APPENDIX A

1. Selected quotations from the Latin grammarians and other writers

Ter. Maurus, K. vi, 331 (see p. 13).

> at portio dentes quotiens suprema linguae
> pulsauerit imos modiceque curua summos,
> tunc *d* sonitum perficit explicatque uocem.
> *t*, qua superis dentibus intima est origo,
> summa satis est ad sonitum ferire lingua.

Mar. Vict., K. vi, 34 (see p. 16). quarum utramque exprimi faucibus, alteram distento, alteram producto rictu manifestum est.

Vel. Longus, K. vii, 58 (see p. 17). *u* litteram digamma esse interdum non tantum in his debemus animaduertere, in quibus sonat cum aliqua adspiratione, ut in *ualente* et *uitulo* et *primitiuo* et *genetiuo*, sed etiam in his in quibus cum *q* confusa haec littera est, ut in eo quod est *quis*.

Priscian, K. ii, 7 (see p. 17). *u* autem, quamuis contractum, eundem tamen (hoc est *y*) sonum habet, inter *q* et *e* uel *i* uel *ae* diphthongum positum, ut *que*, *quis*, *quae*, nec non inter *g* et easdem uocales, cum in una syllaba sic inuenitur, ut *pingue*, *sanguis*, *linguae*.

Mar. Vict., K. vi, 33 (see p. 21). *b* et *p*...dispari inter se oris officio exprimuntur. nam prima exploso e mediis labiis sono, sequens compresso ore uelut introrsum attracto uocis ictu explicatur. *c* etiam et *g*...sono proximae oris molimine nisuque dissentiunt...*g* uim prioris pari linguae habitu palato suggerens lenius reddit.

Cicero, *Or.*, 160 (see p. 26). quin ego ipse, cum scirem ita maiores locutos ut nusquam nisi in uocali aspiratione uterentur, loquebar sic ut *pulcros*, *Cetegos*, *triumpos*, *Cartaginem* dicerem; aliquando, idque sero, conuicio aurium cum extorta mihi ueritas

esset, usum loquendi populo concessi, scientiam mihi reseruaui. *Orciuios* tamen et *Matones, Otones, Caepiones, sepulcra, coronas, lacrimas* dicimus, quia per aurium iudicium licet.

Mar. Vict., K. vi, 21 (see p. 26). uideo uos saepe et *orco* et *Vulcano h* litteram relinquere, et credo uos antiquitatem sequi ...item *corona ancora sepulcrum*, sic et quae *h* in adspiratione desiderant, ut *brachium cohors harena pulcher.* sed ea quatenus debeatis obseruare, ignoratis.

Priscian, K. ii, 30 (see p. 28). in eiusmodi Graeci et Accius noster bina *g* scribunt (sc. *aggulus, aggens, iggerunt*), alii *n* et *g*, quod in hoc ueritatem uidere facile non est. similiter *agceps, agcora*.

Gellius, xix, 14, 7 (see p. 28). inter litteram *n* et *g* est alia uis, ut in nomine *anguis* et *angari* et *ancorae* et *increpat* et *incurrit* et *ingenuus*. In omnibus his non uerum *n*, sed adulterinum ponitur. nam *n* non esse lingua indicio est; nam si ea littera esset, lingua palatum tangeret.

Vel. Longus, K. vii, 54 (see p. 30). nam quibusdam litteris deficimus, quas tamen sonus enuntiationis arcessit, ut cum dicimus *uirtutem* et *uirum fortem consulem Scipionem*, peruenisse fere ad aures peregrinam litteram inuenies.

Quintilian, ix, 4, 40 (see p. 31). atqui eadem illa littera (sc. *m*), quotiens ultima est et uocalem uerbi sequentis ita contingit ut in eam transire possit, etiamsi scribitur, tamen parum exprimitur, ut *multum ille* et *quantum erat*, adeo ut paene cuiusdam nouae litterae sonum reddat. neque enim eximitur, sed obscuratur.

Vel. Longus, K. vii, 54 (see p. 31). ita sane se habet non numquam forma enuntiandi, ut litterae in ipsa scriptione positae non audiantur enuntiatae. sic enim cum dicitur *illum ego* et *omnium optimum, illum* et *omnium* aeque *m* terminat nec tamen in enuntiatione apparet.

Lucilius, 377 Marx (see p. 32).

r: non multum est, hoc cacosyntheton atque canina
si lingua dico; nihil ad me, nomen enim illi est.

Mar. Vict., K. vi, 34 (see p. 32). sequetur *r*, quae uibrato...
linguae fastigio fragorem tremulis ictibus reddit.

Priscian, K. ii, 29 (see p. 34). *l* triplicem, ut Plinio uidetur,
sonum habet: exilem, quando geminatur secundo loco posita,
ut *ille*, *Metellus*; plenum, quando finit nomina uel syllabas et
quando aliquam habet ante se in eadem syllaba consonantem,
ut *sol, silua, flauus, clarus*; medium in aliis, ut *lectum, lectus*.

