
On the Sentence-Question in Plautus and Terence: Second Paper

Author(s): E. P. Morris

Source: *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (1890), pp. 16-54

Published by: [The Johns Hopkins University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/288087>

Accessed: 19/01/2011 17:53

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=jhup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Philology*.

II.—ON THE SENTENCE-QUESTION IN PLAUTUS AND TERENCE.

Second Paper.

I. *nonne.*

The theory that *nonne* was not used by Pl. was proposed by A. Spengel, *Die Partikel "nonne" im Altlateinischen*, Progr. München, 1867. His grounds are three: First, as "*ne* = *nonne*" and *non* express sufficiently all shades of negative questioning, *nonne* would be superfluous. Second, it is *a priori* probable that the copyists changed *non* in some cases into *nonne*, and this accounts for the cases where *nonne* is given in the MSS. Third, the cases given are all but one before a vowel. This one is metrically incorrect, and the demands of sense and metre are satisfied by *non* wherever *nonne* occurs.

These arguments are answered in detail by Schrader, *de particularum -ne, anne, nonne apud Plautum prosodia*, pp. 42-46. First, the early and colloquial Latin is full of double and triple expressions for practically identical ideas, e. g. *rogas? me rogas? men rogas? tun rogas?* Moreover, there must have been a time when "*ne* = *nonne*" and *non* were still in use, while *nonne* was beginning to crowd in by the side of them. The only question is whether this had already begun in the time of Pl. Second, not only *nonne* but *anne* also is found in Pl. only before vowels. The explanation of this fact must apply to both cases, not, as does Spengel's, to *nonne* alone, and is to be found in the very light effect of *-nē*, which caused its shortening in nearly all possible cases to *-n*. See the evidence in Schrader, especially the table on p. 37, showing the preference of Pl. for *ne* before vowels. Omitting words ending in *s*, there are in Pl. only 28 cases where *ne* both follows and precedes a vowel. Schrader gives a full list of the passages where the MSS support *nonne*, which need not be repeated here. Ter. uses it in Ad. 660, Andr. 238, 239, 647, 869, Eun. 165, 334, 736, Heaut. 545, 922, Hec. 552, Ph. 768.

The distinction in sense between *non* and *nonne*, which Kühner, II 1011, 1, attempts to make, is valueless for Pl. and Ter., at least.

K. RELATIVES WITH *ne*.

See Lor., Most.² 738, Brix, Trin.³ 360, Spengel, Andr. 768, Warren on *ne*, Amer. Journ. Philol. II, pp. 79-80.

Relatives with *ne* divide themselves into two classes, according as the antecedent is or is not expressed in the same sentence.

(a). The antecedent is not expressed. Most. 738, *ventus navem nostram deseruit. || quid est? quo modo? || pessumo. || quaene subducta erat tuto in terram?* Curc. 705, . . . *ne quisquam a me argentum auferat. || quodne promisti? || promisi? qui?* Similar to these are Amph. 697, Epid. 719, Mil. 13, Rud. 861, 1019, 1231, Truc. 506, Andr. 768, Ph. 923. The following have the subjunctive in the relative clause, independently of the question, but are otherwise like the preceding: Bacch. 332, Merc. 573, Mil. 973 (MSS *quae*), Trin. 360. In Epid. 449 *quemne* is an early conjecture for *nempe quem*, adopted on metrical grounds.

Here belong also a few cases with other relative words. Bacch. 257, *dei quattuor scelestiorem nullum inluxere alterum. || quamne Archidemidem? || quam, inquam, Archidemidem.* Most. 1132, *ego ibo pro te, si tibi non lubet. || verbero, etiam inrides? || quian me pro te ire ad cenam autumo?* Also with *quiane* Pers. 851. Truc. 696 is a very probable emendation by Spengel.

With these go the few cases of *utin*.¹ Rud. 1063, *animum advorte ac tace. || utin istic prius dicat?* Merc. 576, *tu ausculere mulierem? utine adveniens vomitum excutias mulieri?* Hec. 66, *et moneo et hortor, ne quouisquam misereat, . . . || utine eximium neminem habeam? || neminem.* Hec. 199, Ph. 874, Epid. 225. The last is the only one lacking in clearness.

There are further two cases where *priusne quam* is used, which are closely allied to the preceding. Mil. 1005, *hercle vero iam adlubescit primulum, Palaestrio. || priusne quam illam oculis vidisti?* Truc. 694, *is quidem hic apud nos est Strabax: modo rure venit. || priusne quam ad matrem suam?* Pl. 22 [23], Ter. 5.

These clauses are in their nature, aside from the use of *ne* or the interrogation, incomplete sentences. Some of them have the subjunctive of characteristic, which they could have only as clauses in themselves incomplete. Some few of them, e. g. Trin. 360 (*quin*), Epid. 225 (*utin*), might, if taken alone, be understood as complete sentences, but when all are put together and their simi-

¹ A fuller discussion of these clauses is given below in connection with the history of the interrogative sentence.

larity is noted, I cannot see how they can be regarded as anything else than ordinary relative clauses, separated from the main clause of the sentence. The hypothesis of an ellipsis is made necessary, therefore, not by the use of *ne* or its unusual connection with a relative, nor by the interrogation, but by the relative. And it is plain that *ne* is attached to the relative simply because the word to which it would naturally be appended is not in the sentence. Most. 738 would be *deseruitne ventus eam navem, quae*; Merc. 573, *idne non osculer quod amem?* Or more briefly *dicisne eam (id), quae (quod) . . . ?* So in Epid. 107, *idne pudet te, quia captivam genere prognatam bono de praeda's mercatus?* might have been *quian*, if the other speaker had happened to say *pudet me*. So also Eun. 415, *eone es ferox, quia*.

These questions have in all but two or three cases a rather distinct tone of rejection. This arises from the fact that they supplement in an interrogative tone the statement of the other speaker. This may be done inquiringly, as in Bacch. 257, Mil. 13, or with astonishment, as in Epid. 719, without going so far as to express dissent. But the natural tendency of this, as of all supplementary questions (cf. Engl. "Do you mean . . . ?" "Do you mean to say . . . ?"), is to become corrective or repudiating. In this way these questions come very close to the corrective sense of *quin*, so that it may in certain passages be difficult to distinguish between them.

(*b*). In a few cases the relative clause precedes the leading clause, and the antecedent is either expressed or plainly implied. St. 501, *quaene eapse deciens in die mutat locum, eam auspicavi ego in re capitali mea?* Here the sentence is interrogative, but with the leading clause after the relative, and *ne* is simply appended to the first word of the sentence. Rud. 272, *quaene eiectae e mari sumus ambae, opsecro, unde nos hostias agere voluisti huc?* (*vis tibi huc*, Sch.) This is similar except that in the leading clause a new interrogative *unde* is introduced, by a second thought; that is, the sentence ends with an anacoluthon. In the same way I should explain Cist. IV 2, 6, *quamne in manibus tenui atque accepi hic ante aedis cistellam, ubi ea sit nescio*. Here the substituted second clause is, of course, not interrogative, but it is one which could easily be substituted for an interrogation. In Mil. 614, *quodne vobis placeat, displiceat mihi?* Lor.² omits *ne* because there is no example of such a use of *ne* except where a demonstrative or personal pronoun follows in the main clause. But we are dealing here with unusual and infrequent forms of sentence,

and it seems to me that it is by no means necessary that they should be alike in all points. The only essential is that the relative clause should precede; if Pl. could write *quod vobis placeat, displaceat mihi* ? as Ribbeck and Lor. read, then he could write *quodne vobis*, etc.

Beside these there are some passages where *qui-ne* is used after the leading clause. My collection of examples is not, I fear, complete on this point, nor have I any new explanation to offer except such general suggestion as comes in the line of the remarks to follow upon the extent and variety of the uses of *ne*. Truc. 533 is classed by Lor. (Most.² 738) with Catull. LXIV 180, 182 f., as a continuation; rightly, as I think. On Rud. 767 I should agree with Kienitz on *quin*, p. 2, in thinking *quin(e) ut* impossible. For Cist. IV 1, 1 f. I know neither parallel nor explanation. On Ad. 261 f. see Dz. Krit. Anh., the ed. with notes.

ON *ne* WITH APPARENT NEGATIVE SENSE.

Questions of this kind, in which, as it is commonly expressed, *ne* = *nonne*, are given by Holtze, II 256 ff., in the list of questions with *ne*, but without explanation. Kühner, II 1002, gives a short list of places where *ne* expects an affirmative answer, saying in the index "scheinbar statt *nonne*," but giving no explanation. Hand, Turs. IV 74, gives a partial explanation, but as he starts from the thesis that *ne* has everywhere an appreciable negative force, he says only that *ne* is here a briefer expression for *nonne*. In the commentaries, where the usage is noticed (Bx. on Men. 284, Lor. on Ps. 340), a few illustrations are given. The only real attempt to explain this kind of question is made by Professor Warren in his article "On the enclitic *ne* in early Latin," Am. Jour. of Philol., II, pp. 50-82. After quoting comments of grammarians on *vidin*, *dixin*, etc., he says "I infer that to them [the Latin grammarians] the negative force of *ne* [in *vidin*, *dixin*] is as clear and sharp as the negation in *can't*, *won't*, etc., is clear to an English speaker." In other words, as the context shows, this usage is to be regarded as a survival of the original negative sense of *ne*. The problem of the origin of the *ne*-question will be taken up later, in connection with the general history of the interrogative sentence; this seems a fitting point, however, to gather together the cases in which *ne* has the effect of *nonne*.

They are these: *sumne*, mostly with a relative clause, *videon* (?), *vincon* (?), *possumne* (?), *cognoscin* (?), *scin* in a few cases, *viden*

with infin. and perhaps in some cases with *ut* clause, *facitne, faciuntne, videturne* (?), *estne* in certain cases, the perf. indic. first sing. except one case, *dixitin, iuravistin* (no others in perf. second pers.), possibly two or three in perf. indic. third pers., the impf. subjunctive in apodosis, and possibly two or three with *satine*.

These have been commented upon as they came up, and it has been shown in detail that they are always attended by some circumstance or expression which of itself shows that an affirmative answer is expected. This attendant circumstance may be asserted by a phrase in the question, or it may be obvious from the action or situation of the speaker. *sumne* has a rel. clause, Merc. 588, *sumne ego homo miser, qui nusquam bene queo quiescere?* "Am I not a wretched man? I can never be at rest!" *sumne ibi?* (Rud. 865) "I said I'd be at Venus' temple; am I there?" = "Am I not there?" because he was standing in plain sight in front of the temple. *viden* with infin. asks in *viden* and answers in the infin. Capt. 595, "His body is spotted all over! Don't you see it?" With an *ut* clause, which is less definite than the infin. (see Bx. Trin. 1046 on the difference in independent questions), the *nonne* effect is also less clear. Verbs in the third sing. pres. indic. are almost invariably neutral; the question is genuine; but *facitne* (Amph. 526) has the effect of *nonne*. The full question is *facitne ut dixi?* "I said he would do it. Isn't he doing it?" So the perf. indic. first sing., not simply with *vidin, dixin, edixin*, but in every case but one (*dixin*, Cist. 251 Uss.), contains an assertion in itself and demands an acknowledgment rather than an answer.

Beside these cases in which the *nonne* effect is rather clear, there are others in which it is less distinct. Some of these are marked in the list with a question mark. Thus, *vincon*, Amph. 433, may be either "Am I proving my point?" or "Am I not proving . . .?" The questions indicating recognition, *videon* and *estne hic meus sodalis*, etc., may be taken either way, according as the recognition is more or less complete. *estne haec tua domus?* is a question for information, because there was nothing to show whether it was *tua domus* or not; *estne haec manus?* (Pers. 225) means "Isn't this a hand?" because the hand was violently thrust into view. *sumne apud me?* Mil. 1345, spoken by a person just recovering from a (pretended) swoon, means "Am I in my senses?" If it were used in angry argument it might be spoken with such a tone and manner as to make it mean "Am I not in full possession of my reason?" So *dixin* is the standing example of *ne* = *nonne*, but in Cist. 251 Uss. (Fragm. 27, Ben.) we have *haec tu*

pervorsa omnia mihi fabulatu's. || dixin ego istaec, obsecro ? || modo quidem hercle haec dixisti. Here the half-dazed speaker really does not know whether he had said it or not, and so *dixin* means "did I say that?" and could not possibly mean "didn't I say that?"

