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I.

THE USE OF THE NEGATIVE IN CICERO'S LETTERS.

The purpose of this study of Cicero's Letters is to discover the facts regarding the use of negatives with the Indicative, Subjunctive, and Imperative Modes; to test the applicability of various statements made by grammarians, and, if necessary, to formulate new rules. The statistics were gathered only from those letters which were written by Cicero, not from those which were sent to him.

On the following page appears a general table of the negatives which were found in my examination of the Letters, to which it is perhaps well to prefix these remarks regarding the classifications:

1. The subjunctive of desire includes all those subjunctives which express an idea of will or wish.

2. The subjunctive of obligation and propriety, though undoubtedly derived from the subjunctive of desire (See page 47), having lost all idea of volition or wish, is classified in a division apart from the Independent Subjunctive of Desire. It will be noticed that there is one example of ne with this use of the subjunctive, but it is one of the only two examples of this kind in all Cicero.

3. There will be no attempt to distinguish between the forms neque, nec, or neve, neu, because it is evident that there is no syntactical difference between them. Emory B. Lease in his article "Livy's Classical Philology Volume 3, Part I, proved that the shorter forms were merely a later growth from the longer and were in part a matter of stylistic peculiarity with different authors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Et non</td>
<td>88:</td>
<td>I:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>I:</td>
<td>9:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non (modō)</td>
<td>754:</td>
<td>35:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>5:</td>
<td>3:</td>
<td>31:</td>
<td>87:</td>
<td>6:</td>
<td>8:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neque (nece)</td>
<td>754:</td>
<td>35:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>5:</td>
<td>3:</td>
<td>31:</td>
<td>87:</td>
<td>6:</td>
<td>8:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nihil</td>
<td>I99:</td>
<td>6:</td>
<td>I:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>23:</td>
<td>35:</td>
<td>2:</td>
<td>4:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nullus</td>
<td>I99:</td>
<td>6:</td>
<td>I:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>23:</td>
<td>35:</td>
<td>2:</td>
<td>4:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemo</td>
<td>I13:</td>
<td>2:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>I3:</td>
<td>I4:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>2:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuter</td>
<td>6:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>2:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>I:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nequisquam</td>
<td>2:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>I:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nihilo</td>
<td>I6:</td>
<td>I:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>I:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nihil dum</td>
<td>7:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non dum</td>
<td>36:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>I:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nec dum</td>
<td>5:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nusquam</td>
<td>8:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>I:</td>
<td>2:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numquam</td>
<td>9I:</td>
<td>I2:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>I6:</td>
<td>16:</td>
<td>3:</td>
<td>5:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutiquam</td>
<td>2:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>I:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haud</td>
<td>6:</td>
<td>I:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne quisdem</td>
<td>92:</td>
<td>6:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>1:</td>
<td>2:</td>
<td>I6:</td>
<td>16:</td>
<td>3:</td>
<td>5:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>I:</td>
<td>I6:</td>
<td>6:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>I60:</td>
<td>I83:347:</td>
<td>6:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neve</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>I:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nedum</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td>0:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The figures in this table show clearly that the negative for any idea other than that of desire is in general "non", (Hale: Buck 464,1; Bennett, 277,280,284,297), whereas in clauses of desire ne is the most common negative. (Hale: Buck 461,1; Bennett, 274,279,295, Allen and Greenough, 266,269,183). Other negatives, too, such as nihil, nemo, etc. are used infrequently in such clauses in comparison with the Indicative and other Subjunctives. It is in expressions of the latter two types, then, that details concerning the usage of negatives other than ne and neve are to be studied.

The first part (A) of my paper, therefore, will be devoted to a consideration of the uses of various negatives in the Indicative and the Subjunctive in statements and corresponding assumptions and questions; the second part (B) to a discussion of the negatives used with the Imperative and the Subjunctive of desire.

PART A.

I. Et Non and Neque.

There is no question that neque is used regularly instead of et non to connect a negative idea with a preceding idea. Et non, however, sometimes appears. Grammarians have attempted to explain it on the ground that non is used to modify a single word. Roby (2235) for instance says that et or ac non is used in clauses in which a single word is to be negatived, or which is intended as a correction of what has preceded.
Hale and Buck, 307, Sections 3 and 7, limits et (atque) non to those expressions in which a contrast is to be expressed or emphasis to be gained. His examples are "manere et non discedere", Caecil, 2.5; and "perinquum et non ferendum", Pomp. 22.63. The second example is evidently intended to illustrate what Hale means by emphasis. He might better have said that the non was used to negate a single word, for such is its function in relation to "ferendum", Lane(659) says that while neque was ordinarily preferred to et non, the latter was sometimes used in Cicero and Livy. He, however, attempts no explanation. There is then only one reason given by grammarians for the use of et (atque;-que) non instead of neque: the negation of a single word or phrase, sometimes for the sake of contrast or correction.

There are in all 99 passages in the Letters containing et (atque,-que) non as compared with 907 instances of neque. This means that in 90% of the examples in which a negative idea is joined to another idea, neque is used in preference to et non. An examination of the 99 examples (or the 10-) referred to above shows that in 77 at least the non negatives, a single word or phrase, as often as 47 times expressing clear contrast, and that in 22 the negative appears to modify the whole idea or clause rather than a single word or phrase. The examples are as follows:

Non as the negative of a single word or phrase.

Contrast.

I. Sum enim avidior etiam quam satis est gloriae et tamen non alienum est dignitate tua-, Fam. 9.I4.2.

3. Multi-sunt, non in suburbanis, non in hortis, non in ipsa urbe, et, si nunc sunt, non-erunt. Att. VIII, 38.

4. Id et nobis erit perìucundum et tibi non sane devium. Att. II, IV. 7.I.

5-6. Sed haec (legatio) et praesidii apud pudorem Pulchelli non habet satis et a fratris adventu me ablegat; ill a et munitior est et non impedit quominus adsim cum velim. Att.II, XVIII. 3, 8810.


10. Iam ista tua culpa est, qui verecundiam tecum extuleris, et non hic nobis cum reliqueris. Fam. 7.8.2. (XXVI).

II. Et hic eventus,-, non minori curae est quam tibi semper fuerunt casus mei.(Fam.VI.X. I.7).

I2. Teneor tamen,-, et mehercule non tam sum peregrinator iam, quam solembam. Fam. VI. XVIII. 5.5.

I3. Tu enim me afflixisti, tui me inimici tua me invidia, ac non ego te misere perdidì. Q. pr. I.III. I.6.

I4. Et mediocris quidem est visus consecutus, non in te sed magis in errorem meum,-, Fam. V.II. 2.5.
I5. Et qui quid attigi non feci inflammandi tui causa sed testificandi amoris mei. Fam. II. IV. 2.II.
I6. Simulque non de me is peius quam de te existimat. Fam. III. VIII. 7.IO.
I7. Magnas habet certe copias et habebit non Italiae vectigal, sed civium bona. Att. IX.XIII. 4.8.
I9. Atque hoc nonopinione timeo, sed interfui sermonibus. Att. IX.IX. 38.
22. Multisque in rebus mihi magno usui fuit et fides et prudentia, et, ut opinor, tibi in Alexandrino bello, quantum studio et fidelitate consequi potuit, non defuit. Fam. XIII. XVI: 3.I.
23. De Buthrotiis et tu recte cogites et ego non dimitto istam curam. Att. XIV.XI. 2.5.
26. Quo et ipse cupierat et ego non minus. Q.pr.III.II. 7.5.
27. Quod et magnam partem Italiae Caesar occupavit et nos non habemus exercitum tam amplum neque tam magnum quam ille. Att. VIII.XIII. C. 4I.
28. In Britanniam te profectum non esse gaudeo, quod et labore caruisti et ego te de rebus illis non audiam. Fam. VII.XVII. 3.10.
29. Eique legi letteras non tuas, sed librarii tui, Att. VI.VI. 4.I5.
30. Significavit sperasse se aliquid et id quod animum induerat paulisper non tenuit, sed - ad se rediet. Att. VII.III. I05.
31. Euyeypy tua consilia et tamen pro temporibus non in-cauta mihi valde probantur.
32. Contra dixit L. Torquatus omnibus-que libentibus non obtinuit. Q. pr. III.III. 2.II.
33. Miserias omnes in quas incidii per summam iniuriam et scelus non tam inimicorum meorum quam invidiorum. Att. III.VII. 2.7.
34. Cui et virtus illius non minus quam mihi nota est et haec ipsa studia,-, notiora; Brutus, I.XV. 2.4.
35. Si te Tarentum et non Samarobrivam missem. Fam. VII.XII.I.4.
36. Cum et illi cives optimi sint et ego ab ista laude non absim. Att. VIII.XID. IOI.
38. Si aut, quo die dixi sententiam, perfecta essent et non in diem exdiei dilata. Brutus, II.I. I.I5.
40. Scriberem, si aut tua humanitas expectaret, aut-pateretur, aut res verba desideraret ac non pro se ipsa loqueretur.
Fam. 3.2.2.
42. Nam caedam video,- et impetum-, et exsilium reditum et tabulas novas et turpissimorum honores et regnum non modo Romano homini sed nePersae quidem cuquam tolerabile, Att. X.VIII. I9.
43. Atque hoc non soluminte,- satis habebit sed etiam mihi ipse sua concessit voluntate. Att. IX.VII. 5.I4.
44. His te ita versari, ut et publicanis satisfacia et socios perire non sinas, divinae cuiusdam vitutis esse videtur. Q. fr. I. I. 33.9.
45. Atque hoc in illis tribunis pl. non laedebat; Att.III.XXIII.39. ( A law made by their own body was not binding on the tribunes; it was binding on the people).
46. Scripsi propter diligentiam cautionis meae in qua et maneo et manebo et, idem ut facis, non desistam rogare. Q.fr.I.II.4.I.

