'ET' IN ARSI AFTER ELIDABLE SYLLABLES IN THE VERGILIAN HEXAMETER

BY

E. D. KOLLMANN

(Tel Aviv University)

Summary : One of the difficulties experienced in the Vergilian hexameter is presented by the fact that in a comparatively large number of verses the conjunction *et*, apparently bearing the ictus but not the word accent, follows immediately upon a word ending in a vowel or in *-m* preceded by a vowel. Elision of the final vowel which is usually assumed, even if understood (as it is done now) as an amalgamation of the vowels so that both are heard, leads to three unpleasant and illogical phenomena : (1) mutilation of the word preceding *et*; (2) undue stress on *et*; (3) break in the chain of intonation. Attempts have been made to solve this problem by assuming elision of the *e* of *et* instead of the final syllable preceding *et*, but so far no cogent proofs for this theory have been given. It is demonstrated in this paper that the vowel of *et* has indeed been weakened. The first matter dealt with is the pronunciation of *-am, -em, -um* which was proved already by Quintilian to be entirely different from that of *m* in other positions. There is hardly any doubt that the vowel before final *m* was nasalized in compensation for the loss of the consonantal articulation of the final *m*. The weakening of the vowel of *et* is proved by the word *identidem*, which Priscian explains as *idem et idem*. After it has been shown that *et* after *-am, -em*, etc. became *ᵉt*, the behaviour of *et* after vowels is examined. The expressive value of the vowels in Latin poetry is well known. Any break in the chain of vowels by weakening the final syllable of the preceding word instead of the vowel of *et* seriously harms the verse. This difficulty is felt especially in Proper Names.

An additional proof in favour of our assumption is educed by the fact that word-groups in 'clash' or in 'coincidence' (between verse ictus and prose accent) are more clearly distinguished, the word preceding *et* and in most cases the word following it, being in clash.

Verses of the types *et genus inuisum et rapti Ganymedis honores* [1] or *uela dabant laeti et spumas salis aere ruebant* [2] are rather frequent in Vergil's *Aeneid*. These types essentially belong together, as in both

---

[1] Verg. *Aen. I* 28.
[2] Verg. *Aen. I* 35.

cases the weak monosyllable *et* is preceded by a word whose final syllable should be elided [3], whereas the vowel of *et* should remain unchanged. This results in the monosyllable *et*, phonetically the weakest word of all in Latin, bearing the ictus and being unduly stressed; on the other hand, the word preceding *et* is impaired, thus unbalancing the verse.

This difficulty has been observed, but so far no reasonable explanation has been offered. Shipley [4], who dwelt on this problem as early as 1924, has pointed out and correctly summed up some of the difficulties arising out of the common procedure, stating briefly that he had studied the problem, but could not, for reasons of brevity, give details. He contented himself, therefore, with a short explanation based on his known view that the metrical ictus is of no importance whatsoever in the hexametric line. His statements are most interesting and it is much to be regretted that he did not return to this subject later.

As we are dealing here with the problem of elision of words preceding *et*, I should like to state his words in this connection in full [5]:

"All the evidence goes to show that in the cases of elision it was the *et* which in most cases suffered, and not the preceding syllable: e.g. A III 40 *auditur tumul' t uox reddita fertur ad auris*. The final *o* of *tumulo* was pronounced with practically its full value, while *et* was reduced — much as our *and* is often reduced to *'nd* — without losing its vowel completely as was the case with *est*. The fact that *et* comes after the main caesura at the beginning of the second colon, would make the sound less noticeable in the verse, even if it amounted to a slight anacrusis.

This explanation which, I am convinced, is the only conclusion possible in the light of the evidence, enables us to read:

(A II 774) *obstipui steteruntque comae 't uox faucibus haesit*, and many other lines with difficulties of the same sort without sacrificing sense to conventional metrical ictus".

This hypothesis has remained so far without explanation; Shipley's view seems to me the only possible solution to the problem. In this study an attempt will be made to confirm it by facts and to explain this phenomenon not the way Shipley might have done, but with the aid of metrical ictus and its connection with word accent.

As shown in a previous paper [6], there appear to be convincing reasons for the conclusion that in the hexametric line, at least in Vergil's *Aeneid*, both prose accent and metrical ictus are active and, together with the quantities of the vowels, are the governing factors for the expressive value of the verse. All three of these factors have, therefore, to be taken into consideration when analyzing or when reading verse.

---

[3] 'Elision' does not mean disappearance of one of the two vowels, but an amalgamation of both, so that both are heard. See J. Soubiran, *L'Elision dans la poésie latine*, Paris, 1966, especially pp. 55—91.

[4] F. W. Shipley, *Hialus, Elision, Caesura in Vergil's Hexameter*, Transactions of the Amer. Philol. Association, Vol. LV (1924), pp. 137/58.

[5] *l.c.*, p. 154.

[6] *Remarks on the Structure of the Latin Hexameter*, Glotta, Vol. XLVI (1968), pp. 293—316, where the principles of the method have been explained.

Furthermore, clash and coincidence of intonations (i.e. prose accent and verse ictus) are the main elements in the verse; and we have been able to demonstrate that the Latin hexameter is composed of verse groups both in clash and in coincidence, as well as mixed and intertwined groups, where sound-form and sound-strength, the Sound-Level [7], correspond to syntactic structure.

I should like to mention the attempt of Hellegouarc'h to solve the problem : like Shipley he does not believe that the ictus may influence the accent; he does not accept Shipley's theory and tries to overcome the difficulty with the aid of the caesura [8].

Shipley's theory is mentioned again by J. Soubiran in his exhaustive book on elision in Latin poetry [9], and extended to words ending in -*m* before a vowel. We shall return to his opinion later.

Before we proceed, some facts shall be educed : [10]
The number of verses showing *et* in arsi :

(1) -*am*, -*em*, -*im*, -*um* (%)		(2) Vowels	(%)	No. of Verses
Eclogae	9 (1.13 %)	8	(1 %)	829
Georgica 1—IV	51 (2.5 %)	80	(4 %)	2188
Aeneid I—XII	240 (2.4 %)	305	(3.05 %)	9896
for comparison :				
Catull c. 64	1 (0.25 %)	2	(0.5 %)	408
Lucretius l.I	5 (0.5 %)	13	(1.3 %)	1117
Horace				
Sat. l.I	5 (0.5 %)	12	(1.2 %)	1030
l.II [11]	14 (1.4 %)	27	(2.7 %)	1083
Epist. l.I	14 (1.4 %)	28	(2.8 %)	1002
Ovid				
Met. l. I	3 (0.5 %)	8	(1 %)	779

From this summary it can be seen that the feature we are dealing with is frequent in Vergil, but is by no means confined to the verses of the Mantuan poet.