Further, there are questions like those already cited, having the same degree of *nonne* effect, but not having *ne*. They will be found below under IV G. Examples are And. 423, *sum verus ?* (cf. Rud. 865, *sumne ibi ?*), Eun. 532, *dico ego mi insidias fieri ?* Even in *quis* questions a similar effect may be produced, e. g. Asin. 521, *quid ais tu ? . . . quotiens te votui Argyrippum filium Demaeneti compellare . . . ?* which is very nearly "Haven't I often forbidden . . . ?"

It seems clear that we have to do here with a shading or tone, which is not always associated with *ne* and therefore cannot be produced by it, but which is always associated with certain attendant circumstances and varies in intensity as these circumstances vary. If the *nonne* effect were really a negation, due to the negative force of *ne*, there could be no half-tones, no cases about which there would be any doubt as to the presence of the *nonne* effect. But in fact the same form passes through various gradations of meaning: *estne frater intus ? estne tibi nomen Menaechmo ? estne hic meus sodalis ? estne haec manus ?* Between *dixin* and *dixin* there is nothing like the gap that there is between *can* and *can't* in declarative sentences. If, however, we turn to English interrogative sentences and compare, e. g. "Can I help you?" with "Can't I help you?" we see that, though one question starts from the affirmation and the other from the negation, they have both approached neutrality of meaning, so that we can imagine circumstances which would permit the use of either. But if *can* and *can't*, in spite of their different forms, may be used almost indifferently in questions, much more must *estne* and *estne*, alike in form and origin, have seemed to a Roman identical, even though the circumstances may have given them slightly varying shades of meaning. It seems to me, therefore, quite erroneous to hold that the "*ne = nonne*" questions are distinctly negative in sense; rather they are neutral questions, with very slight (possibly negative) shading, used in circumstances where the modern idiom employs the neutral-negative question. Later I hope to show that *dixin = "didn't I say?"* is not in reality more immediately connected with the original *nē* than is *dixin = "did I say?"*

II. *num*.

Of all the interrogative particles *num* and *an* are the most difficult.

In regard to the etymology of *num* two distinct opinions are held. One (e. g. Corssen, Kühner, Landgraf Reisig-Haase, III, p. 301, note) is that *num* is the accus. sing. masc. of the pronominal stem *no-* and bears the same relation to *nunc* as *tum* to *tunc*. The other (Ribbeck, Lat. Partik., p. 12, Stolz-Schmalz, p. 299) is that *num* contains the negative *ne* and means "nicht zu irgend einer Zeit." This seems to be connected in the Stolz-Schmalz grammar (p. 298) with a theory that all questions except the disjunctive necessarily contain a negative word.

In regard to the meaning also of questions with *num*, there is a considerable variety of opinion, though it is usually said that *num* expects a negative answer. Kühner, as usual, appears to test the answer expected by the answer received, an error upon which I have commented before. One reason for the uncertainty in regard to *num* is that it has no special sets of phrases connected with certain verbs or certain persons or numbers, like *summe*, *ain*, *vin*. Except *numquid vis* and *num moror* it has formed no idioms which could serve as a starting-point for investigation. It would therefore be useless to divide *num* questions according to the person and tense of the verb, as was done with *ne*, and the only course left is to note the leading tendencies of meaning, applying such tests as the context furnishes, and remembering that the results must necessarily be somewhat uncertain. In doing this one must take some pains to rid himself of the inclination, which we get from familiarity with the classical Latin, to attach to *num* the idea of a negative answer, and must endeavor to look at each case without bias.

(a). There are many cases where the context shows that the speaker could not possibly have held the negative opinion or have expected a negative answer. Amph. 1073, *numnam hunc percussit Iuppiter? credo edepol*. Andr. 477, *num immemores discipuli?* ("Your pupils have forgotten your instructions, haven't they?") Aul. 389, *strepitust intus. numnam ego conpilor miser?* Andr. 591, *hem, numnam perimus?* Eun. 947, *quae illaet turbast? numnam ego perii?* Aul. 242, *sed pro Iuppiter, num ego disperii?* (Müll. Pros. 305, *nunc*). Men. 608, *num ancillae aut servi tibi responsant? eloquere: inpune non erit*. Men. 413, *pro Iuppiter, num istaet mulier illinc (from Syracuse) venit, quae*

te novit tam cate? Amph. 620, . . . *quid ais?* *num abdormivisti dudum?* || *nusquam gentium.* || *ibi forte istum si vidisses quendam in somnis Sosiam.* (So Goetz-Loewe.) Other sure cases are Amph. 709, 753, Cist. IV 1, 6, Poen. 976, Eun. 286, Heaut. 517.

While the context shows that the speaker in several if not in all of these held the affirmative opinion, this does not anywhere appear to be so distinctly expressed as to make it possible to put *nonne* in the place of *num*. They seem rather like neutral questions: "Has Jupiter struck him? I really believe he has!" "What a noise there is! Am I getting robbed?"

Pl. 10, Ter. 5.

(b). In some cases the question is clearly asked for information. Men. 890, *num larvatus aut cerritus?* *fac sciam. num eum veturnus aut aqua intercus tenet?* This is asked by a physician who wants to know his patient's symptoms. Merc. 173, after a vague but disquieting announcement of misfortune, a father whose son is at sea asks, *obsecro, num navis periit?* || *salvast navis.* Asin. 31, *dic serio, quod te rogem . . . num me illuc ducis ubi lapis lapidem terit?* Merc. 215, *num esse amicam suspicari visus est?* Other passages are similar to these, but I have preferred to give only those where the context makes the inquiring tone clear beyond question.

In the following cases the context does not forbid the negative sense, nor does it require it. If it is presumed on the evidence of the later usage that *num* requires a negative answer, these questions would not be inconsistent with the rule; if it can be shown that *num* is properly neutral in sense, there is nothing to prevent these cases from being so understood. They are Asin. 619, Aul. 161, Bacch. 212, Cas. II 6, 32, V 2, 31, 54, Capt. 658, Merc. 131, Mil. 924, Most. 336, 905, 1109, Poen. 1079, 1258, 1315, Rud. 235, 1304, Truc. 546, 602, Ad. 487, 697, Andr. 438, 971, Eun. 756, 829, Ph. 846. In Men. 612, Rud. 830 there is perhaps an inclination toward the negative.

Pl. 27, Ter. 7.

(c). Rather sharply distinguished from the preceding uses is the use of *num* in sentences which, like "*ne* = *nonne*," challenge the hearer to acknowledge something which the dialogue or the action makes evident. This is always a negative, but it is not quite accurate to say that *num* here "expects a negative answer." It challenges the hearer to deny, if he can, but the denial is not waited for. Capt. 632, *meam rem non cures, si recte facias. num ego curo tuam?* Men. 606, *potin ut . . . molestus ne sis?* *num te appello?* Precisely similar to these is *num moror?* "I'm not

delaying, am I?" Curc. 365, Most. 794.¹ Cf. *numquid moror?* Epid. 681, *quid me quaeris? ecce me! num te fugi? num ab domo absum? num oculis concessi a tuis?* Heaut. 793, 794 (twice) is similar. Also with the first pers., Ps. 220, Men. 565, Mil. 291, Truc. 379, Heaut. 738, Ph. 411, 524.

With second pers. less frequent. And. 496, 578, and probably Eun. 854. I find no cases in Pl.

With the third pers. Curc. 94, *num mutit cardo? est lepidus.* Most. 345, *num mirum aut novom quippiam facit?* "There's nothing remarkable in his being drunk, is there?" Truc. 352, *num tibi nam amabo ianuast mordax mea, . . . ?* "You don't suppose my door will bite, do you?" softened by *nam* and *amabo*. Ps. 1289, Asin. 576, Poen. 866, Andr. 366, 877, Eun. 163, 575, Heaut. 514, Hec. 707, Ph. 848. Pl. 17, Ter. 16.

The large proportion of these with the first person is noteworthy, as supporting the analogy with "*ne = nonne.*" (Cf. *sumne, dixin.*) This analogy is further supported by the fact that the two kinds of question occur together, e. g. Rud. 865, *dixeram praesto fore. numquid muto? sumne ibi?*

Numquis, numquid.

Some of the same difficulties which attend the discussion of *num* appear also in *numquis*, and the arrangement is in general the same.

(a). In some cases the context shows that a negative expectation is improbable. Most. 999, *numquid processit ad forum hic hodie novi?* (cf. 1004) || *quid tu otiosus res novas requiritas?* Most. 1031, *perii, interii.* || *numquid Tranio turbavit?* Lor. transl. "Hat Tranio irgend einen Streich gespielt?" and the very mention of T. shows that Simo thinks him the probable source of trouble. Merc. 369, *sed istuc quid est, tibi quod commutatust color? numquid tibi dolet?* Bacch. 668, *numqui nummi, ere, tibi exciderunt, quod sic terram optuere?* Eun. 272, *numquidnam hic quod nolis vides?* || *te.* || *credo: at numquid aliud?* || *quidum?* (= What makes you think so?) || *quia tristi's.* Also Bacch. 538, Andr. 943.

¹ Kühner, II 1008, 2, translates this "soll ich noch bleiben?" taking this rendering with time-force apparently from Draeger, I 342, who perhaps took it from Haud. IV 319. In Curc. 365 the preceding words are *eamus nunc intro, ut tabellas consignemus?* after which *num moror?* could not possibly mean "soll ich noch .bleiben?" Nor is this sense any better in Most. 794.

The negative opinion is not so entirely impossible here as it is in some cases with *num*, but it is unlikely. I think it may be said that no one would suppose that these questions required a negative answer, if he took them by themselves, apart from the influence of later usage, as should of course be done.

The following cases are less clear: Capt. 172, Curc. 23, 25, Merc. 642, 716, Men. 608, Most. 548, 750. Pl. 13, Ter. 2.

(b). A negative answer was probably expected in Asin. 830 (*numquidnam*), Men. 1146, Ps. 1330, Rud. 832, Eun. 994, Ph. 563, but so far as a negative implication exists, it is due to the challenging tone noticed above with *num*. These cases therefore form a middle step to the following class. They are Cas. III 5, 41, Poen. 1355, Ps. 728, Eun. 283, Hec. 865, Ph. 474, 509. With *numquidnam*, Bacch. 1110, Ad. 265, Andr. 325, Heaut. 429, Hec. 267.

The question *numquis hic (ad)est?* used when the speaker wants to impart a secret, deserves special mention. It is used Most. 472, Mil. 994, 1019, Rud. 948, St. 102, Eun. 549. Cf. also Trin. 69, below. This seems to mean "Is there any one here? (I hope not)" and to be in its form almost neutral. Pl. 14, Ter. 11.

(c). *numquis*, with negative effect, in questions challenging the hearer to deny an evident fact.

Pers. 462, 726, Cas. II 6, 70, *numquid moror?* Cf. *num moror?* Rud. 865, quoted above, Rud. 736, *fateor, ego trifurcifer sum: . . . numqui minus hasce esse oportet liberas?* Also with *numqui minus*, Rud. 1020, Ps. 160, Ad. 800, and *numqui nitidiusculum*, Ps. 219. Other cases of *numquid* are Mil. 1130, Ps. 919, Pers. 551, Ad. 689, Eun. 163, 475. The challenging tone is somewhat less distinct in Amph. 347, Bacch. 884, Eun. 1043, Ps. 495 resembles Ps. 368, Most. 1141. In Epid. 593 there is an affectation of humility and innocence, but the general sense is the same. Trin: 69, *numquis est hic alius praeter me atque te?* is especially instructive. It is essentially the same in form as *numquis hic (ad)est?* Mil. 994, 1019, etc., but differs from them in the circumstances. The passage is (*venio malis te ut verbis multis multum obiurigem. || men? || numquis . . . ? || nemo.*) The form of the question and the quiet answer *nemo* show that it is properly only an ordinary question, "is there any one else here?" but when brought into connection with *men?* "do you mean *me?*" it assumes a challenging tone and seems to demand a negative answer.

