548

O EGREGIE GRAMMATICE:
THE VOCATIVE PROBLEMS OF LATIN WORDS
ENDING IN *-IUS*[1]

A long-lasting and sometimes acrimonious debate over the correct vocative form of second-declension Latin words in *-ius* began more than 800 years ago. For the past century most classicists have considered the matter to be settled, and little discussion on the subject has taken place. Yet the century-old conclusions we now so unthinkingly accept are based on very little evidence and are internally inconsistent in some of their details. The past hundred years have provided us not only with more Latin to work with, better tools for search and analysis, and a more complete knowledge of the history of the Latin language, but also with a new understanding and respect for the ancient grammarians and their views on the structure of their language. It is time to re-examine the ancient and modern views on the vocative of *-ius* words, to see whether any viable conclusions can be drawn and whether the ancient grammarians may have more to contribute than our predecessors believed.

The parameters of the problem are simple. Second-declension Latin nouns and adjectives with a masculine singular nominative ending in *-us* normally have a masculine singular vocative in *-e*; virtually all other forms of the vocative are identical to the nominative. Yet when a word's nominative has an *-i-* before the *-us*, the *-ie* vocative ending which the normal rule leads us to expect is rare; it does occur, but a simple *-i* is more common, as *Marce Tulli*. The problem of *-ius* vocatives, as it is normally conceived, is one of how to formulate a rule that will account for the attested vocatives in *-i* and those in *-ie*: which words have which ending? A corollary problem—in my view equally important but almost never mentioned—is that of how and why there came to be two types of vocative ending for *-ius* words. The answer to either one of these questions should help point the way to the answer for the other.

We can begin by listing the evidence involved.

1. All Roman proper names ending in *-ius* form a vocative in *-i*, as *Luci*, *Corneli*, or *Iuli*. This ending appears from an early date[2] and continues unchanged into the Middle Ages; it is widely attested at all periods. The same rule applies to names of Roman divinities (e.g. *Mercuri*, Horace, *Carm.* 1.10.1), but it does not always apply to Greek names (see below). Exceptions (Roman names attested with a vocative in *-ie*) are extremely rare but include *Cassie* at Pompeii (*CIL* 4.9115), *Marcie* in the poems of Luxorius (*Anthologia Latina* vol. 1.1, 309.1 and 309.8 Shackleton Bailey), and *Gaie* and *Lucie* in a medieval glossographer.[3]
2. The noun *filius* almost always forms a vocative *fili*, which likewise appears early,[4]

[2] For example, *Tati*: Enn. *Ann.* 104 (Skutsch).
[3] G. Goetz (ed.), *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* (Amsterdam, 1965), 647–8.
[4] For example, *Marce fili*, Cato, fr. 1 (p. 77 Jordan).

lasts throughout the empire, and is well attested at most periods. There is, however, one example of the form *filie*, from the third-century (B.C.) poet Livius Andronicus (fr. 2 Blänsdorf).

3. Other words are poorly attested, but the following evidence[5] can be assembled (excluding, for the time being, vocatives attested only by being cited without quotation in grammarians' discussions of this problem):

(a) Vocatives in -*i*:

> *volturi* 'vulture': Plautus, *Capt.* 844.
>
> *manuari* 'thief' : Laberius *apud* Gellius 16.7.3.
>
> *canteri* 'horse': Sulpicius Galba *apud* Festus, *De Verborum Significatu* 282 Mueller (p. 356 Lindsay).
>
> *geni* 'spirit': [Tibullus] 3.11.9 (It is possible that *genius*, capitalized in this passage by some editors, is being used as a name.).
>
> *Feretri* (epithet of Jupiter): Livy 1.10.6.
>
> *lanifricari* (meaning uncertain): *CIL* 4.1190 (Pompeii).
>
> *emboliari* 'one who performs in interludes': *CIL* 4.1949 (Pompeii).
>
> *noxsi* 'harmful': *CIL* 4.3494g (Pompeii).
>
> *lanternari* 'lantern-bearer': *CIL* 4.7621 (Pompeii).
>
> *imaginari* 'unreal': *CIL* 4.10249 (Pompeii).
>
> *Arcadi* 'Arcadian': Apuleius, *Met.* 6.7.3.
>
> *temerari* 'reckless': [Quintilian], *Decl. Maj.* 17.18.

(b) Vocatives in -*ie*:

> *Leucesie* (divine epithet): *Carmen Saliare* 2 (Blänsdorf).
>
> *Bromie* (name of Bacchus): Plautus, *Men.* 835.
>
> *Laertie* '(son) of Laertes': Livius Andronicus 4 (Blänsdorf) and Laevius 20 (Blänsdorf).
>
> *die* 'divine': Ennius, *Ann.* 106 (Skutsch); *CIL* 6.21521 (line 31); Optatianus Porfyrius, *Carm.* 22.2.
>
> *Saturnie* '(son) of Saturn': Ennius, *Ann.* 444 (Skutsch).
>
> *conscie* 'sharing knowledge': proposed as an emendation to Ticida fr. 1 (Blänsdorf) by Housman, *CQ* 1 (1907), 158.
>
> *Cyllenie* (name of Mercury): Manilius 1.30, 2.440, 2.943.
>
> *Nysie* (name of Bacchus): Columella 10.248.
>
> *Euhie* (name of Bacchus): Columella 10.224 (*bis*) and Statius, *Theb.* 2.72.
>
> *Delie* 'of Delos': Columella 10.224; Statius, *Theb.* 5.532; Claudianus, *In Rufinum* 2 praef. 6 (p. 29 Hall).
>
> *Phrygie* 'Phrygian': *CIL* 4.1975a (Pompeii).
>
> *Pythie* 'Pythian': Statius, *Theb.* 4.289.
>
> *Lycie* 'Lycian': Statius, *Theb.* 10.344.
>
> *Lyrcie* (place-name): Statius, *Theb.* 4.117.
>
> *Olmie* (name of a river): Statius, *Theb.* 7.284.
>
> *Sperchie* (name of a river): Statius, *Ach.* 1.628.
>
> *Tirynthie* 'Tirynthian': Statius, *Silv.* 3.1.1 and 4.6.90.
>
> *Phoebeie* 'of Phoebus': Statius, *Silv.* 3.4.6.
>
> *Poeantie* '(son) of Poeas': Valerius Flaccus 1.391.
>
> *pie* 'pious': *CIL* 3.207.2 (*c.* 215 A.D.); Optatianus Porfyrius, *Epistula ad*

---

[5] In approximate chronological order by first appearance of each word. These lists should be reasonably complete for Latin literature until *c.* A.D. 200, but no claim for completeness is made with regard to later material or to inscriptional evidence.