Without Contrast.

48. Sed volui-, et interea me esse in oculis civium-non alienum putavi; Att. IV. II. 84.
49. Et erat primi libri sermo non alienus a Sca#evolae studiis. Att. IV.XVI. 45.
51. Quaērē quomām comitia habita sunt, tuque nihil ad me scribis proinde habeto ac si scripsisses nihil esse, neque temporis non longinqui speductum esse, non moleste feram. Att. III. XIII. IO.

52. Disputas tu quidem et amanter et prudenter et a meis consiliis ratio tua non abhorret-, Att. XX. 2.4.


54. Is me nec proficiscentem Apameam prosecutus est nec cum postea in castra venisset, quide disceret, num quid vellem, rogavit et fuit aperte mihi nescio quare non amicus. Att. VI. III. 6.7.


56. Brevitas tuarum litterarum me quoque breviorem in scribendo facit, et vere dicam, non satis occurrit, quid scribam. Fam. XII.IX. I.2.

57. Sed Pańska fuere videtur de Clodio item-que de Dēstraro et loquitur severe, si velis credere, illud tamen non belle, ut mihi quidem videtur, quod factum Dolabellae vehementer improbat. Att. XIV. 2.6.

58. Et quidem iam etiam non obsoena verba pro obscoenis sunt: Fam. IX.XXII. 4.8.


60. Coponianam villam et veterem et non magnam novi,--,
Att. XII.XXXI. 2.4.
62. Omnia quae in tuis rebus agam et non laboriosa mihi et honesta videbuntur. Fam. V.XI. 2.II.
64. Tua mandata persequar diligenter et in adiugendis hominibus et in quibusdam non alienandis: Q. fr. II.XII. 2.2.
65. Acilius maximo meo beneficio est, et est non ingratus meque vehementer observat: Fam. VII.XXX. 3.4.
66. Est enim longum iter discendentemque te, non sine magno dolore dimittam; Att. XII.XVIII. 37.
67. Cosinius-valde mihi bonus homo et non levis et amans tui est et talis qualem-. Att. I.XIX. II.6.
68. Nam et semper me coluit diligentissimeque observavit et a studiis nostris non abhorret; Fam. XIII.XXII. I.3.
69. Quod est subinane in nobis et non ἁψυχοσεούμεν', id afficitur quadam delectatione; Att. II.XVII. 2.5.
70. Qui et tibi non privato et prore non privata sua, mittebantur; Fam. III.VIII. 4.I2.
72. Et ego te-, et tu me consiliario fortasse non impertissimo, usus esses,-- Fam. I.IX. 29.
73. Ut ea scriberem ad te, quae et saluti tuae conducere arbitrarer et non aliena esse ducerem adignitate. Fam.IV.VII. 1.'8
74. Et vidisse mihi multum videris-, et hoc tempore non solum sapiens, sed etiam beatus; Fam. VII.XXXIII. I.8.
75. Quamquam et Pompeio plurimum-debebam, et eum non solum beneficio sed amore etiam et perpetuo quodam iudicio meo diligebam,-- Fam. I.IX. 63.
II

76. Et non omnia nostra corpora opponimus? Att. VII.XXIII. 14.
77. Ac primum Graecis id quod acerbissimum est, quod sunt vectigales, non ita acerbum videri debet, propterea quod--.

2. Non, apparently the negative for a clause.

1. Et tamen Dionysius noster et, qui est nobiscum Nicias Cores non rebatur oppidum esse Piraea, Att. VII.III. II9.
2. Urgebar ab eo ad quem misi et non habebam exemplar. Q. Att. IV.VII.83.I. Tovy. III.VIII. 1.
3. Et longum est iter et non tatum et non video quid prodesse possis si veneris. Fam. XIV.XII. I.
5. Qui-numquam-putent, et, cum-dicant, ne malum habeat, non quo id natura rectum sit, non intellegant sè de callido homine loqui, non de bono viro. Att. VII.II. 44.
9. Sed ego--, non habeo-neque enim venalia sunt,--, et confici
nisi per hominem et peritum et diligentem non possunt,—Q.fr.

III.IV. 5.6.

I0. De Ocella parum ad me plane scripseras, et in Actis non erat. Fam. II.XV. 5.2.

II. Atque ego haec tam esse quam audio non puto, et,—Q.fr.

I.II. 9.10.

I2. Neque hanc vendituram puto,—et illud alterum quam sit difficile, te non fugit. Att. XII.XIII. 2.3.


I4. Atque haec non ego prīūs sum suspicatus quam mihi palam denuntiata sunt, neque eam pertimui,—quam—. Att. VIII.XI. d.90.

I5. Sed,—non possumus nisi hoc, non videri eam tuam esse dignitatem neque fidem omnibus cognitam, ut contra alterutrum,—arma feras, et hoc non dubitamus, quin—. Att. IX.VII. a.23.


I7. De Octavii conicione idem sentio quod tu, ludorumque eius apparatus et Matuis ac Postumius mihi procuratores non placent. Att. XV.II. 3.3.

I8. In hac solitudine careo omnium colloquio quumque mane me in silvam abstrusi deviam et asperam, non exeo inde auta vesperum: Att. XII.XV. 4.
I9. Nihil esse quod ad laudem attineat quod non tu optime perspicias et tibi non sine cuiusquam hortatione in mentem veniat quotidie. Q. fr. I.I. 45.II.

20. Si (comitia) facta erunt tabellarius non erit profectus, tota comitia perscribam. Att. IV.XV. 68.

21. Hos ego sermones, quod et multi sunt et tuam existimationem, ut ego, sentio, non offendunt, laccessivi numquam. Fam. III.VIII.

7. 10.


According to my interpretation, then, of the examples of et (atque,-que) non, in 78-% of the instances at least, the negative serves to negate a single word, very often for the sake of contrast. An examination of the examples of neque, however, shows that it too is used where there is apparently just as clear a negation of a single word or phrase, often in contrast. There are in all 57 examples at least of this use of neque. They are:

Neque used to negate a single word or phrase.

With Contrast.

