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](#)

Praeterpropter in Gell. Noct. Att. XIX. 10

Frank F. Abrott

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 07 / October 1898, pp 359 - 360

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00033138, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00033138

How to cite this article:

Frank F. Abrott (1898). Praeterpropter in Gell. Noct. Att. XIX. 10. The Classical Review, 12, pp 359-360 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00033138

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

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

*nescio quid hoc praenimis plebeium est et in opificum sermonibus quam in hominum doctorum disputationibus notius. At enim Fronto, iam voce atque vultu intentiore: 'itane', inquit, 'magister, dehonustum tibi deculpatumque hoc verbum videtur, quo et M. Cato et M. Varro et pleraque aetas superior, ut necessario et Latino usi sunt?' Thereupon also one of Fronto's friends reads a passage from the Iphigenia of Ennius in which *praeterpropter* occurs. The story proceeds: *Hoc ubi lectum est, tum deinde Fronto ad grammaticum iam labentem: 'audistine', inquit, 'magister optime, Ennium tuum dixisse 'praeterpropter' et cum sententia quidem tali, quali severissimae philosophorum esse obiurgationes solent? petimus igitur, dicas, quoniam de Enniano iam verbo quaeritur, quis sit ignotus huiusce versus sensus:**

'Incerte errat animus; praeterpropter vitam vivitur.

Et grammaticus sudans multum ac rubens multum, cum id plerique prolixius riderent, exsurgit et abiens: 'tibi', inquit, 'Fronto, postea uni dicam, ne inscitiores audiant ac discant.' On the one hand the colloquial or vulgar character of the word under discussion is abundantly proved by the remark of Fronto's friend that it is *multorum hominum quos loquentis id audias*, by the confession of the narrator that *praeterpropter* is a *verbum usitatum pervulgatumque*, and by the scornful words of the *grammaticus* who stigmatizes it as *praenimis plebeium et in opificum sermonibus.....notius*. On the other hand it occurs in the classical Latin of Cato, Varro and Ennius and is used by *pleraque aetas superior*. Perhaps no better illustration can be found of the fact that

colloquial Latin and archaic formal Latin have much in common. To put it in another way, the *sermo cotidianus* of a given period evidently preserved many words, expressions and constructions, which in an earlier period had been the common property of colloquial and literary Latin, but which contemporaneous literary Latin did not use. This fact has been recognized by Schmalz (e.g. *Z. f.d. Gymn.* 1881, p. 87), and by others, but the failure to recognize it constitutes in the writer's opinion the fundamentally weak point in the attempt which Sittl has made (in the *Jahresbericht ü. Vulgär- u. Spätlatein*, 1891, pp. 226-286) to prove that 'das Vulgärlatein, mit welchem die Latinisten operieren, ist ein Phantasiegebilde.' Words and expressions which are not found in the formal writings of men who are accepted as the literary models of a certain period are not necessarily vulgar or even colloquial, and in inveighing against the practice of those who would thus classify them Sittl is doing a service; but, on the other hand, to prove that a certain word in a piece of literature of Cicero's time, for instance, occurs in the formal Latin of an earlier period does not, as Sittl tacitly assumes throughout his article (e.g. pp. 231-4), disprove its colloquial character. The truth of this fact is well illustrated by *praeterpropter*. This brief discussion has perhaps also accomplished the secondary purpose of this note in showing that the judgment of the maligned *grammaticus* with reference to good usage was better than that of his critics.

FRANK F. ABBOTT.

The University of Chicago.

DOMI, DOMO (CATULLUS 31, 14).

THE use of *domi* denoting 'of one's own' to which editors of Plautus have called attention (e.g. Tyrrell on *Mil.* 194, myself on *Rud.* 1335) is, I am persuaded, of wider extent than is commonly supposed, and is not limited to Plautus.

The following list of passages is merely a 'prima vindemiatio.'

1. *domi est*: Plaut. *Rud.* 292, 357, 1335, *Bacch.* 225, 365, *Pers.* 45, 122, *Mil.* 1154, *Poen.* 867, *Truc.* 554; Cic. *ad. Att.* x. 14, 2 (*nam id quidem domi est*). But the most interesting passage under this head is Catullus 31, 14. I find I have been antici-

pated by Prof. Tyrrell in my interpretation of the phrase *quidquid est domi cachinnorum*, but it seems worth while to put on record the results of an independent observation. I would punctuate the preceding line somewhat differently from Prof. Tyrrell, so as to make the *vos* emphatic:—

Gaudete vosque, o Lydiae lacus undae;
Ridete quidquid est domi cachinnorum.

'And do you too rejoice, ye Tuscan waters of my lake; laugh all the rippling laughter that you know'; the clause *quidquid*—