Constantinum 7 (p. 2 Polara); Hilarius, Hist. fr. A 6.3 (Feder, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. 65, p. 88); *Historia Augusta* Vulc. Gall.: Avid. Cass. 13.2, Ael. Lampr.: Alex. Sev. 7.1 (vol. 1, pp. 95, 255 Hohl); Prudentius, *Cathemerinon* 3.2; Corippus, *In Laudem Iustini Augusti Minoris* 2.126; Venantius Fortunatus, *Carm.* 3.9.77 (p. 103 Reydellet); also other Christian examples.

impie 'impious': Commodianus, *Instructiones* 1.26.30, 1.28.5 (Martin); Constantine, *Epistula Ario et Arianis* (*Patrologia Latina*, ed. Migne, vol. 8, pp. 513a, 513c, 513d); Ausonius, *Epitaphia Heroum* 19.5, *Epistulae* 23.34 (pp. 62, 275 Prete); S. Hilarius, *De Trinitate* 5.16, 5.33, 6.14; Prudentius, *Peristephanon* 10.588; Dracontius, *Orestis tragoedia* 189, 831, *Carmina profana* 10.436 (= *Medea* 436); also other Christian examples.

regie 'royal': Ausonius, *Epistulae* 20.10 (p. 267 Prete).

Iunonie '(son) of Juno': Ausonius, *Ecl.* 14.14 (p. 107 Prete).

Cythereie 'of Cythera': Ausonius, *Precatio* 26 (p. 80 Prete).

abstemie 'abstemious': Ausonius, *Commemoratio Professorum Burdigalensium* 15.9, 24.9 (pp. 47, 54 Prete).

Martie 'of Mars': Ausonius, *Ordo Urbium Nobilum* 19.1, *Epistulae* 23.83 (pp. 198, 277 Prete).

Babilonie 'Babylonian': *CIL* 6.511.15 (377 A.D.).

Darie (name of Persian king): Vulgate, Daniel 6.6;[6] Iulius Valerius, *Res Gestae Alexandri* 2.20 Rosellini (2.32 Kübler).

egregie 'excellent': Jerome, *Epist.* 133.12.2 (Hilberg), *Contra Joannem Hierosolymitanum* 8 (414) (*Patr. Lat.* vol. 23, p. 377b); Augustine, *Contra Iulianum Opus Imperfectum* 3.56 (Zelzer); Marius Mercator, *Liber Subnotationum in verba Juliani* 7.4, 8.25 (*Patr. Lat.* vol. 48, pp. 148b, 158a = Schwartz, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, tome 1, vol. 5, pp. 14, 18); Sedulius, *Epistulae ad Macedonium* 1.2 (Huemer, *CSEL* vol. 10, pp. 6, 173); [Leo I], *Sermo* 17.4 (*Patr. Lat.* vol. 54, p. 514b); Felix III, *Epist.* 12 (*Patr. Lat.* vol. 58, p. 969b); Gelasius I, [Leo I] *Codex Canonum Ecclesiasticorum* 49.3 (*Patr. Lat.* vol. 56, p. 635c); Ruricius, *Epist.* 1.2 (Demeulenaere, *Corpus Christianorum* vol. 64, p. 315); Ennodius, *Vita Epiphani* p. 374.2 Hartel (= p. 105.7 Vogel), *Dict.* 9, p. 453.4 Hartel (= p. 113.36 Vogel); Hormisdas, *Epist.* 32 (*Patr. Lat.* vol. 63, p. 436d); also other Christian examples.

nuntie 'messenger': Augustine, *Sermo* 291.5 (*Patr. Lat.* vol. 38, p. 1319); [Augustine], *Sermo* 120.7 (*Patr. Lat.* vol. 39, p. 1986); [Fulgentius], *Sermo* 53 (*Patr. Lat.* vol. 65, p. 920d).

eximie 'outstanding': Augustine, *Epistulae* 35.5, 56.2, 86, 97.1, 100.1, 112.2, 127.1, 133.3 (*bis*), 138.20, etc.; [Augustine], *De Magnificentiis Beati Hieronymi* (*Patr. Lat.* vol. 22, p. 285); Maximus Madaurensis, *Epist.* 16.4 (*Patr. Lat.* vol. 33, p. 82); Ruricius, *Epistulae* 1.1 (*Corp. Chr.* vol. 64, p. 313); also other Christian examples.

Lindie 'of Lindos': Sidonius Apollinaris, *Carm.* 2.158, 15.45.

Semeleie '(son) of Semele': Dracontius, *Carmina Profana* 10.587 (= *Medea* 587).

---

[6] Both *Darie* and *Dari* appear in manuscripts, and the latter is found in many editions, but the most accurate critical edition (*Biblia Sacra Iuxta Latinam Vulgatam Versionem ad Codicum Fidem*, vol. 16 [Vatican, 1981]) takes *Darie* as the more authentic reading.

Olympie 'Olympian': Luxorius, *Anthologia Latina* vol. 1.1, poem 348.2
(Shackleton Bailey).

inscie 'unknowing': Corippus, *In Laudem Iustini Augusti Minoris* 3.383;
Theodulfus Aurelianensis, *Carmina* 3.1 (*Patr. Lat.* vol. 105, p. 322c).

noxie 'harmful': Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita S. Martini* 1.462.

vicarie 'deputy, successor': Alvarus Cordubensis, *Epist.* 10.1 (*Patr. Lat.* vol.
121, p. 467d); Salomon, *Versus ad Dadonem* (*Patr. Lat.* vol. 132, p. 563b).

temerarie 'reckless': Grimaldus Sangallensis, *Liber Sacramentorum* 147 (*Patr.
Lat.* vol. 121, p. 856d).

socie 'comrade': Hrosvit, *Callimachus* 3 (p. 149 Strecker); S. Bernard, *De
Gradibus Humilitatis et Superbiae* 569 (*Patr. Lat.* vol. 182, p. 955d).

A cursory glance at these lists suggests that the key distinction is one between
substantives and adjectives: the former appear normally to have vocatives in -*i*, the
latter in -*ie*. The 'definitive' treatment of the -*ius* vocative question, by Neue and
Wagener,[7] accepts this obvious grammatical distinction and is followed or paralleled
by some notable scholars.[8]

Yet such a division does not account for all the data; *noxsi, imaginari, temerari,
Feretri, Arcadi, socie, nuntie, vicarie, Lyrcie, Olmie, Sperchie, Darie,* and *filie* are
counter-examples, and many of the 'adjectives' in -*ie* are in fact used substantivally in
context. Can these objections be dealt with? *Lyrcie, Olmie, Sperchie,* and *Darie* have a
long *i*, making them different from most -*ius* words, and could be set aside for that
reason. *Noxsi* could be eliminated because its context is obscure, but the word is
traditionally interpreted as a vocative.[9] *Imaginari* might be a noun in context; the word
is once attested as a noun, but it is usually an adjective (cf. *TLL*, s.v.). *Temerari* could
be excluded because of textual problems, though twentieth-century editors of the
Declamationes Maiores unanimously accept it.[10] *Filie* can be argued to be an archaism,
a relic of the period when all -*ius* words had vocatives in -*ie*; such an argument is,
however, incompatible with the latest views on the history of the change from -*ie* to -*i*
(see below). *Nuntie* first appears in the fourth century, and *socie* and *vicarie* even later,
so they could be excluded for chronological reasons, but such a policy would discount
most examples of adjectives in -*ie* as well. *Arcadi* is generally acknowledged to be a
problem without a solution.