Quintilian, xii, 10, 29 (see p. 34). nam et illa, quae est sexta
nostrarum, paene non humana uoce uel omnino non uoce
potius inter discrimina dentium efflanda est.

Quintilian, i, 7, 20 (see p. 36). quid quod Ciceronis tempori-
bus paulumque infra, fere quotiens *s* littera media uocalium
longarum uel subiecta longis esset, geminabatur, ut *caussae,
cassus, diuissiones*? quomodo et ipsum et Vergilium quoque
scripsisse manus eorum docent.

Quintilian, i, 4, 11 (see p. 39). sciat enim Ciceroni placuisse
*aiio Maiiam*que geminata *i* scribere.

Priscian, K. ii, 13 f. (see p. 39). et *i* quidem...pro duplici
accipitur consonante...quando in medio dictionis ab eo incipit
syllaba post uocalem ante se positam subsequente quoque uocali
in eadem syllaba, ut *maius, peius, eius*, in quo loco antiqui solebant
geminare eandem *i* litteram et *maiius, peiius, eiius* scribere.

Ter. Maurus, K. vi, 343 (see p. 39).
> *i* media cum conlocatur hinc et hinc uocalium,
> *Troia* siue *Maia* dicas, *peior* aut *ieiunium*,
> nominum primas uidemus esse uocales breues,
> *i* tamen sola sequente duplum habere temporis.

Gellius, iv, 17 (see p. 40). *obiciebat o* littera producta multos
legere audio, idque eo facere dicunt ut ratio numeri salua sit...
subicit u littera longa legunt...sed neque *ob* neque *sub* prae-
positio producendi habet naturam, neque item *con*.... in his
autem quae supra posui et metrum esse integrum potest et
praepositiones istae possunt non barbare protendi; secunda
enim littera in his uerbis per duo *i*, non per unum scribenda

est. nam uerbum ipsum, cui supradictae particulae prae-
positae sunt, non est *icio* sed *iacio*.

Gellius, x, 4, 4 . '*uos*', inquit, 'cum dicimus, motu
quodam oris conueniente cum ipsius uerbi demonstratione
utimur et labeas sensim primores emouemus ac spiritum atque
animam porro uersum et ad eos quibuscum sermocinamur
intendimus. at contra cum dicimus *nos*, neque profuso inten-
toque flatu uocis neque proiectis labris pronuntiamus. hoc
idem fit et in eo quod dicimus *tu*, *ego*...ita in his uocibus quasi
gestus quidam oris et spiritus naturalis est.'

Cicero, *Div.*, ii, 84 . cum M. Crassus exercitum
Brundisi imponeret, quidam in portu caricas Cauno aduectas
uendens 'Cauneas' clamitabat. dicamus, si placet, monitum
ab eo Crassum 'caueret ne iret'; non fuisse periturum, si omini
paruisset.

Quintilian, i, 7, 27 . illud nunc melius, quod *cui*
tribus quas praeposui litteris enotamus; in quo pueris nobis ad
pinguem sane sonum *qu* et *oi* utebantur, tantum ut ab illo *qui*
distingueretur.

Vel. Longus, K. vii, 51 . non idem est *z* et *sd*, sic
quo modo non est σίγμα καὶ δ et ζ...scribe enim per unum ζ
et consule aurem: non erit ἀζηχής quo modo ἀδσηχής, sed
geminata eadem ἀζζηχής quo modo ἀσσηχής. et plane siquid
superuenerit me dicente sonum huius litterae, inuenies eundem
tenorem a quo coeperit.

Consentius, K. v, 394 . mihi tamen uidetur (sc. *i*)
quando producta est, plenior uel acutior esse; quando autem
breuis est, medium sonum (sc. inter *e* et *i*) exhibere debet.

Ter. Maurus, K. vi, 329 .

igitur sonitum reddere cum uoles minori,
retrorsus adactam modice teneto linguam,
rictu neque magno sat erit patere labra.
at longior alto tragicum sub oris antro
molita rotundis acuit sonum labellis.

Ter. Maurus, K. vi, 329 .

> *e* quae sequitur uocula dissona est priori (sc. *a*),
> quia deprimit altum modico tenore rictum
> et lingua remotos premit hinc et hinc molares.
> *i* porrigit ictum genuinos prope ad ipsos
> minimumque renidet supero tenus labello.

Cassiodor(i)us, K. vii, 150 . *lacrumae* an *lacrimae*, *maxumus* an *maximus*, et siqua similia sunt, quo modo scribi debeant, quaesitum est. Terentius Varro tradidit Caesarem per *i* eius modi uerba solitum esse enuntiare et scribere: inde propter auctoritatem tanti uiri consuetudinem factam.

Ter. Scaurus, K. vii, 16 . *a* igitur littera praeposita est *u* et *e* litteris, *ae, au*...apud antiquos *i* littera pro ea scribebatur...ut *pictai uestis*...sed magis in illis *e* nouissima sonat.

Mar. Vict., K. vi, 8 . Accius, cum longa syllaba scribenda esset, duas uocales ponebat, praeterquam quae in *i* litteram incideret: hanc enim per *e* et *i* scribebat.

