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](#)

On the Use of *Neque* and *Nec* in Silver Latin

Emory B. Lease

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 04 / May 1902, pp 212 - 214
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00205970, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00205970

How to cite this article:

Emory B. Lease (1902). On the Use of *Neque* and *Nec* in Silver Latin. The Classical Review, 16, pp 212-214 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00205970

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

or period of *twenty-seven* nights (see Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* III. 375 note and Chronol. 243): and though the first mention we have of it is in the *Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus*, 186 B.C., even Diels (*op. cit.* p. 43) allows that it must have its origin 'in the oldest epoch of Roman history.'

Once more, the number three constantly meets us in the stamping dance of rustic peoples; it is natural to man in this form of dance, as Mr. W. H. Hadow has pointed out to me, in order to preserve the balance, and may be traced in the song and dance of the Arval Brethren (Henzen, *Acta. Fr. Arv.* p. 26), in the dance of the Salii, in that of Horace's *fossor* (*Od.* III. 18. 16) in the words *tripudium*, *tripodare*, *triumphus*, &c., and in the dance music of every people: I have myself been kept awake a whole night in an inn on the Italian side of the Alps by the constantly repeated *tripodatio*

of dancers celebrating the feast of their patron saint. Now I find in the *Tabulae Iguvinae* (Buecheler, *Umbrica* p. 133), which contain probably the oldest and purest religious ritual to which we have access in ancient Italy, a clear case of this threefold stamp *nine times repeated*. The words 'nuvis ahtrepudato' can hardly be otherwise translated than into 'novies tripodato.' In this case the number twenty-seven grows in the easiest way out of the natural tendency of man to stamp three times in the earliest forms of the dance in which he delights.

I maintain then that the number twenty-seven is not peculiarly Sibylline, and that if the Argean puppets were really of that number, it can be accounted for on other grounds, without ascribing to them a late and Sibylline origin.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

ON THE USE OF *NEQUE* AND *NEC* IN SILVER LATIN.

The writers of the Silver Age stand in marked contrast to those of the Golden Age in their attitude toward *neq*. Both in prose and in poetry a decided preference is manifested for the shorter form. The wider use of the negative particle, *neq*, may have been influenced by the wider use of the connective, *ac*.¹ This preference for *ac* is shown by the fact in nine of the most important writers² of this period, *ac* is used 4264 times (70 per cent.) and *atque* only 1847 times (30 per cent.). Sen. Mai., e.g., shows his preference in a marked way, using *ac* 728 times to *atque* only 119; Tac., *ac* 893 times to *atque* 312; and Suet., *ac* 627 times to *atque* only 217. In poetry, however, we find a different condition of affairs prevailing. Here metrical considerations often have the deciding vote in determining the particular form to be used, and in this case the verdict

was in favour of *atque*, thereby reversing the decision of the prose writers. In nine of the principal poets of this period we find *atque* used 1132 times (61 per cent.) to *ac* only 735 times (39 per cent.) that is, *atque* in poetry = 61 per cent., in prose = 30 per cent. and in several of the poets the contrast is strongly marked, as, e.g. Val. Flac. uses *atque* 145 times to *ac* 79 times; Statius *atque* 222 to *ac* 107 times; Martial *atque* 59 times to *ac* once; and Juvenal *atque* 156 to *ac* 59 times. Seneca is the only poet to furnish an exception to the rule that *atque* is the poetical preference. He uses *atque* only 46 times, *ac* 109 times; but when it is taken into consideration that the larger part of his tragedies is written in the Iambic trimeter, which is closely allied to prose, the shift to the prosaic usage is explained.³ This tendency, for the prose writers to use *ac*, the poets *atque*, is exemplified in the usage of two earlier writers, Vergil and Livy. In the first six books of the *Aeneid* *atque* is used 95 times (64 per cent.) to *ac* 53 times (36 per cent.); on the contrary, Livy in xxi and xxii uses *ac* 213 times (67 per cent.) to *atque* 104 times (33 per cent.).

Nec, although parallel with *ac* in origin, being brought into existence by the same

¹ *ac*, according to the prevailing view (Stolz, *Formenlehre*³, §§ 46 and 69; Hist. Gram. §§ 250, 353, 355; Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* p. 598. Luc. Mueller, *De Re Metr.*² p. 426, however, regards the *a* as long. We are without the light that metrical usage might throw upon the subject, as *ac* never occurs in any good poet before a vowel.

² For a list of the prose writers and poets, cf. under *neque enim*, p. 214. In making this investigation the writer made use of the latest Teubner texts, except for Quintilian (Meister), and Juvenal (Friedlaender), and text variants were noted. For Tacitus the lexicon of Gerber and Greef, and for Petronius that of Segebadet Lommatzsch, were used.