Similar in general effect to these are questions with *numquae causast quin* used in *stipulatio*. See Lor. Einl. zu Ps. Anm. 9.

Aul. 262, *sed nuptias hodie quin faciamus numquae causast? || immo hercle optuma*. Capt. 353, Amph. 852 (*numquid causam dicis quin*), Ps. 533, Trin. 1188 *numquid causaest quin . . .* Here the question expresses in interrogative form the fact to which the previous dialogue has led up, that is, the readiness of the other person to make the bargain. As *numquid moror?* means "Isn't it plain from my actions that I am not delaying?" so this means "There is no objection on your part, is there? to the bargain." The negative sense thus forced upon the question justifies *quin* and *immo*.
Pl. 21, Ter. 5.

(d). *numquid vis?* On this *formula abeundi* Don. remarks, Eun. II 3, 50 (341), "abituri, ne id dure facerent, *numquid vis?* dicebant iis, quibuscum constitissent." Brix, Trin.³ 192, translates, "Wünschest du sonst noch etwas?" and I should agree with him in thinking that the words in themselves contain no negative. The politeness of the question would be slight if it meant "You don't want anything more, do you?" It is like the shopman's question, as the customer takes out his money, "Can I show you anything else?" The courtesy consists in making the offer as if it were to be accepted; the negative suggestion comes from the readiness already shown by the other speaker to bring to the interview to a close. There is no challenge, and the analogy to *numquis hic adest* is close.

Numquid vis? is used Amph. 542, 544, Bacch. 604, Capt. 191, Curc. 516, 525, Men. 328, 548, Merc. 325, Mil. 1086, Ps. 665, Trin. 192, Truc. 883, Ad. 432, Hec. 272.

Other forms are *numquid me vis? n. aliud me v.?* and with *ceterum*, Aul. 175, 263, Cist. I 1, 121, Curc. 522, Epid. 512, Mil. 575, Pers. 692, 708, Eun. 191, Ph. 151, 458.

Without verb, *numquid aliud (me)?* Bacch. 757, Capt. 448, Mil. 259, 1195, Most. 404, Poen. 801, Eun. 363.

With infin., Capt. 400 (*nuntiari*), Ps. 370 (*dicere*).

With *quin* clause, Cist. I 1, 119, Amph. 970, Ad. 247.

Other verbs are *imperas*, Eun. 213, *me rogaturus*, Trin. 198, *me morare*, Poen. 911. *num quippiam* is used Pers. 735, Truc. 432 (Müll. 463, *numquid nunc*).
Pl. 33, Ter. 8.

When *quid* is in the acc. cognate or of "compass and extent," it has very little weight in the sentence, and *numquid* becomes nearly equivalent to *num*, serving merely as an interrogative particle. So *numquid moror?* is about the same as *num moror?* and see Rud. 865, Pers. 551, Most. 750, Andr. 943, Ps. 1330, Asin. 830, Rud. 832, etc.

The following passages have been passed over as conjectural or too doubtful for use:—*num*, Amph. 321, Cas. II 2, 24, II 6, 22 (conj. Uss.), IV 3, 14, 620 Gepp., 809 Gepp. (Uss. 892, *nunc*), Men. 823, Merc. 981, Poen. 258, Ps. 472, Trin. 922, Truc. 186, 546, 723, Ad. 395. *numquid*, Cas. 757 (Gepp. conj.), Most. 726, Truc. 639.

The uncertainty in regard to the etymology of *num* and the lack of sharply distinguished idioms makes the history of the uses obscure, but the challenging use, which afterward became the use "expecting a negative answer," seems to bear somewhat the same relation to *num* in neutral questions that "*ne* = *nonne*" bears to the ordinary *ne*. That is, the negative opinion of the speaker and so the expectation of a negative answer are made apparent by something in the action or, less often than with "*ne* = *nonne*," in the words. This is so similar to the special use of *ne* that it needs no further comment. Rud. 865, where *num* in the challenging sense and *ne* in the sense of *nonne* are both due to the same influence, is a good illustration.

The only question is whether *num* in this challenging use preserves anything of its original force.

It is hardly possible that *num* has here any original negative effect, since a negative force would require an affirmative answer. Nor am I able to see in these questions the slightest trace of time-force, such as Kühner and Draeger find in *num moror* and *numquid vis*. To succeed in shoving an Engl. *now* or a German *nun* into the translation without destroying the sense, does not prove the existence of any time-force in *num*. It seems probable also that the loss of the time-force was a necessary accompaniment of the development of an interrogative particle out of an adverb of time.

There is, however, another use of *nunc*, which seems to me to be connected with the challenging *num*, that is, *nunc* in the sense of "in view of this," "under these circumstances." This use appears to be closely related to *nam*, in that it reasons from what precedes, and as it shows the pronominal force of *nunc* it is probably an early sense. At any rate, it is found in Pl., and in *quid nunc ago?* has a distinct challenging force. Cf. the adversative use in Livy, pointed out by Wölfflin³ on XXI 13, 2. The circumstances which give a challenging tone to questions, even when they have *ne* (Ad. 136), would tend to preserve this tone in a word which already possessed it.

While the neutral *num* is found in later Latin, e. g. Hor. Sat. II 6, 53, *numquid de Dacis audisti?* it was, perhaps even in the time of Pl., a dying usage, being pushed aside by *ne* in its ordinary sense. But so far as I can judge from the incomplete statistics at my command, the challenging *num* increased in usage, and took its regular sense of expecting a negative answer.

III. *Ecquis, ecquid, en umquam.*

The commonly received derivation of *ecquis* is from *en-quis* with assimilation of *en*. Ribbeck, however, Lat. Partik. p. 42, points out the difficulty of supposing that *en* (*em*) could change to *ec*, in view of forms like *hunc*, *illunc*, and prefers to leave *ec*-unexplained.

Kühner, II 995, makes two curious mistakes in classing *ecquis* with *quis* interrogative, and in saying "in direkten Fragen zeigt es an dass man mit Bestimmtheit eine negative Antwort erwartet."

As with *numquis* the variations in the form of the question are not sufficient to serve as a basis for classification, and all that can be done is to show the general function and note some of the idiomatic uses.

(a). In the masc. and fem., and in the neuter as subject or object, *ecquis* is a colorless interrogative-indefinite. Some few exceptions to this will be noted below.

Amph. 856, *dic mihi verum serio, ecquis alius Sosia intust, . . . ?*
Rud. 1033, *ecquem in his locis novisti?* Asin. 514, Capt. 511,
Cist. IV 2, 42, Epid. 437, Men. 135, Mil. 782, Ps. 971, St. 222, 342,
Truc. 508.

When, as frequently happens, *ecquis* is in agreement with some definite word or phrase, the indefinite *quis* has little more force than the indefinite article. Poen. 1044, *sed ecquem adolescentem tu hic novisti Agorastoclem?* Esp. with the plural, Ps. 484, *ecquas viginti minas paritas ut a med auferas?* the special sense of *quis* seems wholly lost. Merc. 390, Ps. 482, Rud. 125, 313, 316, Hec. 804. Also perhaps Mil. 794, Most. 770. These questions could be about as well expressed by *-ne*.

ecquis est qui with the subjunct. occurs Cas. V 3, 12, Curc. 301, Merc. 844, Most. 354, Rud. 949.

In three cases, Merc. 844, *ecquisnam deust, qui mea nunc laetus laetitia fuit?* Rud. 971, Eun. 1031, there is an expectation of a negative answer, but it has nothing to do with *ecquis*, which is in its ordinary sense. These are the only cases of *ecquis* masc. or fem. except those given below, used in knocking at a door.

ecquid as subject of *est*, with partitive gen. Asin. 648, *ecquid est salutis?* Pers. 107, Poen. 257, Rud. 750, Truc. 897, Ph. 474. Possibly Truc. 93.

ecquid as direct object. Men. 149, Pers. 225, Poen. 619, Ps. 739, Rud. 1030, St. 338, Eun. 279, Heaut. 595, Ph. 798. Verb to be supplied Merc. 282. Pl. 40, Ter. 6.

(b). *ecquid* in the accus. of "compass and extent." With *meministi*, Bacch. 206, Mil. 42, Pers. 108, Poen. 985, 1062, Rud. 1310. With *amas*, Asin. 899, Cas. II 8, 19, Truc. 542, Eun. 456; *amare videor*, Poen. 327; *adsimulo*, Men. 146; *madere*, Most. 319; *placent*, Most. 906; *oneravit*, Mil. 902; *sentis*, Men. 912; *facere coniecturam*, Men. 163; *ecquid te pudet*, Cas. II 3, 26; Poen. 1305, Ps. 370, Andr. 871; *ecquid lubet*, Curc. 128; *ecquid in mentemst tibi*, Bacch. 161.

With adjectives, Mil. 1106, 1111, Ps. 746, 748, Truc. 505.

Pl. 26, Ter. 2.

In many of these cases *ecquid* has degenerated into an interrogative particle (cf. *numquid*). It has generally a neutral effect, indicating nothing as to the answer expected, but like *ne* or *num* it may be used in circumstances which admit only one answer, and so may seem to expect an affirmative or negative. *ecquid matrem amas?* (Asin. 899) is used where only the negative is possible; *ecquid amas nunc me?* (Cas. II 8, 19) hopes for an affirmative answer. *ecquid te pudet?* is not distinguishable in effect from *non te pudet?* And in general *ecquid* not only resembles *num*, *numquid*, but is also frequently used in immediate connection with them.

(c). *ecquid* with pres. indic. 2d sing. in impv. sense. Aul. 636, *ecquid agis?* || *quid agam?* Cist. III 12, Epid. 688, Amph. 577, *ecquid audis?* Aul. 270, Pers. 488, Trin. 717; Truc. 584 is uncertain, but *ecqui auditis* (Sch.) is without parallel. This use is less marked with other verbs, yet some impv. force seems to be present with all verbs in 2d pers., except where *ecquid* is defined by a partitive gen. or other phrase. Curc. 519, *ecquid das . . . ?* Poen. 364, *ecquid ais?* Ps. 383, *ecquid inperas?* So, somewhat less clearly, in Poen. 385, Men. 149, Rud. 1030. In these questions *ecquid* has no new and special force; the impv. effect is produced, as in *abin*, *audin*, by the asking of an urgent question about an action, which would be either going on or just about to take place. It is not to be expected that there should be any sharp line dividing impv. questions from others of similar form, and Men. 149, Rud. 1030, form a kind of half-way point between *ecquid adportas boni?* and *ecquid agis?*

(d). Like these in sense are a few questions in 3d pers. with *ecquis* as subject. Asin. 910, *ecquis currit pollinctorem arcessere?* Bacch. 11, Cas. II 2, 2, Men. 1003, St. 352, Cas. II 6, 52, *praecide os tu illi hodie. age, ecquid fit?* has the same kind of sense, and Uss. rightly compares *quid fit?* Bacch. 626, 879, to show that *fit* has really the effect of a 2d pers. active. *ecquid fit?* = *ecquid agis?* very nearly. With impv. effect, Pl. 21.

(e). One of the most common uses of *ecquis* is when the speaker is impatiently knocking at the door of a house, and, while the cases are not all alike in sense, I place them by themselves because they illustrate the gradual transitions which questions with *ecquis* make from one meaning to another.

ecquis hic est? Amph. 1020, Bacch. 582, Capt. 830, Men. 673 (*e. h. e. ianitor?*), Mil. 1297, Most. 339, 899, Poen. 1118, Rud. 762, Eun. 530 (*est om.*). *ecquis in villast*, Rud. 413, *in aedibust*, Bacch. 581.

With other verbs the impv. effect appears, as in *d. ecquis (hoc) aperit (ostium)?* Amph. 1020, Capt. 830, Most. 900, 988, Bacch. 582, Ps. 1139, Truc. 664. Most. 445 probably belongs here. Cf. Lor.², Krit. Anm. With *exit*, Bacch. 583, Most. 900, Truc. 255. *Pl. 23, Ter. 1.*

The noticeable point is that these two kinds of questions are frequently used together, e. g. Amph. 1020 f., Most. 899 f., Rud. 413, Bacch. 581 ff. Cf. *quin* with impv. and with pres. indic. *ecquis in aedibust (villast)?* evidently can have no impv. force. But as the questions are alike in everything except the verbs, the difference in sense must be due to the fact that the active verbs *aperit, exit* answer themselves; it is plain that no one is opening, is coming out, and the underlying idea, "if no one is doing it now, he should do it at once," becomes prominent, with its semi-impv. force.