Mar. Vict., K. vi, 66 . συναλοιφή est, cum inter duas loquellas duarum uocalium concursus alteram elidit... nec tamen putaueris quamlibet de duabus eximi posse: illa enim quae superuenit priorem semper excludet.

Mar. Vict., K. vi, 66 f. . συνεκφώνησις uero, cum duae uocales in unam syllabam coguntur...ut cum *Phaethon* in metro sic enuntiatur, ut ex trisyllabo nomine disyllabum faciat....

...κρᾶσιν, id est cum unius litterae uocalis in duas syllabas fit communio, ut *audire est operae...quaecumque est fortuna*... quae ueluti per contrarium συνεκφώνησιν in metris imitatur.

Quintilian, i, 5, 30 . namque in omni uoce acuta intra numerum trium syllabarum continetur, siue eae sunt in uerbo solae siue ultimae, et in iis aut proxima extremae aut ab ea tertia. trium porro, de quibus loquor, media longa aut acuta aut flexa erit; eodem loco breuis utique grauem habebit sonum, ideoque positam ante se id est ab ultima tertium acuet.

Servius, K. iv, 426 (see p. 84). accentus in ea syllaba est, quae plus sonat. quam rem deprehendimus, si fingamus nos aliquem longe positum clamare. inuenimus enim naturali ratione illam syllabam plus sonare, quae retinet accentum, atque usque eodem nisum uocis ascendere.

2. Chronology of sources

Accius	b. 170 B.C.
Audax	? 6th cent. A.D.
Augustine	354 to 430 A.D.
Bede	673 to 735 A.D.
Caesar	100 to 44 B.C.
Caper	2nd cent. A.D.
Cassiodor(i)us	c. 490 to 585 A.D.
Charisius	4th cent. A.D.
Cicero	106 to 43 B.C.
Cledonius	5th cent. A.D.
Consentius	5th cent. A.D.
Cornutus	1st cent. A.D.
Diomedes	4th cent. A.D.
Dionysius of Halicarnassus	1st cent. B.C.
Donatus	4th cent. A.D.
Festus	? 2nd cent. A.D.
Gellius (Aulus)	2nd cent. A.D.
Lucilius	c. 180 to 102 B.C.
Macrobius	4th–5th cent. A.D.
Marius Victorinus	4th cent. A.D.
Martianus Capella	4th–5th cent. A.D.
Nigidius Figulus	1st cent. B.C.
Nisus	1st cent. A.D.
Pliny the Elder	23 to 79 A.D.
Plutarch	c. 46 to 120 A.D.
Pompeius	5th cent. A.D.
Priscian	5th–6th cent. A.D.
Probus	4th cent. A.D.
Quintilian	c. 35 to 95 A.D.

Sacerdos	3rd–4th cent. A.D.
Sergius	4th–5th cent. A.D.
Servius	4th–5th cent. A.D.
Stilo (L. Aelius)	c. 154 to 90 B.C.
Terentianus Maurus	2nd cent. A.D.
Terentius Scaurus	2nd cent. A.D.
Varro	116 to 27 B.C.
Velius Longus	2nd cent. A.D.

APPENDIX B

The pronunciation of Latin in England

Anyone who has listened to Latin as pronounced until recently in the Westminster play, or at Grace by elder members of Oxford and Cambridge high tables, or in legal phraseology, will be aware that it bears little relation to the pronunciation of Latin with which we have been concerned. This 'traditional' English pronunciation was the result of a variety of influences.

In the first instance, Latin in England had from earliest times been affected by native speech-habits. Already in the Old English period vowel-length had ceased to be observed except in the penultimate syllable of polysyllabic words, where it made a difference to the position of the accent (hence correctly e.g. *mínǐma, minóra*). Otherwise new rhythmical laws were applied, the first syllable of a disyllabic word, for instance, being made heavy by lengthening the vowel if it were originally light (hence e.g. *pāter, lībrum, ōuis, hūmus,* for *păter,* etc.); there seems, however, to judge from Aelfric's grammar, to have been a practice of preserving Latin quantities in verse. 'Soft' *g* was pronounced as a semi-vowel [y], and intervocalic *s* was voiced to [z].

After the Norman conquest, Latin in England was taught through the medium of French, by French schoolmasters, and this resulted in the introduction of some peculiarities of the French pronunciation of Latin, e.g. the rendering of both consonantal *i* (*iustum,* etc.) and 'soft' *g* (*gentem,* etc.) as an affricate [dž] (as in English *judge*). 'Soft' *c* came to be pronounced as [s] (after the thirteenth century, when earlier French [ts] changed to [s]); all vowels were shortened before two or more consonants, e.g. in *census, nullus;* and Romance practice reinforced the tendency to lengthen vowels in open syllables (e.g. † *tēnet, fōcus,* for *těnet, fŏcus*).