I. Iacet in maerore meus frater neque tam de sua vita quam de mea metuit. Att. X.IV. 66.


5. Et tamen, mi Attice, auguria quoque me incitant quadam spe non dubia, nec haec collegii nostri ab Atto, sed illa Platonis de tyrannis. Att. X.VIII. 62.
6. Tanto me dolere adfecit, ut postea iacuerim, neque nunc tam pro se quam contra me laborare dicitur. Att. XI.IX. 37.
7. Itaque Homerus non Aiacem, nec Achillem, sed Vlixem appellavit πτόλεμορφον. Fam. X.XIII. 2. 8.
8. Atque haec non ego priusquam suspicatus quam mihi palam denuntiat sunt, neque ea tam pertimui, si subeunda essent, quam declinanda putavi, si honeste vitare possem. Att. VIII.XI. d.92.
11. Non queo ad te nec libet scribere-. Fam. XVI.II. I.
12. Non ego oppugnavi fratrem tuum, sed fratri tuo repugnavi, nec in te, ut scribis, animo fui mobili, sed ita stabili, ut-. Fam.
13. Dolebamque pilis et gladiis, non consiliis neque auctoritatis nostris de iure publico disceptari; neque ego, ea-, divinabam futura, sed - timebam-, Fam. VI.I. 5.10.
14. Ea sublata tota sunt, nec mihi magis quam omnibus,-. Fam. I. VIII. 3.II.
16. Nihil enim scribis; neque ego ad te his duobus mensibus scripsram; Fam. VII.IX. I.2.
18. Non possum dicere eum praefuisse neque possum negare afuisse. Fam. XIII.XXIX. 43.
19. Sed - affirmo - neque id ambitione adductus facio, sed-. Fam. XIII.XXXI. 2.2.
22. Itaque mirum in modum omnes a se bonos alienavit neque id magis amicitia Clodii adductus fecit quam studio perditarum reum atque partium. Att. I.XIV. 6.10.
23. Commemationem causarum abiecimus, nec tamen ad hanc insolentiam, sed ad illam tuam lauitiam. Fam. 9.20.I.
25; Abes diu - neque nos te fruimur et tu nobis cares. Att. II. I. 4.8.
27. Cumque ingressus essem dicere quid oportuisset - nec vero quicquam novi, sed ea quae cotidie omnes-. Att. XV.XI. 2.
28. Quam quidem ego eius petitionem gravissimus in senatu sententiis oppugnassem, neque tam illius laedendi causa quam defendendi atque ornandi Catonis; Fam. I.IX. I9.9.
29. Deinde ἀτονωτατοι esse me qui Romam omnino post haec arma non accesserim neque id tam periculi mei causa fecerim quam dignitatis. Att. XV.XXVI. I.12.


32. Tamen maximam laetitiam cepi, neque vero ob eam causam, sed mehercule, quod est. Fam. III.IX. 2.5.


34. Neque solum ea perspicis; quae geruntur quaeque iam gesta sunt, sed etiam qui cursus rerum, qui exitus futurus sit. Fam. IV.II. 3.

35. Venies enim, exspectatus, neque solum nobis, sed prorsus omnibus; Fam. IV.X. I.6.

36. Versorque, nec audio solum, quod ipsum esset miserum, sed etiam video, Fam. IV.XIII. 2.

37. Docuerunt. Neque id erat HS XXX, ut scribis, sed HS XIX; Fam. V.XX. 3.

38. Liberasti, neque solum ad tempus maximam utilitatem attulisti, sed etiam ad exemplum; Att. XIV.XVIII. a.8.

39. Tuas igitur exspecto, nec actorum solum, sed etiam futurorum. Att. XV.IV. 5.II.

40. Videtur fore, neque solum propter rei publicae, sed etiam propter anni tempus; Fam. IX.V. I.2.
41. Sciebam-, neque solum Romae, sed etiam Deli tuum videbam. Att. IX. IX. 100.
42. Neque Caesari solum, sed etiam amicis euis omnibus -, libentissime supplicabo. Fam. 6. I4. 3.
44. Cum iiro bellum gerit, neque solum cum Metello sed etiam cum Fabio. Att. II. I. 5.
45. Αἰσχρος Τρεις as nec solum cives, sed etiam amici officio revocor; Att. VII. XII. 28.
46. Nec id ad voluptatem refero sed ad communitatem - atque-. Fam. XX. XXIV. 3.

Without Contrast.
47. Non enim vidisses fratrem tuum, nee vestigium quidem eius nec simulacrum, sed quando effigiem spirantis mortui. Q. fr. I. III. I.
48-49. Quae ad nos nec obscurum nec vario sermone, sed et clarissima et una omnium voce perfertur. Fam. II. V. I. 6.
50. In quo omnia dicta sunt, neque vero hac in causa modo, sed constanter saepe in senatu: Fam. I. IX. 8.
51. Ac iam hoc loco non hortatione neque praeeptiss sed precibus tecum fraternis ago-. Q. fr. I. I. 412.
52. At etiam de te concionatur, nec impune: Fam. XII. XXII. I. 4.
53. Incredibile est, quanta me molestia affecerit. nec meher-cule ex ea parte maxime, nee, Att. XV. I. I. 2.
54. sequi in urbem recepit invitus; neque solum spe sed certa re iam et possessione deturbatus est meo iustissimo honestissimo convicio. Fam. XII. XXV. 2. 10.
55. Una, quod versabatur in hoc studio nostro, - , et cum ingenio, - , nec sine industria; Fam XIII.X. 2.8.
57. Ea quae ad nos magis pertinent, nec tamen multo; Att. XII.XI.

Of the 907 examples of neque, there are, 57 instances in which the negation of a single word or phrase appears, but of the 57, the neque is used 18 times in combinations of the solum-sed etiam type, twice with umquam, and once with quicquam - a total of 21. The combination neque solum - sed etiam is much preferred to et non solum - sed etiam, for to the 18 of the former, there are only 5 of the latter. Neque umquam and neque quicquam are also established idioms. So then, neque is to be expected in these 21 examples, and they should not be included in a comparison of neque with the 11 examples of et non in the negation of a single word or phrase. It appears, then, that neque was used aside from the exceptions mentioned, only about \( \frac{1}{3} \) as often as et non in the negation of a single word or phrase.

Further et non is used with comparative frequency in combination with a preceding et. There are in all 21 examples of this type, or 22% of the total number of et non's, whereas et-neque is found 32 times, or in 4% of the total number of neques'.

Again et non - et is used 5 times, or in 5% of the total number of non's; neque - et, 39 times, or 4% of the total number of neques'. We may say, then, that while Cicero used the et - et non combination 66% as often as "et-neque", he used "et non - et" only about 13% as often as neque - et.
Gildersleeve 480, R 3, N 3b, says that "neque - et" seldom used in early Latin was more frequently used by Cicero; and that "et - neque" was introduced by Cicero, who commonly used it. He, however, does not mention the "et - et non", "et non - et" combinations, and leads us to think that Cicero used "neque - et" much more frequently than "et - neque, although they stand in the ratio of 32 to 39. At the beginning of my investigation, I thought that the rather frequent examples of et - non might be explained, perhaps, as due in most cases to the fact that they occurred in combination with a preceding et. My theory, however was not substantiated by the final results. I found rather that the et non in the combination was due, except in perhaps 3 instances to the fact that the non was used to negate a single word or phrase.

Concluding Statements Regarding the Use of Neque Versus et non.

I. Neque is regularly used instead of et non to add a negative idea to a preceding idea.

2. When et non is used, the non usually exerts its force upon a single word or phrase.

3. Neque also may be used to negate a single word or phrase, but only about one half as often as et non.
The types most commonly found are, as the table shows, the "non modo-sed etiam", and the "non solum-sed etiam".

Roby (2240), tries to distinguish the meanings of these expressions, explaining that "non modo" is "not exactly", and "non solum", "not only". In the expression of some ideas, "non modo" is employed, he says, where "non solum" would be impossible: for instance in this passage, "quae civitas est in Asia, quae non modo imperatoris aut legati sed unius tribuni militum animos ac spiritus capere possit?" C. Man. 22. Surely the substitution of "non solum" would not alter the meaning. There is no reason apparently why any distinction should be attempted as to the general thought conveyed by the "non modo" and the "non solum" types.
Cicero, however, preferred "non modo." Aside from the "non (modo) (solum)-sed etiam" combinations, which appear with almost equal frequency, non modo is used in 74-% of the examples either in combination or alone; non solum, in 26-%.

The ratio of "non modo" to "non solum" when followed by ne-
quidem is much larger, for it is used 17 times as often. Re-
garding this expression, Hale 299, says that "When the phrase
"non modo (or "non solum")---sed ne-quidem" is used in a sen-
tence containing but a single verb, the second negative is felt throughout the whole' ("not only not - but not even").

His parenthesis makes his meaning clear, although his state-
is rather hazy. The word "whole" might apply to the sen-
tence or to the phrase under consideration. Roby, too, 2240.3,
is inexact for Cicero's letters, for he says that, "If a pred-
icate or other word is common to both clauses but stands with
the latter, the non after the modo or solum is frequently
omitted." In the letters, however, it is always omitted.

As to this detail of usage then we may say that in Cicero's
letters, "When the phrase non modo (solum) sed (verum) ne-
quidem is used with a common predicate or other word which
stands with the second half of the phrase, the meaning is
"not only not- but not even."