---

[7] cp. *Remarks*, Glotta, Vol. XLVI (1968).

[8] J. Hellegouarc'h, *Sur un type de vers Virgilien — uela dabant laeti et spumas salis aere ruebant*, R.E.L. XL (1962) p. 236 ss. especially p. 240 ss. where previous literature is quoted. The essence of his explanation is that a monosyllable *before* a caesura (which, as we shall see later, is a wrong assumption in the case of *et*) comes to stress the word following immediately after it.

[9] J. Soubiran, *op. c.*, p. 181 ss. and p. 132/3 (finals in -*m*).

[10] The values in brackets represent percentages of the phenomenon out of the total number of verses in the respective poems. In order to make the statistics more readable, even if they are somewhat less accurate, the following approximate values have been used : *Eclogae* : 800 verses (actual number of verses : 829), *Georgica* : 2000 (2188), *Aeneid* : 10 000 (9896). Catull, c. 64 : 400 (408), Lucretius I : 1000 (1117), Horace : *Saturae* l. I : 1000 (1030), *Saturae* l.II : 1000 (1083), *Epistulae* l. I : 1000 (1002), Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.I : 800 (779).

[11] Surprising is the difference between the first and the second book of the *Saturae*, and the fact that the second book of the *Saturae* is quite close to the *Epistulae*. I dare not comment on this.

We shall now try to look into the nature of the word preceding *et* according to the following groups [12]:

(1) -am, -em, -im, -um   **(2) Vowels**

(a) Nouns	Ecl.	Georg.	Aen.		Ecl.	Georg.	Aen.
-am	3	9	25	-ă	—	13	41
(gen. { -um	—	4	15	-ĕ	—	1	4
plur.) {-arum, -orum	—	1	4	-ī	—	4	27
-um	3	9	46	-ā	—	—	3
-em	—	10	35	-ē	—	1	1
-im	—	1	—	-ō	—	14	41
				-ū	—	1	4
				-ae	—	7	15
Total	6	34	125		—	41	136
	(ca.0,75%)	(1.7%)	(1.25%)			(ca. 2%)	(1.36%)

(b) Adjectives	Ecl.	Georg.	Aen.		Ecl.	Georg.	Aen.
-am	—	1	7	-ă	—	1	5
-em	—	1	5	-ā	—	1	1
-um	—	1	21	-ī	—	2	7
				-ŏ	—	1	7
				-ae	—	3	1
Total	—	3	33		—	8	21
		(0.15%)	(0.33%)			(0.4%)	(0.2%)

(1) -am, -em, -im, -um   **(2) Vowels**

(c) Pronouns	Ecl.	Georg.	Aen.		Ecl.	Georg.	Acn.
-um	—	1	1	-ă	—	—	2
-cum	—	—	3	-ĕ	—	—	1
-dem	—	—	2	-ē	—	—	3
				-ī	—	2	4
				-ŏ	—	2	—
				-ae	—	1	—
Total	—	1	6		—	5	10
		(0.05%)	(0.06%)			(0.4%)	(0.1%)

(d) Verbs	Ecl.	Georg.	Aen.		Ecl.	Georg.	Aen.
-am	1	1	5	-ă	—	—	—
-em	—	—	3	-ā	—	1	4
-bam	—	—	2	-ĕ	1	1	6
				-ē	—	1	2
-ēre+ĕre+re				1	8+0+1	19+2+2
{ inf. +				1	2	7
pf. 1st ps.+				2	0	5
I { pf. 2nd ps. +				1	0	4
imp.				0	1	0
ŏ				1	—	22
Total	1	1	10		7	15	73
	(0.13%)	(0.05%)	(0.01%)		(0.9%)	(0.75%)	(0.73%)

[12] For details see the *Appendices*.

	(1) -am, -em, -im, -um				(2) Vowels		
(e) Participles	*Ecl.*	*Georg.*	*Aen.*		*Ecl.*	*Georg.*	*Aen.*
-am	—	—	5	-ă	—	1	2
-em	—	2	8	-ĕ	—	—	1
-um	—	3	3	-ĭ	—	—	6
Total	—	5	16		—	1	9
		(0.25 %)	(0.16 %)			(0.05 %)	(0.05 %)
(f) Adverbs	*Ecl.*	*Georg.*	*Aen.*		*Ecl.*	*Georg.*	*Aen.*
-um	—	1	10	-ă	—	—	2
-im	—	1	2	-ĕ	—	1	4
nequiquam	—	—	1	ubi	—	—	4
quondam	—	—	1	modo	1	1	3
				-ō	—	—	3
				-ū	—	1	—
Total	—	2	14		1	3	16
		(0.1 %)	(0.14 %)		(0.13 %)	(0.15 %)	(0.16 %)
(g) Conjunctions	*Ecl.*	*Georg.*	*Aen.*		*Ecl.*	*Georg.*	*Aen.*
etiam	—	2	—	quoque	—	—	1
equidem	—	—	1	noun +			
				-que	—	2	5
quamquam	—	—	1				
Total	—	2	2		—	2	6
		(0.1 %)	(0.02 %)		(0.1 %)	(0.1 %)	(0.06 %)
(h) Proper Names	*Ecl.*	*Georg.*	*Aen.*		*Ecl.*	*Georg.*	*Aen.*
-am	1	1	6	-ă	—	3	4
-em	—	1	3	-ĕ	—	1	1
-im	—	1	4	-ĭ	—	1	8
-um	1	—	20	-ō	—	—	17
				-ae	—	—	5
Total	2	3	33		—	5	35
	(0.25 %)	(0.15 %)	(0.33 %)			(0.25 %)	(0.35 %)

The most important testimony on the pronunciation remains that of Quintilian [13] who states clearly that final -*m* after vowel before another vowel was pronounced in a way entirely different from its pronunciation in other positions. The conclusion drawn by modern grammarians is that such endings were pronounced as something very close to a nasalized vowel [14], whereas Soubiran [15] assumes a consonant like *w*.

The vowel preceding -*m* is expressly stated by ancient grammarians to be short, [16] which may contradict the usual assumption that a vowel

[13] *Inst. or.* IX, 4, 40; cf. also Priscian II 29, 15 s.K and Velius Longus VII 54 13—15 K.

[14] M. Leumann, *Lat. Grammatik*, I. Bd., München 1963, par. 155. E. H. Sturtevant, *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*, 2nd ed., Philadelphia, 1940, par. 174 c, 174 d, 175, W. S. Allen, *Vox Latina*, Cambridge, 1965, pp. 30—31.