Not until the mid fourteenth century did English begin to

establish itself as the medium of instruction for Latin (owing largely to the efforts of the educational reformer John Cornwall). Thereafter Latin in England continued to develop along national lines, until the publication in 1528 of Erasmus' dialogue *De recta Latini Graecique sermonis pronuntiatione*, which comments on a number of national peculiarities in the current pronunciation of Latin and seeks to reform them in the direction of the classical language. The dialogue is written in a light-hearted style, and the disputants, in the manner of didactic fables, are represented in animal guise, as *Ursus* and *Leo*, the bear being the instructor. The dialogue makes a number of important deductions about the ancient pronunciation of Latin, including the 'hard' pronunciation of *c* and *g* before all vowels, the voicelessness of intervocalic *s*, and the importance of vowel length.

Erasmus made two visits to England, one to London in 1506 and another from 1509 to 1514. During his second visit he spent some time in Cambridge, and it was here that his views on Latin and Greek pronunciation were later most vigorously propagated. In 1540 John Cheke was appointed as the first Regius Professor of Greek in Cambridge, and his friend Thomas Smith, another classical scholar, as Regius Professor of Civil Law. Both were only twenty-six at the time, and had been deeply impressed by Erasmus' published work. Erasmus had limited himself to precept, and seems never actually to have used his reformed pronunciation; Ursus in fact comments that it is better to humour existing habits than to get oneself laughed at and misunderstood; in the words of Erasmus' predecessor in reform, Jerome Aleander, 'scientiam loquendi nobis reservantes, usum populo concedamus'.[1] Erasmus does, however, set the spoken word high amongst his educational priorities ('primum discet expedite sonare, deinde prompte legere, mox eleganter pingere'), and it is clear from the dialogue that he hoped for a gradual improvement in pronunciation.

In Cambridge, Cheke and Smith set about a radical and practical reform of both Greek and Latin pronunciation on Erasmian lines; Cheke in fact devoted six inaugural lectures to

---

[1] A clear echo of Cicero, *Or.*, 160 (see pp. 95 f.).

the subject, on successive days, under the title '*de literarum emendatiore sono*'. The reforms were, however, opposed by the Chancellor of the University, Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, who in 1542 published an edict specifically forbidding the new pronunciation of either language. As penalties for infringement, M.A.s were to be expelled from the Senate, candidates were to be excluded from degrees, scholars to forfeit all privileges, and ordinary undergraduates to be chastised. For some time Gardiner's authority triumphed, but the intellectual weakness of his position is clear from some of his arguments; he complains, for example, that undergraduates are becoming insolent, by using an 'exotic' pronunciation, and delighting in the fact that their elders cannot understand it. He objects that the reforms would put Cambridge out of step with Oxford (and Oxford, as Gardiner elsewhere comments, 'liveth quietly')—to which Cheke replies, 'Neque tantum mihi quid Oxonia faciat, quam quid facere debeat, cogitandum. Neque minor est Cantabrigiae laus, si ipsa ad promovenda studia aliquid quaerat, quamquam Oxonia eadem retardet.'

Cheke later supported the claims of Lady Jane Grey, and briefly acted as her Secretary of State. Gardiner, who had spent most of Edward's reign in the Tower, was released on the accession of Mary, and made the most of his restored powers. Having earlier defended Henry's breach with Rome, he presided at the reconciliation under Mary, and preached at court, on the eve of Jane's execution, in favour of severer treatment for political offenders. Cheke's property was confiscated, and he was imprisoned in the Tower for more than a year. He was subsequently given leave to travel abroad and proceeded to Padua, and thence to Strasbourg, but was brought back to England only to die a broken man in 1557. On Elizabeth's accession the next year, Gardiner's edict was repealed (the Bishop himself having died in 1555).

But reformers had still to reckon with inertia and with the
† vested interests of the 'traditional' pronunciation of Latin; and in any case the advantages of the new pronunciation in England were soon to be diminished by an accident of linguistic history.

For the reforms came at a time when the extensive changes from the Middle English to Modern English vowel system were still incomplete; and so any reforms in Latin or Greek pronunciation underwent these vowel-changes as sub-dialects of English—the Latin vowels *ā, ī, ē*, for example, became diphthongs [ey], [ay], [iy], as in English *name, wine, seen.*

It was thus a strangely pronounced language, far removed from classical Latin, which was current in England by the nineteenth century. Apart from the peculiarities already dis- †
cussed, the following features may be mentioned. In poly-syllables with light penultimate, the antepenultimate (accented) vowel was, with some exceptions, shortened—hence e.g. *stāmina, sexagēsima* became *stămina, sexagĕsima*; *Oedipus* became *Ĕdipus* and *Caesaris* became *Cĕsaris* (*oe* and *ae* being pro-nounced as *e*—hence also *Ĕschylus* for *Aeschylus*): but, for ex-ample, verbal *amāveram, mīserat.* This shortening did not take place in the case of an *u* (hence e.g. *tūmulus* for *tŭmulus*, with lengthening), nor if there was hiatus between the last two syllables (hence e.g. *ālias, gēnius* for *ălias, gĕnius*, with lengthen-ing: but compounds *ŏbeo, rĕcreo*, etc.). On the other hand, shortening took place in any case if the vowel was *i* or *y* (hence *fīlius, Lȳdia*). The 'parasitic' *y*-sound which precedes an English *u* was treated as a consonant, and so *văcuum* remained '*văcyuum*' and did not become *vācuum*. The lengthening seen in e.g. *ītem* for *ĭtem* applied also to *mihi* (*mīhī*) but not, sur-prisingly, if the following consonant was *b* (hence *tĭbĭ, sĭbĭ, ĭbĭ, quĭbus*).[1] ‡

Since English spelling is largely historical, the traditional pronunciation is of course often equivalent to a reading in terms of English spelling conventions—though it is not entirely so accounted for.