Feretri can be handled in two ways. Sometimes it is argued to be a proper name and
thus correct, since proper names take the vocative in -*i*. Yet this strategy is inconsistent,
since many of the words attested in -*ie* (e.g. *Bromie, Cyllenie*) are also proper names. If
the key division is really one between adjectives and substantives, then proper names

---

[7] F. Neue and C. Wagener, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* (Leipzig, 1892–1902), vol. 1,
127–33; vol. 2, 42–4.

[8] For example, R. Kühner and F. Holzweissig, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen
Sprache*, vol. 1 (Hannover, 1912²), 446–7; B. L. Gildersleeve and G. Lodge, *Gildersleeve's Latin
Grammar* (Boston, 1895³), 16, 37; J. B. Greenough et al., *Allen and Greenough's New Latin
Grammar* (Boston, 1931), 22; L. Holford-Strevens, 'More notes on Aulus Gellius', *Liverpool
Classical Monthly* 9 (1984), 149–50. Note that J. Wackernagel, *Über einige antike Anredeformen*
(Göttingen, 1912), 17, appears to endorse this view but in fact introduces important qualifi-
cations of it; Wackernagel's formulation of the rule for the vocatives of -*ius* words, which he
mentions only in passing, is actually closer to the one presented in this paper than to that given in
Neue and Wagener.

[9] Cf. A. Mau, index to *CIL* 4, p. 761. Interpretation of the graffito containing this word is
difficult if one takes *noxsi* as a vocative, but even more difficult if one does not.

[10] L. Håkanson (Stuttgart, 1982); G. Lehnert (Leipzig, 1905).

must take the vocative in -*i* because they are substantives, not the other way around. To explain *Feretri* by saying that it is a proper name is to admit that the underlying division is not really one between adjectives and substantives at all.

It is also possible to argue that *Feretri* is a substantive, on the grounds that it is attested with the -*i* genitive ending characteristic of substantives (see below). Yet there is no question that it is used adjectivally as a vocative, while many of the epithets attested with -*ie* vocatives act more like substantives. And if the classification as adjective or substantive is based on a word's usage elsewhere rather than its immediate context, it becomes even more difficult to argue that *imaginari* is not an adjective.

Thus all the counter-examples except *Arcadi* can with some ingenuity be explained away, but the explanations required have varying degrees of plausibility and often create new problems.

Another problem with the traditional explanation of the -*il-ie* distinction, perhaps more serious than the counter-examples, is the scarcity (until the late empire) of examples of the 'adjectival' treatment. If in early, classical, and Silver Latin adjectives of -*ius* words were so rare in the vocative, it is most unlikely that they managed to preserve, over a period of more than four centuries, a paradigm different from that of the much more frequent nouns. This objection is sometimes countered by pointing out that -*ius* nouns and adjectives have different endings in the genitive singular, and therefore they could also have different endings in the vocative. It is true that -*ius* adjectives began to take a genitive in -*ii* before the substantives did, and therefore that for a time the two paradigms differed,[11] but the genitive case is far more common than the vocative, and so it was much easier for such a distinction to be maintained there. Moreover, the distinction in the genitive did not last very long, suggesting that paradigmatic differences of this type were hard for Latin speakers to keep up even in the case of relatively common forms.

The substantive/adjective distinction is further weakened by the fact that most, perhaps all, attested examples of the 'adjectival' vocative ending before the third century A.D. are probably Grecisms. In Greek, words in -ιος have a vocative in -ιε, and thus a Latin -*ie* on a Greek word could simply be a reflection of the Greek form. Such Grecisms would be parallel to the -*eu* vocative normally used for Greek names in -*eus* when they appear in Latin[12] and the -*i* vocative which Roman authors frequently give to Greek names in -*is*.[13]

It is often stated[14] that, in Latin, Greek names in -*ius* have the same -*i* vocative as Roman ones, unless they are really names in -ειος (like *Lyrcie*, *Darie*, and the other names with long *i*). There are some examples of such Latinized vocatives: *Demetri* (Horace, *S.* 1.10.90, *Epist.* 1.7.52; Livy 40.15.2), *Parrhasi* (Seneca, *Contr.* 10.5.9, 24, 26), *Encolpi* (Petronius 91.8, 94.10, 102.5, 105.9, 114.5), *Asclepi* ([Apuleius], *Asclepius*, *passim*), *Lai* (Statius, *Theb.* 7.355), and others from the late empire. Yet the fact that in these examples a Greek name has a Latinized vocative does not mean that such names are necessarily always Latinized; one can also find Latinized vocatives of Greek names in -*eus*,[15] but that does not prevent the -*eu* ending from occurring as well.

In the examples listed under (3b), it is notable that all but one of the words

---

[11] See M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, vol. 1 (Munich, 1977), 424–5; cf. also C. Lachmann, *In T. Lucretii Cari De Rerum Natura Libros Commentarius* (Berlin, 1882⁴), 325–9.

[12] For example, *Orpheu* (Vergil, *G.* 4.494), *Theseu* (Catullus 64.133).

[13] For example, *Pari* (Ovid, *Ep.* 16.83), *Iri* (Vergil, *A.* 9.18).

[14] For example, Neue and Wagener (n. 7), vol. 1, 127–8.

[15] *Penee* (Ovid, *Am.* 3.6.31), *Alphee* (Stat. *Theb.* 4.239).

occurring before the third century A.D. are names, and that most of these are clearly Greek names and used of Greek gods or heroes. This type of context is the one in which we would most expect a Greek ending, and thus *Bromie, Delie, Phrygie*, and most of the others are very likely to be Grecisms. *Die* is certainly the result of Greek influence, since the entire poetic use of the word *dius* in Latin is traceable to Ennius' deliberate imitation of Greek δῖος.[16] Whether *Leucesie* and *Saturnie* are Grecisms in the texts where they occur is a more difficult problem, but Greek influence is certainly possible in both cases.

The traditional explanation that nouns take the ending -*i* while adjectives take -*ie* is thus most inadequate for any period before the third century A.D. Not only are there a significant number of counter-examples, but all the examples of the 'adjectival' treatment are either late or attributable to Greek influence. Before considering other possible explanations for the -*il*-*ie* difference, however, let us examine the data a bit more closely. They are peculiar, and we may gain more by paying attention to their oddities than by trying to force them into a neat pattern.

The most surprising feature of our data is the fact that there is so little early, classical, or Silver Latin evidence for the vocatives of -*ius* words other than names and *filius*. Of course, only words with certain types of meaning are likely to be used in the vocative case, so the lack of examples could be due to the fact that the most common addresses, words like *frater, carissimus, scelestus*, and *puer*, do not happen to end in -*ius*. Yet this explanation cannot account for the full extent of the problem, for classical authors use many -*ius* words freely in the vocative in the feminine, the neuter, or the plural, while very late authors use them in the masculine as well.