[15] *Op. c.*, p. 132.

[16] Priscian, II 23, 13 ss. K; cf. Allen, *op. c.*, p. 30.

before a nasal becomes long, as in the case of vowels before *nf*, *ns* [17]. This problem is important for the verse, its structure and its reading, but we disregard it, because it has no immediate connection with the subject of this paper. The assumption of a replacement of consonantal *-m* by the nasalization of the preceding vowel does, however, explain why *-m* in such positions was felt to be equal to a vocalic ending.

Since Soubiran's book [18] appeared there can be no doubt that elision does not mean disappearance of either vowel; our problem will, therefore, be formulated like this :

In the verses A I$_{26-28}$:   *manet alta mente repostum*
        iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria formae
        ét genus ínuisum ét rapti Ganymédis honóres

---

[17] Cicero, *Orator* 159 and Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* II 17; cf. Allen *op. c.*, p. 31 : "It is of interest that preferences regarding the elision of vowel $+m$ are the same as for long vowels or diphthongs — a further indication that the vowel was in fact not only nasalized but lengthened."

In note 1, p. 31, Allen states that the behaviour of final short elidable vowels in Vergil, *Aen.* I is different from that of final long vowels (including diphthongs) and of final *m*, the statistical data of the latter two groups being very close. The same result is obtained by examining all hexameters, from Ennius to Ovid, which show elision before light syllables. The data as given by Allen are : 3947 for short vowels, 416 for long vowels and diphthongs, and 514 for syllables with final *m*.

I should like to mention in the following the results obtained by examination of a limited number of cases in the course of the present study, *i.e.* cases where the heavy syllable *et* before a consonant is preceded by elidable syllables ending in short or long vowels (including diphthongs) and in final *m*.

	Catull c. 64	Lucretius I		Sat. I	Horace Sat. II	Ep. I
short vowels	0	10		4	13	14
long vowels	2	3		8	14	14
final *m*	1	5		5	14	14

	Ovid, Met. I		Ecl.	Verg. Georg.	Aen.
short vowels	5		3	36	99
long vowels	3		5	44	206
final *m*	3		9	51	240

This examination seems to prove in general terms that Allen's statement is correct. The data of the *Aeneid* where the number of cases examined permits the drawing of conclusions, may be of special interest : 99 elidable short vowels against 206 long vowels and 240 cases of final *m*.

We may conclude that words ending in final *m* before a vowel were indeed regarded as though they ended in a long nasalized vowel.

I have to add, however, that in this study we are dealing with elidable syllables before a stop consonant (*t*) and a distinction should be drawn between such consonants and fricatives; this fact does not seem to have been taken into consideration in the statistics quoted by Allen, although he points out that "a final *m* followed by a closely connected word beginning with a stop (plosive or nasal) consonant seems to have been treated rather as in the interior of the word" (p. 31).

[18] See note 3. On p. 71 S. draws attention to the known opinion of Probus, quoted by Gellius *N.A.* (XIII, 21, 6) that there is a difference between *turrim* and *turrem* and that the form required in Vergil's verse *A.* II 460 *turrim in praecipiti stantem* is *turrim*. This would have been senseless, had the difference not been heard. By the way, Charisius, I 39, K. p. 45 12—13 Barwick quotes the verse as : *turrem in praecipiti stantem*.

the question is not whether we should read :

    ét genus inuis' ét   or   *ét genus inuisúm 't'* ;

but the alternatives are :

    ét genus ínuis^u ét   or   *ét genus ínuisú 't*.

The first alternative impairs the word *inuis(um)*, robbing it of its ictus, and shifts the main intonation on to the weak *et* without any reason whatsoever, except tradition, which is not borne out by ancient testimonies, but is contrary to Quintilian's statement.

The second alternative gets rid of the 'little upstart', in Shipley's terms, leaves the word *inuisum* intact with ictus on its first and third syllables, and prose accent on its second syllable, strongly intonated indeed, as becomes its sense.

At this stage, a few words should be said about the caesura. The verse : *et genus inuisum et rapti Ganymedis honores* undoubtedly has a caesura, a penthemimeres, before *rapti*. That is all we can state, and express by the traditional metrical analysis.

Again Shipley is right in my opinion when considering *'et'* preceded by the caesura [19]. If we divide :

    et genus inuisum et ‖ rapti Ganymedis honores,

it will be seen and heard that *et* is lagging behind *inuisum*, although its main function is to join *genus inuisum* and *rapti Ganymedis honores*. It is sufficient that the verse starts with *et* which clearly belongs to the following, because the foregoing verse has also two parts separated by a caesura : *iudicium Paridis ‖ spretaeque iniuria formae*, joined by *-que* [20].

There can be no doubt that we have to divide this verse, and practically all of those we are dealing with, in such a manner that *et* belongs to the second part of the verse, i.e. stands a f t e r the caesura.

If this is so, then the word before the caesura, being complete and intact, shows clash of ictus and accent, and it can be seen that in most of the verses under discussion a word group in clash is formed.

Our assumption that the vowel of *et* is glossed over and that the word before it remains unimpaired, actually implies that this word has clash, which is a regular feature before a caesura [21]. Now it is interesting to note that in the majority of verses the word after *et*, i.e. the word after the caesura, also has clash. In many of the verses concerned a continuous group of words in clash is formed [22]. Elision of the word preceding *et* leaves it in a kind of suspension and breaks the chain of clash [23].

The next verse, showing the phenomenon we are dealing with, is I 41. On regarding its content we see :

Pallasne	*Argiuum atque ipsos potuit*	(clash) [24]
exurere classem	*submergere ponto*	(coincidence)
ob noxam 't furias		(clash)
unius	*Aiacis Oilei*	(coincidence)

---

[19] By caesura I understand with Drexler and others a syntactic incision, dividing the verse into syntactic units.

[20] In this respect too, Hellegouarc'h's solution is altogether insufficient.

[21] See H. Drexler, *Einführung in die Römische Metrik*, Darmstadt, 1967, p. 19 ss. and especially p. 86 ss.

[22] For details see *Appendix* 3.

[23] This will be still more apparent in the case of words ending in vowels, see p. 75 ss.

[24] It will be observed that syntactic structure and intonation are parallel : *Pallasne*... ... *Argiuum atque ipsos potuit* against : *exurere classem* and *submergere ponto*.

This fine and certainly not unintentional texture is broken if we read : *unius ob nox⁔ ét furias Aiacis Oilei*, the *et* being utterly meaningless, whereas the group *unius ob noxam ᵉt furias Aiacis Oilei* shows the offender at the beginning and at the end of the verse, in genitive, in coincidence [25], whereas the guilt lies in the middle of the verse, in clash : *noxam ᵉt furias*.