Truc. 255, Trin. 870, *heus, ecquis his foribus tutelam gerit?* show how slight a variation of sense might turn an impatient question into an impv. It seems to mean "Is any one guarding this door?" (= *ecquis hic ianitor est?* Cf. Trin. 1057 f.). If the phrase *tutelam gerere* were in any degree active ("come to the help of, save, protect"), it would be impv. And even with *est* there is sometimes a shade of impv. effect, cf. Most. 899, *heus, ecquis hic est, maxumam qui his inuriam foribus defendat?*

(f). In a few cases, by a kind of anacoluthon, *ecquid* is preceded or followed by another interrogative word. Bacch. 980, *quid quod*

te misi, ecquid egisti? Ps. 740, *quid, si . . . , ecquid habet?* In Pers. 310 the MSS give *ecquid, quod mandavi tibi, estne in te speculae?* Rit. *est nunc*, with other changes *metr. grat.* There are probably other cases; my list is not, I think, complete.

In Cas. II 6, 22 (270 Gepp.), Ps. 737, Pers. 534, *ec* is supplied by conjecture. In Asin. 432 *ecquis* is a corruption of a proper name.

Upon *ecquis* in general Draeger, I, p. 344, acutely remarks, "eine specielle Bedeutung hat diese Form der Frage nicht, doch ist oft eine besondere Dringlichkeit bemerkbar." This urgency, which is the main characteristic of *ecquis*, suggests a connection with the vivid *em* or *en* rather than with the indefinite *equē*, but is of course not decisive.

It is remarkable that Ter. uses *ecquis* so seldom; he appears to have anticipated the classical usage, in which *numquis* is much more common than *ecquis*.

En unquam.

These words occur in the MSS Cist. I 1, 88, Men. 925, Rud. 987, 1117, Trin. 589, Ph. 329, 348. To these Brix adds by a very probable conjecture Men. 143. To what has been said by Ribbeck, Partik. p. 34, I have nothing to add, except that Brix seems right in saying on Men.³ 143 that the words are not necessarily emotional.

IV.—QUESTIONS WITHOUT AN INTERROGATIVE PARTICLE.

Questions without a particle occur about nine hundred times in Plautus and Terence. Before proceeding to the consideration of these in detail, some two or three points which have a general bearing upon them must be noticed.

In the first place, as the line which divides declarative from interrogative sentences is not clearly defined nor indeed capable of clear definition, and as *ne* would be used mainly where the questioning tone was rather clearly felt by the speaker, we must expect to find among sentences without a particle many semi-interrogative sentences; about these we cannot always be certain how much questioning effect they may have had. These, with some other sentences which omit *ne* for special reasons, I shall set aside first, as contributing least to the history of the interrogative sentence.

In the second place, there are three conceivable ways in which an interrogative sentence might differ from the same sentence put

declaratively: (1) it might omit words which the declarative sentence would contain; (2) it may contain words not found in the declarative sentence; (3) it may differ in the order of the words. There is no other way in which a question may be marked in writing. Omitting the first case, which of course does not occur, we must include under the second not only the recognized interrogative particles *ne, num, an, ec-*, with *quis* in all forms, but also cases where a personal pronoun is expressed to help out the interrogative emphasis (if I am right in supposing that such cases may be found), as well as the cases where a word is used in meanings that have no parallel in declarative sentences, e. g., *ita, satis* and perhaps *iam, etiam*. In the third case, where the changed order is the only thing to indicate the question, we have the questions whose interrogative character may have been fully denoted in speaking by voice-inflections and tones. We may in part recover these inflections by the analogies of modern colloquial usage, but such analogies are of course to be used only with great caution. Most of the tone and inflection must escape us; only when the emphasis was strong enough to affect the order of the words has it left any mark upon the written language. And even when the order is changed under the stress of interrogative emphasis, there remains the difficulty of distinguishing this from other kinds of emphasis, which so frequently cause variation from the so-called normal order.

It is plain, therefore, that no perfectly logical classification of questions without a particle is possible. In the following arrangement I have placed first the sentences in which the interrogative tone seems slight, the sentences which lie in the borderland between questions and assertions; second, the sentences in which the interrogative tone, though generally distinct, was not sufficient to affect the order. After these I have gathered together a few sentences in which the order of the words seems to mark the question. These divisions overlap one another somewhat, but they will at least serve as indications of certain groupings and tendencies of usage, and in this way help toward an understanding of the history of the interrogative sentence.

A.—IDIOMS AND SENTENCES WITH SLIGHT INTERROGATIVE EFFECT.

1. *possum*. St. 324, *possum scire ex te verum?* || *potes*. Amph. 346, Cas. III 5, 26 (Becker, 178 f.), Pers. 414, 423, all with dependent infin. and with *possum* at the beginning of the sentence.

These questions are strongly ironical, but they are in form questions for information. The irony consists in using a formal interrogation instead of a less courteous command. We should therefore expect *ne*. Its absence is due to the compound nature of *possum*; to say *pos-sum-ne* would have been against the usage, which required, e. g., *molestusne sum*, not *molestus sumne*, and so *potis-ne sum*, not *potis sum-ne*. Plautus therefore does not use *possumne* at all; Terence does not feel the compound nature of *possum* so plainly, and uses it once in a sense exactly the same, Eun. 712, *possumne ego hodie ex te exculpere verum?*

Pl. 5, Ter. o.

potin in 2d and 3d pers. is perhaps preserved longer by its idiomatic use with *ut*. *potestne* does not occur in Pl. or Ter.

2. *cesso*. Aul. 397, *sed cesso priusquam prorsus perii currere?* Capt. 827, *sed ego cesso hunc Hegionem onerare laetitia senem?* Aul. 627, Cas. II 3, 20, III 6, 4, Epid. 342, Merc. 129, Mil. 896, Pers. 197, Rud. 676, Truc. 630, Ad. 320, 586, 712, Andr. 845, Eun. 265, 996, Heaut. 410, 757, Hec. 324, Ph. 285, 844.

Pl. II, Ter. II.

These are all in soliloquy and all have an infin. without subject accus. The verb stands first or preceded only by *sed*, *at* and a word or two, *ego*, *etiam*, except in Epid. 342, when the infin. comes first.

These sentences are generally punctuated with a question mark, but single passages are marked with a period by Bent., Umpf., Wagn., Speng., Uss. Taking them all together it is plain that they are not questions for information; in many cases, e. g. Capt. 827, Ph. 844, they have not even the hesitating tone of *videon* in soliloquy nor the challenging demand of *sumne*. I believe that the position of *cesso* at the beginning of the sentence (*cesso ego* three times in Pl.) is due to non-interrogative emphasis, so that the sentence means something like "This is regular shuffling—foolish hesitation," or *Hibernice* "Sure it's delaying I am." That this emphatic recognition of the meaning of the speaker's action approached an exclamation is plain from Epid. 342, *sed ego hinc migrare cesso, . . . ?* and the use in connection with other exclamatory questions (Merc. 129, *at etiam asto?* *at etiam cesso . . . ?*) shows a leaning toward the interrogation. But on the whole the emphasis which caused *cesso* to stand at the head of the sentence was not the questioning emphasis, and the *cesso* phrases lie nearer the declarative than the interrogative sentence. There is no connection with the use of the pres. indic. in fut. sense.

Compare also the Terentian use of *cessas*, given below under D, which in some respects resembles *cesso*.

3. *nempe*. To the full discussion of the uses of *nempe* by Langen, Beiträge, pp. 125-132, I have nothing to add. Though perhaps properly printed with a question mark, these sentences are not really interrogative. They add an interpretation, more or less hesitating and conjectural, of what has been said by the other speaker. Langen calls such a sentence "eine als sicher richtig bezeichnete Voraussetzung, resp. Behauptung." As with the Engl. "doubtless," the tone and inflection might so far overcome the proper sense of *nempe* as to give the sentence a half-interrogative effect.

The list below may not include all cases which in any edition are marked with an interrogation point.

Aul. 293, Asin. 117, 339, Bacch. 188 [so Goetz, but cf. Lang. p. 131], 689, Cist. II 3, 56, Curc. 44, Epid. 449 (Goetz *quemne*), Men. 1030, Mil. 337, 808, 906, 922, Most. 491, 653, 919, Ps. 353, 1169, 1189, Rud. 268, 343, 565, 567, 1057, 1080, 1392, Trin. 196, 328, 966, 1076, Truc. 362, And. 30, 195, 950, Eun. 563, Hec. 105, Ph. 307. Pl. 31, Ter. 6.

4. *fortasse* (*fortassis*), *scilicet*, *videlicet*. Sentences with these words are sometimes printed as questions. They are similar to *nempe* questions, except that, from its proper meaning, *fortasse* is more hesitating. I have noted the following cases: *fortasse*, *fortassis*, Amph. 726, *tu me hic vidisti?* || *ego, inquam, . . . || in somnis fortassis?* (cf. Most. 491, *nempe ergo in somnis?*), Bacch. 671, Curc. 324, Pers. 21, 441, Rud. 140, And. 119, Heaut. 824, Ph. 145, 901.

scilicet, Eun. 346, Heaut. 705, Ph. 695.

videlicet, Capt. 286.

Pl. 7, Ter. 7.

In a few cases sentences similar to these, containing a parenthetic *credo*, are punctuated as questions, but I have made no record of them.

In all these cases, with *cesso*, *nempe*, *fortasse*, *scilicet*, *videlicet*, we have sentences which lie between an assertion and a question, and which could have either effect according to the inflection of the voice.

B.—REPETITIONS.

When a speaker takes up and repeats words just used by the other person in the dialogue, it is because these words in particular have excited some emotion, surprise or incredulity or indignation.

The effect is not necessarily interrogative, but rather exclamatory, shading off into interrogative.

1. The words are repeated without change, and the verb is not expressed.

Amph. 692, . . . *ut dudum dixerat*. || *dudum? quam dudum istuc factumst?* Amph. 901, Capt. 838, 844, Men. 380, 615, Merc. 735, Mil. 376 (Bx. uses period), Most. 383, 477L², 493, 638, 642, 810, Poen. 474, Ps. 79, 305 (but cf. Lang. Beitr. 315), 345, 637, 717, 842, Rud. 799, St. 749, Trin. 941 twice. In Curc. 636 the repetition is due to doubtful conjecture. In Trin. 375, . . . *ducere uxorem sine dote*. || *sine dote uxorem?* || *ita*, Ritschl's *uxoremne* has been accepted by Brix, who quotes instances of *ne* with second or third word in the sentence. His list might be somewhat enlarged, but the only cases where the MSS give *ne* with a noun in repetitions are Epid. 30, *armane*, and Eun. 573, 992, *pro eunuchon*. The latter is the nearest approach to a parallel to *uxoremne*, and does not give it much support. The passages from Ter. are Ad. 700, 753, And. 328, 663, 945 (Dz. only), Eun. 184, 318, 370, 856, 859, 908, 1073, Heaut. 192, 331, 587, 815, 861, 938, Hec. 432, 639, Ph. 300, 385, 553, 558, 642, 790, 981.

Cases where *non* is repeated are given below.

Pl. 25 [27,] Ter. 27.

2. Slight changes are made in the repeated words, especially in the person of pronouns. Curc. 582, *tuom libertum*. || *meum?* Cas. II 6, 14, III 6, 12, Men. 282, Poen. 762, 1238, Ps. 715, 723, Truc. 918, Ad. 697, 934, Eun. 745, 798, Hec. 209, Ph. 447.

In the following the changes are greater. Capt. 148, *alienus* . . . || *alienus ego?* *alienus ille?* Aul. 784, *renuntiare repudium iussit* . . . || *repudium rebus paratis exornatis nuptiis?* Eun. 224, 626, And. 928, Ad. 182, 960. Ph. 1047 is an improbable conjecture. In Rud. 728 Sch. reads *det*. In Aul. 326 the only objection to Wagner's text, *fur? etiam fur trijurcifer*, is that it makes the thought unnecessarily involved. Cas. II 5, 10, *cum uxore mea?* is changed by Gepp. to *uxoren*, cf. Trin. 375. In Andr. 469, Merc. 525, there is, strictly speaking, no repetition of words but only of the thought. Curc. 323 *ain tu? omnia haec?* is similar.¹

Pl. 14 [16], Ter. 12.