Thus *pius* is used by classical and Silver Latin poets in the feminine and plural vocatives,[17] but never in the masculine singular.[18] Deliberate avoidance of the latter form is suggested by Ennius' use of the abstract *pietas* as an apparent substitute for the vocative of *pius*,[19] and by the fact that *pius Aeneas* is such a common phrase in Vergil that the absence of *pius* in address to Aeneas is striking. *Impius* is likewise used repeatedly in the feminine vocative,[20] but not in the masculine. *Socius* 'comrade' is not uncommon in the feminine vocative,[21] and the plural is fairly frequent as an address,[22] but the masculine singular was evidently not in use. Female messengers can be addressed as *nuntia* 'messenger',[23] but the much more common males are never called

[16] O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford, 1985), 210–11. The vocative δῖε is not uncommon in Greek poetry, e.g. *Iliad* 8.185, 11.608, 12.343, 14.3, 24.618.

[17] Ovid, *Am.* 2.6.3, *Tr.* 5.3.47; Statius, *Silv.* 5.3.284.

[18] Throughout this paper, statements about the non-occurrence of words are based on the following evidence: (i) A corpus of 15,319 vocatives collected by hand from literary and non-literary sources from the Republican period and the first two centuries of the Empire. Most works in Latin literature before A.D. 200 are included in this corpus, but not all. (ii) Where practical, electronic searches of the PHI Latin database using the Pandora program. This method could not be used in the case of vocatives having the same form as very common adverbs, genitives, or other common words (e.g. *proprie, fili, die*), but it has been used in all other cases. Most words have also been checked on the *Patrologia Latina* database, though this fact is not usually relevant for claims of non-occurrence. (iii) Perusal of the standard reference works, including where available the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*.

[19] Enn., *Ann.* 4 (Skutsch) and Skutsch (n. 16), 157.

[20] Propertius 2.9.20, 2.17.3; Ovid, *Met.* 10.345, 14.736; Seneca, *Ag.* 953; Lucan 5.158, 9.71.

[21] Seneca, *Ag.* 234, *Med.* 568, *Her. F.* 309, 900, *Phaed.* 864, *Her. O.* 880.

[22] I have found twenty-nine examples, e.g. Lucilius 1323; Vergil, *A.* 1.198; Horace, *Carm.* 1.25; Livy 21.21.3; Valerius Maximus 3.1.2; Lucan 2.483.

[23] Ovid, *Met.* 11.585; Valerius Flaccus 1.794.

nuntie. Regius occurs repeatedly in the feminine vocative,[24] but not in the masculine. *Egregius* appears in the plural and neuter,[25] but until the late empire the masculine singular is found only in a grammatical debate (see below). *Conscius, temerarius, noxius, serius, anxius, funebrius*, and *hostilius* likewise occur in address in the feminine or neuter, but not (except as noted above) in the masculine.[26]

The vast majority of preserved Latin addresses are directed towards men, not women. In the first four centuries of Latin literature *pater* 'father' is three times as common as *mater* 'mother' as an address to humans (the discrepancy would be still greater if one included addresses to gods), *puer* 'boy' is more than three times as common as *puella* 'girl', *rex* 'king' is twice as common as *regina* 'queen', and *dominus* 'master' is twelve times as common as *domina* 'mistress'.[27] The pattern we are seeing with the *-ius* words is thus even more striking than it appears at first sight; it cannot be coincidental but must be due to a deliberate avoidance of the masculine singular vocative. And this avoidance is not simply an avoidance of *adjectives* in *-ius*, but something larger, since it applies to *socius* and *nuntius* as well as to the adjectives.

Why did Roman authors avoid these vocatives? A clue to the answer can be gained from an examination of the prehistory of the Latin vocative. Originally, all words belonging to the thematic declension would have formed a masculine singular vocative in *-e*; the Greek treatment of *-ιος* words, in which the *-i-* makes no difference to the formation of the vocative, is a continuation of this original pattern. Exactly how Latin moved from this original *-ie* to (long) *-i* has long been disputed; the shift was often thought to depend on some sort of sound change, contraction, or apocope, though some scholars preferred to argue for analogical replacement.[28] Now, however, Italicists believe that original **ie* became (long) *i* in open syllables (thus including all vocative endings) in proto-Italic, but that most of the effects of this change were obscured in Latin by later analogical developments.[29] This means that the change from *-ie* vocatives to *-i* vocatives occurred at a very early period, before Latin had even developed into a language distinct from Oscan or Umbrian, and that it affected both substantives and adjectives, both ordinary words and proper names.

Within the structure of the Latin language, this vocative in *-i* was an anomaly. It was common for Latin words to have a vocative the same as the nominative, and common for them to have a vocative in *-e*, but a vocative which differed from the nominative and did not end in *-e* was a striking irregularity. Languages preserve irregularities in common words and tend to regularize in less common ones; that is why in languages such as French or German it is usually the most heavily used verbs that are irregular.[30]

[24] Ovid, *Met.* 7.21, 13.483, 13.523, *Pont.* 2.9.1; Seneca, *Ag.* 341.

[25] Vergil, *A.* 7.212; Statius, *Theb.* 10.240.

[26] *Conscia*: Propertius 1.12.2; Ovid, *Ep.* 7.191; Martial 6.10.9; *temeraria*: Ovid, *Met.* 1.514; Lucan 8.579, 8.795; Statius, *Theb.* 12.366; *noxia*: Lucan 8.823; *seria*: [Tibullus] 3.6.52; Fronto, p. 9.15 van den Hout; *anxia*: Valerius Flaccus 2.113; *funebria*: Ovid, *Am.* 1.12.7; *hostilia*: Statius, *Theb.* 12.256.

[27] Statistics taken from the glossary of E. Dickey, *Latin Forms of Address* (forthcoming).

[28] Cf. M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, vol. 1 (Munich, 1977), 424; F. Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (Heidelberg, 1948), 343. An early date for this change was often argued from the antepenultimate accentuation of vocative forms like *Váleri*, though this evidence is difficult to evaluate; see Gellius (13.26); Priscian (*Grammatici Latini*, ed. Keil, II 302.13–18); Servius (on *Aeneid* 1.451); Leumann (above), 425; G. Bernardi Perini, *L'accento latino* (Bologna, 1964), 43–5; Sommer (above), 344.

[29] Michael Weiss, Alan Nussbaum, and John Penney, personal communications; for the antecedents of this idea, cf. Sommer (n. 28), 100.

[30] Cf. J. Bybee, *Morphology* (Amsterdam, 1985), 119–21.