III. Non and neque quisquam etc., versus nemo, et nemo etc.
Nemo umquam etc. versus numquam quisquam etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Non quisquam etc.</th>
<th>versus</th>
<th>Nemo etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Non aliquid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nihil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non quicquam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Non Ullus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nullus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non aliquis quaedum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These figures agree with the grammarians, who unite in saying that nemo etc. is used more frequently than non quisquam. (See Lane 2403, Kühner Page 814 et seq. Gildersleeve 480). Kühner, moreover, makes the statement that "non quis quam" etc. was used in classical times when the two ideas of any and not were to be especially vivid and that they are usually separated by a word. Gildersleeve says that the longer form may be used in poetry, or to produce emphasis. The examples in the letters are as follows:

5. Tu esti non potuisti ullo modo facere, Att. XI.XXI. 4.
10. Non Mehercule quemquam audivi hoc gravissimo et pestilentissimo anno adolescentulum aut puerum mortuum, qui - Fam. V.XVI. 4.15.

II. Non possum existimare plus quemquam a se ipso quam me a te amerti; Fam. XV.XXI. 3.5.


II3. Quem cui nostrum non saepe praetulit? Att. IX.XIII. 85.

II4. Non enim umquam turpor - fuit, Att. I.I6. 3.V.

From these figures it is clear that exceptions to the rules concerning "nemo" etc. versus "non quisquam" etc. are almost negligible. The explanation tendered by Kühner and Gildersleeve - i.e. that the non followed by a positive such as "ullus", etc. is used to make the ideas of negation and indefiniteness more prominent - is fairly satisfactory. It is perhaps more accurate to say that such expressions are used when the negative is to exert its force especially on the verb (I,2,3,8), is to produce contrast (6,II,12), or is to make vivid the negative and indefinite ideas (4,5,7,16,14)

(II.) "Et nemo" etc. versus "Neque quisquam."

I. Et nemo 2 Neque quisquam 29
2. Et nullus, a, um 5 Neque ullus, a, um 43
3. Et nihil 0 Neque quidquam (quid) 36
4. Et (-que) numquam 2 Neque umquam 18
5. (et)-que nusquam 1 Neque usquam I

Grammarians agree that the negative copulative with a positive indefinite expression is far more common than the conjunction "et" or "que" with a negative indefinite.
Neither Hale, Kiihner, nor Gildersleeve suggests the possibility of deviation from the fixed order, and Lane merely says that Cicero and Livy "sometimes", caesar and Sallust "rarely" use the latter form of expression. The general rule holds true for the letters, for in comparison with the 127 examples which verify this rule, there are only 10 exceptions. Of the 10, five show an idea of contrast:—

1. Esti ea perturbatio est omnium rerum ut suae quemque fortunae maxime poenitent nemoque sit quin... Fam. VI.II. I.

2. Quod et Quintus, frater meus, legatus est Caesaris et nullum meum minimum dictum, non modo factum, pro Caesare intercessit. Fam. I.IX. 21.30.


5. Ille ipse,—, caedis initium quaeret nullamque etiam ob causam me auctoremuisse Caesaris interficiendi criminatur,—, Fam. XII.II. I.6.

Five examples, moreover, are used in the combination (que) et-et (que) nullus, etc.

I-2. See 2 and 4 above.

4. Quoniam et abes,—, et scribendi necessitas nulla est—.
Att. XII.XXXIX. 2.IO.
5. Et afui proficiscens in Graeciam et posteaquam de medio
cursu rei publicae sum voce revocatus, numquam per M. Antoni-
ium quietus fui,—. Fam. X. I.3.

Of the 127 examples of "neque quisquam" etc., there were
only 8 in which the combination "et-neque quisquam" etc appeared,
i.e. 6%. This number and percent seem small in comparison with
the 5 out of 10 examples or the 50% in which "et-et nemo" etc
was used.

In addition to the examples mentioned, there are two others:-
1. Hoc vero regnum est et ferri nullo pacto potest. Att.II.XII.I.2
2. Cognovi enim te gratissimum omnium idque numquam destiti
praedicare. Fam. V.XI. I2.

In these sentences there is apparently no idea of contrast,
nor is the combination "et - et nemo" etc used.

All then that may be said regarding the use of "neque quisquam"
etc versus "et nemo" etc in Ciceros' letters is that -
1. Neque quisquam etc is nearly always used in preference to
et nemo etc.
2. Usually when et nemo etc is used, it either follows an-
other et (que) or expresses a contrast.
3. Neque quisquam etc is used after a preceding et (que) more
often than et nemo, but proportionately with much less fre-
quency.
(III) Nihil umquam etc. versus Numquam quisquam etc.

I. Nihil umquam 22 Numquam quisquam 1

2. Nullus umquam 8 Numquam ullus, a, um 4
   Fam.III.II.3.II.Fam.V.VII.I.7.

3. Nemo umquam 8 Numquam quisquam, a, ic (adj) I
   Att.VIII.V.2I.

4. Nemo umquam 8 Numquam quisquam 1
   Att.IV.III.86.

For Cicero's Letters, at least, the statements of both Lane (See 2403 Lane) and Gildersleeve would have to be modified, for the one saus that nemo umquam is "generally" used for numquam quisquam; the other, that while in English "no one ever" or "never any one" etc may be used, in Latin, the former type is "invariable", as, for instance, "nemo umquam." The truth is that in the Letters, with the exception of "numquam ullus" etc, the "nemo umquam" type was almost always used. Just as in English, though it is more common to say "I have never seen anything more inspiring," yet it is not wrong to say "I have seen nothing at any time more inspiring," so Cicero said in Att.VII. XVII. "No one ever took away so much of the city's spoils" (nemo umquam), but in Att.VIII.IV.2. he said "never have I decreed this to any defendent." (numquam reo cuiquam).

IV. Nondum, Necdum, Nihildum.

These three negatives, which are of infrequent occurrence, are neglected by the grammars. Roby, 2334, however, says that necdum is used instead of et nondum. This is true, apparently, for there is not a single exception to the rule; but five ex-
amples to verify it. Further, although there were seven pas-
sages containing nihildum, there was not one instance of non-
dum quidquam, etc. Evidently, then, it was customary in Latin
to say "nothing yet" instead of "not yet anything"

V. Haud.

Of the six examples of hand, it is used twice with scio an,
one with the verb amo, and three times with the adjectives
(meliorI, Paulo 2). There is no instance of haud with a pro-
nominal adjective such as quisquam etc,- a usage which Kühner
(page 184 et seq) says is especially frequent. He agrees with
Bennet, however, in saying that Cicero seldom used haud except
in the phrase "haud scio an," The Hale and Buck (297-a) rule
is, on the whole, satisfactory,- In Ciceronian use it (haud)
was employed sparingly, and mostly to modify adjectives and
adverbs expressing quantity, kind, or manner. It is also
used with a few verbs such as scio and dubito.

VI. Ne-quiridem.

Ne-quiridem in the phrase non modo (solum)-sed has been dis-
cussed in section III of Part A. In general, it is used when
prominence is to be given to some word, phrase, or clause, and
this word, phrase, or clause is included within the ne-quiridem
compound. Further, this phrase exercises a negative force over
the whole clause in which it stands. When, however, it is used
with another negative of general force, it does not combine to
produce a positive, but strengthens the negative idea with some
special word, phrase, or clause.
Example:— Neque enim rogavit ne me quidem. Att.XI.XXIV.I3.

Non praetermittam ne illud quidem; Q.fr.II.V. 2.I.

When, again, the ne quidem directly modifies the verb, if a negative object follows, such as nihil, the whole has a positive force:— ex."Nihil iam ne inservio quidem."Att.IX.V. 45.

PART B.

I. Negatives used with the Imperative.

Prohibition was not expressed in Latin, as a rule, with the imperative and a negative. In all Cicero's Letters, there were only 8 passages containing both a negative and an imperative:— 4 with non, 2 with neque, 1 with nihil, 1 with ne-quidem. and, of the 8 negatives, only three could be supposed to modify a verb. They are:—

I. Habe tuum negotium nec quid res mea familiaris postulet quam ego non curo, sed quid velim et cur velim, exixtima. Att. XII.XXII. 3.

H. C. Elmer in his article on the Latin Prohibitive, Part II. in the American Journal of Philology, Vol.I5, says that the conjunction does not negate the meaning of the verb, but that the force of the negative is exerted upon the first quid clause. Bennett, however, in his reply to this article, cites this passage as an example of nec used with the imperative, affirming that the negative belongs naturally with the existima and that any other interpretation is forced. There is in this sentence,— even bennett must admit it,— a clear idea of contrast between "quid res mea familiaris postulet —", and "quid
velim et cur velim," and the meaning evidently is, "Manage your business and consider not what my estate, which I am not concerned about, demands, but what I desire and why." Since then, there is a contrast between these two ideas either neque or et non is the form of negative expression to be expected. If neve is ever used with sed to express a contrast, I should be pleased to see the example.