¹ Repetitions preceded by *quid?* are not included in these lists. They are in many cases best punctuated with a comma after *quid* and cannot be clearly distinguished from repetitions like Capt. 1006, . . . *gnate mi*. || *hein, quid gnate mi?* ("What do you mean by *gnate mi?*"), or even like Ps. 46, *salutem* . . . ||

3. The verb, if it is in the 3d pers., may be repeated without change, either with or without other words. Curc. 173, *te prohibet erus* . . . || *prohibet? nec prohibere quit nec prohibebit*. Aul. 720, Cas. III 5, 38, Epid. 699, Merc. 181, 534, Most. 376, 481, 554, 830, 946, 1079, Poen. 1309, Rud. 1095 (infin.), Trin. 969, Truc. 306, Ad. 934, And. 876, Eun. 956, 984, 986, Heaut. 606, Hec. 100 (infin.), Ph. 510 (twice). Pl. 16, Ter. 9.

4. The verb may be changed in person and other changes or additions may be made. Aul. 761, *quod subrupuisti meum?* || *subrupui ego tuom?* Aul. 652, Bacch. 681, 825, Capt. 611, Cas. III 5, 10, Curc. 705, Epid. 712, Men. 394, Mil. 556, 1367, Most. 1029, Ps. 509, 711, 1203, Truc. 292, Ad. 565, And. 617, Eun. 162, Heaut. 720, 1009, 1013, Hec. 206 and perhaps Hec. 72, Ph. 389, Ad. 940, 950. Cf. also Trin. 127, above. In Aul. 720 *nescis?* is used as if some spectator had said *nescio* in answer to the previous question *dic igitur, quis habet*. In Men. 645, *palla mihi domo subrupta*. || *palla subruptast mihi?* the person of the pronoun is intentionally unchanged; in Most. 375, . . . *ego disperii*. || *bis peristi? qui potest?* the speaker is drunk.

Cases where the change is still greater cannot be classified minutely, and the question whether the speaker is introducing a new idea or catching up one which has been implied in the previous conversation can be settled only by a careful reading of the context. Such cases are Ps. 344, Trin. 605, Ad. 726. Sometimes the repetition is in the thought, not in any one word, and amounts to an interpretation of what has been said with the intention of bringing out more clearly some one aspect of it. So Ad. 747, *domi erit*. || *pro divom fidem, meretrix et mater familias una in domo?* Capt. 262, *ut vos hic, itidem illic apud vos meus servatur filius*. || *captus est?* (= "you mean that he is a prisoner?" not "is he a prisoner?") Ad. 538, *lupus in fabula*. || *pater est?* (Cf. Dz. note. Nearly equal to "what! my father?") So Men. 1058. When the idea has only been implied in a general way, the whole passage must be read. So Bacch. 145, Cist. II 1,

quam salutem? That is, they run over into *quis* in repetitions and ordinary *quis*-questions. They are Amph. 410, Ba. 114, 569, 852, Merc. 542, 685, Mil. 27, 316, 323, 470, Pers. 741, Rud. 736, 881, St. 597, Andr. 765, Eun. 638, Heaut. 311.

There is something of the same difficulty when the verb is repeated; so *erras*. || *quid erro?* (Men. 1025) is very near to *amat* . . . || *quid? amat?* (Eun. 986), and without the help of the voice inflection it is impossible to draw perfectly sharp lines; cf. Mil. 819 with Ps. 711.

24, Mil. 976, Rud. 752 (III 4, 47), in Par.; Sch. gives period. St. 599, Eun. 636; also, I think, Ph. 548, Ad. 433, though the previous implication is less distinct.

Here belong also a few cases of exclamation, consisting of two or three words in which an idea already suggested is summed up. Asin. 487, *nunc demum?* Andr. 474, *hui, tam cito?* Also And. 755, Eun. 87, and Hec. 875, which would have had a verb if it had not been interrupted.

In a few passages a long sentence is taken up in parts and repeated interrogatively in order to get confirmation of each particular. The passages, which are too long to quote, are Capt. 879 ff., Ps. 1152 ff., Rud. 1267 f., Eun. 707 f., Heaut. 431 f.

Repetitions with variation of phrase, Pl. 31 [32], Ter. 23.

In all these cases there is a common element of repetition, generally exclamatory, frequently though not necessarily rejecting the repeated idea. When the repetition is plain, and no change is made except in person of verbs or pronouns, there is really nothing interrogative in the effect of the sentence, though it seems possible that an interrogative effect might be produced as in English by the voice-inflection. The common forms of reply, *ita dico, id volui dicere*, or a repetition of the word (Capt. 838, *cedo manum. || manum?* || *manum, inquam*), show that there is no request for information in this form of question. But the moment the speaker adds to the repeated words some idea of his own, or repeats not the precise words but some modification of them, he introduces an element which in the full logical presentation of his thought would require a separate question. Thus Ad. 726, *scio. || scis et patere?* means in full "You know it! And do you endure it, too?" Aul. 784, *renuntiare repudium iussit . . . || repudium rebus paratis exornatis nuptiis?* "Break the engagement! Does he propose that when everything is ready for the wedding?" In such cases the exclamatory structure of the first words is carried over into the second part and the real question is merged in the exclamation. Very possibly there would be in the Latin, as in the English, a slight pause after *repudium*.

Further, when the idea only is repeated in words which amplify or interpret it, the line which separates such exclamations from real questions is easily passed. Thus in Ad. 950, *agellist hic sub urbe paulum . . . || paulum id autemst?* does not mean "is that a little matter?" but "is that *what you call* a little matter?" In Capt. 262, given above, the change from *captus est?* "you mean that

he's a prisoner?" to *captusne est?* "Is he a prisoner?" is so slight that either might be used in such a conversation. In repetitions which are considerably changed, therefore, we cannot use the principle here outlined as a basis for deciding text questions. Especially in the long series of repetitions it is impossible to be sure that *ne* would not be used. Cf. Capt. 879, *meum gnatum?* MSS *meumne*, and so Bent., Fleck., Goetz. And generally in the long-continued repetition the speaker swings away from the exclamatory form, his emotion cooling, and tends to question facts instead of statements of facts.

While the preceding classification is one of function rather than of structure, it nevertheless corresponds pretty closely to a distinction in form. In nearly all the complete sentences, the verb is near the end, or at least not near the beginning; that is, the order is declarative, not interrogative. The exceptions are Aul. 652, 761, Trin. 127, Truc. 747. In Aul. 652, *certo habes*. || *habeo ego? quid habeo?* ("Have! have what?") the verb is first for emphasis, and so, I think, in Aul. 761, *quod subrupuisti meum*. || *subrupui ego tuom? unde? aut quid id est?* Of Trin. 127 I have spoken above, and in this passage, and in Truc. 747, *non licet* with infin., the repetition is so precise and immediate that the phrases cannot be interrogative. But even granting these exceptions, it is plain that the late position of the verb in the sentence and the exclamatory nature of the repetition belong together.

The use of *autem* with repetitions I have not thought it necessary to notice, after the remarks of Langen, Beitr. 315 f. Cases in which *ain?* precedes the repetition will be found also under that word, which is more frequent in Pl. than *autem*.

5. The repeated verb is in the subjunctive.

(a). Repetitions of an imperative. Aul. 829, *i, redde aurum*. || *reddam ego aurum?* Mil. 496, *ausculta, quaeso*. || *ego auscultem tibi?* Cist. 241 U, Merc. 749 twice, Most. 579, 620 L², Ps. 1315, And. 323 (only Umpf.; better with period), 894. Twice the reply is by a third speaker, and the verb is in the 3d pers., Ph. 1001, *tu narra*. || *scelus, tibi narret?* and Eun. 797. Besides these, Asin. 93 is a dittograph of 94; St. 471 implies the omission of a vs. containing an impv. or its equivalent; Pers. 188 is confused and probably not a repetition. Langen, Beitr. 123, objects to Wagner's punctuation and explanation of Aul. 82, and proposes, apparently with hesitation, *quippini ego intus servem?* I should follow Wagner's text, . . . *intus serva*. || *quippini? ego intus*

servem? understanding *quippini* to be the servant's assent to her master's order, while the next line is spoken in a grumbling undertone. Men. 198, *salta sic cum palla . . .* || *ego saltabo? sanus hercle non es*, and Merc. 915 are remarkable as the only cases in which the future repeats an impv. It must be connected with the impv. use of the fut. indic. 2d pers. and with the original fut. sense of the subjunctive. Pl. 9, Ter. 4.

(b). The impv. is only implied, or is expressed in the form of a question.

Bacch. 627 *non taces, . . .?* || *taceam?* With *iubesne?* Eun. 389; with *non vides?* Eun. 676; with *quid dubitas dare?* Ps. 626. Also Ad. 938, Andr. 231, Ph. 988.

(c). Repetitions of a subjunctive, either impv. or in a subordinate clause. In the former case the subjunctive is like the preceding; in the latter it is merely a quotation with change of person, as with indicatives. Ps. 1226, *saltem Pseudolum mihi dedas.* || *Pseudolum ego dedam tibi?* Ps. 486, . . . *paritas, ut a med auferas.* || *abs te auferam?* With other tenses, Ps. 288, *surruperes patri.* || *surruperet hic patri, . . .?* Bacch. 1176, Cas. II 6, 14, II 8, 18, 21, Men. 1024, Merc. 567, 575, Most. 183, Rud. 842, Ad. 396, Andr. 282, 382, 649, 900, Hec. 589, 670, Ph. 120, 382, 775. Also Most. 895, though it is partly corrupt.

There remain several passages in which the idea which is repeated and rejected by the subjunctive, is not distinctly expressed. Capt. 208, *at fugam fingitis . . .* || *nos fugiamus? quo fugiamus?* Asin. 838, *an tu me tristem putas?* || *putem ego quem videam esse maestum . . .?* Asin. 482 is an interpolation; Rud. 728, *habeat, si argentum dabit.* || *det tibi argentum?* is an early correction now supported by A, Ps. 318, Truc. 625. Amph. 813, *mi vir, . . .* || *vir ego tuos sim?* (DEJ *sum*); Hec. 524, *mihine, mi vir?* || *vir ego tuos sim?* (*sum* all MSS exc. A), Andr. 915, *bonus est hic vir.* || *hic vir sit bonus?* ("Das soll ein Ehrenmann sein?" Speng.). Cas. I 1, 26, *mea praeda est illa . . .* || *tua praeda illa accit?* (*est* BJE). The passages support each other, in spite of the variation in the MSS. It is plain, also, that *vir ego tuos sum?* would mean, "I am not your husband," while *sim* means "I am not going to be your husband any longer"; i. e., *sum* would deny the fact, *sim* rejects the claim. Pl. 22, Ter 17.

C.—*Rogas, negas, rogitas* AND SIMILAR VERBS.

Somewhat closely connected with repeated sentences is a group of verbs in the 2d pers. of the pres. indic., which *sum* up in a word

or two the idea of the previous sentence. For example, in Aul. 764, *nequē . . . dixi neque feci*, the second speaker instead of repeating the words in an exclamatory tone, *non dixisti?* sums up the sentence in the single word *negas?* This usage, though distinct enough with a few verbs, shades off, as repetitions do, by the addition of ideas not contained in the previous sentence, into ordinary questions or exclamations.

1. *rogas* alone. Aul. 634, *quid tibi vis reddam?* || *rogas?* Epid. 64, *amatne istam . . .?* || *rogas?* *deperit.* Bacch. 206, 216, 980, Capt. 660, Cas. II 3, 35, Epid. 276, Pers. 42 (Ba. Rit. *rogan*), 107, Poen. 263, 386, 733, Ps. 740, Rud. 860, St. 335, Trin. 80, Truc. 505, Ad. 772, And. 163, 184, 267, 909, Eun. 324, 436, 574, Heaut. 532, Ph. 574, 704, 915. Pl. 18, Ter. 12.