³ Cf. further; 'The use of *atque* and *ac* in Silver Latin,' in *Studies in Honor of Professor Gildersleeve*, pp. 413-425.

forces, followed a different line in the course of its development. *Ac* was early put under certain restrictions, and, while writers of every period felt at liberty to use *nec* before vowels, the same privilege was not accorded to *ac*.¹ The use of *nec* before vowels, however, was also subject to certain limitations. As is known, it did not meet with the approval of Caesar, who avoided it entirely, while Cicero availed himself of the privilege only on rare occasions. The writers of the Silver Age felt differently about it. Quintilian, who always stood for high ideals, and preached Cicero in season and out of season, uses *nec* before vowels about 150 times. With this writer, as with others of the same period, the same word was not always treated in the same way. Before *immerito*, e.g., he uses *neque* 7 times and *nec* 8 times; in 5, 8, 5 but two lines separate *nec ulla* from *neque ulla*. The usage before the vowel *u* deserves particular attention. *Nec* is used before *ullo* in 4, 5, 26 and 9, 4, 7; before *usquam* in 7, 4, 23; before *umquam* in 4, 2, 104. Sen. phil., however, uses *neque ulla* but two times (Ira 2, 19, 5: Dial. 6, 22, 1), *nec ulla*, on the other hand 13 times; *neque umquam* but once (Dial. 12, 9, 4) to *nec umquam* 8 times. So also, Tac. uses *nec* before *u* 46 times.² Eskuche (Einl. Friedlaender's Juv. p. 59, says that the MSS. require *nec* before *u*, 'weil ein *q* vor *u* sich nicht sprechen lässt.' The solution of this question depends upon one's attitude toward Elision. If the final vowel is entirely suppressed,

c of course represents the pronunciation, and, if spelling is to represent the sound, *nec* should always be written before *u*. But, as is well known, several eminent authorities maintain that the final vowel was only partially suppressed, which consideration, of course, alters the case.

As remarked above, the writers of the Silver Age were fond of *nec*. A striking illustration of this is the usage of one of the greatest stylists of the period, Seneca; in 7729 verses in his tragedies he uses *nec* with great frequency, but does not use *neque* at all. Other poets also show the same attitude toward these two particles. Lucan uses *nec* about 320 times, but *neque* only 21 times. *Nec* is very freely used in the following poets, while *neque* is rare: Val. Flac. uses *neque* only 31 times (7 before a cons., 23 before a vowel, once before *h*); Sil. Ital. only 14 times (*neque vos* 9,344; *neque tot*, 13, 80; *neque ego*, 17,357; and *neque enim* 11 times); Statius uses *neque* 47 times (26 before *enim*, all the rest before vowels exc. 2,549, in Theb. 1,371 G has *nec*, and in 4,149 Mueller reads *nec*); Martial uses *neque* 12 times (add to Luc. Mueller's list, Re Metr.² p. 504: 3, 50, 6; 7, 14, 7; 20, 1, and to Friedlaender's Index s.v. 3, 50, 6 and 11, 58, 7). Luc. Mueller says that Juvenal uses *nec* more than 160 times and *neque* 9 times, 'no more,' but I have been able to find but 7. The usage of Petronius, compiled from the Lex. of Segebadet et Lommatsch, is as follows:

Nec { before vowels = 37
 ,, cons. = 129

Neque { before vowels = 12.
 ,, cons. = 37.

Petronius, as the other writers of this period, shows the same preference for *nec*: 166 to 49. In Tacitus the contrast is not so great, as he uses *nec* 506 times to *neque* 445 times. He uses *nec* before vowels 189 times.

II. *Neque* (*nec*) *enim*.

This formula deserves especial attention.

In *Prose* { *neque enim* = 344 (86 per cent.)
 nec enim = 52 (14 ,, ,,)

In *Poetry* { *neque enim* = 72 (73 per cent.)
 nec ,, = 27 (27 ,, ,,)

According to Draeger, Hist. Synt. II.² p. 68, *nec enim* is found first in Ter. Hec. 834.³ It appears sporadically in the class. period,⁴ but is used more freely, owing to the preference for *nec* in all positions, during the Silver Age. The usage in general may be seen from the following table:

¹ It may be added, by way of explanation that while *nec* could easily arise before vowels from *nequ(e)*, *ac*, owing to the presence of the *t* before the *-que* could never in this situation get further than *acc* (as, e.g. *atqu(e) illum*, *atc*, *acc*). This explains why *nec* might be used before vowels, while *ac* could not. (Frotscher (Quint. p. 262), however, would have it that it is the sound that settles the matter: '*Quis est enim, quin sentiat, ac angusta et nec angusta quantum sono differant. Meo certe sensu posterius altero tanto mollius iudicandum videtur.*' This view

is hardly correct.