By the mid nineteenth century, however, schoolmasters were beginning at least to observe vowel-length in open syllables (doubtless owing to the exigencies of metrical teaching), and

---

[1] For these and further details see especially J. Sargeaunt, 'The pronunciation of English words derived from Latin', in *S.P.E. Tract* No. 4; G. C. Moore-Smith, 'The English language and the "Restored" pronunciation of Latin', in *Grammatical Miscellany offered to O. Jespersen*, pp. 167 ff; Attridge, *op. cit.*, pp. 21 ff.

later the 'hard' *c* and *g* were being introduced in some quarters. Around 1870 a new reformed pronunciation of classical Latin was formulated by various Cambridge and Oxford scholars. The matter was discussed in that year by the Headmasters' Conference, but compromise resolutions by Oxford, together with some actual opposition, delayed the general introduction of the reforms; and it was only in the early twentieth century, under initiative from such bodies as the Cambridge Philological Society and the Classical Association, that the earlier prejudices
† began to be overcome in English schools and universities. Reaction, however, died hard, and even as late as 1939 *The Times* saw fit to suppress a letter against the old pronunciation by the Kennedy Professor of Latin at Cambridge.[1]

These reforms can hardly be said to constitute a thorough-going reconstruction of the classical pronunciation. They do not go so far as to involve any actually non-English sounds, or even English sounds in unfamiliar environments; and it is the bridging of the gap between the 'reformed' and a 'reconstructed' pronunciation that forms one of the purposes of this book.

The traditional English pronunciation was certainly far removed from classical Latin—but it was not the only offender amongst 'national' pronunciations. Latin in France had been pronounced along national lines from earliest times, with a particular disregard for vowel-length and accentuation; vowels +*m* were pronounced as nasalized vowels, with consequent changes of quality—hence, for example, in Merovingian times *cum* is found spelt as *con*. Reform of pronunciation was one of the tasks entrusted to Alcuin by Charlemagne, but this resulted only in the requirement that every letter should be given *some* pronunciation; in later centuries we still find e.g. *fidelium* rhymed with *Lyon*, and Erasmus (who considered the French pronunciation the worst of all) observes that the French pronounced *tempus* as '*tampus*'. *u* was regularly pronounced [ü] as in French; *qu* was pronounced as [k]; and even the mis-

---

[1] On the recent history of the reform movement see L. P. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry*, pp. 3 ff. On ecclesiastical pronunciation see F. Brittain, *Latin in Church* (Alcuin Club Tracts, 2nd rev. ed.).

spelling *ch* in *michi*, *nichil* (see p. 45) was pronounced as the [š] in French *champ*. In the sixteenth century we find punsters identifying e.g. *habitaculum* with French '*habit à cul long*',[1] to quote one of the less scabrous examples.

In the mid sixteenth century more serious attempts were made at reform in France, notably by Charles Estienne, who had studied Erasmus' work, and wrote a treatise *De recta Latini sermonis pronunciatione et scriptura*, for the instruction of his nephew, Henri. But in France, as in England, the forces of reaction were strong. We are told, for example, that around 1550, when the professors of the Collège de France attempted to introduce such reforms, they were opposed by the theologians of the Sorbonne—who even tried to deprive a priest of his benefice for using the new pronunciation (condemning it as a 'grammatical heresy'). This conflict centred particularly on the pronunciation of *qu*, one of the key-words in the dispute being *quamquam*; thus, according to one tradition, an academic scandal came to be known as a '*cancan*' (and thence any kind of scandalous performance). Later attempts at reform in France have been less successful than in England, and have had to reckon with such reactionary bodies as the 'Société des amis de la prononciation française du Latin'.

One gains some idea of the unacceptability of various national pronunciations in the sixteenth century from Erasmus, who describes in his *Dialogue* how speakers from various countries delivered addresses in Latin to the Emperor Maximilian. A Frenchman read his speech 'adeo Gallice' that some Italians present thought he was speaking in French; such was the laughter that the Frenchman broke off his speech in embarrassment, but even greater ridicule greeted the German accent of the next speaker; a Dane who followed 'sounded like a Scots- † man', and next came a Zeelander—but, as Erasmus remarks, 'dejerasses neutrum loqui Latine'. Ursus here asks Leo, who tells the story, whether the emperor himself was able to refrain from laughter; and Leo assures him that he was, since 'assueverat huiusmodi fabulis'.

[1] Tabourot, *Bigarrures*, ch. 5 ('Des équivoques latins-françois').

