LANGUAGE

JOURNAL OF THE LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA

EDITED BY BERNARD BLOCH

VOL. 28, NO. 4, PART 2 OCTOBER–DECEMBER 1952

SUPPLEMENT

LANGUAGE DISSERTATION NO. 49

METER AND CASE IN THE LATIN ELEGIAC PENTAMETER

BY

GEORGE JOSEPH SIEFERT, JR.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA DISSERTATION

PUBLISHED BY LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Reprinted with the permission of the original publishers

KRAUS REPRINT CORPORATION
New York
1966

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850752090004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LANGUAGE

JOURNAL OF THE LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA

EDITED BY BERNARD BLOCH

VOL. 28, NO. 4, PART 2 OCTOBER–DECEMBER 1952

SUPPLEMENT

LANGUAGE DISSERTATION NO. 49

METER AND CASE IN THE LATIN ELEGIAC PENTAMETER

BY

GEORGE JOSEPH SIEFERT, JR.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA DISSERTATION

PUBLISHED BY LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Reprinted with the permission of the original publishers

KRAUS REPRINT CORPORATION
New York
1966

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850752090004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Copyright 1954 by Linguistic Society of America

Printed in U.S.A.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850752090004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ROLANDO GRVBB KENT

VIRO DOCTRINA STVDIISQVE PER TOTAM AETATEM INDECLINATIS INSIGNI

GRATVS AC MEMOR

DISCIPVLVS

HOC DEDICAVIT OPVSCVLVM

IN QVO CENSENDVM NIL NISI DANTIS AMOR

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850752090004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

THE EXPENSE OF PUBLISHING THIS WORK WAS IN PART
BORNE BY A GRANT FROM THE RESEARCH FUND
OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850752090004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The great debt of gratitude that I owe Dr. Roland G. Kent, formerly Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Pennsylvania, who suggested the subject of this dissertation, and under whose direction it was begun and brought well on its way toward completion, I tried to express in the dedication of my work to him. It is a matter of the keenest regret to me that Professor Kent did not live to see this dissertation in print, as the last of a series conceived and directed by him.

I am deeply obliged to Dr. James Craig La Drière, my colleague at the Catholic University of America, who throughout the process of composition and revision placed his time and his great critical acumen at my disposal, with unfailing patience and generosity.

Thanks of another order are due my friends, Messrs. Daniel Murphy and John Margolis, of the Margo Wine Company in Philadelphia, for permission, graciously requested by the one and as graciously granted by the other, to use for days on end a valuable calculating machine, which not only lightened immeasurably the task of composing the tables, but also suggested a further exploitation of the statistics, from which the labor of computing so many proportions by long division might have deterred me.

And if it is right to single out for special thanks the one to whom one owes everything, I would thank in this place my mother, who through many long evenings helped me faithfully with the work of checking and re-checking, and all the excess of arithmetic that this dissertation involved.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850752090004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 9
II. Method of investigation 14
III. Forms more frequent in the second hemistich: the neuter plural, nominative, accusative, and vocative 19
IV. Forms more frequent in the second hemistich: the nominative and vocative singular, masculine and feminine 26
The vocative singular in direct address and apostrophe 30
ille, ipse, iste 33
Coupling of like forms; agreement of flanking words concluding hemistichs, with or without homoeoteleuton 37
V. Other forms more frequent in the second hemistich. Summation 44
NAV neuter singulars in -*ĕ* 44
Singular genitives in -*s* preceded by short vowel, ablatives in -*ĕ* 47
mihi, tibi, sibi 50
Datives and ablatives plural in -*bus* 52
Greek forms 55
Summation 58
VI. Forms less frequent in the second hemistich: general considerations 61
VII. Tables showing apportionment of forms among declensional categories 71
VIII. Tables showing proportions of short syllables provided by declensional inflections 91
IX. Miscellaneous tables 111
X. Bibliography 124

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850752090004 Published online by Cambridge University Press