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 Some Latin and Greek Negative Forms

F. W. Thomas

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 08 / October 1891, pp 378 - 379

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00179405, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00179405

How to cite this article:

F. W. Thomas (1891). On Some Latin and Greek Negative Forms. The Classical Review, 5, pp 378-379 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00179405

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

possible; *-bu-* can have nothing to do with *venio*, nor could *ng*₂ become anything but *ng* (cf. *unguentum*, Umbr. *umen*, Skr. *añjís*). Stowasser's suggestion is, to say the least, extremely improbable: there is no reason for believing that the word is a borrowed one, especially as it is also found in Umbrian. Nor does Bersu's etymology seem to me to be at all certain. Notwithstanding Bugge's remarks (*l.c.*) I am still inclined to think that Curtius and others were right in looking upon *ambulo* as a compound of *amb(i)* and a root meaning *to go*. A root *el* or *ol* with the sense of *to go* would meet the requirements of the case. Now a root *el-* (*ela*) with this signification is found in the Keltic languages;—Irish *ad-ellaim*, *go to*, *di-ellaim*=*deviare*, *declinare* etc. (Thurneysen, *Kelto-Romanisches* 34, Ascoli, *Lexicon Palaeo-Hibernicum* lv.), W. *elaf*, *I shall go*, *elwn*, *I went*, Corn. *ellen*, *I went* (*Grammatica Celtica*² 599 sq.). Thurneysen suggests hesitatingly that this verb *ellaim* is a compound of *ess*=*ex* and a stem *lā* seen in *rola*, *rāla*, *dorala*, *venit*, but **esslaim* would have become *ēlaim*, a compound which is actually found in the sense of *escape*, and is referred to by Prof. Thurneysen himself. It is easier then to regard *ella* as a simple verb. At the same time it is not necessary to separate it from the stem *lā*; we may suppose a root *el-* or *ela*, *lā* like *τελα-τλā*,

κέρα-ς κρά- δειμον, etc. (cf. *Kuhn's Zeitschrift* xxxi. 396 sq.), cf. also Ir. *rām*, *oar*, *rāim*, *I row*, by the side of *ἐρεμὸν* etc. If Thurneysen is right in identifying this intransitive *lā* with the transitive *lā* in the sense of 'bring, place, throw,' we might also perhaps compare *ἐλαίνω*, *ἐλάσαι* stem *ela-*, though the meaning is somewhat different. In *ellaim* the second *l* will belong to some suffix; *ell* in Keltic is ambiguous, it seems to me most probable that we have a formation with an *n* suffix: *ellaim* might stand for **elnāmi*, with substitution of a strong form of the root for a weak as in Latin *consternāre* compared with **Skr. strṇāmi*, and with the same change of conjugation.

As to the meaning of *ambulo*, it does not seem to be nearly so strongly opposed to the idea of composition with *ambi* as Bugge supposes. In *ambulo*, *walk about* (*sedeo* the preposition *ambi* is perfectly natural. With *ambulo*, *go on a journey*, *bene ambulato*, *bene ambula et redambula*, in expressing a wish for a pleasant journey, cf. Irish *imm-adall*, *a journey* (*imm*=*imb*, *ambi*), *ni maith immadall indomnaich*, *it is not good to travel on Sunday* (Windisch, *Wörterbuch* 619), *imm-lai* *he goes away, goes off* (*ib.* 625). As to Umbrian *amboltu* (Bücheler, *Umbrica* 93), it is not safe to dogmatise on the meaning and usage of a word which is found only once.

J. STRACHAN.

ON SOME LATIN AND GREEK NEGATIVE FORMS.

1. *Nōn* *noenu* *noenum*.

THE derivation of *nōn* from *noenu* *noenum* = *ne oinom*, adopted by Latin grammarians from Lachmann to Schweizer-Sidler and, so far as I know, questioned by none, might seem to have stood the test of time. But in spite of the fact that it is supported by the English *not* = *neought* and German *nein* = *ne ein*, it is open to serious objection.

The first objection is that *non* and *noenum* are employed side by side in Ennius, Plautus, Lucilius, Lucretius, and Varro. In the case of the last three *noenum* might indeed be an archaism. But there is no reason for supposing it to be so in Ennius and Plautus. Secondly, the compound *nolo* is found not only in Ennius, but also in the fragments of the XII. Tables. We shall therefore have to suppose a quite impossible contraction of **noinomvolo* to *nolo*, since *noinom* could scarcely have become *non* as early as the

fixing of the recorded text of the XII. Tables. The old derivation of *nolo* from *ne volo* (rejected by Corssen *Aussprache* &c. ii. 1027—8) is untenable because (1) we have no evidence that the *Italic* change of *ev* to *ov* was repeated in Latin and *neuter* as well as *nevolt* *nevis* &c. are against any such supposition, (2) granted a form *novolo*, we have no reason to suppose that it would become *nolo*: *Nola* for *Novla* is Oscan. Thirdly, the transition from *noinom* to *nōn* is phonologically impossible. The extremely doubtful *coraverunt* is scarcely evidence for *oi* becoming *ō*, and the dropping of the termination is unexplained.