The third verse (I 117) presents essentially the same picture. Here is the group in full :

I 115—117	*magister uoluitur*		(coincidence)
excutitur [26]	*pronusque* [27]	*in caput*	(clash)
ter fluctus ibidem torquet	*uorat aequore uortex*		(coincidence)
ast illam	*agens circum ᵉt rapidus*		(clash)

Again, it can be seen how syntactic structure and intonation correspond :

        magister, uoluitur
against : *éxcutitúr   pronúsque, ín caput*;
        ter fluctus torquet   uorat aequore uortex
against : *illám, agéns, circúm, rapidús.*

These three examples are sufficiently representative of this feature ; most, if not all verses quoted in the Appendix, can be analyzed with similar results [28].

To sum up, *et* comes a f t e r and not b e f o r e the caesura, so that a syntactic as well as an intonation group is formed ; furthermore, *genus inuisum* refers to *iudicium Paridis, unius ob noxam* is continued by *furias Aiacis Oilei*, and the wonderful onomatopoetic verse 117 with its *r*, especially *or*, and its *t*, and its many short vowels (all but 2 out of 16) requires that *circum* should be left intact.

The arguments adduced so far seem to be convincing, although those who do not believe in a dynamic or mainly dynamic ictus in Latin will not accept them, but our assumption of the weakening of the vowel of *et* can be proved by one instance of a group of words connected by *et* :

The word *identidem* [29] is explained by Priscian as *idem et idem* [30]. If this is right [31], then it means that *idem et idem* was pronounced as

---

[25] I assume that *unius, illius,* etc. were not felt as clashes but as parallel forms to be used just as *unius, illius.*

[26] *excutitur, rapidus* are in clash, but on account of their structure they cannot be in coincidence. I prefer to distinguish between such cases and cases of clash where the poet had the alternative to use the same word in clash or in coincidence, and chose clash. The former cases I call 'structural clash' as opposed to 'voluntary clash'.

[27] It has been explained in my article in Glotta, why I regard words joined by *-que* and other enclitics as being in clash, although the prose accent is on the penult.

[28] It should, however, be borne in mind that no method can give results without any exceptions, or give an explanation fitting all cases.

[29] To be sure, *identidem* does not appear in Vergil.

[30] Priscian II 598, 22 K cf. *Th. L.L.* s.v. and Soubiran, *op. c.,* p. 59 and note 2.

[31] cp. W. Corssen, *Über Aussprache, Vokalismus und Betonung der lateinischen Sprache,* Leipzig, 1859/9, vol. II, p. 270, who maintains that Priscian's explanation is untenable, because *idem et idem* would have become *id-et-idem,* as did *animaduerto* and *ueneo* from *animum aduerto* and *uenum eo.* In his opinion, the final *-m* in old Latin was so weak that it was elided before a vowel. Corssen's explanation of *identidem* as *idem-ti-dem* is much less probable than that of Priscian.

idem't idem. This may well show the way to a reappreciation of *et* after *-em*, etc., even in prose.

We now have to turn to *et* after words ending in vowels and shall see, on the whole, the same picture.

Here 4 groups can be distinguished :

(1) long vowel (other than *ē*) or diphthong   : *laetī ét*
(2) -*ē*   : *longē ét*
(3) short vowel (other than *ĕ*)   : *res dură ét*
(4) -*ĕ*   : *illĕ ét*

Obviously there is the least difficulty, when *ét* follows upon a word ending in -*ĕ*, so that we may safely disregard this group ; for the purpose of our examination we shall include group (2) in group (1), and have, therefore, to deal with two groups only.

We shall again take two lines at random, in the order of their appearance :

(a) I 35 *uela dabant laeti ét spumas salis aere ruebant*
(b) I 48 *bella gero. ét quisquam numen Iunonis adorat*

We have already seen that the traditional reading causes

(a) a change more or less substantial in a strong word fully necessary in the context,
(b) an illogical strengthening of *ét*,
(c) avoidance of clash,
(d) assumption of an illogical caesura.

Reading *laet'ét* would cause another difficulty : the long vowel *i* has to be shortened[32] and glossed over on account of the vowel of *ét*. A glance at the whole passage (v. 34—37) shows the following vowel-structure :

34	$i_{\bar{e}}$	$\bar{o}_e$	$\bar{u}_{\mathfrak{l}\,u}$	ae_e	$\bar{u}_{\mathfrak{ll}}$	a_u
35	$\bar{e}_{a\,a}$	$\bar{a}_{\mathfrak{a}e}$	$\bar{i}_{\bar{u}}$	$\bar{a}_{\mathfrak{a}\,l}$	$ae_{e\,u}$	$\bar{e}_a$
36	$u_{\bar{u}}$	ae_e	u_e	$\bar{a}_u$	$e_{o\,e}$	u_u
37	$ae_{\bar{e}}$	u				

It is difficult not to hear the *u*-vowels, both long and short, intonated and unintonated, which characterize Iuno, especially in verse 36 :

cum Iuno aeternum seruans sub pectore uulnus
and in the following verse : *secum.*

There are only two bright spots in this terrible foreboding : *uix*, at the beginning of the paragraph, and *laeti*, although in verse 34 there are also three faint bright vowels, three additional *i*-s, but they are not strongly stressed ; on the other hand, there are three long ictus-bearing dark vowels (*ō, ū, ū*).

To impair *laeti*, the only hope in this gloomy picture, and shift the centre of gravity of the verse to the meaningless *ét*, would mean to break the texture of these verses ; *laeti* has to remain intact ; if it does, *ét* cannot remain so.

_____

[32] The procedure of shortening a long vowel before another vowel is quite frequent, but in such cases nothing is to be gained and everything to be lost by applying it.

It should be stressed again that we do mean to say that the verse was read *laeti 't*, so that the vowel of *et* was faintly heard, but not recorded on the metrical scheme[33].

It seems unnecessary to point out that assumption of the caesura after *et* is illogical here just as in the verses with *et* after *-am* etc.[34] Furthermore, there is no reason to assume that *spumás* following immediately on *ét* is intended to be stressed[35].

Our second example is I 46—49 : [36]

I 46 ss   *ast ego, quae diuum incedo regina Iouisque*
          et soror et coniunx, una cum gente tot annos
          bella gero. et quisquam numen Iunonis adorat
          praeterea aut supplex aris imponet honorem?

The *o*-sound here is characteristic for Iuno, queen of the gods, who has been hurt[37]. This cannot be incidental.

There is also a parallelism between *incedo* and *gero* (both in clash), which is lost, when we assume the colorless *et* as remaining intact, and read : *bella ger° et*.