When an irregular word is regularized, however, the change is not immediate; the form passes through a period of avoidance, in which the irregular form no longer sounds 'right' but the memory of its existence is strong enough to make a regular form sound incorrect as well.[31]

This pattern of linguistic development explains the distribution of Latin vocatives in *-i* and in *-ie* very nicely. Those words which were very frequently used in address, *filius* and the proper names, acted like common irregular verbs: they retained the anomalous vocative ending. Those words which were less often used in address, on the other hand, eventually ceased to sound 'right' to the Roman ear and so were avoided in the masculine vocative. Finally, in the late empire, these words were regularized, producing the late examples of vocatives like *pie*, *regie*, etc.

If we accept this explanation, the rule for the vocative ending should be: *-ius* words common in address end in *-i*; words not common in address are avoided in the masculine singular vocative until the late empire, when they form a vocative in *-ie*. By this formulation, *filie* and many of the words listed under (3) above are apparent counter-examples. Can they be reconciled with this theory? The early examples of *-ie* vocatives can be explained as Grecisms, and the *-i* vocatives can be seen as continuations of the inherited vocative ending into the period of avoidance; avoidance is not something that could either begin or end abruptly. The only word which is seriously problematic, in fact, is *filie*, since this form is presumably not a Grecism and cannot be an archaism either if the change of *-ie* to *-i* dates to proto-Italic.

In order to understand Livius Andronicus' use of *filie*, we need to look take a more general look at the use of *filius* in address. The vocative *fili* is common in prose, of course, but it is extremely rare in poetry. *Filius* itself is not particularly a prose word; it occurs both in comedy and in high-register poetry,[32] though it is less frequent in poetry than in prose. (The lower frequency in poetry seems to be due to the fact that its synonym (*g*)*natus* is exclusively poetic and thus does not compete with *filius* in prose.) But with very few exceptions[33] the vocative *fili* is confined entirely to prose, despite being metrically unproblematic in hexameters and most other Latin metres. Its feminine equivalent, *filia*, which does not have the problematic ending, is used freely as a vocative not only in prose, but also in comedy and classical poetry,[34] despite the fact that daughters are addressed much less often than sons in Latin literature.[35] The use of the feminine vocative, and of forms of *filius* other than the vocative, point to avoidance of the form *fili* in poetry.

Additional evidence that poets systematically avoided the form *fili* is the fact that they also avoided another very common vocative in *-i*, *mi*, vocative of *meus* 'my'.[36] It is

---

[31] Cf. S. Pinker, *Words and Rules: The Ingredients of Language* (New York, 1999), 125–31.

[32] For precise statistics, see *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, s.v. *filius*, 752–3.

[33] Catullus 33.2, 33.8, 37.18; Pomponius (p. 108 Blänsdorf; this reading is perhaps to be emended to *filia*; cf. E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* [Oxford, 1993], 109); Phaedrus, *Fabulae Novae* 5.5; Terentianus Maurus, *De Syllabis* 283 (p. 52 Beck). There are some more exceptions in the late empire, e.g. Commodianus *Apol.* (= *Duob. Pop.*) 379, 449, *Instructiones* 2.17.1 (Martin).

[34] Plautus, *Men.* 822, 844; Propertius 4.11.67; Horace, *Carm.* 1.16.1; Ovid, *Met.* 1.481, 10.467, *Fasti* 4.456, 4.483.

[35] For the expected ratio of males to females in this type of address, compare the figures on (*g*)*nate* and (*g*)*nata* in poetry, at 179 to 46, or *fili* and *filia* in prose, at 61 to 9.

[36] See my article '*O dee ree pie*: the vocative problems of Latin words ending in *-eus*', *Glotta* (forthcoming). One should note that the two cases of avoidance are not identical, since in comedy *fili* seems to be avoided while *mi* is common; in other types of poetry, however, both are equally avoided.

striking that Catullus and Terentius Maurus, two poets who do use *fili*, are also the only two high-register poets (before the late empire) who use *mi*.

Yet such avoidance could be awkward, and on occasion poets felt a need for a vocative of *filius*. At least, such is the conclusion which presents itself when one considers Horace's use of the nominative *filius* as a vocative.[37] Livius Andronicus' *filie* could have been motivated by the same factors as Horace's *filius*: a poet's attempt to avoid the form *fili* without depriving himself entirely of a vocative for the word *filius*. Andronicus could easily have borrowed the *-e* ending from other second-declension Latin words; the occasional appearance of *-ie* in the vocatives of proper names shows that such analogy did happen from time to time.[38]

In this connection it is notable that nearly all of the *-i* vocatives listed under (3a) above come from prose, not poetry, and that an unusually high percentage of them come from non-literary sources. It looks as though the avoidance of vocatives of *-ius* words may have differed in different registers of the language: the poetic register seems to have been more rigorous in avoidance than the subliterary language. Moreover, when a word in *-ius* does occur in the vocative, the treatment seems to be different in the different registers. The lower register is in this respect more conservative, and most of the time the resulting vocative ends in the inherited *-i*; the poetic register is more likely to get around the use of this inherited form by some kind of innovation.[39]

With this hypothesis in mind, let us look at the ancient grammarians, who devoted much discussion to the problem of the vocative of words in *-ius*. An early version of their thinking was reported in the second century by Aulus Gellius:

Defessus ego quondam diutina commentatione laxandi levandique animi gratia in Agrippae campo deambulabam. Atque ibi duos forte grammaticos conspicatus non parvi in urbe Roma nominis certationi eorum acerrimae adfui, cum alter in casu vocativo 'vir egregi' dicendum contenderet, alter 'vir egregie'.
    Ratio autem eius, qui 'egregi' oportere dici censebat, huiuscemodi fuit: 'Quaecumque' inquit 'nomina seu vocabula recto casu numero singulari "us" syllaba finiuntur, in quibus ante ultimam syllabam posita est "i" littera, ea omnia casu vocativo "i" littera terminantur, ut "Caelius Caeli", "modius modi", "tertius terti", "Accius Acci", "Titius Titi" et similia omnia; sic igitur "egregius", quoniam "us" syllaba in casu nominandi finitur eamque syllabam

---

[37] *Carm.* 1.2.43 and perhaps *Sat.* 1.6.38; for a different interpretation, see J. Svennung, *Anredeformen* (Uppsala, 1958), 269.

[38] Additional motivations for Andronicus' use of *filie* can also be found. J. H. W. Penney suggests (personal communication) that trisyllabic forms of *filius* and *filia* prefer the position after the caesura of a Saturnian (cf. Andronicus frs. 12, 13, 19, 21 Blänsdorf), providing formulaic pressure for *filie*. L. Holford-Strevens suggests (personal communication) that 'Livius Andronicus was not a native speaker, hence (like the early Irish Latin writers and their Anglo-Saxon pupils) not inhibited by a sense of what is simply not done; moreover he was constructing from scratch a Latin epic diction that should stand to the Latin he heard spoken as Greek epic diction did to the Greek he spoke. We may therefore expect not only archaisms, or borrowings from the Italic dialects, but straightforward inventions.'