Erasmus says that in his day the best speakers of Latin came from Rome, but that the English were considered by the Italians to be the next best. This statement is sometimes quoted with some satisfaction in England; but it may well be that it referred to the ecclesiastical rather than the lay pronunciation. One has also to record the account given by another great scholar, Joseph Scaliger, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, regarding the Latin pronunciation of an English visitor: 'Anglorum vero etiam doctissimi tam prave Latina efferunt, ut...quum quidam ex ea gente per quadrantem horae integrum apud me verba fecisset, neque ego magis eum intelligerem, quam si Turcice loquutus fuisset, hominem rogaverim, ut excusatum me haberet, quod Anglice non bene intelligerem.' Such a performance can hardly be accounted for simply on the basis of the changes in the English vowel † system between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Finally, it should perhaps be mentioned that the Italianate pronunciation of the Roman Catholic church, whilst it is probably less far removed from classical Latin than any other 'national' pronunciation, has no special status as evidence for reconstruction. An attempt to spread the Italianate pronunciation throughout the Catholic church was made in a letter of Pope Pius X to the Archbishop of Bourges in 1912, an attempt which met with some success after the First World War; at the present day this movement may be expected to be intensified as a result of the *Constitutio Apostolica de Latinitatis studio provehendo* ('Veterum sapientia', 22 Feb. 1962) of John XXIII. But it is of interest to note in this connexion an article by the Vice-Rector of the Biblical Institute in Rome (*L'Osservatore Romano*, 14 March 1962) which advocates 'a return to the pronunciation of the ancient Fathers of the Church' in the light of current linguistic research.

A note on the pronunciation of gn

In William Salesbury's treatise on Welsh Pronunciation (1567) there is the interesting observation: 'Neither do I meane here to cal them perfite and Latinelike Readers as many as do reade

angnus...for *agnus*, *ingnis* for *ignis*', which suggests that our reconstructed pronunciation of *gn* (see p. 23) had earlier antecedents in England. This pronunciation seems also once to have been traditional in German schools. E. J. Dobson (*English Pronunciation 1500–1700*, II, 1006 f.) suggests that the *ngn* pronunciation in England was based on the teaching of the Latin grammarians—but in fact they have nothing to say on the matter; and the arguments now used to reconstruct the pronunciation had not yet been proposed. We do, however, surprisingly find this pronunciation prescribed in Erasmus' *Dialogue*; his conclusions appear to arise partly out of an over-interpretation of Marius Victorinus (who in fact discusses *ng* but not *gn*), and partly out of an inadequate analysis of the Italian pronunciation of *gn*. He thus by chance arrived at the correct answer by entirely false reasoning; and his work could be responsible for the subsequent English and German pronunciations.

There remains a problem, however, in the apparent existence of yet earlier pronunciations of this type, at least in England. Somewhat before Erasmus' *Dialogue*, Skelton had rhymed *magnus* with *hange us*, though perhaps one should not attach much importance to this. As early as the fourteenth century one finds spellings with *ngn* for Latin-derived words, as *dingnete* in the *Ayenbite*; these could be based on the common Old French spelling, with the first *n* indicating nasalization of the preceding vowel—in the fourteenth-century *Tractatus Orthographiae* of Coyrefully, composed in England for the English, we read: '*g* autem posita in medio diccionis inter vocalem et consonantem habebit sonum quasi *n* et *g* ut *compaignon* (a phonetic misanalysis like that of Erasmus regarding Italian)....Tamen Gallici pro majori parte scribunt *n* in medio ut *compaingnon*... quod melius est.'

In English grammar schools up to at least the mid fourteenth century, French schoolmasters will have pronounced *gn* as a palatal [ñ]. English students may well have compromised with a pronunciation [ŋn], i.e. velar + dental nasal (the palatal being articulated midway between the two). They would be en-

couraged in this by the spelling of Latin-derived words borrowed through French (like *dingnete*), and by phonetic analyses such as that of Coyrefully. The pronunciation of Latin *gn* as [ŋn] in England could therefore have arisen well before Erasmus' reconstruction.

APPENDIX C

The names of the letters of the Latin alphabet

Two books and several articles have been written on this subject, and it is briefly discussed in some more general handbooks. The books are:

L. Strzelecki, *De litterarum Romanarum nominibus*: Bratislava, 1948;

A. E. Gordon, *The Letter Names of the Latin Alphabet* (U. Cal. Pubns: Classical Studies, vol. 9): Berkeley, 1973.

The latter is the fuller and more accessible work. I find myself in agreement with most of its findings, and here present only a summary of the arguments and most probable conclusions, in which I have drawn largely on Gordon's sources.

No particular problems are presented by the vowels. From the earliest sources onwards their names appear with the simple phonetic value of the letter, in its long form, i.e. *ā, ē, ī, ō, ū*. This is clear from their use in verse in Lucilius, e.g.

A primum est, hinc incipiam, et quae nomina ab hoc sunt,

where the hexameter requires that the first syllable be heavy, therefore *ā*. Similarly in the sotadic lines of the grammarian Terentianus Maurus, e.g.

