The Classical Quarterly

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

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Latin Imperative in - *mino*

J. Fraser

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 5 / Issue 02 / April 1911, pp 123 - 125

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800019492, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800019492

How to cite this article:

J. Fraser (1911). The Latin Imperative in - *mino*. The Classical Quarterly, 5, pp 123-125
doi:10.1017/S0009838800019492

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE LATIN IMPERATIVE IN *-MINO*.

IN Plautus and elsewhere in old Latin there is an imperative suffix *-mino* of medio-deponential meaning: *opperimino*,¹ Pl. *Truc.* 188 (Ambr.), *progre-dimino*, id. *Pseud.* 859, *arbitramino*, id. *Epid.* 695, *praefamino*, Cato, *RR.* 141, 2, *famino* Paul. Fest. 62, 10, Th., all 2 sg.²; in legal documents, *antestamino* (*si in ius uocat, ni it, antestamino, igitur em capito*), in the *XII Tables*, *fruimino* (*is eum agrum habeto niue fruimino*), *CIL.* 1, 199, *profitemino* in *Lex Iulia Municipalis*, all 3 sg.³ The generally accepted explanation of the form is that it arose from a contamination of the ordinary 2 pl. medio-passive imperative in *-minī* and the 2, 3 sg. forms in *-tō*, Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 517, Von Planta, *Gramm. d. oskisch-umbr. Dial.* II, pp. 310 sqq., Buck, *Elementarb. d. oskisch-umbr. Dial.* p. 112, Sommer, *Hdb. d. lat. Laut- u. Formenlehre*, p. 366, Stolz, *Lat. Gramm.*³ p. 158.⁴ The Oskan and the Umbrian forms in *-mo*, *-mu*, U. *spahamu*, *eturstahmu*, *persnimu*, O. *censamur*, all of 2 or 3 sg., and U. *arsmahamo*, *caterahamo* of 2 or 3 pl., are identified with the Lat. *-minō* forms on the assumption that the Osk-Umb. *-mu* represents an older **-mnō* which in turn arose by syncope from **-menō*,⁵ Von Planta, *l.c.* This explanation is the most satisfactory that has been given, and we may suppose that Latin, Oskan, and Umbrian had an imperative form in **-menō*.

How to account for this common Italic form is still a difficult problem. The generally accepted theory, which has been mentioned above, is improbable in the extreme. In the first place the *-mino* forms, whether in Latin or in the other dialects, are not confined to the 2 pl., while the Latin *-minī* is used only here. Why Latin should have restricted this form to the 2 pl. is not quite clear, unless it did so as a consequence of the use of an apparently identical form in the 2 pl. pres. ind. after both suffixes had become **-menci*. At any rate, there is no trace of *-minī* in Latin in any other person than 2 pl.; and this alone would make it extremely hazardous to treat *-mino* as a development of it. But there is another, and even graver, objection to this theory. If the **-menō* imperative forms have come from *-minī* (<**-menaī*) + **-tō*

¹ So Apuleius *Metam.* 1, 22.

² Unless in Paul. Fest. '*famino*' *dicito* is 3 sg.

³ We may add *legitor uel legimino*, Diom. 1, 356, 27, *denuntiamino* in the Acts of the Arval Brethren.

⁴ See also Giles, *Manual*², p. 468.

⁵ The theory that Osk-Umb. *-mu*, *-mo* is a participial form corresponding to Lith. *-ma-s*, like the explanation of Lat. imper. *-minī* as equivalent to Gk. *-μενοι*, has to account for the use of a participle as an imperative.

(<*-tōd), they must have done so either in the common Italic period, and then Lat. -minō, Osk-Umbr. -mu -mo are independent developments of a common original; or the contamination must have taken place independently in the different dialects, and this is scarcely probable; or the forms spread from one dialect to the others. To either of the first two alternatives there is the fatal objection that there is no trace in Oscan or Umbrian of a 2 pl. imperat. in *-minī, *-mnī or *-mī; and it is impossible to assume that such forms once existed, but were entirely superseded by the later forms in *-menō > -mu, -mo. The third alternative, too, is not very inviting. The borrowing, if borrowing there was, must have been on the part of Oscan and Umbrian, for only in Latin, where both -minī and -mino actually exist, could -mino have originated in the way supposed. Now, so far as we can judge, the -mino imperative forms must have been comparatively rare in Latin, while in Oscan and Umbrian the -mu -mo forms are common. We must therefore hesitate to assume that a rare Latin form could have been borrowed and become a common form in two geographically distinct and independent dialects. Other objections to making -mino -mu -mo an offshoot of -mini might be made, but what has been said will be sufficient to suggest that another explanation of the forms must be sought.