[39] In opposition to the above it could be noted that *filius* is also attested at Pompeii as a nominative for vocative (*CIL* 4.5213), and that a number of other *-ius* words also occur there in the nominative for vocative construction: Διονυσιος (3885), *Pumidius* (4338), *Latimius* (4844), (*H*)[e]*rmorius* (10174). It is sometimes implied that these words occur in the nominative at Pompeii because of their problematic *-ius* ending (cf. Svennung [n. 37], 271, 278), but this is not the case. The use of nominatives for vocatives is a general feature of the language of the Pompeiian graffiti (cf. V. Väänänen, *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes* [Helsinki, 1937], 195, 217) and is in fact less frequent with words in *-ius* than with other words in *-us*: when used as addresses, the former appear in the nominative 6 per cent of the time (total 82 examples) and the latter 8 per cent of the time (total 172 examples).

praecedit "i" littera, habere debebit in casu vocandi "i" litteram extremam, et idcirco "egregi", non "egregie", rectius dicetur. Nam "divus" et "rivus" et "clivus" non "us" syllaba terminantur, sed ea, quae per duo "u" scribenda est, propter cuius syllabae sonum declarandum reperta erat nova littera, quae digamma appellabatur.'

Hoc ubi ille alter audivit: 'o' inquit 'egregie grammatice vel, si id mavis, egregissime, dic, oro te, "inscius" et "impius" et "sobrius" et "ebrius" et "proprius" et "propitius" et "anxius" et "contrarius", quae "us" syllaba finiuntur, in quibus ante ultimam syllabam "i" littera est, quem casum vocandi habent? Me enim pudor et verecundia tenent pronuntiare ea secundum tuam definitionem.' Sed cum ille paulisper opposito horum vocabulorum commotus reticuisset et mox tamen se conlegisset eandemque illam, quam definierat, regulam retineret et propugnaret diceretque et 'proprium' et 'propitium' et 'anxium' et 'contrarium' itidem in casu vocativo dicendum, ut 'adversarius' et 'extrarius' diceretur, 'inscium' quoque et 'impium' et 'ebrium' et 'sobrium' insolentius quidem paulo, sed rectius per 'i' litteram, non per 'e', in eodem casu pronuntiandum eaque inter eos contentio longius duceretur, non arbitratus ego operae pretium esse eadem istaec diutius audire clamantes conpugnantesque illos reliqui.   (14. 5)

Once, tired by my daily study, I was walking in the field of Agrippa for diversion and relaxation. Seeing by chance two grammarians of no small reputation at Rome, I witnessed their fierce debate, in which one asserted that *vir egregi* was correct in the vocative case, and the other argued for *vir egregie*.

The argument of the one who thought that *egregi* was correct was along these lines: 'Whatever names or words end in *-us* in the nominative singular and have *i* before the last syllable all end in *-i* in the vocative case, as *Caeli* from *Caelius*, *modi* from *modius*, *terti* from *tertius*, *Acci* from *Accius*, *Titi* from *Titius*, etc.; therefore *egregius* too, since the nominative ends in *-us* and the letter *i* precedes that syllable, should have a final *-i* in the vocative case. Thus *egregi*, not *egregie*, is the proper form. For *divus*, *rivus*, and *clivus* do not end in *-us*, but in the syllable which should be written with two *u*'s, for whose sound the new letter called *digamma* was invented.' [i.e. *divus*, *rivus*, and *clivus* are not counter-examples, because they end not in *-ius* but in *-iuus*.]

When the other heard this, he said, '*O egregie grammatice* ['o excellent grammarian'], or if you prefer, *egregissime* ['most excellent'], tell me, I beg of you, what are the vocatives of *inscius*, *impius*, *sobrius*, *ebrius*, *proprius*, *propitius*, *anxius*, and *contrarius*, which end in *-us* and have the letter *i* before the final syllable? For shame and modesty restrain me from pronouncing them according to your rule.' The first grammarian, disturbed by the opposition of these words, was silent for a little while but soon collected himself. He held on to the same rule he had defined earlier and defended it, saying that *proprius*, *propitius*, *anxius*, and *contrarius* should have the same vocative as *adversarius* and *extrarius*, and that also *inscius*, *impius*, *ebrius*, and *sobrius* were more correctly (if less commonly) pronounced with *i* in the vocative, not with *e*. The debate between them was prolonged for a rather long time, so, not thinking it worth my while to listen to those same arguments any longer, I left them there shouting and fighting.

The version given here follows the standard Oxford text of Gellius (ed. P. K. Marshall, 1968), but an important alteration has recently been proposed. Holford-Strevens[40] suggests that *Modius* and *Tertius* should be capitalized, since both are attested as names and on the grounds that the adjective *tertius,* if not a name, ought (following Neue and Wagener's rule) to form a vocative *tertie*. One drawback to this suggestion, as Holford-Strevens admits, is the grammarian's reference to *nomina seu vocabula* 'names or words'; such a statement implies that not all of the examples following are proper names. Nevertheless, in coming to a final understanding of this passage one should be able to decide whether the proposed capitalization is correct or not.

At first glance, Gellius' story looks only mildly informative. It tells us that the vocative of *egregius* did not at this period have a fixed form, and that it shared this problem with a number of other words ending in *-ius*. Such uncertainty is precisely

[40] L. Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius* (London, 1988), 131, and id., 'More notes on Aulus Gellius', *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 9 (1984), 149–50.

what we would have predicted from the evidence already discussed, since Gellius is writing shortly before the period in which -*ie* vocatives start to appear.

Yet looking more closely one is struck by how strange the examples in this passage are. With the exception of *impius* and the proper names, not a single one of the parallels cited on either side of this debate is actually attested in the masculine singular vocative, in any form. Moreover, a number of them are words which cannot possibly have been at all frequent in the vocative. How often did ancient Romans need a vocative for *proprius* 'own' or *contrarius* 'opposite' (to say nothing of *modius* 'measure' or *tertius* 'third', if they are not names)? One would be inclined to suspect that Gellius deliberately gave ridiculous examples in order to make fun of the dispute, were it not for the fact that examples cited in actual grammatical treatises are sometimes just as peculiar (see below).

Despite this handicap, Gellius' grammarians seem to have no trouble coming up with vocatives for these words. Their willingness to do so is not in itself surprising, since ancient grammarians had a tendency to invent vocatives in order to fill out the paradigms of words which were unlikely to be used in address. Vocatives for *ille*, *ipse*, *iste*, *is*, *idem*, *qui*, *quicumque*, and other pronouns appear in grammatical treatises,[41] although the more astute grammarians were careful to refute such errors by emphasizing that most pronouns could not be used as addresses and therefore did not possess vocatives.[42] What is interesting about Gellius' arguing grammarians is not the fact that they are able to think of vocatives for words unlikely to be used in address, but how they present these vocatives. They appeal to the forms as authorities, and while some of these authorities are disputed, others are not. The grammarians give a strong impression that they are dealing with an external reality, that they have heard the forms they cite and expect their opponents to have heard them as well. The admission that for some words the forms in -*i* are less common than those in -*ie* makes no sense without such an external reality.