2. *rogitas* alone. Aul. 339, *qui vero?* || *rogitas?* Rud. 1361, Ad. 558, Eun. 366, 675, 794, 897, 948, 1008, Heaut. 631, Ph. 156, 257. With *at*, Andr. 828, Hec. 526. Pl. 2, Ter. 12.

The question which precedes *rogas?* *rogitas?* has *ne* once, *non* once, *etiam* once, *ecquid* four times; the other 37 cases, including all from Ter., have some kind of *quis* question. It is hardly likely that this is accidental, but I can see no reason for it, unless it be that a mere exclamatory repetition of e. g. *quid ego deliqui?* in the form *quid tu deliquisti?* would not be sufficiently differentiated from the ordinary question *quid tu deliquisti?* This might lead to the addition of *rogas* (see below) or to its substitution for the repetition.

With some four or five exceptions the speaker makes no pause for an answer after *rogas*, *rogitas*, but continues with some reply to the previous question. No answer is needed, in fact; the apparent question is purely exclamatory, performing the same function as exact repetitions, and differing little from the Engl. "What a question!"

3. *negas?* Curc. 711, *non commemini dicere.* || *quid?* *negas?* || *nego hercle vero.* Aul. 764, Men. 306, Mil. 829, Ph. 740.

Pl. 4, Ter. 1.

Though a pause is regularly made after *negas* and it is answered in three cases by *nego hercle vero*, it is entirely similar to *rogas*, *rogitas*.

4. *rogas*, *rogitas*, *negas* followed by other words.

rogitas etiam? Cas. V 4, 18.

rogas me? Men. 713, Amph. 571 (MSS *rogasne*. See O. Seyffert, Philol. 29 (1870), 385-6), Ad. 82, 665, Eun. 653; *rogitas*,

quod vides? Ps. 1163; *rogitas quid sit?* Heaut. 251; *negas, quod oculis video?* Rud. 1067. *negas novisse me?* (After *novi cum Calcha simul*) Men. 750. Pl. 6, Ter. 4.

5. *rogas, rogitas, negas* preceded by other words.

etiam rogas? Bacch. 331, Merc. 202, Andr. 762; *etiam rogitas?* Aul. 424, 437, 633; *me rogas?* Men. 640, Heaut. 780, Mil. 426; *quid negoti sit, rogas?* (cf. Becker, 198), Aul. 296, Mil. 317; *quid fiat, facias, agam, metuam*, etc. Ad. 288, Eun. 837, Heaut. 454, 780, Merc. 633 (V. Beck., 209, MSS *men rogas*), Amph. 1025, 1028, Aul. 551, Bacch. 65, 1196, Curc. 726, Merc. 721, Most. 907 (*ecquid*), Rud. 379, St. 333, Eun. 720, *de istac rogas virgine?*

tu negas? And. 909. Men. 630 (MSS *tun*) and 821 (MSS *tu*) have been given above under *tun*. Bx. reads *tu* in both, Rit. *tun*, but it is entirely likely that Pl. should use *tu* and *tun negas* without discrimination. On Capt. 571 see Bx. Anh., Langen, p. 220. *tu negas med esse (sc. Sosiam)?* Amph. 434, Fleck. *tun. etiam negas?* Merc. 763. Pl. 23 [24], Ter. 8.

In all cases where *rogas, rogitas* has a dependent clause, the clause is repeated from the preceding question, e. g. *quid negotist?* || *quid negoti sit, rogas?* In such cases both the repetition and the verb *rogas* are exclamatory, and the implication is intended that no such question should have been asked. But in the few cases where new ideas are introduced the exclamatory rejection is less prominent and the questioning effect appears. The most distinct case is Eun. 720, *quid faciundum censes?* || *de istac rogas virgine?* || *ita*, where there is no rejection. Other cases of *negas* with infin. have a faint interrogative tone.

6. With a few other verbs in the 2d pers. pres. indic. These are not clearly marked off from other verbs (esp. *verba dicendi*) in the 2d pers., but a few cases will suffice to show that this exclamatory use is not confined to *rogas, rogitas, negas*, but extends also to other words. Only the cases in which the verb stands alone, or nearly alone, are given here, because with a dependent infin. or clause the distinction is less clear.

Hec. 527, *peperit filia? hem, taces? ex quo?* Bacch. 777, *quid fit? quam mox navigo . . . ? taces?* Eun. 695, 821. In Merc. 164 *taces* is a conjecture of Ritschl, differing from all other cases in not coming immediately after a question: the passage is, besides, an interpolation. *derides?* Merc. 907, Ad. 852. Ps. 1315 is improbable. *inrides?* And. 204. *narras*, Heaut. 520 *nihil nimis.* || '*nihil*' *narras?* And. 367, *non opinor, Dave.* || '*opinor*' *narras?*

non recte accipis; *certa res est*. Also Ph. 401. To these Ad. 398, *vigilantiam tuam tu mihi narras?* bears the same relation that repetitions of an implied idea bear to exact repetitions. With these I should place Andr. 754, *male dicis?* Hec. 706, *fugis?* Heaut. 883, *chem, Menedeme, advenis?* (cf. *tu hic eras?*). Men. 166, *agedum, odorare . . . quid olet? apstines?* In Ph. 515 A has *optundis*, the other MSS *obtunde*; most editors follow Fleck. and read *optundes*. Phaedria has been pouring out petitions to Dorio, who does not trust his promises and expresses his deafness to prayers for mercy in this word, *optundis*, "You keep at it?" "You hammer away at my ears?" The future is entirely out of place, while the present is entirely in accord with the manner of Ter., who uses this kind of exclamation, especially with single words, very frequently. For parallel in sense, cf. Ad. 769, *tu verba fundis hic sapientia?* and Andr. 348, *optundis, tam etsi intellego?* Ps. 943 R. *meram iam mendacia fundes*, is properly future.

Here also belongs *cessas*, with or without infin. Cf. *cesso*, above. *cessas?* Hec. 360, Ph. 565; *sed (tu) cessas?* Hec. 814, Ph. 858; with infin., Andr. 343, Ad. 916. Not in Pl. Pl. 3 [4], Ter. 19.

To these might be added a considerable number of cases showing a less distinct relationship to *rogas*, and gradually shading off till the reference to the preceding speech or act would be imperceptible and the sentence would become distinctly interrogative. These cases will be given under other headings.

As the repetitions were marked, though not quite invariably, by having the verb near the end of the sentence, so in this class the distinction of function is marked by a special form, the use of the 2d pers. pres. indic. without dependent words, except *me*, *etiam* and a clause or infin. repeated from the preceding speech. The typical form is *rogas* and the departures from it are few and unimportant.

D.—QUESTIONS WITH *non* AND OTHER NEGATIVE WORDS.

Questions without a particle containing a negative word occur about two hundred times in Pl. and Ter. Of these about 180 have *non*. The problem in regard to these sentences is to see whether they have any special interrogative form, and to determine their relation to *nonne*.

1. *non* in repetitions. These may or may not have a verb. Cist. II 1, 35, *non edepol . . . recipis*. || *non? hem, quid agis?* Ad. 661, 803. Andr. 194, Heaut. 780. Asin. 445 is entirely uncertain. *quid? non?* Andr. 587, Heaut. 894.

Epid. 482, *haec non est ea. || quid? non est? || non est.* Most. 594, *non dat, non debet. || non debet?* Asin. 480, Men. 302, 503, Merc. 918, Poen. 173, 404, Ps. 326, Rud. 341, 1372, Ad. 112, Eun. 179, 679, Heaut. 612, Hec. 342. Pl. 12, Ter. 11.

Other cases occur in which the repeated idea is so expanded as to make it in part a new sentence, e. g. Most. 950, *nemo hic habitat. || non hic Philolaches adulescens habitat hisce in aedibus?* Cf. cases above, IV B. But the line which separates these from other *non*-questions is very indistinct, and I have preferred to place them below with other sentences of like form.

2. The remaining questions with *non*, except those having impv. effect, are arranged in three classes according to the position of *non* and the verb: (a) *non* and the verb together at the beginning of the sentence; (b) *non* and the verb together at the end; (c) *non* at the beginning, the verb at the end. These three arrangements do not, of course, cover all possible forms of sentence; *non* and the verb may be together in the middle of the sentence; they may be separated by a word or two, but generally the main part of the sentence, especially if there be a dependent infin., is not divided, but lies all together either after or before or between *non* and the verb.

(a). *non* and the verb are at the beginning of the sentence. Here are included some cases where *quaeso, eho, quid* or a vocative precedes, some in which *ego* or *tu* comes between *non* and the verb, and the short sentences consisting of *non* and the verb only.

non vides with infin. or clause. Asin. 472, *inpure, nihili, non video irasci?* Most. 811, *non vides tu hunc voltu uti tristist senex?* || *video.* Asin. 326, Bacch. 1136, Men. 947, Pers. 642, Ps. 1297, Rud. 942, Heaut. 1013. Without clause, Eun. 675, *ubi est?* || *rogitas? non vides?*

non tu scis with infin. or clause. Merc. 731, *non tu scis quae sit illaec?* || *immo iam scio.* Men. 714, 911, Mil. 1150, St. 606. Without clause, Asin. 215, *non tu scis? hic noster quaestus ancupii simillumust.* So Asin. 177, Amph. 703. The second sentence is here added paratactically, instead of being subordinated.

Other verbs in 2d pers. pres. indic. *non audes* with infin., Asin. 476, Ps. 1316 (A *nonne*), Truc. 425; *non audis*, with clause Ps. 230, alone like *non tu scis*, Poen. 1011; *non soles respicere te*, Ps. 612; *non intellegis?* Amph. 625; *non quis . . . durare*, Truc. 326; *non amas me?* Cas. V 4, 9; *non habes venalem amicam . . .* Ps. 341 (cf. 325); *non ornatis . . .?* Cas. III 2, 16; *non arbit-*

raris . . . ? Trin. 789 (MSS nonne); non clamas ? non insanis ? Ad. 727; non cogitas . . . ? Heaut. 239; quid ? non obsecro es, quem . . . ? Ph. 742.

Perf. indic. 2d pers. *non nosti nomen meum ? Men. 294, Truc. 595; non (con)meministi, Men. 533, 1074, Epid. 639; non audivisti . . . ? Rud. 355; non tu dixisti . . . ? And. 852 (MSS dixisti).*

Impf. indic. Epid. 599. Fut., in short sentences, Cist. II 1, 31, 32, Merc. 750, Eun. 696.

Impersonals. *non licet* with infin. Mil. 1404, *non licet mihi dicere ? Asin. 935, Ps. 252, Rud. 426, Truc. 747. non (te) pudet, Men. 708, Poen. 1301, Ph. 525.* Without infin. or gen. the order indicates nothing; *non te pudet ? Men. 741, and non pudet te ? Trin. 1017* are indistinguishable.

Other tenses and persons are less frequent. First pers. pres. Cas. III 6, 12. In Amph. 403 ff., where the MSS. give *nonne* in several cases, the close connection of the questions with each other obscures the effect of the order. There are three cases with 1st pers. I can see nothing to distinguish Amph. 539, *non (MSS nonne) ego possum, furcifer, te perdere ?* from Rud. 1125, *non ego te comprimere possum sine malo ?* though the order is different. Ph. 543, *non triumpho, si . . . ?* has clear *nonne* force, and, less clearly, Ph. 489, Trin. 1153.

Third pers. pres. indic. Hec. 360, *non sciunt ipsi viam . . . ? St. 393, Eun. 839.* Impf., Aul. 294, *quid ? hic non poterat . . . ? Bacch. 563.* Plupf., Ph. 804.

Pres. subjunct., Hec. 341, *quid faciam misera ? non visam uxorem Pamphili, . . . ? Eun. 46, Ph. 419, Heaut. 583.* Rud. 969 is conditional. Pl. 57, Ter. 18.

Many of the sentences just given might have been placed in the preceding class as repetitions of a previously implied negative. Thus *non nosti* follows *quisquis es* or some other expression of uncertainty; *non amas me ?* Cas. V 4, 9 is distinctly implied before; Ps. 341 has been asserted in 325; and so Ph. 742, Rud. 335, all cases of *(con)meministi* and of the pres. subj. 1st pers.