2. Ne paulum quidem me otium habuisse indicato. Q.fr. 2.I5. The ne-quidem in this sentence belongs with the infinitive clause.

3. Cura igitur nihil aluid nisi ut valeas; Fam. XVI.IV. 2.

There is no doubt that the nihil is the object of the imperative cura. This, then, is the only instance in Cicero's Letters in which a negative is used directly with an imperative.

The remaining examples of the negative indisputably belong with single words other than the verb. They are:

1. De Terentia ita cura, ut scribis, meque hac ad maximas aegritudines accessione non maxima-libera. Att. XII.XXIII.2.3.

2. Perge, mi Brute, et iam non cum aliis sed tecum ipse certa. Fam. XI.XV. 2.2.


4-5. Et illa scribe, non ex doctrina, neque ex libris. Att. X.XIV. I7.

Hale and Buck in their grammar (496 d) say that the Imperative was not used in prohibition except in early and legal Latin and infrequently in late prose. Evidently they did not intend section 464, Ia to apply to the Imperative, for there they say that, "ne-quidem, nihil, numquam, nemo, and nullus," are used with all kinds of mood ideas.
His former statement seems to be nearer the truth, for, as has been said nihil is the only negative which is used directly with an Imperative in the Letters.

Gildersleeve (274, I. Note) says that non with as imperative instead of the usual ne was found only in Ovid, but that the use of neque in the place of neve to connect one Imperative with another began in classical Latin and became more common later. He too cites the overworked example in Cicero, Att. XII. XXII. 3. nec-existima, which Bennett makes so much of and even Hale (464, I, b) uses as an exception to the rule regarding negatives with the imperative.

He, however, along with Bennett, Allen and Greenough, Lane, and Kühner, says that a negative of any sort with the imperative was very rare.

Elmer, in the article previously referred to, denies that neque with an imperative was ever used prior to Cicero, although neve was used 121 times (nearly all in laws). He says, also that in the period of Cicero, aside from Att. XIV. XXII. 3. I2, there is only one clear instance of neque used with the imperative and that in the Augustan period it was seldom used; that later on, the distinction between neve and neque broke down in poetry.

It is true that neque was almost never used with the Imperative, and never at all in Cicero aside from the nec-existima example, but it is also true that neve was avoided in classical Latin in this use, and in Cicero never appeared outside of laws.

Bennett in replying to Elmer declared that Elmer was mistaken in saying that neque was never used with the Imperative.
prior to Cicero, and cites a passage in the Spoletium inscription of the 2nd century B.C.; hence locicom ne quis violated neque exvehito neque experto, quod locui siet, neque cedito nisei, etc. Such instances, he agrees, can not be frequent, whereas neve was used as many as 121 times in early laws. When he made this latter atatement, he had evidently found other examples since his publication of "The Ayntax of Early Latin: The Verb", for in that book he mentions only 24 examples of neve (neu, neive, nive, Pages 364-365), with the imperative, all of them being included in 13 passages. Further, he gives 7 examples, which are intended to show neque as a connective between imperatives. Three of the seven, however, are not used to connect the verbs at all. They are:


2. Mirari noli neque me contemplarius; Poem II29.


The 4 remaining examples are contained in two passages, one, an inscription containing three examples; the other, a passage from a quotation in Livy's (Ver Sacrum). Lease in his paper on "Livy's Use of Neque and Neve with an Imperative or Subjunctive," says that there is one other example in Livy in an official document.

In early Latin, then, neve was used almost invariably with the imperative instead of neque. As for Cicero, however, neither was used to connect imperatives, for the only example of neve with imperatives is in a quotation from a law; the only one
of neque, is used for the sake of contrast.

As to the Letters, in particular, there is only one example of a negative used with the imperative (aside from Att. XIV. XXII. 8.I2), and that is nihil.

Instead of expressing prohibition in this way, Cicero in the Letters used the following devices:

| I. Noli (-ito) and the infinitive (nolito was used only once) | 30 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2. Cave (-eto) with the present subjunctive | 31 |
| I. Cave without ne | 18 |
| 2. Cave with ne | 1 |
| 3. Caveto | 2 |

III. Perfect Subjunctive with a negative.

| I. With ne | 14 |
|-----------------------------|
| 2. neque | 5 |
| 3. nihil | 6 |
| 4. nullus | 12 |

(5. non modo-sed ne quidem | 1)

4. Present Subjunctive (3rd person) with ne | 3
II. Negatives used with the Independent Subjunctive of Desire.

Table of Negatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prohibition</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Wish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neque</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nihil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nullus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne-quivem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in this table which are of especial interest are those relating to the frequency with which non, neque, nihil, nullus, ne-quivem are used with the prohibitive subjunctives. Ne or neve are the negative particles which are supposed to belong with such subjunctives. Some grammarians, indeed, do not admit the possibility of the appearance of other negatives with an independent volitive subjunctive. (F.N.I.A.G. 439-450. Sonnenscheim 316; Bennett 274, 275, 276. Bennett, however, in his Syntax of early Latin: the Verb does admit the possibility. Harkness 489-3). Burton (768-934), however, says that ne is used regularly, non rarely, and Lane (1543), that in negative subjunctive exhortations or commands, ne, nemo, nihil, numquam etc and rarely non are found. Roby (2229-2230), also, in his grammar says that non and nec (nec frequently in Ovid and Livy) are
occasionally found with an imperative or passive subjunctive instead of ne or neve, but he adds that independent or dependent expressions of desire, ne quis, ne quando, ne ullus, neculi; etc, are used instead of nemo, etc. The Hale and Buck grammar, (464), includes among the negatives used with ideas of desire, ne and neve (the sentence negatives), ne-quidem, nihil, numquam, nemo, nullus, and non (as the negative of a single word). He says further that exceptionally neque was used; in Cicero, often with independent prohibitions, occasionally in independent requests; that in poetry and "later Latin neque is used more freely for neve and even after negatives." and that "In double prohibitions neque-neque as well as ne-neve are occasionally used in all periods." Kühner (in his Ausführliche Lateinische Grammatik, III Band, I teil, Section 48), says that the negative for the subjunctive or will is nē or a word made of a compound with nē like nemo, nullus, numquam, nihil, etc., but that when a single word is to be negatived, non is necessary ("notwendig"). (F.N.I. the same section, Kühner says that in old and late Latin the distinction between ne and non broke down, and in proof gives examples of utīquam non in the subjunctive of wish. It is more probable that the non in such instances is due to the fact that such expressions originated in questions of Ideal Certainty. (See Hale and Buck's grammar 5II, I,N.I). He adds, also, that when an affirmative volitive is attached coordinately with a negative volitive subjunctive, neque is the copulative used, and neve appears in no instance in classical Latin in this use. After a negative imperative, however, or imperative subjunctive, an independent
vollitive expression was continued by neve, through analogy with final clauses. Neque-neque. again, was preferred to neve-neve as a correlative phrase with the subjunctive of will.

An examination of the Letters shows that:—

I. Ne, although it is by far the most commonly used negative is not the only one to be found with the independent vollitive subjunctive.

2. Non was not used except to negate single words other than verbs.

3. Although neve was never used with the independent vollitive, neque appears five times with the perfect subjunctive, et ne once, and ac ne once.

4. Nihil was used with the perfect prohibitive subjunctive instead of ne quid or quidquam; and nullus instead of ne ullus; but ne quid is used in the present subjunctive of command instead of nihil.

Following are the examples upon which these four statements are based:—

I. Ne.

1. Sed acta ne agamus, reliqua paremus. Att. IX.VI. 56.

2. Si ille queritur, si scribit ad amicos, si idem Fausta vult, Philotimus ut ego ei coram dixeram, mihiqne ille receperat, ne sit invito. Milone in bonis. Att.V.VIII.I9.

3-4. Et and ac ne

a. Haec ego ad te: tu, si quid novi - nam quotidie aliquid exspecto - confestim ad me; et, si movi nihil, nostro more tamen ne pumptiamur inter-mitti litterulas. Att. XIV.IV. 2.8.
5-6 Ne quid.


b. Si quid eiusmodi acciderit, ne quid tibi sit fama tibi sit fama mea potius; Att. XVI.II. 2.6.

7. Huic ego litteras ipsius arbitratusabo: eae te ne moverint; has scripi in eam partem, ne me motum putares. Att. XVI.I. 6.5.