Yet how can the grammarians have heard these forms often enough to appeal to them in this way, given how rare the vocatives concerned must have been? Perhaps they had indeed heard the forms, but not as vocatives. A native speaker of Latin would have known, when presented with a form, whether he had ever heard it before; if he had not, it would sound unfamiliar, that is, wrong. If he had in fact heard it, the form would sound perfectly acceptable, and it might take a native speaker some thought to work out whether the form he was discussing was really the one with which he was familiar, or a homonym of it. Could Gellius' grammarians have been appealing not to an external reality involving vocatives, but to one involving other words that were homonyms of vocatives?

Latin adjectives in -*ius* regularly form adverbs in -*ie*. The final *e* in such adverbs is long, while the *e* of the vocative ending is short, so the two should not be homonyms. But final vowels are virtually always unaccented in Latin, and in the imperial period the distinction between long and short *e* was lost in unaccented syllables.[43] At this point, adverbs of -*ius* adjectives would have been homonymous with any vocatives in -*ie* which were created. Is it an accident that most such vocatives seem to have been created only once the adverbs became homonymous and thus provided a model?

---

[41] For example, Keil IV 132.1, 11, 17, 24, 31, 133.22, 38. The 'vocative' forms are the same as the nominatives.

[42] Keil III 22.13–23.10, 166.3–8, 207.14–19.

[43] David Langslow, personal communication; see also e.g. B. Löfstedt, *Studien über die Sprache der langobardischen Gesetze* (Stockhom, 1961), 37.

Let us examine Gellius' examples more closely. Nine words mentioned in this passage have disputed vocatives, with one grammarian arguing in favour of an *-i* ending and the other in favor of *-ie*. Seven of these (*egregius* 'excellent', *inscius* 'unknowing', *impius* 'disloyal', *sobrius* 'sober', *proprius* 'own', *anxius* 'worried', and *contrarius* 'opposite') form adverbs in *-ie*, and some such adverbs are very common; I have found more than 600 examples of *proprie*. The other two words in this group, *ebrius* 'drunken' and *propitius* 'favourable', do not form attested adverbs, though this lack is somewhat surprising given their meaning, and we may wonder whether the lack of attestation is accidental. Thus a Roman who had never seen or heard any of these words used in the vocative might still find that the form in *-ie* sounded familiar, and might not initially realize that it was not the familiar *qua* vocative.

In contrast to this situation is that of the seven words which are cited, without dispute, as forming their vocatives in *-i*. Three of these words are Roman proper names; names always formed such vocatives in *-i* and were used comparatively frequently in the vocative, so the fact that they do not form adverbs is probably irrelevant here. It is, however, significant that the four other words in this group, *modius* 'measure', *tertius* 'third', *adversarius* 'enemy, inimical', and *extrarius* 'external', also fail to form adverbs in *-ie*: **modie*, **tertie*, **adversarie*, and **extrarie* are all completely unattested. (*Modius*, being exclusively a noun, could not in any case form an adverb, and the other three, though adjectives, have meanings which make adverbial usage inherently unlikely and indicate that the lack of attestation is probably not accidental.) Thus the arguing grammarians would have found the *-ie* ending completely unfamiliar in the case of these words.

The division of words in this passage between those which could form a vocative in *-ie* and those which could not thus is not random, nor does it reflect an adjective/substantive divide; rather it follows the extent to which homonyms of vocatives in *-ie* were in use as adverbs. Words which formed adverbs in *-ie* could also form vocatives in *-ie*, and those which did not produce adverbs, on the whole, could not form such vocatives in Gellius' day. Such a distribution suggests that the adverbs were indeed responsible for the development of vocatives in *-ie*.

This explanation also suggests that there is no need to make nonsense out *of nomina seu vocabula* by capitalizing *modius* and *tertius*. The chief argument in favour of such a move was that the vocative of *tertius* ought otherwise to be **tertie*, but in fact it would more likely have been *terti* at this period, like *adversari*, since there was no corresponding adverb to provide a model for **tertie*.

In Gellius' time there seems to be an implicit assumption that all words in *-ius* must form their vocatives in the same way; it is the presence of two different models that causes the argument over *egregie*. The same assumption seems to underlie the statements of the fourth-century grammarian Charisius, who declares that all nouns in *-ius* have a vocative in *-i*, though the only examples he gives are names.[44] By the early fifth century, however, a distinction had been drawn between names and other words in *-ius*. Servius states the rule as follows:

Vocativus enim singularis secundae declinationis tunc in i exibit, cum nominativus singularis in ius fuerit terminatus in genere masculino in proprio nomine, ut hic Mercurius o Mercuri. Hoc enim nomen et ius terminat nominativum et masculinum est et proprium. Si autem nominativus us terminatur, ut hic doctus, vocativum facit o docte; et si appellativum sit, licet ius terminatur,

---

[44] Barwick 23.16–24, 203.2–5 = Keil I 24.26–32, 159.19–21.

ut hic impius o impie facit, hic egregius o egregie. Sed huic regulae contrarium est hic filius o fili.
Quare maiores nostri timentes ipsum vocativum similem fecerunt nominativo, ut Virgilius dicit
        corniger Hesperidum fluvius regnator aquarum.   (Keil IV 409.10–19)

The vocative singular of the second declension will end in -i when the nominative singular
ended in -ius in the masculine in a proper name, as *Mercuri* from *Mercurius*. For this noun ends
in -ius in the nominative, is masculine, and is a proper noun. But if the nominative ends in -us,
as *doctus*, it makes a vocative *docte*; likewise if it is not a proper noun, even if it ends in -ius, as
impius forms the vocative *impie* and *egregius egregie*. But the vocative of *filius, fili*, violates this
rule. Therefore our ancestors, fearing the vocative itself, made it resemble the nominative, as
Vergil says [at *Aeneid* 8.77]:
        corniger Hesperidum fluvius regnator aquarum
[using *fluvius* as a nominative for vocative].

This passage shows a development in usage from the time of Gellius. *Egregius* is no
longer a disputed word; the vocative in -*ie* has won out. In addition, a distinction
between proper names and other words has been recognized, so the -*ius* nouns are no
longer treated as a unified group. These two developments are probably related. As
long as words like *egregius* were unclear in their vocative formation and generally
avoided in the vocative, it was natural for a grammarian who had to make a
pronouncement to connect them to the names, which did form undisputed vocatives.
But once forms such as *egregie* became well established, a clear distinction between
them and the names was apparent. Of course, grammarians were interested in classical
rather than contemporary usage, but when classical usage offered no examples on
which to base a rule, the rule could be formed from later evidence. Servius' acceptance
of *egregie* is thus further evidence of the systematic avoidance in classical literature of
vocatives of -*ius* words other than names and *filius*.