² Consonants were also similarly treated; Quint, says *ex duobus* 5 times to *ex* 8 times; with *contrario*, *ex* 7 times (Neue Formenlehre, omits 7, 4, 9 and 10, 1, 19, and cites 5, 14, 4 where Halm and Meister read *vel contrario*); with *contrario* Seneca phil. uses *ex* 11 times, but *ex* 4 times.

³ Here, however, Dziatzko reads: *neque enim*.

⁴ It may be noted here that Livy in the 3rd Decade uses *neque enim* 19 times to *nec enim* 6 times.

The detailed usage of the principal writers of this period may be seen from the following table :

PROSE.	NEQUE ENIM.	NEC ENIM.	POETRY.	NEQUE ENIM.	NEC ENIM.
Vell. Pat.	3	0	Phaedrus.	1	0
Val. Max.	5	0	Seneca.	0	0
Seneca. { Phil. = 41 } { Epist. = 16 } ⁵⁷		Phil. = 29 } { Epist. = 8 } ³⁷	Persius.	1	0
Petron.	7	3	Lucan.	11	4
Plin. Mai.	28	1	Val. Flacc.	14	2
Quint.	116	2	Sil. Ital.	11	7
Tacitus.	49	9	Statius.	26	12
Plin. Min.	72	0	Martial.	4	0
Suet.	7	0	Juvenal.	4	2
TOTAL.	344	52	TOTAL.	72	27

NOTES.

(1) *Nec enim* is very rare in prose except in Seneca, who shows an unusually large number of examples. The combination is entirely lacking in Vell., Val. Max., Plin. Min. and Suet. It is doubtful whether Plin. Mai. uses it at all, as in N. H. iii, 2, A r v read *nunc*.

(2) Quintilian's usage is noteworthy: *neque enim* 116 times to *nec enim* but two times. In view of the marked preference for *neque enim*,—how strongly marked the table shows—certain editors, as Spalding, have maintained that Quint. does not use *nec enim* at

all. The two passages concerned are 5, 9, 6 and 9, 3, 79. In both of these passages Halm and Meister read *nec enim*. For the first there are no MSS. variants, and to the second Halm adds: '*nec mei, neque edd.*' The fact that *nec enim* was used at least 52 times by the prose writers of this period, and the fact that his pupil Tac. used it 9 times, lends a certain support to the reading *nec enim* in these two passages.

(3) In poetry *nec enim* was not used at all by Phaedr., Sen., Pers., and Mart., while the preference for *neque enim* in Val. Flacc., Mart., is noteworthy.¹

III. *Nec* (= *ne . . . quidem*).

Riemann (Et. Tit. Liv.² p. 278) cites 7 examples of this usage from Livy. Later writers, especially Quintilian, used it more freely. This writer furnishes 21 examples, (Draeger's list, H.S.² p. 71 f. = the list of Hand Turs. IV. p. 109). Schmalz Lat. Synt.³ p. 455 omits Martial from his list of the writers using *nec* in this sense. Martial furnishes 7 examples (cf. Friedlaender ad XII, 97, 8 and add 5, 70, 6 and 6, 77, 1). Quint. uses *neque* in this sense 6, 1, 53; 9, 14, 7; 11, 3, 2 and 12, 10, 66; Tac. 6 times (H. 4, 80; Ann. 2, 82; 3, 29; 56; 15, 18; Dial. 8). Tac. also uses *nec* 5 times (G. 6; Ann. 11, 30; 12, 43; 14, 55 and Dial. 37); Juv. 3 times 2, 152; 3, 90; 14, 246. cf. also Petron. § 47 (H reads *ne*). *Nec* in this sense was frequently used by Lucifer Cagliari, Tert. and Cyprian (cf. Hartel, Arch. f. Lat. Lex. III. 26²).

¹ Draeger cites Apul. Met. 3, 8 for *nec enim*. To this add 5, 19 : 29, and 31.

IV. *Nec dubie*.

This expression belongs to post-Classical usage and is very rare. According to Draeger Livy uses it only once (2, 23, 13). Quint. also uses it in 2, 14, 2 and 3, 4, 1. (He uses *non dubie* in 7, 2, 6; 9, 4, 67; and 11, 2, 1, and *haud dubie* in 1, 1, 4 and 10, 1, 85, while Livy uses the latter 26 times in the 3rd decade.)

V. *Nec . . . Neque*.

This combination is also very rare. I have noticed but two examples in Quintilian.

(a) each before a vowel, 8, 6, 64 *nec aliud . . . neque alio*.

(b) first before a consonant, second before a vowel, 1, 3, 10 *nec me . . . neque illum*.

Petronius 94 furnishes a different combination, *nec Gilon . . . neque ego*.

EMORY B. LEASE.

The College of the City of New York.

² *nec . . . quidem*, a very rare usage, was noticed in Quint. Decl. 331, 8 and 335, 11 (R).