Further *non vides, non tu scis, non licet, non pudet* closely resemble *rogas ?* etc., in that they sum up in a single word the effect of the previous sentence. Cf. Eun. 675, *ubi est ? || rogitas ? non vides ?*

(b). *non* and the verb together, but not at the beginning of the sentence; in most cases at or near the end.

None in indic. with 1st pers.

Second pers. Epid. 514, *fides non reddis?* Eun. 463, *quid? hunc non vides?* Amph. 659, 937, Cist. III 11, Trin. 810. Perfect, Men. 505, *tuom parasitum non novisti?* Aul. 772. Fut., Mil. 696. Plupf., Ph. 384.

Third pers. Hec. 231, *cum puella anum suscepisse inimicitias non pudet?* Cas. IV 4, 25 (A, Gepp. *nonne*). In Asin. 395 the Goetz-Loewe text, *sed post non rediit huc?* seems to me improbable on account of *sed*, which is not found elsewhere in *non*-questions.

With subjunct., Eun. 798, *ego non tangam meam?* Impf., Eun. 591. In Rud. 723 the subjunc. is independent of the question.

Pl. 10 [11], Ter. 5.

These few cases are not different in sense from the preceding. *non pudet* at the end has the same relation to *non pudet* at the beginning that *quid sit me rogatas?* bears to *rogatas quid siet?*

(c). *non* and the verb are separated, *non* being at the beginning, the verb generally at the end.

In the first pers., Amph. 518, *carnufex, non ego te novi?* the same, Capt. 564, Men. 408. *non . . . sum*, Heaut. 920; *non . . . possum*, Rud. 1125. Amph. 406 has *nonne* in MSS. Perf. indic., Men. 512, *non ego te indutum foras exire vidi pallam?* Men. 631.

Second pers. pres. Pers. 385, *non tu nunc hominum mores vides, . . .?* Capt. 969, Cas. V 4, 28, Epid. 480, Men. 307, Merc. 133, 881, 913, 1014, Pers. 670, Rud. 347, 740, 870, And. 710, Ph. 492. Perf. indic., Epid. 638, *quis tu's homo, . . .?* || *non me novisti?* Mil. 428, Men. 438, Poen. 557, Rud. 1372, Heaut. 436. Impf. indic., Ad. 560, *non tu eum rus hinc modo produxe aibas?* || *factum*. Capt. 662, Pers. 415, Ps. 500. Fut. indic., And. 921, *non tu tuom malum aequo animo feres?* Eun. 819, Hec. 603, Ph. 1002.

Third pers. Bacch. 1193, *non tibi in mentemst, . . .?* Bacch. 1000, Cas. III 2, 17, Most. 950, Ad. 94, 754, Hec. 236, Ph. 392. Amph. 406 is in a series of *non*-questions, and in 404, 405, 407, 452 the MSS have *nonne*.

Pres. subjunct. 1st pers. Epid. 588, *non patrem ego te nominem . . .?* Truc. 732, Eun. 223. Impf. subjunc., Trin. 133, Curc. 552, (B *nonne*). Third pers., Ph. 119 in apodosis.

In a few cases, Asin. 652, And. 149, 752, Ad. 709, the verb is omitted.

Pl. 42, Ter. 18.

The following are corrupt or conjectural: Cas. III 5, 53, Men. 453, 823, Mil. 301, Most. 555, Poen. 258, Truc. 257, 259.

As has been said, this division is not entirely precise, either for

interrogative or for declarative sentences. Single words, mostly conjunctions or interjections, occasionally precede *non*, a pronoun or adverb (*nunc*) sometimes separates *non* and the verb, and in the third class, under (*c*), the verb is frequently followed by two or three words, instead of being at the end. Also, in using the order as a basis for comparison, sentences consisting of *non* and the verb only must of course be thrown out, as well as other short sentences like *non te pudet?* *non me novisti?* and perhaps *fides non reddis?* Cf. *non manum abstinēs?* Even *non nosti nomen meum?* cannot differ greatly from *tuom parasitum non novisti?* But longer sentences fall pretty plainly into these three classes.

There are no statistics in regard to the position of *non* in declarative sentences, but taking a single play, and counting only simple sentences like those used in questions, there are in Trin. 33 cases, divided as follows:

	Declar.	Interrog.
(a) <i>non</i> and verb early, . . .	6 = 18 per cent.	75 = 50 per cent.
(b) <i>non</i> and verb late, . . .	11 = 33 per cent.	15 = 10 per cent.
(c) <i>non</i> and verb separated, . . .	16 = 49 per cent.	60 = 40 per cent.

Taking the first two classes, it appears that *non* and the verb are put in the first place much more frequently in interrogative than in declarative sentences. This is due mainly to the large number of questions which resemble *rogas?* viz., *non vides, non tu scis, non nosti, non licet, non pudet*; the rest are either repetitions or sentences which would have *non* and the verb early for emphasis (Bx. on Trin. 414), even if they were declarative. A consideration of the order therefore strengthens the conclusion indicated by the meaning, that these are not properly questions, but exclamations, which presuppose a negative opinion on the part of the other speaker, and express doubt or rejection by repeating the negation in an exclamatory tone. In the cases under (*a*) only the verb and *non* belong to the repetition, and these therefore stand first as the starting-point of the speaker's thought. Cf. Aul. 784, . . . *renuntiare repudium iussit . . . || repudium rebus paratis exornatis nuptiis?* Where the verb and *non* stand at the end, the exclamatory tone is sustained through the whole sentence.

In the third class, (*c*), *non* comes at the beginning of a declarative sentence almost invariably in order that it may go with some single word. So in the Trin. with *ita* 649, *fugitivos* 1027, *credibile* 606, *optuma* 392, *salis* 249, 623, *minus* 409, *edepol* 357, *temere*

740. In 705 only *enim* separates *non* from the verb; in 341, 414, 976 *non* contrasts one clause with another. The only cases in which it can go with the whole sentence are 480, 720 and perhaps 211. But when such sentences as these become interrogative they drop *non*, that is, they pass to the interrogation from the affirmation, not from the negation (cf. Paul, Princip.² p. 110), and appear in the forms *itan est? fugitivosne est? satin habes?* etc. On the other hand, of the 60 cases in questions there are scarcely half a dozen in which *non* could be taken with any one word. It is true that it very frequently stands just before a personal pronoun, *ego, tu, me, mihi*, but it does not negative the pronoun, nor would the pronoun be emphatic if the sentence were declarative. This seems rather to be another instance of the expression of the personal pronoun under the influence of the interrogative inflection, and its presence and close connection with *non* strengthen the hypothesis that this form of sentence is properly interrogative, not exclamatory like (a) and (b). *non* is placed first in order that it may go with the whole sentence (= "is it not true that . . .?").

Schrader gives 24 cases in Pl. and Ter. of *nonne*; of these 19 have the verb late, 4 contain only *nonne* and the verb, and only one (Ps. 1317 *nonne audes . . .*) has *non* and the verb together. In later Latin also, so far as I have been able to examine, *nonne* comes first and the verb at the end. I should therefore regard this third form of the *non* sentence as a true interrogation and the source of the *nonne* questions.

To this distinction *non* with pres. indic. 1st sing. seems to be an exception. Whatever its form, it has generally the meaning of *nonne*.

3. *non* with the second pers. pres. indic., with impv. force. *non taces?* Amph. 700, Asin. 931, Bacch. 470 (*non tu t.*), 627, Cas. V 4, 14, Curc. 712, Men. 618, 1026, Merc. 211, 484, 754, Most. 734, Ph. 987, 1004; *non tu (hinc, istinc) abis?* Men. 516, Ps. 1196, St. 603, Eun. 799; *non mihi respondes?* And. 743, Ph. 992; *non te tenes?* Men. 824; *non manes?* Ph. 849; *non tu te cohibes? non te respicis?* Heaut. 919; *non omittitis?* Ad. 942; *non manum abstines?* Ad. 781; *non tu tibi istam praeluncari linguam largiloquam iubes?* Mil. 318. *non taces?* Ps. 889 (B, Goetz); I prefer *non places* (CD, Lor.) Pl. 17, Ter. 10.

That these have impv. effect is shown by the reply *taceam?* Bacch. 627, Ph. 987, as if after *tace*. But the questioning effect

is also felt, as appears from the other form of answer *non* (*hercule vero*) *taceo*, Cas. V 4, 14, Curc. 912, Men. 618. These do not differ in any essential point from other questions with *non*, and something of impv. force may be felt in *non vides* (cf. *videsne*), *non tu scis* and even in *non licet*.

4. Other negatives used in questions without a particle are these :

nil. nil respondes? Ad. 641, Eun. 152, Poen. 259. These are like *non taces?* with an impv. effect. The other cases of *nihil* are all in Ter., Ad. 244, And. 949, Eun. 735, Hec. 462, 811; I should add Cas. prol. 78 and Merc. 912, generally punctuated with period.

nullus, Bacch. 718, Ps. 294, 1002; *nemo*, Ad. 529; *neque . . . neque*, Amph. 756, Pers. 131. Pl. 6 [8], Ter. 8.

The negative word in these sentences (except *nil respondes?*) is not at the beginning of the sentence and has no effect upon the question. Its presence is accidental, and the questions are like other forms of interrogative sentence without particle, with which they might have been classed.

E.—QUESTIONS WITH *iam* AND *etiam*.

Questions without a particle, having *iam* at or very near the beginning, occur 50 times, beside two (Ad. 700) without verb. In most of these *iam* has the same sense as in declarative sentences. Thus *iam ferio foris?* Men. 176 is "at once"; Merc. 222, *iam censes patrem abiisse a portu?* "by this time, already." So also with *nunc*, Ad. 290. With the perfect indic. the meaning "by this time, already, so soon" is quite distinct. In a few cases there is an approach to the impv. effect (cf. *etiam*). Merc. 884, *prehende. iam tenes?* || *teneo*. || *tene*. Most. 836, *iam vides?* Closely connected with this is a kind of assertive force, as if the sentence were both interrogative and strongly declarative. So most cases of *iam tenes?* *iam vides?* *iam scis?*

There are also a few cases in which I can see no time-force. Pers. 25, *iam servi hic amant?* Ps. 472, *iam tibi mirum id videtur?* (Rit. num, Lor. an). Asin. 929, *iam subrupuisti pallam, quam scorto dares?*

The passages in which *iam* is found are, with pres. indic. 1st pers., Men. 176, Eun. 814; 2d pers., Amph. 798, Asin. 338, Capt. prol. 10 (incomplete vs. Bx. *iamne*), Cist. II 3, 69, Epid. 25, 401, Merc. 222, 884, Most. 836 [III 2, 154 is a mere repetition], Pers.

528, 589, Poen. 578, Trin. 780 (*tenes iam?*), Truc. 881, Ad. 290, Eun. 703, 1016; fut., Heaut. 350; perf., Amph. 962, Asin. 929, Cas. II 3, 34, Merc. 658, Mil. 1344, Most. 668, Pers. 483 (MSS *an iam*), 484, Rud. 1386, St. 317, Trin. 912, Truc. 378. Third pers. pres., Pers. 25, 485, Poen. 590, Ps. 472, St. 529, Truc. 508 (twice), Ad. 388, Eun. 704; perf., Amph. 957, Asin. 410, 437, 638, Merc. 823, Mil. 1429, And. 806, Ph. 525, 796. The text is doubtful in Rud. 1383, 1369. Ad. 700 is without verb. Ph. 22 with period.

Pl. 40, Ter. 10.