Servius' comment on the reasons behind the use of the nominative for vocative
construction is perceptive. Nominatives for vocatives do, of course, occur with words
not ending in -*ius*, and the ancient grammarians were well aware of that fact; they
usually illustrate it with *degener o populus* from Lucan (2.116).[45] Yet some examples of
this construction do appear to be an attempt to avoid the problematic -*ius* vocatives, as
we have seen. Servius seems to have noticed the lack of classical evidence for the
formation of -*ius* vocatives other than names and *filius* and realized that it was due to
systematic avoidance which could also be seen in the use of nominatives for vocatives,
an observation that many modern scholars have failed to make.

Other grammarians of the fifth century and later are largely in agreement with
Servius' definition of the rule, though they do not always use the same examples.
Probus gives the -*ie* ending not only to *egregius*, but also to *pius, ebrius, alius, medius*,
and *sobrius*.[46] Priscian applies it to *pius, socius*, and *fluvius*,[47] Phoca mentions *fluvie*
and *socie* (Keil V 429.7–26), Beda uses *impie* (Keil VII 278.5–13), pseudo-Sergius and
the *Ars Anonyma Bernensis* cite *pie*,[48] and Marius Plotius Sacerdos and the *Frag-
mentum Bobiense* cite *egregie*.[49] Servius himself gives his rule in different words in his
commentary on *Aeneid* 8.77, and there he uses *pie* and *fluvie* as examples.

A few variations do occur. Priscian says that the vocative of *filius* can be either *fili* or

---

[45] This phrase is in fact an exclamation, not an address, and therefore it does not illustrate the
nominative for vocative construction, but rather the nominative of exclamation. The point the
grammarians were making is, however, unaffected by their choice of examples.

[46] Keil IV 9.1–3, 19.6–10, 105.15, 194.35–7; cf. 4.14–18.

[47] Keil II 300.17–305.21, III 447.24–448.4, 487.7–19, 511.20–512.3; cf. also III 205.20–3.

[48] Keil IV 496.34–497.7, 498.17–20, VIII 104.15–34.

[49] Keil V 556.7–16, VI 474.1–4, VII 541.15–18.

filie (Keil II 305.7–15); this is due not to a change in the usage of this word, but to his observation of Livius Andronicus' *filie*. Charisius points out that names sometimes have a vocative in *-ie* and that this form is a Grecism (Barwick 89.22–4 = Keil I 71.9–11); here again the ancient grammarians have been more perceptive than many modern scholars. Both of these points are sometimes repeated by later grammarians[50] and do not seem to have been controversial.

Less easily accepted, however, was a claim on the part of some grammarians that *-ius* words could form vocatives in *-ii*. This view first appears in Terentius Scaurus (early second century), who presents it as follows:

Deinde per detractionem hoc modo scribendi ratio corrupta est, quibusdam uno i scribentibus genetivum eorum nominum quae ius nominativo singulari finiuntur, ut Antonius Antoni, Tremelius Tremeli, exigente regula ut in horum genetivis i littera geminetur, quoniam genetivus singularis non debet minorem numerum habere syllabarum quam nominativus, quin immo interdum etiam maior fit. propter quam causam ego etiam vocativos horum per duo i, non, ut consuetudo usurpavit, per unum putem esse scribendos, quia non debeat aeque vocativus minorem numerum syllabarum habere quam nominativus. ita o Antonii et o Aemilii in singulari vocativo et dicendum et scribendum esse contenderim.   (Keil VII 22.4–13)

Then spelling has been corrupted through abbreviation, so that certain people write with one *i* the genitive of nouns which end in *-ius* in the nominative singular, as *Antoni* from *Antonius* and *Tremeli* from *Tremelius*. The rule requires that the *i* be double in the genitives of these words, since the genitive singular should not have a lesser number of syllables than the nominative, but sometimes even has more. For which reason I would think that even the vocatives of these words should be written with two *i*'s and not, as habit has incorrectly asserted, with one, because the vocative should not properly have a lesser number of syllables than the nominative. Thus I would argue that in the singular vocative one should both say and write *o Antonii* and *o Aemilii*.

Charisius asserts, also in the context of a discussion of the genitive, that the vocative of *pius* is *pii* and attributes that view to Varro,[51] although this statement conflicts with his opinion, expressed elsewhere, that the vocative of *-ius* nouns has a single *i*.[52] A similar confusion can be seen in Probus, who normally quotes the vocatives of names with a single *i* but in one passage asserts that their proper vocative ending is *-ii*, as *Mercurii*, invoking the rule that second-declension nouns have the same number of syllables in all cases except the genitive plural (Keil IV 105.15–22). Clearly all the grammarians who suggested vocative forms in *-ii* were motivated by this rule of syllable parity, which was explicitly refuted by Priscian in another context (Keil II 301.7–16). Since Scaurus, the earliest grammarian to refer to it, makes it clear that the rule contradicts observed reality, and since the grammarians who give it almost always contradict themselves, the grammarians' statements in favour of vocatives in *-ii* need not be taken seriously.

With this exception, however, the grammarians' statements were remarkably perceptive, and basically accurate for the Latin of the fourth century A.D. and later. Even for the earlier periods, the grammarians were more correct than many modern scholars, in that they succeeded in putting the chief distinction among *-ius* words in the right place. The main division is indeed between names and *filius* on the one hand, and all other words (both adjectives and substantives) on the other hand; though in Gellius' day the *-ie* ending seems to have been restricted to words that could form

---

[50] For example, Keil VIII 104.15–34.
[51] Barwick 55.19, 99.15–17 = Keil I 45.15, 79.3–5.
[52] Cf., also in connection with the genitive, Barwick 21.22–4, = Keil I 23.19–20.

adverbs in -*ie*, by the fourth century it had spread to substantives as well, as the examples of *nuntie* attest.

The grammarians also made a number of statements about classical usage which are more accurate than those of many modern scholars: they recognized both the Greek nature of many -*ie* vocatives and the classical tendency to avoid vocatives of -*ius* words. They also recognized that usage had changed between the classical period and their age, another fact overlooked by many more recent scholars.

In fact, the ancient grammarians seem to have grasped most of the elements of the following history of vocatives of -*ius* words, though not of course the reasons behind those elements. The inherited -*ie* vocative ending became -*i* at a very early period, with the result that until well into the imperial period words which were common in address formed a vocative in -*i*. Those less common were normally avoided, especially in the higher registers of the language; if used, however, they too normally formed a vocative in -*i*, except for some Greek words which took -*ie*. Then the vocative paradigm was regularized by the creation of vocatives in -*ie* for the words whose vocatives had formerly been avoided; this change was aided, and perhaps set off, by sound changes that made adverbial forms available as models for vocatives. At first these new vocative forms were not fully accepted by purists and were largely confined to words which formed adverbs in -*ie*, but in the absence of classical models of vocatives with another form, the -*ie* ending spread to substantives by the fourth century and eventually took over except in the case of *fili* and proper names.

Columbia University   ELEANOR DICKEY
                                         ed202@columbia.edu