9. Tu, si intervallum longius erit mearum litterarum, ne sis admiratus; Fam. 7.I8.3.


11. Planco et Oppio scripsi equidem, quoniam rogaras, sed, si tibi videbitur, ne necesse habueris reddere, -quum enim tua causa fecerint omnia, vereor ne meas litteras supervacanas arbitrentur-, Oppio quidem utique quem tibi amicissimum cognovi; verum, ut voles. Att. XVI.II. 5.4.

12. Jocum autem illius de sua egestate ne sis aspernatus; Q. fr. II.X. 5.3.
I3. Tu, mi frater, simul et ille venerit, primam navigationem, dummodo idonea tempestas sit, ne omiseris.


I5. Quidquid euisdem generis habebis, dignum Academia tibi quod videbitur, ne dubitaris mittere et arcae nostrae confidito. Att. I.IX. 2.5.


I7. Nam i Damon νομάλαν ἀργίας excusationem ne acceperis.
Att. V.XI. 63.

I8. Sed hoc ne curaris, Att. IV.XV. 42.


2. Non.

I. Sit lictor non suae sed tuae levitatis apparitor. Q. fr. I.I. I3.II.

2. Sit anulus tuus non ut vas aliquod, sed tamquam ipse tu, non minister alineae voluntatis, sed testis tuae; Q. fr. I.I. I3.4.

3. Non modo-sed ne-quidem; quod me de Bacchide statuarum coronis certiorem fecisti, valde gratum, nec quidquam posthac non modo tantum sed ne tantulum quidem praeterieris. Att. XV.XXXVI. 3.4.

3. Neque

I. Tametsi possum vel absenti recordare enim quibus laudationem ex ultimis terris miseris; nec hoc per-

2. Tu tamen, si quid de Hispaniis sive quid aluid, perqeq", quaeso, scribere, nec meas litteras expertaris, nisi cum, quo opto, pervenerimus, aut, si quid excursu. Att. X. XVIII. I2.

3. Quod me de Bacchide, statuarum coronis certiorem fecisti, valde gratum, nec quidquam posthac non modo tantum sed ne tantulum quidem praeterieris. Att. XV. XXVII. 33.

4. Alteris iam litteris nihil ad me de Attica sed id quidem in optima spe pono, illud accuso non te sed illam; ne salutem quidem. At tu et illi et Piliae plurimam, nec me tamen irascri indicaris. Att. XIII. XXII. II.

5. De Drusi hortis, quanti licuisse tu scribis, id ego quoque audieram, et ut opinor, heri ad te scripseram, sed quanti quanti bene enitur, quod necesse est: - Ad Siccam scripsi, quod utitur L. Cotta: si nihil conficeretur de Transtiberinis, habet in Ostiensi Cotta celeberrimo loco sed pusillum loci, ad hanc rem tamen plus etiam quam satis: id velim cogites. Nec tamen ista pretia hortorum pertimueris, nec mihi iam argento nec veste opus est nec quibusdam amoenis locis, hoc opus est. Att. XII. XXIII. 35.

4. Nullus


5. Nihil

I. Si quis est, in quo iam offenderis, dequo aliquid

2. De me nihil timueris, sed tamen promitto nihil. Att. IV.XVII. 58.


4. A Quinto fratre his mensibus nihil exspectaveris; nam Taurus propter nives - transiri non potest. Att. V.XXI. I97.

5. Indicabo enim tibi, tu illi nihil dixeris. Att.V.XI.58.


In all these examples the meaning appears to be volitive and any other interpretation seems to me to be forced. However convenient for some purposes a theory may be which excludes from volitive expressions all negatives other than ne, neve in sentence negation, and non, neque in word negation, facts rather than convenience or theory should determine a final opinion as to how a Roman expressed a negative command.

Elmer in Part I of his paper "The Latin Prohibitive" in the American Journal of Philology, Volume XV; in which he tried to establish the distinction in meaning between the present and perfect subjunctives in prohibitions, excludes all examples used with nec, numquam, nihil, because, as he said, there are "serious objections to explaining any one of those introduced by nec (neque) in the best prose writers, and some of those introduced by nihil, numquam, as instances of the same construction
as that found in "nefeceris".

Later in the same volume of the American Journal of Philology appeared his second paper dealing with "The Latin Prohibitive," in which he tried to prove that the examples of nec with the perfect subjunctive, which had been regarded as prohibitions, could not be volitive, and secondly that they should be classified as subjunctives of Obligation or Propriety. In introducing the destructive half of his discussion, he says that "the best starting point to discover to what extent neque (nec) was used in prohibitions will be found in expressions whose prohibitive character is beyond all question, viz. expressions in which the verb is in the imperative, or, if in the subjunctive, preceded by another verb which itself is introduced by ne or neve." Then he enters into an examination of these types of expression.

I. First, he declares that neque was never used with an imperative prior to Cicero, although neve was found at least 121 times, and that it appears only once in the Ciceronian period (Cic.Cat.8.10), aside from the "nec existima" (Cic.Att.XIV.XXII.3.12), example in Cicero's Letters in which the nec is apparently used for the sake of contrast. Further, he shows that it remained rare during the Augustan period, but "by the time, however, of Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid, the old distinction between neque (nec) and Neve (neu) had broken down, and the one was used almost as freely as the other with the imperative. But from first to last the use remained a poetical license."
Bennett in his reply to Elmer (which appeared in Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. IX), and in his *Syntax of Early Latin, The Verb,*" proves that neque was used, tho' rarely, with the imperative prior to Cicero. (See pages 30-31 of his paper). Elmer, therefore, seems to be inaccurate in regard to this one matter. Further the fact that Cicero did not use neque with the imperative (except in the nec-existima" example) has no significance, aside from substantiating the truth that a prohibition in classical Latin was very rarely expressed by a negative with the imperative, because Cicero did not use neve any more often than neque with an imperative.

2. Secondly, Elmer considers the use of the subjunctive in prohibitions. Only when a ne or neve has preceded, according to him, is it certain that a prohibition is expressed. That seems to me, however, to be no more of a test than if an imperative should precede, whether it be a negative or not. Nevertheless, having accepted as the only proof as to the volitive character of an independent subjunctive, the presence of a preceding ne, or neve, he points to the fact that of all the examples with nec and the perfect subjunctive which have been regarded as prohibitions, not one is preceded by a ne or neve. In his own words, "In not one of the examples has anything preceded that even suggested a prohibition." I should like to call his attention to this passage which he himself quotes among his examples:

Ad. Att. 10.18.2. Tu tamen, perge, quaeso scribere, nec meas litteras exspectaris, nisi cum quo opto pervenerimus,
aut si quid excursu."

Surely the imperative "perge" although not itself a prohibition, leads the reader to expect that the perfect subjunctive coordinated with it is likewise a command, in this case negated. The shift from the imperative to the subjunctive mood, may very well have been due to a disinclination of the part of Cicero to combine a negative with the imperative.

It seems to me unnecessary, however, that a ne or neve, or even an imperative precede a perfect subjunctive with neque (nec) in order that its volitive character may be evident. The context, in a more general sense, must indicate what meaning the author is trying to express. For that reason, although none of the examples of nec with the perfect subjunctive which I have classified as prohibitive, follows a ne or neve, I consider myself justified in regarding them as volitive expressions.

Elmer next tried to prove that neque was never found with a passive subjunctive connected with a prohibitive accompanied by ne. Bennett in his article "Elmers' Theory of a Subjunctive of Obligation or Propriety" quotes 9 in disputable examples of this sort in Plautus and one in Terrence. (F.W.I. Cornell Studies in Class, Phil. No. IX).

3. The third argument which Elmer presents, is that fact that certain writers who never used ne with the perfect subjunctive in prohibitions, use neque and the perfect subjunctive. Ovid, for instance, although he never used ne with the perfect, used nec eleven times in clauses very similar to those in Cicero. The same condition holds true, he says, of Vergil, Tibullus and Propertius. Again, in the orations of
Cicero, in which ne never appears in this construction, except once in a quotation, nec was used several times. For the sake of fairness, it seems to me, Elmer should have mentioned at this juncture, however, the fact that in the Letters, there are 13 examples of ne with the perfect subjunctive to five of neque. Cicero, then, so far as the Letters go, is not to be included among those, who, though freely using nec with the perfect subjunctive, used ne with the prohibitive, seldom or not at all.

Bennett denies that these facts mentioned by Elmer, regarding the usage of various authors, have any bearing on the problem, for they were probably due, he says, to a natural idiosyncrasy. This appears to me a reasonable explanation, substantiated by the fact that even within the different works of a single writer such as Cicero in the Orations and the Letters ne (perf. subj.) may not be used at all in one set of writings, but frequently in another set. (F.W.I.Cornell Studies in Class. Phil. No.IX) (F.N.2. See preceding paragraph).

