174  
 collus 60 II 171  
 colus 130  
 compitus 36 II 167



corium 63  
 cornu 111  
 crines 81 II 174  
 crux 75  
 cubitus/m 57 II 170  
 culex 68  
 cupressus 138  
 dies 152 II 188  
 domus 103f. II 179  
 dorsus 60 II 171  
 fames 116 II 181  
 fetus 111  
 ficus 138  
 finis 68 II 172  
 fluctus 112 II 180  
 fluvia 141 II 186  
 forceps 76  
 forus/m 23 II 163  
 frenum 24 II 163  
 fretum 132 II 185  
 frons, -tis 82  
 fulmentum 147 II 187  
 galbeus 149  
 ganeum 144  
 gelus 133 II 185  
 gener 96 II 177  
 gladius/m 24 II 163  
 glutinum/gluten 93 II 176  
 gradus 112  
 grossus 17  
 grus 156  
 guttur 83 II 174  
 hallec 79  
 heres 100 II 178  
 holus 99  
 humus 47  
 impetus 115 II 180  
 intibus/m 26  
 iocus 26 II 164  
 iubar 70  
 iuger 99 II 177  
 labia 145 II 187  
 lacertus 61 II 172  
 lamentum 148 II 187  
 lanitia 143 II 188  
 lapiderum 118 II 181

lapis 140 II 186  
 latex 76 II 173  
 latrina 142 II 187  
 laurus 110  
 lembus 18 II 161  
 lens 76  
 locus 27f. II 164  
 lue/ae 92  
 lupinus/m 30 II 165  
 lutum 52  
 lux 77  
 luxuria/es 91  
 macellum 53 II 170  
 maceria/es 92  
 magistratus 112  
 mantele 93 II 176  
 mataris 89 II 176  
 materia/es 92  
 menda 143 II 188  
 messis 77  
 metus 86  
 millus/melium 30  
 modius 37  
 moenia 93 II 176  
 mundus 37 II 167  
 muria/es 92  
 murtus 139  
 mustaceus/m 31 II 165  
 myrtetum 148 II 187  
 nasus/m 58 II 171  
 naverum 118 II 181  
 navis 78  
 nequitia/es 92  
 nox 153 II 188  
 nubis 78  
 nucerum 118 II 181  
 os, -sis 101 II 178  
 ostrea 145 II 187  
 palumbes 157  
 pampinus 17 II 161  
 panis 70  
 pannus 122  
 papaver 71 II 172  
 patibulum 53  
 pavus/o 94 II 177  
 pecus 137 II 186

pedatus 108  
 penus 127f. II 184  
 pilleus/m 31 II 166  
 pinus 109  
 pistillus 37  
 plebes 115  
 porrum 32 II 166  
 puer 157 II 189  
 pugnus 61  
 pulvis 79  
 qualum/quasillum 54 II 170  
 quies 117 II 181  
 ramentum 149 II 187  
 rastrum 33 II 167  
 regerum 118 II 181  
 rete 119  
 ritus 113  
 sagus 39 II 168  
 sal 72 II 173  
 salus, -i 40 II 168  
 sanguen 84 II 175  
 scopus/scopio 95  
 scutum 55 II 170  
 segnitia/es 92  
 sequester 97  
 sexus 87  
 sibilus 110  
 simia 158  
 sinapi 80  
 sīnus 40  
 situla 141  
 socer/socrus 102  
 sonus 110 II 179  
 sorderum 117 II 181  
 sparus 41 II 168  
 specus 135  
 spes 116 II 180  
 spicum 150 II 188  
 stirps 64  
 sueres 101 II 178  
 sumbolus 42  
 supparus 42  
 tapete 126 II 184  
 tergum/s 125 II 183  
 termo/termina 123 II 183  
 terricula 146 II 187

testa/um/u 120 II 182

tonitrus 134

torques 66

torrus 97

transtrum 56

trapetus 123

tributum 56

trulleus 43

tumultus 113

uter, -tris 73

uterus 62

vasum 98 II 177

versus 113 II 180

veru 114

vesper 120 II 182

viscus 44

vulgus 46 II 169

vultus 135 II 185

BIBLIOGRAPHYTEXTS

PLAUTUS is quoted according to the edition of Ernout,  
Paris, Les Belles Lettres