The old theory was right in so far as the -mino imperatives were supposed to have some connexion with the -tō imperatives. Apart from the form, the sense in both cases is identical, the command referring to what must be done after something else has happened. Thus *si quo hic gradietur pariter progredimino*, Pl. Truc. 859, *facto opere arbitramino*, id. Epid. 695 agree with the legal use *ni it antestamino*; and in CIL. I, 199, is *eum agrum habeto niue fruimino* the -to and -mino forms are used side by side. The same use is certain for Umbrian: *pune menes akeṛuniamem enumek eturstamu*, 'cum uenies A. tunc exterminato,' tab. Ig., I g. 17, *ape angla combifiansiust perca arsmatia anouihimu*, 'cum oscines nuntiauerit . . . induimino' ib. VI b. 49, etc., and in the one Oscan ex. *pis ceus bantins fust censamur*, 'qui ciuis Bantinus erit censor,' TB 19, the shade of meaning required is the same. In the Latin the Oscan and the Umbrian imperative forms in -tō -tu used in this sense the 'future' character of the imperative is indicated by the addition of the abl. of a demonstrative pronoun to the verb-stem, e.g. in *cum de bello Romano cogitabis inter primos amicos Hannibalem habeto*, Liv. XXXIX, 19, 6, 'as soon as you begin to think . . . from that point you must consider . . .' So in Sanskrit *tād* is employed in a somewhat similar connexion, e.g. *yād vīrūpācaram mārtyeshu . . . ghr̥tāsya stokām sakṛd āhna āśnām tād evēdām tatṣpāṇā carāmi*, RV. X, 95, 16, and so the compound *tādītā*, *yād indrāhan prathamajām āhīnām . . . tādītā śātruṃ nā klā vivitse*, ib, I, 32, 4, 'When, Indra, you slew the first-born of serpents . . . from that time forth you have found not one enemy.' Here we have the use of *tād* which must have preceded the compound imperative forms, Skt. -tād, Lat. -tō, Gk. -τω. It is evident that in view of the use of the Italic imperative in -mino, -mu, we shall be justified in supposing that here

too we have a similar fusion of a stem with a demonstrative form marking the stage at which the action is to begin. The necessary demonstrative we have in Skt. *āḍ* the abl. sg. of the stem of *asya*, -*ās*,¹ used chiefly in the apodosis of compound sentences. One appropriate example occurs *RV.* I, 82, 1, *yadā naḥ sūnṛtāvataḥ kṛā āḍ arthāyāsa id*, 'now that you have made us rich in song, therefore, (after that), allow our prayer,' where *āḍ* is actually employed with the imperatively used subjunctive. Numerous other examples can be found in Grassmann, *Wtb. zum Rig-Veda*, p. 174. We have here a demonstrative particle **-ōḍ* which evidently could be used in the same sense as **-tōḍ* to mark the point at which the action of the verb was to commence.²

The origin of the Italic imperative ending **-menō* is now obvious. The use of a case of a nominal stem, a so-called infinitive, as imperative is seen in Latin in the ordinary medio-passive 2 pl. ending -*minī*, the dat. of a -*men* stem, thus *faminī*, so far as the formative and case elements go, is identical with a Gk. *φάμεναι*. To the Gk. *φάμεν* would correspond Lat. **famen*, the loc. sg. of a stem like *regimen* < **rege-men*, *sūmen* < **sūg-men*, *agmen* < **ag(e)-men*,³ which, with the addition of **-ōḍ*, would give the -*famino* (< **famenōḍ*) of Cato, and, by syncope, and simplification of *mn*, an Oscan-Umbr. **famu*. This explanation of *famino*, etc. as an old infinitive form in a future imperative sense accords well with the use of the infinitive for imperative in Gk., cf. Monro, *Hom. Gramm.*² p. 207, Henze, *der imperativische Infinitiv in den homerischen Gedichten*, *BB.* XXVII, pp. 106-137.

J. FRASER.

KING'S COLLEGE,
ABERDEEN.

¹ From this stem, and not from **so-*, comes Gk. *ὤς ὤδε* = Skt. *āḍ*. The spiritus asper is due to the relative *ōs* < *iō-*.

² If it were not that in Skt. the imperat. in -*tād* appears to be commoner as 2 sg. than as 3, I should be inclined to explain e.g. *bhavatād* as **bheuet-ōḍ*, that is the 3 sg. injunctive with -*ōḍ*; so Lat. *regitō* < **reget-ōḍ*, etc. This would have the advantage of allowing the 3 pl. form e.g. *regunto* < **regont-ōḍ* to be explained as an original and not

an analogical formation. But whether **iōḍ* or **-ōḍ* was the suffix, analogical extension must have taken place in the sg., unless both suffixes were used, **-tōḍ* with the 2 sg. imperat. ending in a vowel, and **-ōḍ* with the 3 sg. injunct. ending in a consonant. It may be noticed that in Skt. *āḍ* is very common while *tād* is not.

³ A suffixless loc. of an -*n* stem may be e.g., Umbr. *ferine* < **feren-en*.