4. The next step in Elmers' argument against the interpretation of nec with the perfect subjunctive as an expression of prohibition rests upon the meanings of verbs used in such constructions. He says that although verbs denoting mental action with two or three exceptions were not used in prohibitions in the perfect subjunctive prior to the period of decline, 15 out of 38 examples of nec with the perfect subjunctive, covering all literature from the earliest times to the Augustan period, are verbs of mental action. Bennett observes that the fifteen all belong to the century and a half after Plautus, and says that the
original use of the tense was probably extended later in the language. It evidently had been extended by the time of Cicero's Letters, for of the 13 examples of ne with the perfect subjunctive 7 or 54% are verbs of mental action: they are, repudiariis, putaris, curiaris, dubitaris, habueris (in the sense of consider), sis aspernatus, sis admiratus. The fact, then, that 15 out of 38 examples of nec with the perfect subjunctive in Latin literature extending to the period of decline, are verbs of mental action, has no weight in proving that they are not prohibitive in character.

5. The last part of the destructive half of Elmers' article attempts to show that "neque is never used by Cicero to negative the subjunctive in purpose clauses or in any other dependent volitive clauses." He prefaces his attempted proof by saying that "every purpose clause is at the same time a result clause as well." Then he gives examples in English to prove his statement:

I. I wish to train my children properly that they may in after years be honored citizens. (Result)

In (1) Elmer says that the speaker by the use of "that" and "may" shows that the idea of purpose is uppermost in his mind; in (2), but the use of "so that" and "will" that the idea of result is uppermost.

To me, however, it seems clear that both these sentences express purpose, and that they, at least, do not tend to prove Elmers' contention that every purpose clause is a result clause.

Elmer next points out the difficulty sometimes met in dis-
tinquishing a clause of purpose from one of result. Altho' his examples were not well selected for proving his point, it is undoubtedly true that there is sometimes such a difficulty. That fact, however, does not prove that it is impossible ever to be sure as to whether a clause expresses purpose or result - a proof which was necessary, it would appear, if Elmer expected metamorphose all purpose clauses containing negatives other than ne, neve, in sentence negation, or non, neque in word negation into clauses of result.

Third, Elmer maintains that sometimes a dependent clause, the volitive character of which is shown by its negative, is used where a result clause would be expected. Several examples from Brix were given as illustrations. Not one of them, however, as correctly Bennett observes, need imply result rather than purpose. The presence of "ita" seems invariably to cause Elmer to expect a clause of result.

Finally, Elmer contends that a result clause is used occasionally where a purpose clause would be expected. The presence of a neque in the dependent clause seems to have influenced his interpretation, for all of them are naturally interpreted as purpose. Bennett (F.N.I. Cornell Studies No. IX) discusses the examples at considerable length, and also arrives at the conclusion that they express purpose. Two of the passages are so clearly volitive that it may be well to quote them, merely as illustrations of what Elmer regards as a result clause.
I. Cic. in Caecil, I6.5.2. Qui si te recte monere volet suadebit tibi ut huic discedas neque mihi verbum illum respondas.


As Bennett observes, if these dependent clauses express result, we should be justified in expecting to find sometime clauses like this, "suadebit ut non respondas" or "commonefaciunt ut non-cogat," which do not occur. He admits that there is one sentence in the list given by Elmer, in which the dependent clause might possibly be regarded as result. It is as follows:-Cic. de Off. "Efficiendum autem est ut adpertitus rationi oboediant eamque praecurrant nec propter pigritam aut ignaviam deserant." But is this not a very clear expression of will?

Toward the close of his discussion of purpose clauses and other volitive expressions, Elmer attempts to explain the presence of neque in parenthetical purpose clauses on the ground that it is due to the lack of any real idea of purpose in the stereotyped parenthetical clause, as:-

I. Verr. II.3.4.8.II5. Nunc ut hoc tempore ea---praetermittam, neque eos appellem, a quibus omne frumentum eripuit, ---quid luci fiat cognoscite;

2. Ib II.4.20.45. Ut non conferam vitam neque existimationem tuam cum illius hoc ipsum conferam, quo tu te superiori interitis.

3. Id de imp. Cic. Pomp. I5.44. Itaque ut plura non dicam neque aliorum exemplis confirmand quantum auctoritas valeat in bello, ab eodem Cic. Pompeio omnium rerum egregiarum exempla sumantur.
It seems plausible that the presence of non may be explained as due to lack of volitive feeling, but I agree with Bennett, who says that the neque does not require any such explanation, in as much as it has been shown to be used in other volitive clauses.

Next, Elmer calls attention to the use of non and neque to modify a single word in any mode. Though ne may also be used with single words it indicates, according to him, that the verb is absolutely negatived, and that the action is not to take place "under any conceivable circumstances," whereas if neque is used, "the act is to take place, but with certain restrictions, and it is these exceptions and restrictions that are introduced by the negative in neque. When the feeling of negative volition extends over the whole clause, and everything in it, and all the negatives partake of the volitive coloring, we have neve." It is true, as he says, that neque in the examples quoted by him, has the significance which he points out, but what of the fact that "neque--neque", not "neve--neve" is used with verbs in a correlative sense?

Finally, Elmer considers those questions, containing non or neque, known as deliberative and supposed to be of volitive origin. They are, he asserts, not deliberative at all, and compares "ne doleam" "ne iaceam" Cic. ad. Att.XII.40. with cur ego non laeter? the former of which he avers, expresses the operation of will, whereas the latter has no idea of will whatsoever. The comparison, however, is not valid, for as Bennett noticed. the "ne doleam" and "ne iaceam" are dependent volitlives. (F.N.I. The passage from which they were
taken is as follows:— Cíc.ad.Att.XL.40. Quod scribis te vereri, ne it gratia et auctoritas nostra hoc meo maerore minuatur, ego, quid homines aut reprehendant aut postulent nescio: ne doleam? qui potest? ne iaceam? quis umquam minus? Elmer, himself, later admits that there is no example of ne with a deliberative subjunctive. But, disregarding all this Elmer says that non with the Subjunctive in true deliberative questions is never found; that when it appears in so called deliberative questions in the present subjunctive, "the context shows that the question is settled already, and so is purely rhetorical in character and equivalent to a negative assertion of obligation or propriety or possibility, or else asks for information anticipating in reply, an assertion of obligation or propriety or possibility."

Granting that there is no example of non with a true deliberative, and that questions, generally classified as deliberative, may in many cases be translated by an expression of "obligation or propriety or possibility," I see no reason for denying that they may have sprung from the volitive. Bennett suggests the plausible explanation that the negatative questions of the type "did not spring into being until the affirmative ones had lost their volitive force and had become a mere rhetorical way of making an assertion." He supports his view by the fact that non supplanted ne in quamvis clauses, adversative ut clauses, and clauses of proviso with dummodo in later Latin, all of which are clearly of volitive origin. It seems inconsistent that Elmer is not willing to grant that non could be used in these so called deliberative clauses, which, though
apparently of volitive origin, had lost their volitive force, when in his explanation of the appearance of neque in parenthetical purpose clauses, he says that the negative was possible, because the clauses were merely stereotyped expressions, without real volitive feeling.

So then, Elmer has presented five objections to considering neque with the perfect subjunctive as an expression of prohibition. His arguments, however, have all been shown to be fallacious.

Nevertheless, supposing that he had made valid his position, he tried to show that the perfect subjunctives with neque are examples of obligation or propriety, a modal force, originating, as he believed, not in the volitive subjunctive, but in the subjunctive of contingent futurity. In as much as Bennett in his reply has ably proved that Elmers' arguments in support of his theory are not tenable, and since, after it has been shown that there is no valid reason for refusing to accept the examples of neque with the perfect subjunctives as prohibitives, it will not be to the advantage of my discussion, to argue as to the origin of the subjunctive used in the sense of obligation and propriety. I shall content myself with presenting my conclusions as to this function of the subjunctive:

I. The subjunctive of obligation or propriety in questions probably developed from purely volitive questions. In this use it is very often introduced by such words as quid, quidni, quae, quamobrem, and cur. The first person present was most common in classical prose, but there was a gradual extension into all tenses and persons.
2. The subjunctive expressing obligation or propriety in statements was probably an outgrowth of the subjunctive of command. When an expression of the will is thrown into the past, it becomes an expression of past obligation. "You are to do" becomes "you were to have done", or "You ought to have done." After the idea of obligation was established in the imperfect and pluperfect subjunctive, it probably spread into the present and perfect to some extent. With the loss of volitive signification, the negative ne was superseded by non, the negative of statements. Two examples of ne with the pluperfect subjunctive survive in Cicero, (F.N.I. Verr.2.3.84."neemisses" Ad.Att.2.I3."aut ne poposcisses"), which verify this theory of the origin of the subjunctive of obligation and propriety in statements. Elmer was inclined to deny the validity of these examples, apparently because they did not fit in with his theory. He said that if we accepted them, we should have to translate the examples of ne with the perfect subjunctive as obligation or propriety. Although that does not follow, yet I should be ready to translate the perfect subjunctive in that way, whenever the context warrants it. Until satisfactory evidence has been produced against regarding these two passages as bona fide instances of commands thrown into the past, I prefer to accept them as valid.