> *E* quae sequitur vocula dissona est priori

and

> nitamur ut *U* dicere, sic citetur artus.

The long vowel is also specified by the grammarian Pompeius in his *Commentum Artis Donati* (Keil, v, 101): 'quando solae proferuntur, longae sunt semper'.

This practice is the opposite of what we find in India, where the short vowel was used to refer to each pair of short and long vowels: cf. Allen, *Phonetics in Ancient India* (O.U.P., 1953), p. 14. But it is in full accord with a general principle of Latin

phonology: for there are in Latin no monosyllabic words ending in a short vowel: beside Greek σύ, for example, Latin has tū (-quĕ, -nĕ, -uĕ are of course not full words but enclitics, which form a phonological unity with the preceding word). There are good reasons why this should be so; for every full word in Latin must be accentable, and a single light syllable would, as we have seen (supp. note to p. 91), not provide the necessary stress-matrix.[1]

The same names incidentally seem to have been used for *i* and *u* regardless of whether in a particular case they had vowel or consonant function, though Terentianus speaks, for example, of 'consonans *u*' or '*u* digammon' (cf. Gordon, p. 18).

The plosive consonants *b, c, d, g, p, t* also present few problems. Not being pronounceable by themselves, they were named by the addition of a vowel (long, for the reasons given above), namely *ē*. For example, a line of Lucilius ends as follows:

> ...non multum est *d* siet an *b*.

The heavy quantity of *an* requires that the name of *b* begins with *b*; and if this also applied to *d*, then the name of that letter must have a long vowel, since it is required to have heavy quantity. These conclusions are confirmed by one of the *Carmina Priapea*:

> Cum loquor, una mihi peccatur littera: nam *te*
> *pe* dico semper, blaesaque lingua mea'st;

and another beginning 'CD si scribas...' also requires long vowels. The same applies to the letters in the sotadic line of Terentianus,

> *b* cum uolo uel *c* tibi uel dicere *d, g,*

where the names of *c* and *d* must begin with the consonant, and therefore also that of *g*, and the names of *c* and *d* must then have long vowels. Other grammarians, some citing Varro, specify these names as ending in *e*—the length of which, as we have seen, is established by metre.

---

[1] Even in Greek the earliest names of the short ε and ο were respectively εἶ and οὖ, i.e. long [ē̦] and (originally) [ō̦]: cf. *VG*, p. 85. On the Byzantine name ἒ ψιλόν see *VG*, p. 76.

Two other plosives provide exceptions to the general rule, *k* and *q*. An anonymous commentary on Donatus speaks of these as neither beginning nor ending with *e* (cf. Gordon, p. 21). In the Antinoe papyrus (4th–5th cent. A.D.) their names are given as κα, κου, and these are confirmed by Probus, Pompeius, and Priscian. These letters are of course superfluous, since they could be replaced without ambiguity by *c*; but they had been used in early inscriptions, and survived in special uses (see p. 15). Their names, *cā* and *cū*, must owe their vowel qualities to the particular vowel environments in which the letters were used, i.e. *Kalendae*, *K(aeso)*, and the combination *qu*, though some modern writers have related them (and the letter-names more generally) to Etruscan writing habits.

The aspirate *h* tends to be excluded from ancient accounts, which follow Greek practice in considering it as a 'breathing' rather than a true consonant (cf. p. 43 and supp. note). Some of the grammarians, however, do give its name as *ha*, and length of vowel is proved by metre in Terentianus (cf. Gordon, pp. 18, 52). The quality of the vowel is perhaps connected in some way with that of *cā* for *k*, which is the next consonant in the alphabet.

Of the remaining letters, *f*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, *s* are all 'continuants', i.e. sounds which, unlike the plosives, can be prolonged and so, like the vowels, could form independent syllables (cf. the pronunciation of the second syllable of *bottle* or *button*, or the exclamation *pst*[1]). For this reason they were termed *semiuocales* (after the Greek ἡμίφωνα): cf. p. 37, n.1 and *VG*, p. 17; *AR*, pp. 32–4. *x* (like Greek ξ, ψ, ζ) is also commonly included amongst these as containing the continuant *s*. It would theoretically be possible to name all these letters simply by sounding them, without the addition of a vowel; but Terentianus says that he cannot name them because their sound is hardly adequate, particularly in verse. This statement, together with those of some other grammarians, suggests (though this is not certain) that the letters in question had in fact at some

---

[1] Cf. Terence, *Phormio*, 743:
    (so.) quem semper te esse dictitasti? (ch.) st! (so.) quid has metuis fores?
with *st* forming a heavy syllable (Gordon, p. 4).