I propose, therefore, to derive *nōn* from *nō* + *ne*, the latter member being either a second negative or a particle of emphasis seen in

men' obesse, illos prodesse, me obstare, illos obsequi! (Ennius ap. Cic. *De Div.* i. 31. 66: vide Minton Warren, *Am. J. Phil.* ii.).

The negative *nō* is found in the collocation *nōsve* = *nisi* in the Iguvine Tables VI. b 54, where *nōsve ier* = *nisi ibitur*, and is also to be seen in the form *noisi* = *nisi*, which occurs in the Duenos inscription and elsewhere.

But, further, may we not ask whether it is quite certain that *noenu* and *noenum* stand for *ne* + *oinom*? At any rate a different etymology will now at once suggest itself. *noe(nu)* may very well be identical with *noi(si)*, which is a combination of *nō* with the deictic *i* of *qui* and *οἷοσσι*. The second constituent of *noenum* will then be the enclitic equivalent of Greek *νῦ νυν*. *m* in *-num* is no objection, vide *tum*. That the particle *nū* was originally a frequent addition to negatives is proved by Sanskrit *nanu* (*nenu*), already in R̥ig-Veda a single word, and by the common conjunction of *οὐ νυ* and *μή νυ* in Homeric Greek.

2. *νώδυνος* *νωλεμές* *νώνυμος* *νωδός* *νωχελής* *νωχέλεια* *νωχαλός* *νώψ*.

In these words we might be tempted to find a trace of the negative *nō* established for Italic. But *νώδυνος* *άνώνυμος* *άνώματος* *άνώροφος* and *άνώχυρος* render it necessary to regard the *ω* in all the cases as either the preposition *ω* Sk. *ā* or lengthened from *ο* by a process corresponding to the Sk. *vrddhi*. What is noticeable in the words in question is that they are Greek instances of the full negative *ne* in composition, for which phenomenon cf. Lat. *neuter* &c. Sk. *nākis*, and perhaps also Greek *νέκταρ* = Sk. *aksāra*. (?) The old derivation of *νώδυνος* &c. from *νη* + *οδνη* &c. is refuted by the circumstance that *νώνυμος* is found in Homer and that we never hear of an intermediate form such as **νεωδυνος*.

F. W. THOMAS.

ELLIS'S NOCTES MANILIANAE.

NOCTES MANILIANAE sive dissertationes in Astronomica Manilii: accedunt coniecturae in Germanici Aratea: scripsit R. ELLIS (Clarendon Press, 1891). 6s.

THE readers of Manilius at the present day, whether in England or on the Continent, are few and far between. Nor can this be wondered at; the obscurity and difficulty of the author, both in regard to language and subject-matter, are great and notorious. Yet the astronomical (or rather astrological) poet cannot be neglected by those students of Latin Literature who would take a comprehensive view of their subject, and in particular desire to understand how men thought and wrote in the period of the early Empire. Nor was Manilius neglected by scholars like Scaliger and Bentley in an age which took a more liberal view of the scope of classical scholarship than is current at the present day. Manilius can never become a popular author; but it is well that some of our leading Latinists should open up new paths. The author of the beautiful lines which were inscribed by Goethe in a visitors' book on the Brocken (*Quis caelum posset nisi caeli munere nosse, Et reperire Deum nisi qui pars ipse Deorum est?*) deserves to be better known. To this end Mr. Ellis has devoted his best energies. He has prepared the way for a revised text of Manilius, which we may be

permitted to hope that he will some day produce: his present book is a worthy continuation of his indefatigable labours as editor of the *Ibis* and *Avienus*, and seems specially appropriate to the present day, when the interest in horoscopes and other parts of occult science felt under the early Empire seems to be reviving.

Almost everything concerning the author of the *Astronomica* has been matter of uncertainty. Teuffel (ed. Schwabe, 1890) regards his very name as a matter on which no opinion can be pronounced. This question I believe that Mr. Ellis has definitely settled, so far at any rate as the name *M. Manilius* goes. This name it is true is absent from the oldest MSS. or is inserted by a late hand (*Mālius*); but it probably comes from ancient sources. A letter of Gerbert, afterwards Pope Silvester II., of a date about 1000 A.D., shows that the poet was known by the name of *Manilius* or *Manlius* in the Xth Century. It next turns up in the XVth Century in several MSS. of this date (sometimes in the form *M. Mallius*); also in a letter of Francesco Barbaro to Poggio (A.D. 1417): this piece of evidence may be of importance, as Poggio had discovered a new MS. of the poet at St. Gallen, and had no doubt previously communicated the name to Barbaro. A good deal will depend on what evidence is hereafter brought forward as to the age