ást ego quáe diuum incedó	*Iouísque ét soror ét coniún x*	(clash)
regina		(coincidence)
uná	*geró. 't quisquám numén*	(clash)
cum gente tot annos bella	*Iunonis adorat*	(coincidence)
praéterea aút suppléx arís [38]		(clash)
	imponet honorem	(coincidence)

These examples should suffice to prove that ictus-bearing *et* after vowels had its vowel weakened, whereas the final vowel of the preceding word, being essential, remained unimpaired.

As a last example, I should like to mention Proper Names, which of all words bear mutilation least; they are relatively frequent in the *Aeneid* in this position[39].

No proper names in elidable syllables before *et* in arsi appear in the first book of Lucretius' *De rerum natura*, and in Catull's c. 64; there are 4 in Horace's *Sat.* I, II; 3 in Horace's *Epist.* I; 1 in Ovid's *Metam.* I, whereas in Vergil's *Eclogae* there are 2 (1 in *-am*, 1 in *-um*), in *Georg.* 8 (3 in *-ă*, 1 in *-ĕ*, 1 in *-ī*, 1 in *-am*, 1 in *-em*, 1 in *-im*).

The bulk of these features appears in the *Aeneid* :
35 ending in vowels (17 in *-ō*, 8 in *-ī*, 4 in *-ă*, 1 in *-ĕ*, 5 in *-ae*)

---

[33] It may well be that *et* after vowels was pronounced differently from *et* after *-em*, *-am*, etc.; while its vowel was still heard after a vowel, it may have vanished more or less after *-em*, *-am*, as can be concluded from *identidem*.

[34] See above, p. 7.

[35] Such is the opinion of Hellegouarc'h, see N.8.

[36] As we are not content with metrical analysis alone, but take into consideration vowel structure, syntax and sense, we cannot, of course, operate with single verses, unless they are self-contained units. We shall, therefore, have to regard the broader context.

[37] It may well be that the same vowel is intended to raise some sentiment in one verse, and a different one in another verse.

[38] I have attempted to show in Glotta, *l.c.*, p. 309, that words having coincidence on long-vowelled syllables are key words in the verse. *Iunonis adorat — imponet honorem* are metrically equal; in both of them the *o*-vowel is stressed by accent and by ictus.

[39] See details in *Appendix* 2. To take one interesting example : II 573 *praemetuens Troiae et patriae communis Erinys*. There are three feet beginning with *-ae*. I would not cut out one of them by reading *TroiꞋe ét*. By the way, all ictus-bearing syllables in this verse are *natura longae*.

33 ending in -*m* (21 in -*um*, 6 in -*am*, 4 in -*im*, 2 in -*em*).

So far we have been dealing with *et* after long vowels; a certain difficulty is raised by words ending in short vowels, e.g. *A* I 111:

in breuia et syrtis urget miserabile uisu

should be read *in breuiá 't syrtis* with the ictus on the short final syllable.

There are not many examples in Latin verse of short finals bearing the ictus, but they can be found, e.g. Cat. c. 4, 9 *Propontidá trucemue*, Cat. c. 64, 186 *nullá spes*, and in Vergil:

A I 341 *longá (e)st iniuria*, VI 32 *fatá (e)st*
XII 161 *magná spes*   VIII 600 *famá (e)st* [40]

and especially *A* III 464: *Dona dehinc auro grauiá sectoque elephanto.*

I do admit that this is a difficulty, but if a choice is offered between *breuiá 't* and *breuiá 't*, we should, in my opinion, choose the former, because it corresponds to the behavior of long vowels and of final -*m* after vowels.

There are, however, some other difficulties which should be mentioned, although none of them is confined to the phenomenon we are dealing with.

(a) Lack of euphony in the following, for instance:

A II 576 *ulcisci patriam 't sceleratas sumere poenas,*

where the consonant group *t−s−c* would be stressed further by the weakening of *'t*; but such cases are found in Vergil, *e.g. A* X 259 *parent se* and others.

(b) Weakening of the vowel of *et* leaves the consonant *t* before dentals, thereby creating a difficulty in hearing the remainder of *'t*, but this certainly was felt less by the Romans who were accustomed to gemination of consonants, than by us.

e.g. A II 568   *seruantem 't tacitam secreta in sede latentur*
         620   *nusquam abero 't tutum patrio te in limine sistam.*

This phenomenon also exists in verses where no elision of the vowel of *et* can be assumed, e.g. VII 616 *hoc et t(um) Aeneadis* and others.

(c) *ét ......'t*; there the first of the corresponding conjunctions stands at the beginning of the verse in arsi, bears the ictus, and the second, after -*m* or after vowel, is weakened.

e.g. V 747 *et Iouis imperium 't cari praecepta parentis.*

This raises the question of correspondence between words in the same or in neighbouring verses; many instances show that such a correspondence is real, even if one of the corresponding words is in clash and the other in coincidence. According to our opinion, the correspondence is stronger when both parts are either in clash or in coincidence [41].

The evidence and the conclusions may be summarized as follows:

(a) After words ending in -*m* or in a vowel *et* does not bear the ictus, but its vowel is weakened and the final syllable of the preceding word bears the ictus, remains intact and in clash.

(b) Thereby the chain of intonation (continued clash) or the chain of vowels, or both, are left intact.

(c) Proper Names remain unimpaired and fully expressive.

(d) The verse is syntactically divided by the caesura b e f o r e and not after *'t*.

(e) The structure of the word *identidem* confirms the solution proposed, which removes the illogical stress of the weak *et*.

---

[40] But: *A* XI 309 *ponite. spes sibi quisque.*
[41] IX 467 *Eúryalí 't Nysí* against
    III 425 (*ora*) *exsértantém 't nauis* (*in saxa trahentem*).

APPENDICES :

Appendix 1 : Elidable Finals before *et* in arsi, according to Frequency. *Appendix 2* : *et* in arsi after elidable Syllables, according to Verse Foot. *Appendix 3* : Verses with *et* in arsi showing Word Groups in Continuous Clash. *Appendix 4* : List of Proper Names with Elidable Finals before *et* in arsi. *Appendix 5* : *et* in arsi and *et* in thesi in Vergil's Poems.