Other editions consulted:-

Oxford Classical Text - Lindsay 1903

Teubner Text - Götze-Schöhl 1922

Separate works:-

- |                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| Amphitruo       | - Palmer 1906                           |
| Asinaria        | - Havet-Freté 1925                      |
| Aulularia       | - Thomas 1913                           |
| Captivi         | - Lindsay 1900                          |
| Epidicus        | - Duckworth 1940                        |
| Menaechmi       | - Brix 1912                             |
|                 | Knight 1919                             |
|                 | Thoresby-Jones 1929 (first ed.<br>1918) |
|                 | Moseley-Hammond 1935                    |
| Mercator        | - Enk 1932                              |
| Miles Gloriosus | - Brix-Niemeyer 1916                    |
| Mostellaria     | - Sonnenschein 1884                     |
| Pseudolus       | - Sturtevant 1932                       |
| Rudens          | - Sonnenschein 1891                     |

Trinummus - Brix-Niemeyer 1907  
 Gray 1897  
 Truculentus - Enk 1953

## TERENCE

is quoted according to the edition of Marouzeau,  
 Paris, Les Belles Lettres

Other editions consulted:-

Oxford Classical Text - Tyrrell 1902  
 - Lindsay-Kauer 1926  
 Teubner Text - Fleckeisen 1916  
 Comoediae - Ashmore 1908

Scholia:-

Donatus - Wessner 1905  
 Scholia Terentiana - Schlee 1893  
 Scholia Bembina - Mountford 1934

## CATO

De Agricultura

Teubner Text - Keil 1885  
 Götz 1937

## CORPUS INSCRIPTIONUM LATINARUM

## GRAMMARIANS

- Grammatici Latini - Keil 1847-80<sup>1</sup>  
 Nonius - Lindsay 1903<sup>2</sup>  
 Festus - Lindsay 1933  
 Donatus - Wessner 1905  
 Servius - Hagen 1902  
 Varro  
     De Lingua Latina - Spengel 1885  
     De Lingua Latina V - Collart 1954  
 Glossaria Latina - Paris, C.U.P. 1930  
 Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum  
     - Leipzig, Teubner 1888f.

COLLECTIONS OF FRAGMENTS

ENNIUS is quoted according to the edition of Vahlen  
 1903 (2nd ed.)

Other editions consulted:-

- Q. Enni **G**arminum Reliquiae - L. Müller 1884  
 I Frammenti degli Annali - Valmaggi 1956  
 The Annals of Ennius - Steuart 1925

- 
1. Charisius, Priscian and minor grammarians are quoted according to this edition.
  2. Volume and page numbers refer to this edition, line-numbers to that of L. Müller, 1888, as Lindsay gives these, but no line-numbers of his own.

LUCILIUS is quoted according to the edition of L. Müller  
1872

Other editions consulted:-

C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae - Marx 1904

C. Lucili Saturarum Reliquiae - Terzaghi 1944  
(2nd ed.)

CATO is quoted according to the edition of Jordan 1860

OTHER AUTHORS are quoted according to the following editions:-

Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta - Ribbeck 1897  
(3rd ed.)

Comicorum Romanorum Fragmenta - Ribbeck 1897  
(3rd ed.)

Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum - Morel 1927

Historicorum Romanorum Fragmenta - Peter 1883

Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta - Malcovati 1955  
(2nd ed.)

Jurisprudentia Antehadriana - Bremer 1896

(Varronis Menippearum Reliquiae - Bücheler 1904)

Other editions consulted:-

Scaenicorum Romanorum Fragmenta I - Klotz 1953

Poetarum Romanorum Veterum Reliquiae  
- Diehl 1911

Livi Andronici et Cn. Naevii Fabularum  
Reliquiae - L. Müller 1885

Naevius Poeta - Marmorale 1950  
(2nd ed.)

Acci (Praeter Tragoedias) Librorum Reliquiae  
- L. Müller 1872



MODERN WORKS

- Stolz-Schmalz Lateinische Grammatik 1928 (5th ed.)<sup>1</sup>
- Sommer Handbuch der Lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre 1914 (2nd and 3rd ed.)
- Walde-Hofmann Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch 1938 (3rd ed.)
- Ernout-Meillet Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Latine 1951 (3rd ed.)
- Neue-Wagener Formenlehre der Lateinischen Sprache 1902 (3rd ed.)
- Meillet-Vendryes Traité de Grammaire Comparée des Langues Classiques 1953 (3rd ed.)
- Ernout Aspects du Vocabulaire Latin 1954
- Meillet Linguistique Historique et Linguistique Générale 1921
- Collart Varron, Grammaire Latin 1954
- J. Schmidt Die Pluralbildungen der Indogermanischen Neutra 1889

## PERIODICALS

Archiv für Lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik

Archivum Linguisticum

Classical Quarterly

Glotta

Indo-Germanische Forschungen

Latomus

---

1. referred to as L.-H. -- Leumann-Hofmann, the editors of the fifth edition.