time or by some persons been so named, i.e. simply as syllabic consonants. Though such sounds are phonemic in some languages (e.g. syllabic *r̥, l̥* in Sanskrit), they fall outside normal Latin phonology; and another system of naming, attributed to Varro, changes them into acceptable Latin forms by replacing the syllabicity of the consonant by a minimal syllabic of the actual language, viz. by a short vowel (of the same quality as the long vowel in the names of the plosives). In order to conform to the structure of accentable monosyllables in Latin, however, this vowel must precede the consonant (for *fĕ* etc. would be light syllables)—hence *ĕf, ĕl, ĕm, ĕn, ĕr, ĕs,* and *ĕx,* though the last is by some writers changed to *ĭx* on the analogy of the late Greek ξῖ (earlier ξεῖ). In the natural process of phonetic change it is in fact common for syllabic consonants to be replaced by short vowel + consonant (more usually in that order), the quality of the vowel varying from language to language—for example the Indo-European form reconstructed as **km̥tom* '100' (with syllabic *m*) → Welsh *cant,* Gothic *hund,* Lithuanian *šim̃tas,* and Latin *centum.* Eventually it was the Varronian system that prevailed and is found, for instance, in Priscian.[1]

The full established system of Latin letter-names is thus:

ā bē cē dē ē ĕf gē hā ī cā ĕl ĕm ĕn ō pē cū ĕr ĕs tē ū ĕx or *ĭx.*

y and *z* did not form part of the native Latin alphabet, and were only later added at the end. *z* seems to have been referred to by its Greek name as *zēta.* The earliest Latin name of *y* is uncertain, but may have been *hy* [hū] as in Greek;[2] later, however, with the phonetic merging of *y* with *i* (see p. 53), and also loss of *h* (see p. 44), this name would have been confused with that of *i,* viz. [ī]; and to distinguish it, it was given the name of *y*[ī] *graeca:* cf. Spanish *y griega,* Italian *i greco,* French *y grec.*

---

[1] An alternative system, found in the Antinoe papyrus, gives the names of these letters as (disyllabic) ιφφε, ιλλε, etc., with a short vowel preceding and following, and reminds one of Italian *effe, elle,* Spanish *efe, ele,* etc. (cf. Gordon, pp. 3, n. 7, 25, 33).

[2] On the Byzantine name ὒ ψιλόν see *VG,* p. 65.

The English names of the letters reflect basically the traditional English pronunciation of Latin (see pp. 102 ff.). They have been discussed by E. S. Sheldon in *Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature* (Boston) 1 (1892), pp. 66 ff. and 2 (1893), pp. 155 ff.

The change of 'er' to 'ar' (pronounced simply [ā] in standard southern English: cf. p. 32) is the same as occurs in e.g. Middle English *sterre* → Mod. *star*. The letters *j* and *v*, as consonantal forms distinguished from *i* and *u*, are of recent origin (see p. 37, n. 2); the vowel in the name of the former may arise by pre-echo of *k*, but it also serves to distinguish the name from that of *g* (see p. 102); the name of *v* seems at first to have been 'ev' (after the pattern of 'ef' etc: cf. Sheldon, p. 72, n. 1), but the current name is after the pattern of 'tee' etc.

The name of *w* is based simply on its shape, a combination of two *v*'s in their earlier value of *u*: one may compare the Greek name 'digamma' for ϝ (see *VG*, p. 45). The letter appears in late Latin inscriptions especially to represent the sound [w] in Germanic and Celtic names, the Latin consonantal *u* having by then developed a fricative pronunciation (see p. 41).

The origin of the name of *y* is uncertain: one suggestion is that it also was named after its shape, i.e. a combination of V and I. 'Ex' was preferred to 'ix' presumably after the pattern of 'es' etc.

The English name of *z*, 'zed', is ultimately from *zēta*, via French; an older name was 'izzard' [ɪzəd], which Sheldon (p. 75) suggests may have arisen from French 'et zède', as rounding off the recitation of the alphabet. The American name 'zee' is formed on the pattern of 'tee', 'vee', etc.

On the name of *h* see p. 45, n.1.

SUMMARY OF
RECOMMENDED PRONUNCIATIONS

'English' refers throughout to the standard or 'received' pronunciation of southern British English.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>For discussion see page</td></tr>
</table>

ă	As first *a* in Italian *amare* (as vowel of English *cup*:[1] N.B. not as *cap*)	47 ff.
ā	As second *a* in Italian *amare* (as *a* in English *father*[1])	47 ff.
ae	As in English *high*	6o f.
au	As in English *how*	6o ff.
b	(1) As English *b*	21
	(2) Before *t* or *s*: as English *p*	21 f.
c	As English or French 'hard' *c*, or English *k*	14 f.
ch	As *c* in emphatic pronunciation of English *cat*	26 f.
d	As English or French *d* (on *ad-*, see p. 22)	20 f.
ě	As in English *pet*	47 ff.
ē	As in French *gai* or German *Beet*	47 ff.
ei	As in English *day*	63
eu	See p. 63.	
f	As English *f*	34 f.
g	(1) As English 'hard' *g*	22 f.
	(2) *gn*: as *ngn* in *hangnail*	23 ff.
h	As English *h*	43 ff.
ĭ	As in English *dip*	47 ff.
ī	As in English *deep*	47 ff.
i consonant	(1) As English *y*	37 f.
	(2) Between vowels: = [yy]	38 ff.
k	As English *k*	15

[1] Less accurate approximations.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED PRONUNCIATIONS