Data presented in these Appendices have been collected from the following poems, except where stated otherwise :

(1) Catull, *c. 64*
(2) Lucretius, *De rerum natura*, l. I
(3) Horace, *Saturae* ll. I, II
         Epistulae, l. I
(4) Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, l. I
(5) Vergil : *Eclogae, Georgica, Aeneid*

Appendix 1

Elidable Finals before *et* in arsi, according to Frequency

(Percentages of totals in brackets; see Note 10)

(1) Catull, *c.* 64	(2) Lucretius I	(3) Horace		
		Sat. I	*Sat.* II	*Epist.* I
(1) -ĭ 2	(1) -ĕ 7	-am 3	-em 6	-ō 13
(2) -um 1	(2) -ă 3	-ī 3	-ĕ 6	-ĕ 12
3	(3) -um 2	-ŭ 3	-ō 6	-um 8
(0.75 %)	(4) -am 1	-um 2	-am 5	-am 3
	(5) -em 1	-ă 2	-ă 5	-em 3
	(6) -im 1	-ā 2	-ī 5	-ă 2
	(7) -ē 1	-ĕ 2	-um 3	-ae 1
	(8) -ō 1	17	-ā 2	42
	(9) -ae 1	(0.17%)	-ŏ 2	(0.42 %)
	18		-ae 1	
			41	
	(0.18 %)		(0.41 %)	

(4) Ovid, *Met.* I		(5) Vergil		
	Ecl.	*Georg.*	*Aen.*	
-ĕ 5	-am 5	-um 20	-um 123	
-um 2	-um 4	-ă 18	-ō 90	
-em 1	-ī 4	-am 14	-ī 71	
-ā 1	-ĕ 2	-em 14	-em 57	
-ō 1	-ŏ 1	-ĕ 14	-am 54	
-ŭ 1	-ŭ 1	-ō 14	-ă 54	
11	17	-ī 12	-ĕ 42	
(ca. 1.5 %)	(ca. 2.13 %)	-ae 11	-ae 21	
		-ŏ 4	-ā 10	
		-im 3	-ē 10	
		-ē 3	-im 6	
		-ā 2	-ŭ 4	
		-ŭ 2	-ŏ 3	
		131	545	
		(6.5 %)	(5.45 %)	

Appendix 2

et in arsi after Elidable Syllables according to Verse Foot

	Foot					Total
	2	3	4	5	6	
(1) Catull, c. 64	2	1	—	—	—	3
(2) Lucretius, l. I	6	10	2	—	—	18
(3) Horace :						
Sat. l. I	7	4	6	—	—	17
l. II	14	20	5	1	1	41
Epist. l. I	10	21	8	1	2	42
(4) Ovid, *Met.* l.I	6	2	3	—	—	11
(5) Vergil						
(a) *Eclogae*	10	5	2	—	—	17
(b) *Georgica* I	10	12	9	—	—	31
II	16	13	4	—	—	33
III	7	18	4	—	—	29
IV	12	22	4	—	—	38
(c) *Aeneid* I	23	23	5	—	—	51
II	18	27	12	—	—	57
III	16	23	11	—	—	50
IV	9	11	11	—	—	31
V	10	16	6	—	—	32
VI	7	23	10	—	—	40
VII	13	29	6	—	—	48
VIII	13	24	8	—	—	45
IX	17	30	5	—	—	52
X	7	28	4	1	—	40
XI	14	28	8	—	—	50
XII	16	20	13	—	—	49

Appendix 3

Word Groups in Continuous Clash

a) This Appendix contains all verses where words with elidable syllables before *et* in arsi participate in clash groups. Only 'voluntary clash' (see note 26) has been included. Words having 'structural clash' have not been considered ; if such words are also included, the list becomes much longer.

(b) Words and word groups in coincidence are put in brackets ( ).

   (1) Catull, c. 64 :
      273 *procedunt, leni ᵉt resonant (plangore cachinni)*
      385 *heroum ᵉt sese (mortali ostendere coetu)*

   (2) Lucretius, l. I :
      125 *coepisse ᵉt rerum (naturam expandere dictis)*
      139 *(propter) egestatem linguae ᵉt rerum (nouitatem)*
      333 *de summa rerum ᵉt nostris (diffidere dictis)*
      351 *(crescunt) arbusta ᵉt fetus (in tempore fingunt)*
      801 *(ordine) mutato ᵉt motu (facere aeris auras)*

(3) Horace, *Sat.*

I	2	99 *ad talos stola demissa (°t circumdata palla)*
	5	36 *praetextam °t latum clauum prunaeque (uatillum)*
	7	3 *(omnibus) et lippis notum (°t tonsoribus esse)*
	9	5 *(suauiter) ut nunc est, inquam (°t cupio omnia quae uis)*
	9	76 *inclamant uoce (°t licet antestari? ego uero)*
	10	19 *nil praeter Caluum °t doctus (cantare Catullum)*
II	1	71 *quin ubi se a uulgo °t scaena in (secreta remorant)*
		73 *nugari cum illo (°t discincti ludere donec)*
	2	85 *accedent anni (°t tractari mollius aetas)*
	3	106 *si scalpra °t formas (non sutor, nautica uela)*
		203 *uxore °t gnato; (mala multa precatus)*
	5	44 *(plures) adnabunt thynni (°t cetaria crescent)*
	6	29 *quid uis insane (°t quas res agis? improbus urget)*
	7	23 *fortunam °t mores (antiquae plebis, et idem)*
		67 *committes rem omnem °t uitam (°t cum corpore famam)*

Epist. I

1	{	34 *sunt uerba °t uoces (quibus hunc lenire dolorem*
		35 *possis)*
2		8 *stultorum regum (°t populorum continet aestus)*
6		3 *hunc solem °t stellas (et decedentia certis)*
		26 *(porticus) Agrippae °t uia (te conspexerit Appi)*
7		53 *(accipiebat) abi. quaere (°t refer unde) domo (quis)*
10		8 *quid quaeris? uiuo °t regno (simul ista reliqui)*
11		4 *(cunctane) prae Campo (°t Tiberino flumine sordent)*
12	{	22 *(utere) Pompeio Grospho (°t si quid petet ultro*
		23 *defer)*
14		1 *(uilice) siluarum °t mihi (me reddentis agelli)*
16		40 *quem nisi mendosum (°t medicandum uir bonus) est (quis)?*
		43 *quo res sponsore (°t quo causae teste tenentur)*
17		54 *aut cistam effractam (°t subducta uiatica plorat)*
18		27 *plus quam se sapere (°t uirtutibus esse priorem)*
		50 *(uitaeque) °t membris (praesertim) cum ualeas et*
	{	109 *sit bona, librorum (°t prouisae frugis in annum*
		110 *copia)*
19	{	46 *formido (°t luctantis acuto ne secer ungui)*
		47 *(displicet iste) locus, clamo (°t diludia posco)*

(4) Ovid, *Met.* I

(5) Vergil

    (a) *Ecl.*

II	48	*narcissum °t florem iungit (bene olentis anethi)*
V	54	*et uos, o lauri, carpam (°t te, proxima myrte)*