With *etiam* the case is somewhat similar. It is used 68 times, and in many of these the sense does not differ from the uses well known in declarative sentences. Thus without time-force, "also, again," Asin. 677, *furcifer, etiam me delusisti?* Amph. 394, *etiam denuo*, Amph. 702, *etiam tu quoque*, Bacch. 127, *etiam me advorsus*, Epid. 711, Mil. 1206, Pers. 849, St. 427, Poen. 1234, Rud. 817, Ad. 243, 246, Ph. 769, Merc. 538, *etiam nunc*, Merc. 829, Ph. 931, And. 644, Eun. 286, 710 (but with a redundant syllable; Umpf. Dz. om. *nunc*). With time-force, "still, yet," Merc. 129, *at etiam asto?* *at etiam cesso . . .?* St. 574, *etiam valet?*

There are a few cases in which I do not see that *etiam* has any proper meaning. Bacch. 216, *sed Bacchis etiam fortis tibi visast?* cf. Mil. Glor. 1106, *ecquid fortis visast?* Most. 553, *etiam fatetur de hospite?* Pers. 651, *emam [eam], opinor. || etiam 'opinor'?*

The remaining cases all have the verb in 2d pers. pres. indic., and are of two distinct and well defined classes. First, *etiam* with or without *ne* is used to express an impv. · So *etiam (tu) taces?* Curc. 41, Pers. 152, Trin. 514, 790, Ad. 550, *dicis* Pers. 278, *etiam quid respondetis mihi?* Bacch. 670; other cases are Bacch. 1168, Curc. 189, Aul. 255, Asin. 715, Pers. 275, 413, 542, Most. 383, Heaut. 235, Ph. 542. Also *acceptura es*, Rud. 469, and possibly Most. 513 (Lor.² *etiam tu fuge*, but the dialogue is confused). Also Men. 422, *etiam parasitum manes?* which Langen does not include.

Pl. 16, Ter. 3.

Second, *etiam* is used with the 2d pers. pres. in an exclamatory sentence. So *etiam rogas?* (Pl. 2, Ter. 3), *etiam rogitas?* (Pl. 3), given above under IV C. These, like *rogas?* alone, sum up a previous sentence, and *etiam* does not mean "again" or "still, yet," since the preceding question is frequently the first that has been asked. In some of the following cases *etiam* might be taken to mean "still" or "again." Merc. 896, *etiam metuis?* "are you still afraid?" Merc. 982, *etiam loquere?* "you still speak!" But

in most cases no such sense is possible, and these questions so closely resemble those given under IV C that it is difficult to draw any line between them. So *etiam minilare?* Bacch. 785, Truc. 621; *male loquere*, Pers. 290; *male loqui audes*, Capt. 563; *quaeris*, Merc. 981; *mones*, Bacch. 910; *muttis*, Amph. 381, Pers. 827; *inrides*, Most. 1132; *derides*, Men. 499; *clamas*, Amph. 376; *negas*, Merc. 763 (IV C); *rides*, Eun. 1017. In the following the sense of "still" is possible or probable: Merc. 728, 896, 982, Rud. 877, Trin. 572, 708, 991, Eun. 668, Hec. 430, 507. Also Most. 851, *at etiam restas?* (Rit. *restas*: Lor.³ *restat*:)

Pl. 20, Ter. 4.

Andr. 849 should be *responde*, Rud. 733 is entirely confused, Rud. 711 might be included with the preceding, but is generally marked with a period. Bacch. 321, *etiam dimidium censes?* is condemned by Langen, p. 161, but retained, rightly, as I think, by Goetz.

Pl. 54, Ter. 14.

As has been said, there are about 900 questions without a particle in Pl. and Ter.; it now appears that more than 100 of these begin with *iam* and *etiam*. This raises two questions: (1) Were *iam* and *etiam* put at the beginning of the sentence, as *non* appears to have been, under the influence of the interrogative inflection? (2) Or did they, being already at the beginning of the sentence, take on an interrogative function?

As to the first question, a rough count shows that there are about 100 cases of *iam* in declarative sentences in the Amph., Asin., Aul. and Capt. In 30 of these *iam* goes with a subordinate verb or clause; of the remaining 70 about 40 have *iam* at the beginning. For *etiam* I have made no count, but believe the facts to be about the same. It appears likely, therefore, that the position of *iam* and *etiam* is not peculiar to questions, but is common to interrogative and declarative sentences.

The second question could be more surely answered if there were any discussion of the early uses of *iam* and *etiam*. The 42 cases of *iam* in declarative sentences are divided as to persons and tenses as follows:

	Pres.	Impf.	Fut.	Perf.	Pres. subj.	
1st pers.	8	...	14	2	1	= 25
2d pers.	1	1	= 2
3d pers.	9	...	6	= 15
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	18	1	20	2	1	= 42

In questions as follows :

	Pres.	Fut.	Perf.	
1st pers.	2 (fut. sense)	= 2
2d pers.	17	1	12	= 30
3d pers.	9	...	9	= 18
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	28	1	21	= 50

Here is a marked tendency to use *iam* with the first pers. and the fut. in declarative sentences, but with the 2d pers. and the perf. in questions, the 3d pers. and the pres. remaining unchanged. This appears to indicate that *iam* expressed a kind of impatience or urgency, which I suppose to be connected with its use "in contrast with the time at which something was expected" (Harper's Lex., s. v., I. A, 2). A similar assertive force is plain in *etiam*, "and even, even," and in its use in answers, "just so, yes indeed." From the contrast between this subjective standard, which *iam* and *etiam* express, and the actual occurrence result the peculiar uses of these words in questions. Thus *etiam tu taces?* means "Are you keeping still at last? I should have expected it long ago." *etiam dicis ubi?* "Are you going to tell me at once? I asked you long ago." With *iam* this impv. force is much less distinct, but cf. Merc. 884, *prehende. iam tenes?* || *teneo.* || *tene*, with Pers. 413 ff., *accipin . . .? accipe sis . . . tene sis . . . etiam tu . . . tenes?* So in *iam scis?* *iam vides?* there is a kind of challenge or demand, in which the expression of contrast is more important than the idea of time; "now you know, now you see, don't you? though before you didn't."

Langen says, Beitr. 160, in commenting upon Bacch. 319, with Ussing's note '*etiam* interrogantis,' "*etiam* hat aber in der Frage sonst immer seine besondere Bedeutung, hier würde es zu einer blossen Fragepartikel herabsinken." Below on the same page he says that the only case where *etiam* serves merely to give a special shading to the question is the impv. use. I have called attention above to some instances of *iam* (Pers. 25, Ps. 472, Asin. 929) and *etiam* (Bacch. 216, Most. 553, Pers. 651), mostly with the 3d pers., in which I can see no individual meaning for these words, where they seem to me "der Frage eine besondere Nüance zu geben," to use Langen's words. To these I should now add *etiam rogas, rogitas, minitare, negas*, etc., as being questions in which *etiam* has at the most only the meaning "actually, really,"

or, better expressed, has so far lost its proper sense as to serve merely to give a particular shade of meaning to the question, to make the question urgent and impatient and exclamatory. That is, *etiam* has almost and *iam* has less frequently assumed interrogative functions.¹ It is worth noting that *iam* is used without *ne* 50 times, with *ne* 38, while *etiam*, having more interrogative effect in itself, is used without *ne* 68 times, with *ne* only 26 times.

F.—CONTINUED, SUPPLEMENTARY, AND INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS.

Similar in a general way to the partially interrogative sentences given above are certain forms of incomplete questions, which depend upon either a preceding or a following sentence. These for the most part explain themselves, and no full lists of them are given, but it seems worth while to point out their relation to and possible influence upon other forms of question.

1. To a previous question the speaker himself adds a second thought, either in a phrase or a clause, in order to define the main question more precisely.

The added words may follow the question immediately, and be so clearly a part of it as to make it doubtful whether all should not be considered one question. Ps. 617 ff., *esne tu an non es ab illo militi Macedonio? servos eius, qui . . . est mercatus . . . dederat . . . debet?* Mil. 994 f., *numquis hic prope adest, qui rem alienam potius curet quam suam? qui . . . ancuset? qui . . . vivat?* So Men. 380, Poen. 557 ff., Rud. 1185, St. 97, Eun. 46 f., 794, Hec. 676, Ph. 156.

More frequently the continuation is added after an interruption or a reply by the second speaker. In this case the interruption may be almost entirely neglected, as in Poen. 879 f., *scin tu erum tuom meo ero esse inimicum capitalem? || scio. || propter amorem?* Ph. 739, *quis hic loquitur? || Sophrona. || et meum nomen nominat?* Or, the speaker may continue his question because the reply was inadequate, or because he desires to make his question more precise and so compel a different answer. Aul. 773, *dic bona fide: tu id aurum non subrupuisti? || bona. || neque scis quis id abstulerit? || istuc quoque bona.* Ps. 484 f., *ecquas viginti minas paritas ut auferas a me? || aps te ego auferam? || ita: quas meo*

¹ In Bacch. 670, *etiam quid respondetis mihi?* the indef. *quid* is used after *etiam* exactly as it is used after the recognized particles *num*, *ec-* and *an*.

gnato des, qui amicam liberet? See esp. Rud. IV 8 (1265 ff.) Other examples are Most. 974 ff., Poen. 725, 732, Heaut. 894, etc.—about 30 in all. In some cases the continuation begins with *at*, correcting the previous question, and this may make the continuation amount in sense to a new question, though in the form of the original question. Heaut. 973, *ere, licetne?* || *loquere.* || *at tuto?* (all edd. use period). St. 342, *ecquem convenisti?* || *multos.* || *at virum?* Hec. 804, *es tu Myconius?* || *non sum.* || *at Callidemides?* The string of names in Trin. 916 f. is entirely similar, though *at* is not used.

When the original sentence is a *quis*-question, the second part is not so closely dependent upon the main sentence, but it implies, in the full logical expression of the thought, a repetition of the leading verb. Amph. prol. 52, *quid contraxistis frontem? quia tragoediam dixi futuram hanc?* Pers. 718, *quo illum sequar? in Persas? nugas.* About half a dozen cases.

In all continued questions the previous speech is itself a question, and in the words added by the same speaker there is no real interrogative force. They take over the interrogation, with whatever shading of genuine desire for information, of rejection or of exclamation it may have, from the main question. This fact sufficiently explains the absence of an interrogative particle.

2. Resembling these in form but differing essentially in character are the semi-interrogative phrases or clauses which supplement a remark made by the other speaker. In these the interrogation, so far as there is any, is not in the words but in the unexpressed idea, "Do you mean your remark in this way,—if this idea is added?" Hec. 809, *dic me orare ut veniat.* || *ad te?* "(Do you mean) to you?" Heaut. 778, *argentum dabitur ei ad nuptias, aurum atque vestem qui—tenesne?* || *comparet?* "get ready, do you mean?" Amph. 805, *ego accubui simul.* || *in eodem lecto?* || *in eodem.* Aul. 148, Ad. 536, Heaut. 905—about 12 in all. A relative clause may be added in this way, either with (see I. K.) or without *ne*. So Epid. 700, Mil. 973, with Brix's note, Ad. 530, Heaut. 1018.

There are a few places where a brief question is added, not depending upon what has been said, but using the framework of the previous sentence. Ph. 209, *quin abeo?* || *et quidem ego?* Rud. 1161, *ubi loci sunt spes meae?* || *immo edepol meae?* With these I should class a few brief demands, consisting of a word or two and immediately connected with the previous remark. Andr.

928, *ibi mortuost.* || *eius nomen?* Eun. 317, *color verus, corpus solidum*— || *anni?* Eun. 810.

Here belong finally all questions with *si* (*sin, verum si, at si, etsi*). Ph. 492, *nondum mihi credis?* || *ariolare.* || *sin fidem do?* Cf. esp. And. 348, *nuptiae mi*— || *etsi scio?* || *hodie*— || *optundis, tam etsi intellego?* About 10 cases.

3. If the main verb is in the second part of the question, then the first part may shrink away into an almost meaningless phrase, whose only function is to introduce with vividness the main question. This is the case with *ain?* which introduces an exclamatory repetition, with *audin?* introducing a command, and sometimes with *scin tu?* Also *quid?* is used most frequently before exclamations, *quid nunc?* before questions, and *quid ais?* before regular and somewhat formal questions. All of these occur often before questions without a particle, and it is probable that these words of themselves marked the following sentence as interrogative and made the particle unnecessary. In the same way, when two independent questions of similar form are used together, *ne* in the first would suffice for both; cf. Capt. 139, *egone illum non fleam? ego non defleam . . .?* with Brix's note. These are only continued questions, in which the second part has a main verb and has become grammatically independent, but is still so far dependent as to have no separate sign of interrogation.¹

E. P. MORRIS.

¹ Continued questions are common in Pl., but interruptions and supplementary phrases seem to be used much more frequently by Ter.