The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Two Notes on the Latin Subjunctive

Willard K. Clement

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 04 / May 2009, pp 222 - 222

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00082494, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00082494

How to cite this article:

Willard K. Clement (2009). Two Notes on the Latin Subjunctive. The Classical Review, 14, pp 222-222 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00082494

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

sort of argument is not to the point. I may have been unhappy in fixing upon the point of time prior to which the saying is to take place, but I do not see how that has any essential bearing upon the question at stake, *viz.* whether *dixerit* is future perfect indicative. If it be said that the future perfect does not seem natural, the reply will be that perhaps it does not to the English idiom, but it is, so far as I can see, just as natural to the Latin idiom as scores of indisputable future perfects where this tense would be impossible in English, *e.g.* *videro* (Cic. Verr. 2, 61, 150 and often; see Roby, Lat. Gram. p. CVI); *fecero* (Ter. Phorm. 882 and often); and countless other

instances of the same sort. Similarly in *riserit aliquis fortasse* and *fuertit fortasse dicendi* the future perfect seems strange in English, but equally strange uses of the future perfect are met with frequently in some authors and are absent from very few.

I can not feel that Bennett has satisfactorily answered the various objections I raised to the usual interpretation of *aliquis dixerit*. My argument in favour of taking *dixerit* as a future perfect indicative still seems to me to be conclusive and unanswerable.

H. C. ELMER.

Cornell University.

TWO NOTES ON THE LATIN SUBJUNCTIVE.

1. The 'May have' perfect.

Erraverim fortasse, Pl. *Ep.* 1, 23, 2, has apparently been regarded by grammarians as the only instance of the use of the perfect in the sense of 'may have.' Professor Bennett, the latest defender of the 'may potential' (*Cornell Studies* IX), while citing various presents gives only this example of the perfect. A search through a number of representative writers of the Empire failed to reveal a second example, until an examination of the Declamations of the Pseudo-Quintilian for another purpose resulted in the discovery of the existence of ten instances of the usage. They are all of the *fortasse* type, but I am confident that a longer search in Silver Latinity, which I hope to make, will disclose the existence of others, unaccompanied by *fortasse*.

The examples are: p. 183, 3, 4 (Ritter) *fortasse erraverim* in dispiendis causis, minus prudentiae habuerim iuvenis; 69, 13, *vos fortasse plus consumpseritis*, patres; 159, 2, *quod fortasse etiam corruperit mores meos*; 171, 14, *et fortasse accidere somnus hic potuerit* inter plures; 182, 27, *despicendum tibi fortasse fuerit*, ad quem venires; 184, 8, *aliud fortasse fuerit*, quod te postea concitarit; 328, 27, *fortasse etiam contulerint* ista detrimenta deliciis tuis; 344, 1, *et alius fortasse tantum usurpaverit libertatem*; 379, 15, *fortasse morituum non putaveris*.

Fortasse with the present occurs in seven passages (the second of which is cited by Bennett: 12, 2, *fortasse possit*; 27, 28, *habeant fortasse*; 62, 11, *fiant fortasse*; 143, 18, *conveniat fortasse*; 178, 21, *fortasse*

commendet; 189, 12, *possis fortasse*; 327, 25, *adferat fortasse*.

I am making a collection of 'may potentials' in Silver Latin (here more types appear to exist), believing with Bennett that 'other instances quite as decisive could be gathered by systematic searching, particularly in the Latinity of the early Empire.'

2. The Negative with Expressions of the Restitisses Type.

Bennett, speaking of expressions of the *restitisses*, *repugnasses* type, says (*Cornell Studies*, IX, 27): 'the negative is regularly *ne* not *non*.' He cites three passages from Plautus, two from Cicero, one from Seneca, and one from Fronto. The second person occurs in all save the last. The negative in every case but one is *ne*, and here Bennett gives an ingenious, if not entirely convincing explanation of the use of *non*.

The usage is certainly infrequent, for the only instance I have noted in a rather careful examination of a large portion of Silver Latin are three from the Pseudo-Quintilian, where the negative is *non*. They are: 12, 15, *virginem hanc aut viduam non diceres* (dicere A); 37, 4, *invitum non de <di> dissetis*; 53, 18, in his etiam minimis observationibus inhumane non cederes (inhumanum ne ced. B) honorem lateris.

It is to be hoped that the collection may be enlarged, for with only nine passages on which to base the argument (and these in the ratio of five to four) it is impossible to state the regular negative with certainty.

WILLARD K. CLEMENT,

University of Chicago.