    (b) *Georg.*

I	26	*terrarumque uelis curam (°t te maximus orbis)*
	160	*dicendum °t quae sint duris (agrestibus arma)*
	326	*(diluit); implentur fossae (°t caua flumina crescunt)*
II	218	*et bibit umorem (°t cum uult ex se ipsa remittit)*
	360	*uiribus enti quarum (°t contemnere uentos)*
	409	*sarmenta °t uallos primus (sub tecta referto)*
	414	*(uimina) per siluam °t ripis (fluuialis harundo)*

III   136 *(sit genitali) aruo ᵉt sulcos (oblimet inertis)*
    171 *per terram ᵉt summo (uestigia puluere signent)*
    438 *(arduus) ad solem ᵉt linguis (micat ore trisulcis)*
    467 *pascentem ᵉt serae solam (decedere nocti)*
    477 *pastorum ᵉt longe saltus latique (uacantis)*
    541 *iam maris immensi prolem (ᶜᵗ genus omne natantum)*

IV

    214 *(diripuere) ipsae ᵉt cratis (soluere fauorum)*
    266 *hortantem ᵉt fessas (ad pabula laeta uocantem)*
    375 *peruentum ᵉt nati fletus (cognouit inanis)*
    395 *armenta ᵉt turpis pascit (sub gurgite phocas)*

  (c) *Aeneid*

I

    244 *(regna) Liburnorum ᵉt fontem (superare Timaui)*
    248 *Teucrorum ᵉt genti nomen (dedit armaque fixit)*
   ⎰293 *(iura) dabunt; dirae ferro (ᶜᵗ compagibus artis)*
   ⎱294 *claudentur Belli portae (Furor impius isitus)*
   ⎰424 *molirique arcem ᵉt manibus (sobuoluere saxa)*
   ⎱425 *(pars optare) locum tecto (ᶜᵗ concludere sulco.)*
    520 *postquam introgressi ᵉt coram (data copia fandi)*

II

    109 *moliri ᵉt longo fessi (discedere bello.)*
    194 *uenturam ᵉt nostros (ea fata manere nepotes)*
    277 *squalentem barbam (ᶜᵗ concretos sanguine crines)*
    517 *condensae ᵉt diuum amplexae (simulacra sedebant.)*
    771 *quaerenti ᵉt tectis urbis (sine fine ruenti)*
    775 *tum sic adfari ᵉt curas (his demere dictis)*

III

    142 *arebant herbae ᵉt uictum (seges aegra negabat)*
    244 *semesam praedam (ᶜᵗ uestigia foeda relinquunt.)*
    320 *deiecit uultum (ᶜᵗ demissa uoce locuta est.)*
   ⎧349 *procedo ᵉt paruam Troiam (simulataque magnis*
   ⎨350 *Pergama) ᵉt arentem Xanthi (cognomine riuum)*
   ⎩351 *agnosco.*
   ⎰649 *uictum infelicem, bacas (lapidosaque corna),*
   ⎱650 *dant rami ᵉt uulsis pascunt (radicibus herbae).*

IV

   ⎰166 *deueniunt. prima   ᵉt Tellus (et pronuba Iuno)*
   ⎱167 *dant signum.*
    509 *stant arae circum ᵉt crinis (effusa sacerdos)*

V

     27 *iamdudum ᵉt frustra cerno (te tendere contra)*

VI

    267 *(pandere res) alta terra (ᶜᵗ caligine mersas)*
    519 *ingentem ᵉt summa Danaos (ex arce uocabant.)*
    643 *contendunt ludo ᵉt fulua (luctantur harena.)*
    799 *responsis horrent diuum (ᶜᵗ Maeotia tellus)*

VII

     16 *(uincla) recusantum ᵉt sera (sub nocte rudentum)*
     70 *(partibus) ex isdem ᵉt summa (dominarier arce.)*

293 *heu stirpem inuisam ᵉt fatis (contraria nostris).*
539 *armenta ᵉt terram centum (uertebat aratris.)*
745 *(Vfens) insignem fama (ᵉt felicibus armis)*

VIII

347 *hinc ad Tarpeiam sedem (ᵉt Capitolia ducit)*
463 *(hospitis) Aeneae sedem (ᵉt secreta petebat)*
645 *per siluam ᵉt sparsi (rorabant sanguine uepres.)*

IX

165 *indulgent uino ᵉt uertunt (crateras aenos.)*
327 *rex idem ᵉt regi Turno (gratissimus augur.)*
453 *exsangui ᵉt primis una (tot caede peremptis)*
489 *urgebam ᵉt tela curas (solabar anilis.)*
524 *rescindit uallum ᵉt scalas (in moenia poscit.)*

X

121 *nequiquam ᵉt rara muros (cinxere corona.)*
759 *amborum ᵉt tantos (mortalibus esse labores.)*

XI

144 *(ordine) flammarum ᵉt late (discriminat agros.)*
223 *pro Turno, ᵉt magnum (reginae nomen obumbrat.)*
295 *audisti ᵉt quae sit magno (sententia bello)*
414 *oremus pacem ᵉt dextras (tendamus inertis.)*
536 *o uirgo, ᵉt nostris (nequiquam cingitur armis.)*
634 *(armaque corporaque) (ᵉt permixti caede uirorum)*
748 *defringit ferrum ᵉt partis (rimatur apertas.)*

XII

120 *uelati limo (ᵉt uerbena tempora uincti)*
223 *sermonem ᵉt uulgi (uariare labentia corda.)*
376 *loricam ᵉt summum (degustat uulnere corpus.)*
522 *arentem in siluam (ᵉt uirgulta sonantia lauro.)*
757 *responsant circa ᵉt caelum (tonat omne tumultu)*
769 *Laurenti diuo ᵉt uotas (suspendere uestis.)*
799 *ereptum reddi Turno (ᵉt uim crescere uictis.)*
841 *(adnuit) his Iuno ᵉt mentem (laetata retorsit.)*

Appendix 4

List of Proper Names with Elidable Finals before *et* in arsi

(1) Catull, c. 64 ⎫
(2) Lucretius, I : ⎬ no proper names in this position.
                  ⎭
(3) Horace, *Sat.* I :   *Rupili* (7_{19})
                            Caluum (10_{19})
                            Bibule (10_{86})
        Sat. II :   *Scipiadae* (1_{72})
        Epist. I :   *Agrippae* (6_{26})
                            Pompeio Grospho (12_{22})
(4) Ovid, *Met.* I :   *Iouem* (623)