As to the examples of neque with the perfect subjunctive with which the controversy between Elmer and Bennett began, I wish to state my opinion in summary as follows:--

There is no reason why they should not be accepted as valid instances of negative commands,-- an interpretation which is in every example satisfactory. Cicero undoubtedly used neque in-
stead of neve to connect an independent subjunctive prohibition with a preceding statement or command. Bennett in his reply (Cornell Studies No. IX) to Elmer has this to say as to the way in which such a usage may have arisen:—

I. "The correlative use of "neve-neve" with verbs never developed in Latin." "When desirable to express 'neither on the one hand - nor on the other', in connection with the volitive subjunctive, "neque-neque" is the only instrument available."

2. "Again, if a Latin writer wanted to say 'on the one hand I will not conceal anything from you, and on the other, don't you conceal anything from me', the first neque inevitably leads to a second neque, even with prohibitives."

3. If a writer wished to say 'on the one hand let us not measure virtue by high sounding words, and on the other, let us count as good, those men who are so considered', he would naturally say "neque, (not neve)---vicosque" just as Cicero did in Laelius 6.21 (Cornell Studies No. IX.).

Bennetts' conclusion which seems to me very reasonable that once neque was used in one prohibitive expression, it would almost certainly extend to others. Language is elastic. There is no always syntax.

Other negatives, which I found to be used with the independent subjunctive of command were "nihil and nullus". Elmer, again, is unwilling to accept such examples as prohibitive, preferring to explain them as obligation or propriety. The differing opinions of various grammarians were presented at the beginning of the discussion of the Independent Subjunctive of Desire. (See Page 33). I am convinced, however, that these examples are of volitive character, because
I. Such an interpretation is the natural one in view of the context in each instance.

2. Cicero used nihil at least once with the imperative. (F.N. See Page 28)

3. Cicero used both nihil and nullus, though sparingly, in dependent volitive clauses. (F.N.5. See Page 74)

The examples upon which my conviction was based are as follows:

1. De me nihil timueris, sed tamen promitto nihil. Att. IV.XVIII. 58.

2. Indicabo enim, tu illi nihil dixeris. Att.V.

3. A Quinto fratre his mensibus nihil exspectaveris; nom Taurus propter nives - transiri non potest. Att. V.XXI. 197.


One fact which might create a doubt as to the volitive nature of the preceding examples is this:—Although there are two examples of "ne quid" with the present prohibitive subjunctive, there is no instance of nihil. This I believe to be due to the influence of analogy. In dependent expressions of desire, in which the present tense is often used, the perfect infrequently, ne quis etc (See Page 74) was used instead of nemo etc.
These clauses were of common occurrence, too. So then, due to the influence of this construction, "ne quid", etc. was slow in being supplanted by nihil etc in the present subjunctive prohibitions. In the perfect, however, which had not this check of a construction similar to it in form, the nihil etc. had gained the ascendancy over the "ne quid" etc, in Ciceros' time. Indeed in the 13 examples of ne with commands in the perfect subjunctive, there is not one indefinite, pronoun or adverb.

According, then, to the facts as they are found in the Letters, the Independent Subjunctive in Prohibition is most often accompanied by ne, but with the perfect neque and nihil are frequently used. In the present, however, ne is invariable, except for two instances in the negation of a single word.

As to the expression of a negative wish in the Independent subjunctive, the table (Page 33) shows that, unless utinam is used, ne is always found but that with utinam non is more common than ne. I am inclined to agree with the statements in Hale and Buck, (5.II.I.N.I), to the effect that these subjunctives with utinam are by origin questions in the Potential Subjunctive. (I prefer, however, to say, instead of Potential Subjunctive, Ideal Certainty with Potential force.)

III. Negatives Used With the Dependent.

Subjunctive of Desire.

The statistics on page two of this discussion show that ne is used far more often than any other negative in dependent clauses of desire. To a total of 330 instances of ne in such clauses there are only 19 of non, which stands next in order
of frequency. These nineteen examples, which will be discussed later, (F.N.I. See Page 62), seem few; indeed, in comparison with the 134 used in result clauses, or the 378 found in other dependent subjunctives. Grammarians necessarily accept the truth that ne is the negative commonly used with ideas of desire. They are at variance, however, concerning the extent to which other negatives are used and the explanation, in case explanation be necessary, of the usage. Elmer, for instance, is unwilling to admit the presence of any negative other than ne or neve in expressions of desire, except for the negation of single words, while Hale (F.N.2. Hale and Buck, 464. I.a.), at the other extreme, makes the sweeping statement that ne-quidem, nihil, numquam, nullus, and non when used as the negative of a single word are used with all modal ideas. Neither of these views is correct, for on the one hand, as I shall try to show, various negatives other than ne or neve, or non and neque as negatives of single words, were used with the dependent subjunctive of desire; on the other, they were not commonly so used.

In my discussion of the facts concerning the negatives used with dependent clauses of desire in the Letters, I shall take up in order the details as to which there is a difference of opinion:—1st. ne versus ut ne; 2nd. ut non versus ne; 3d. ne non versus ut; 4th. ut nemo etc. versus ne quis etc; 5th. negative conjunctions used within the clauses.

I. Ne versus Ut Ne.

In regard to the formal matter as to the use of ut ne in the place of ne, Gildersleeve (F.N.I.Gildersleeve 540.R.I.) says, "Ut ne is found for ne with apparently no differencein
signification, occasionally at all periods, but not in Caesar Sallust, Livy, in clauses of purpose. Later (F.W.2.Gildersleeve 546.R.3.) he observes that in "complementary final sentences" "Ut ne is not used after verbs of negative signification, as impedio, 'I hinder', recuso, 'I refuse'. Otherwise there seems to be no difference in meaning between it and ne, except that sometimes the ne seems to apply more to a single word in the sentence."

In the Allen and Greenough grammar, (F.N.8. Allen-Greenough 563.e.n.2.), the statement is made, that in "Subjunctive clauses of Purpose", "ut ne occurs occasionally with verbs of caution and effort". It is implied, however, (F.N.4.Allen and Greenough 53I-53I,I), that there is no distinction between the use of the two in clauses of true purpose, except that the ne is used more frequently than the ut ne, for the latter is enclosed in parentheses after ne in the general statement.

Sloman (F.N.5.Sloman 52I,n) differentiates the two expressions in this way: "Ut ne would seem to be specially used by Cicero in negative sentences of 'contemplated Result'; 'finge, aliquid saltem commode, ut ne plane videaris id facere', (Cic. Rosc.A.I9.54.), 'at least makes some plausible pretence, that you may not be clearly proved to be doing that.' "Later, he says, "In one remarkable passage Cicero seems to use 'ut ne' for reasons of euphony, to avoid the repetition of non; ex. 'quo efficitur non ut voluptas me sit voluptas, sed ut voluptus non sit summum bonum.' (Cic.Fin. 2.8.24.) 'the result is not that pleasure is made other than pleasure, but that pleasure is shown not to be the highest good.' Ut ne is not used
by Caesar, Sallust, or Livy."

Lane (F. N. I. Lane 1947) in his general statement regarding the negatives used with the subjunctive of purpose says," in these the negative is ne, or sometimes ut ne-----. Ut ne, though used at all periods (not by Caesar, Sallust or Livy), is chiefly found in older Latin; afterwards ne alone took its place." His explanation of ut ne appears in a preceding section of his grammar (F. N. 2. Lane 1706); about as follows:-

Ne was originally an adverb, but because it came to be used frequently in hypotactic construction, developed from original paratactic expressions such as "metuo, ne ferret," (Pl. Per. 6:24), or "vide, ne me ludas", (Pl. An. 325), it acquired the force of a subordinating conjunction, and supplanted "the less usual ut ne." