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](#)

The Sequence After Ne Prohibitive

W. D. Geddes

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 07 / October 1898, pp 355 - 359

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00033126, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00033126

How to cite this article:

W. D. Geddes (1898). The Sequence After *Ne Prohibitive*. The Classical Review, 12, pp 355-359 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00033126

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

proverbially rosy), but of the rosy effulgence of that divine nature, which they, like the Fates, shared. So *Venus auertens rosea ceruice refulsit*, when she revealed herself as *uera dea* (Verg. *Aen.* i. 402). In Catullus the rosy locks of the Fates are specified to afford the familiar colour-contrast with the white fillets that matched the rest of their clothing. The crimson *instita* is mentioned to mark the dignity of their garb.

Cat. 110, 2 accipiunt pretium quae facere instituunt *codd.*

The device of accounting for *quae* by supposing it equivalent to *eorum quae* (neut.) is at best objectionable. The reading in both *G* and *O* is *que* (in *O* in ligature), for which I would suggest *quod*, 'they easily get their regular market price.' *Pretium facere*, 'to set a price,' is supported by Plaut. *Pers.* 586 '*indica; fac pretium.*' '*Tua merx est; tua indicatio est*'; and a similar error of *que* (in ligature) for *quod* is found in both *O* and *G* in 51, 5 *miseroque* (corrected in *G* to *miseroquod*), and in *O* in 66, 41 *feratque* (where, however, *G* has *ferat qd'*). I have before mentioned this suggestion, but so briefly and in so obscure a place that I trust I may be pardoned for repeating it in this connection.

Tac. *Agr.* 28 *mox ad aquam atque ut illa raptis secum plerisque Britannorum codd.*

Halm's *egressi et cum* seems as satisfactory as anything that has yet been proposed in the puzzling coil of *raptis secum*, and Selling's *utilia* for *ut illa* appears to me certain. But *ad aquam atque utilia* needs no further adjustment to fit in with *egressi* directly, as may be seen from such a passage as Liv. v. 20, 10 *ad praedam Veientem . . . proficis-*

cerentur. The only further change necessary is in the word following *utilia*, which I should read as '*raptim* (from *rapti*). The passage would then stand *mox ad aquam atque utilia raptim egressi et cum plerisque Britannorum*, etc. *Raptim* occurs a dozen times in Tacitus, and always with the idea of something like disorderly haste, such as must have characterised these hurried landings of the Usipii.

Tac. *Agr.* 34 *nouissimae res et extremo metu corpora defixere aciem* in his uestigiis *codd.*

One must evidently choose between *corpora* and *aciem*, and *corpora defixere* sounds to me much more true in this setting than *defixere aciem*, though I cannot share the conviction of Wex that, leaving the question of *corpora* aside, *defixere aciem* would be impossible here. But the attempt to heal the difficulty by quietly dropping out *aciem*, with Rhenanus and others down to Wex, appears to me unreasonably arbitrary, nor am I satisfied with the suggestion that *aciem* is merely a gloss upon *corpora*. Perhaps *aciem* is simply an error for *etiam*, in which case the passage would run *nouissimae res extremo metu corpora defixere etiam in his uestigiis*, etc. *Et* may be considered as a gloss of some student who imagined, and wished to point out, that their desperate plight and the extremity of their fear were co-ordinate causes in planting the Britons where Agricola found them. Yet there are other and common ways of accounting for the unauthorised appearance of an *et* in the MSS.

ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL.

Wesleyan University, Middletown, Ct.

THE SEQUENCE AFTER *NE* PROHIBITIVE.

I.

The question as to the sequence after *Ne* Prohibitive in Classical Latin is one of the most interesting that have emerged in recent years, and America has produced in the person of Professor Elmer a Protagonist¹ whose verdicts on the subject command attention and cannot be ignored or overlooked. In the following papers it is intended to present the results of independent

investigation in the same field, results that are found largely confirmatory of his main position, and it is singular that simultaneously with the researches at Cornell University there should have been developed in the North of Scotland a kindred inquiry on kindred lines coming substantially to the same conclusion, viz. the overthrow of the Madvigian canon as absolutely controlling the sequence in question.

The incidents which led to the critical inquiry in Aberdeen were originally local

¹ Professor Elmer's views are found in *American Journal of Philology*, vol. xv. 2 (1894), and in volume of *Cornell Studies in Cl. Philology*, 1898.

and personal and need not here be detailed. Suffice it to say that Aberdonian scholars, with some trifling exceptions, adhered to the former lead of an Aberdonian scholar, Dr. Melvin, on the subject, and had dared to dissent from the Madvigian canon, thereby arousing some local controversy on the point. In the course of the controversy the present writer was delighted afterwards to find that a strong diversion had set in from the Transatlantic side, and that although English scholarship seemed for a time to have succumbed to the Madvigian influence, the fastnesses of the North refused to accept the yoke, and Aberdeen can now claim to have been the first to maintain the old doctrine and disown the now crumbling heresy.

The canon of Madvig which he sought to impose (Opuscula 2. 105) was that which enjoined the use of *Ne* with the Perfect Subjunctive as the proper form of prohibition or deprecation, and denied or denounced the use of *Ne* with the Present Subjunctive (in prosa oratione prorsus inusitatum), except in what he chose to call general maxims of prohibition. The practical effect was to reduce almost every verb to the maimed condition of Preteritive Verbs, where of course *Ne* with the Perf. Subj. is, from the nature of these verbs, the recognised and

sole machinery. *Ne meminervis* is the proper formula, but it does not follow that with another verb having ampler forms, *don't recall* or *don't bear in mind* should be limited, e.g. to *ne sis recordatus*, and that *ne recorderis* should be tabooed when addressed to an individual. On the contrary, the absurdity of the canon should have been manifest when *ne sis recordatus* is pronounced the right thing, but not *ne sis (stultus, e.g.)* which on Madvig's canon we must not address to an individual. For, if the canon were correct, *ne fueris recordatus* ought to be the sole formula, whereas *ne sis recordatus*, implying that *ne sis* can specifically prohibit, is a demonstration of its futility, when imposed as absolute and infeasible.

In the present paper, which is merely preliminary, I give only a few salient facts, not from classical ground proper but from important outlying fields, showing the instinct of the Latin tongue as strongly opposed to Madvig's dictatorship.

In a fairly representative book such as Alfred Henderson's 'Latin Quotations,' (1869) representing the cream of Latin diction in all the eras, I had the curiosity to count up the several instances of *Ne Prohibitive*. The following is the enumeration:—

Ne with Pres. Subj.

Actum ne agas.
Ad finem ubi perveneris, ne velis reverti.
Aliena ne concupiscas.
Ante victoriam ne canas triumphum.
Aurea ne credas, quaecumque nitescere cernis.
Cave ne quidquam incipias quod post poeniteat.
Cave ne titubes.
De re amissa irreparabili ne doleas.
Esurienti ne occurras.
Ignem igni ne addas.
Leonis catulum ne alas.
Maritimus quum sis, ne velis fieri terrestris.
Mulieri ne credas, ne mortuae quidem.
Ne, cinerem vitans, in prunas incidas.
Ne credas undam placidam non esse profundam.
Ne cui de te plus quam tibi credas.
Ne cuivis invidas.
Ne depugnes in alieno negotio.
Ne despicias debilem.
Ne gladium tollas, mulier.
Ne quid expectes amicos facere quod per te queas.
Ne quid moveare verborum strepitu.
Ne sis unquam elatus.
Ne tentes aut perfice.
Ne vile velis.
Neque nulli sis amicus neque multis.
Nulli te facias nimis sodalem.
Quod sis esse velis, nihilque malis.
Rosam quae praeteriit, ne quaeras iterum.
Uni navi ne committas omnia.

30 Examples.

Ne with Perf. Subj.

Ad consilium ne accesseris, antequam voceris.
Amico ne maledixeris.
Ne vidēris quod videris.
Malum bene conditum ne moveris.
Ne cuivis dextram injeceris.
[Ne malorum meminervis.]
Nemini dixeris quae nolis efferri.
Officium ne collocaris in initum.
Quod dubites, ne feceris.
Quod tibi fieri non vis, alteri ne feceris.

9 Examples (*ne meminervis* not being in dispute).
N.B. Four of these instances are with the usually instantaneous verbs *dico* and *facio*.

In these 30 are included three Present Subjunctives where the negative is *nec* or *nullus*, virtually equivalent to *ne*, and two examples with *cave* prefixed which may be held as auxiliary in proof. Deducting these, however, for sake of Draconian rigidity, there remain 25, all with *ne* and Pres. Subj. against 9 with Perf. Subj.¹ Here, it is manifest, the artificial distinction which the followers of Madvig have rigidly formulated between general and particular prohibitions utterly breaks down; for, if it were valid and binding, these current proverbs and maxims ought to be all in Pres. Subj., and not one ought to be in the Perf. Subj. tense. But the distinction is futile, and the real *differentia*, as Prof. Elmer has indicated, appears to lie in the conception of the action forbidden, according as it is instantaneous or continuous: in the former case the Perf. Subj. is naturally preferred; in the latter the Pres. Subj.

N.B.—In the same volume I noted, in a cursory examination, only one example of Noli (p. 169) but *four* of *ne* with Imperative (pp. 3, 145, 242, 243).

Another important outlying field, though not strictly classical, is the Vulgate version of the Scriptures, which may be claimed as representing the outcome of the Latin Genius at the close of the old classical era and ought to yield evidence of an interesting and valuable kind. In the investigation pursued I have taken the Vulgate of Popes Sixtus V.

and Clement VIII., first for the Old Testament, and thereafter for the New Testament, with results almost uniform throughout the vast area.

These results, which may be held as substantially correct, may be briefly summarised as follows:—

1. Noli, very common, especially with a verb of fear (timere, pavere, &c.).

2. Non with Pres. Subj. not infrequent.

Non with Fut. Indic., not infrequent, as in the prohibitions of the Decalogue.

Sometimes simply predicting, as Job 6, 30.

Non with Imperative, only in limitation to individual word, as Non nobis, Domine, Ps. 115, 1.

3. Ne with Imperative seems not to occur.

Ne with Pres. Subj. is vastly preponderant both in general and in individual prohibitions. Prohibitions of *customs* or *usages* are as a rule so expressed as e.g. Deuteronomy 14, vv. 3, 10, 12, 21.

Ne with Perf. Subj. occurs both in general and in individual prohibitions. Rapid and instantaneous prohibitions are for the most part so expressed.

The examples in the Old Testament of Ne with Pres. Subj. or its equivalents are 344. The examples of Ne with Perf. Subj. or its equivalents are only 24, and adding the 4 examples of Ne memineris not included as of no evidence, the total is only 28, as against 344 of the Pres. Subj. The following tables present details.

VETUS TESTAMENTUM.

I.—SECTION. PENTATEUCH TO ESTHER INCLUSIVE.

	Pentateuch.	Jos. & Judices.	I.—IV. Reg.	I.—II. Paral.	Ezra, Neh. Esth.	
Noli	41	6	27	11	5	90
Non with Pres. Subj.	12	1	9	1	2	25
Ne with Pres. Subj.	40	10	22	4	6	82
— with cave, obsecro, quaero, &c.	26	7	1	0	1	35
— by nec, nihil, &c.	11	2	4	6	0	23
Ne with Perf. Subj.	0	0	2	2	0	4
— with do. and obsecro, &c.	0	0	0	0	0	0
— by nec, nil, &c.	0	0	0	0	0	0

N.B.—The four occurrences of Perf. Subj. in this section are—

I. Regum 3, 17; 20, 38; and II. Paral. 6, 42; 26, 18.

¹ A similar proportion of 3 to 1 holds in the case of the Latin Mottoes Heraldic in *Burke's Peerage*: viz.

Pres. Subj.	Perf. Subj.
Ne obliviscaris.	Ne te quaesiveris extra.
Ne tentes aut perfice.	
Ne vile velis.	

II.—SECTION. FROM JOB TO MALACHI INCLUSIVE.

	Job.	Psalmi.	Proverb.	Cantic.	Eccles.	Isaias.	Jerem.	Lament.	Ezek.	Dan.	XII. Minor Proph.	
Noli	1	18	11	1	2	20	36	1	3	2	15	110
Non with Pres. Subj.	0	9	3	0	1	2	5	1	0	0	1	22
Ne with Pres. Subj.	7	39	48	0	10	20	21	2	4	1	8	164
— with cave, obsecro, quaero, &c.	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
— by nec, nihil, &c.	1	0	8	3	3	2	12	0	6	0	1	36
Ne with Perf. Subj.	0	9	6	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	19
— with do. and obsecro, &c.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
— by nec, nil, &c.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

The twenty occurrences of Perf. Subj. in this section are—

Psalmi 22, 11, 19; 27, 12; 37, 1; 38, 21; 40, 17; 49, 16; 55, 1; 109, 1. (N.B.—In two of these there are variants by Pres. Subj. in Hieronymus [Migne, vol. x. p. 154]).

Proverbia 6, 4; 25, 6; 26, 25; 27, 10; 30, 8; 31, 3.

Eccles. 5, 5; 10, 20.

Isaias 58, 7.

XII. Minores, Osee 4, 15 bis.

(Two occurrences of ne memineris in Isaias 43, 18; 64, 9, and two in Psalms 25, 7; 79, 8.)

CONJOINT RESULT IN OLD TESTAMENT.

	Total Examples.
Noli	200
Non with Pres. Subj.	47
Ne with Pres. Subj. and equivalents	344
Ne with Perf. Subj. and equivalents	24

In the above we have not included, though we might have done so legitimately, *oriental* deprecations by the *third* person Pres. Subj. which, being indefinite, are virtually = ne with *second* person Pres. Subj.; viz. Exodus 32, 22; I. Reg. 25, 25; II. Reg. 13, 32 and 33.

NOVUM TESTAMENTUM.

	Matthæus.	Marcus.	Lucas.	Joannes.	Acta.	Romans.	1 Cor.	2 Cor.	Gal.	Eph.	Philipp.	Coloss.	Thess. I. & II.	Tim. I. & II.	Hebr.	Jac.	Petr. I. & II.	Joan.	Apoc.	
Noli	27	5	27	13	2	8	11	1	2	8	0	3	3	5	8	7	1	5	3	139
New. Pres. Subj.	9	5	13	0	4	1	2	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	42
New. Perf. Subj.	6	7	3	0	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	1	1	4	35

N.B.—The 42 passages with Ne and Pres. Subj. are—

Matth. 3, 9; 5, 42; 6, 1; 6, 13; 6, 25; 7, 6; 18, 10; 23, 10; 24, 6; Mark 5, 7; 9, 25; 10, 19 (ter.); Luke 1, 13; 1, 30; 3, 13; 3, 14 (bis); 6, 30; 8, 28; 9, 3; 9, 4; 11, 4; 12, 4; 17, 23; 21, 8; Acts 7, 60; 9, 38; 18, 9; 27, 24; Romans 13, 8; I. Cor. 5, 9; 10, 7; Gal. 5, 13; 5, 15; Eph. 3, 13; Philipp. 4, 6; I. Thess. 3, 14; Hebr. 12, 5; 12, 25; Apoc. 11, 2. About one-half of these rest on *aorists* conjunctive, the rest on presents imperative, of the Greek.

N.B. 2.—The 35 passages with Ne and Perf. Subj. are—

Matthew 5, 36; 8, 4; 10, 5 (bis); 10, 26; 17, 9; Mark 1, 44; 8, 26; 9, 25; 10, 14; 10, 19 (bis); 13, 7; 13, 21; Luke 3, 8; 9, 3; 10, 7; Acts 10, 15 (11, 9 repeated); 16, 23; 23, 21; Rom. 10, 6; 13, 14; I. Cor. 10, 10; II. Cor. 6, 17; Coloss. 2, 21 (ter.); I. Tim. 5, 1; 5, 22 (bis); I. Peter 3, 14; II. John 1, 10; Apocal. 5, 5; 19, 10; 22, 9; 22, 10. Of these, about 12 are with *dixeris* or *feceris*.

In Greek original the *Aorist* Conjunctive is found in all these passages except Mark 10, 14; 13, 7; 13, 21; Luke 9, 3; Acts 10, 15; Romans 13, 14; I. Cor. 10, 10; II. Cor. 6, 17; I. Tim. 5, 22 (bis); II. Ep. John 10; and Apocal. 5, 5. In these last the Greek original has *Present* Imperative. In two of the former list the Greek is elliptic, presenting no verb, simply *ἔρα μὴ*, viz. Apoc. 19, 10 and 22, 9. Thus out of the 35 examples with Perf. Subj., all except 12 plus the two elliptic examples, rest on *Aorists* in the original.

N.B. 3.—Non (or nihil, &c.) with Pres. Subj. (Prohibitive or Deprecatory) has been noted only in N.T. in Luke 14, 8; John 3, 7; I. Peter 3, 14; I. John 3, 18; Apoc. 2, 10. If these, as being with Pres. Subj. are added as falling under the Ne group, the examples in N.T. of prohibition with Pres. Subj. number 47.

CONJOINT RESULT FROM BOTH OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

	O.T.	N.T.
Noli	200	+ 139 = 339
Ne with Pres. Subj., &c.	344	+ 42 = 386 = (with non, &c., added 5) 391
Ne with Perf. Subj., &c.	24	+ 35 = 59

∴ Pres. Subj. : Perf. Subj. :: 391 : 59, or more than 6 : 1.

The Books of the Apocrypha have been similarly examined in their Latin version, and the results need not be detailed, being kindred to those exhibited especially by the Old Testament, showing a considerable preponderance for Ne with the sequence of the *Present Subjunctive*. Thus in the book of Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) the examples of Ne with *Present Subj.* amount to 77; of Ne with *Perf. Subj.* : 18.

The futility of attempting to differentiate between general and special prohibitions is thus evinced by the interplay of the rival forms in such books as Proverbs, or Ecclesiasticus, where maxims of life conveying general prohibitions to nobody in particular are frequently expressed in the Perfect Subjunctive, in entire discordance with the Madvigian canon.

In particular, *per contra*, we call attention to the oldest prohibition, so reputed, in the world's history, the canon against eating the forbidden fruit. It is the first occurrence in Scripture of the Prohibitive Ne, and if any prohibition was ever individual, it must be that addressed to Adam, apart apparently

from Eve, for the verb is in the Hebrew as in the Latin, in the *Singular* number. But what do we find? in defiance of Madvig, there emerges in the Vulgate Ne comedas (Gen. 2, 17).

How the LXX. Greek has adopted a plural οὐ φάγεσθε, it boots not here to inquire, neither need we remark that 'noli,' as a prohibitive form, would here be entirely inappropriate.

On the whole, it appears probable that the *differentia* is to be sought, not in the arbitrary canon of Madvig, but rather in the nature of the action of the verb, the prohibitive of instantaneous actions falling chiefly into the Perfect, that of continuous actions or states falling chiefly into the *Present Subjunctive*.

The above is only a preliminary reconnoitring of the field, a distant survey of the *champ de bataille*. In our next paper we hope to present evidence from the early Latin time, fairly conclusive in the same direction.

Aberdeen.

W. D. GEDDES.

PRAETERPROPTER IN GELL. NOCT. ATT. XIX. 10.

THE purpose of this note is primarily to call attention to a hitherto unused illustration of the connection between archaic and colloquial Latin, and incidentally to rescue from ignominy the reputation of a worthy Roman grammaticus. Gellius in his *Noct. Att. XIX. 10* writes that on a certain occasion, when a few literary friends were gathered at the house of Cornelius Fronto, architects submitted to Fronto specifications for some projected baths. The story proceeds: *Ex quibus cum elegisset unam formam speciemque veris, interrogavit, quantus esset pecuniae sumptus ad id totum opus absolvendum? cumque architectus dixisset necessaria videri esse sestertia ferme trecenta,*

unus ex amicis Frontonis: 'et praeterpropter', inquit, 'alia quinquaginta.' Tum Fronto dilatis sermonibus, quos habere de balnearum sumptu instituerat, aspiciens ad eum amicum, qui dixerat, alia quinquaginta esse necessaria praeterpropter eum interrogavit, quid significaret verbum 'praeterpropter.' Atque ille amicus: 'non meum', inquit, 'hoc verbum est, sed multorum hominum, quos loquentis id audias; quid autem id verbum significet, non ex me, sed ex grammatico quaerendum est', ac simul digito demonstrat grammaticum harum incelebri nomine Romae docentem. Tum grammaticus usitati pervulgatique verbi obscuritate motus: 'quaerimus', inquit, 'quod honore quaestionis minime dignum est. Nam