(5) Vergil :   *Eclogae* :   *Scythiam* (I 65)   *Elysium* (VI 744)
               Georgica : *Neptune* (I 14)   *Nomentum* (VI 773)
                             Austri (I 333)   *Torquatum* (VI 825)
                             Emathiam (I 492)   *Fauno* (VII 47)
                             Tiberim (I 499)   *Oceano* (VII 226)
                             Rhodia (II 102)   *Thybrim* (VII 242)
                             Capua (II 224)   *Troiano* (VII 319)
                             Venerem (III 210)   *Latium* (VII 342)
                             Pangaea (IV 462)   *Hesperiam* (VII 543)
               Aeneid :   *Liburnorum* (I 244)   *Dardanio* (VIII 14)
                             Teucrorum (I 248)   *Ausonia* (VIII 328, XI 58)
                             Phoenicum (I 344)   *Chalybum* (VIII 421)
                             Cyprum (I 622)   *Tarcho* (VIII 603)
                             Iuno (I 662, XII 841)   *Romam* (VIII 635)
                             Phoenissa   (I 714)   *Neptunum* (VIII 699)
                             Danaum (II 162, 433, 572)   *Dahae* (VIII 728)
                             Priami (II 484)   *Messapi* (IX 458)
                             Danai (II 495, 757)   *Euryali* (IX 467)
                             Hecuba (II 515)   *Sagarim* (IX 575)
                             Troiae (II 573, X 214)   *Phalerim* (IX 762)
                             Troiam (II 751)   *Cinyre* (X 186)
                             Antandro (III 6)   *Antaeum* (X 561)
                             Teucrum (III 53)   *Ausonidum* (X 564)
                             Phoebo (III 188)   *Rapo* (X 748)
                             Harpyiae (III 293)   *Italiae* (XI 219)
                             Trinacriam (III 582, V 393)   *Turno* (XI 223, XII 799)
                             Ausoniam (IV 236)   *Latio* (XI 431, XII 24)
                             Teucri (V 181, 450)   *Orsilochum* (XI 690)
                             Roma (V 601)   *Martem* (XII 108)
                             Xanthum (V 634, X 60)   *Turnum* (XII 148, 809)
                             Phoebo (VI 69)   *Iouem* (XII 496)
                             Leucaspim (VI 334)   *Rutuli* (XII 694)

Appendix 5

et in arsi and *et* in thesi in Vergil's Poems

(1) *Statistics*

	ét	*ét* after elid. syll.	Total	*et*	*et* after elid. syll.	Total	Grand total
Eclogae							
I	8	2	(10)	4	—	(4)	
II	7	2	(9)	2	—	(2)	
III	15	1	(16)	9	1	(10)	
IV	4	1 (1 — ĕ)	(5)	5	1	(6)	
V	5	3 (1 — ĕ)	(8)	7	—	(7)	
VI	6	1	(7)	5	1	(6)	
VII	6	1	(7)	7	—	(7)	
VIII	3	4	(7)	5	—	(5)	
IX	4	2	(6)	3	1 (1 — ĕ)	(4)	
X	5	—	(5)	5	—	(5)	
	63	17 (2 — ĕ)	(80)	52	4 (1 — ĕ)	(56)	(136)

	ét	ét after elid. syll.	Total	et	et after elid. syll.	Total	Grand total
Georgica I	45	31 (5 — ĕ)	(76)	40	10 (7 — ͵	(48)	
II	55	33 (2 — ĕ)	(88)	39	12 (8 — ĕ)	(50)	
III	56	29 (2 — ĕ)	(85)	49	5 (5 — ĕ)	(54)	
IV	45	38 (5 — ĕ)	(83)	45	7 (5 — ĕ)	(52)	
	201	131 (14 — ĕ)	(332)	173	34 (25 — ĕ)	(207)	(541)

Aeneid

	ét	ét after elid. syll.	Total	et	et after elid. syll.	Total	Grand total
I	41	51 (9 — ĕ)	(92)	39	7 (5 — ĕ)	(46)	
II	48	57 (2 — ĕ)	(105)	58	16 (5 — ĕ)	(74)	
III	64	50 (3 — ĕ)	(114)	45	19 (8 — ĕ)	(64)	
IV	41	31 (2 — ĕ)	(72)	45	13 (5 — ĕ)	(58)	
V	64	32 (3 — ĕ)	(96)	55	12 (7 — ĕ)	(67)	
VI	55	40 (0 — ĕ)	(95)	60	13 (6 — ĕ)	(73)	
VII	53	48 (2 — ĕ)	(101)	39	14 (8 — ĕ)	(53)	
VIII	57	45 (5 — ĕ)	(102)	57	7 (4 — ĕ)	(64)	
IX	59	52 (2 — ĕ)	(111)	59	10 (1 — ĕ)	(69)	
X	63	40 (8 — ĕ)	(103)	48	11 (6 — ĕ)	(59)	
XI	54	50 (3 — ĕ)	(104)	75	15 (6 — ĕ)	(90)	
XII	56	49 (3 — ĕ)	(105)	74	13 (6 — ĕ)	(87)	
	655	545 (42 — ĕ)	(1200)	654	150 (67 — ĕ)	(804)	(2004)

(2) Remarks

(1) All cases of *et* have been taken into consideration, irrespective of its meaning.

(2) The statistics show the following :

(a) The relation of number of verses between *Eclogae*, *Georgica* and *Aeneid* is approximately 1 : 3 : 12 ; the total number of occurrences of *et* in arsi is 83 : 324 : 1200, i.e. approximately 1 : 4 : 15 ; *et* in thesi 56 : 204 : 804, i.e. approximately 1 : 4 : 16.

(b) Whereas the number of cases of *et* in arsi after elidable syllables is about 1/3 of the number of *et* in arsi in the *Eclogae* and about 1/2 in the *Georgica*, it becomes almost equal to the number of *et* in arsi in the *Aeneid* (*Ecl.* 63 : 20, *Georg.* 201 : 123, *Aen.* 655 : 545).

(c) The total number of *et* in thesi is about 3/4 of the total number of *et* in arsi and its average is fairly constant. (*Ecl.* 56 : 83, *Georg.* 204 : 324, *Aen.* 804 : 1200).

(d) The number of cases of *et* in thesi after elidable syllables is in the *Eclogae* about 1/13 of the total number of *et* in thesi, in the *Georgica* 1/6, in the *Aeneid* about 1/4.

(e) The total number of *et* in thesi after elidable syllables is 1/5 of the corresponding number of *et* in arsi in the *Eclogae* (4 : 18), about 1/4 in the *Georgica* (33 : 123) and about the same percentage in the *Aeneid* (150 : 545).

(f) The relations mentioned differ in the several poems and may do so even in the several books of the same poem.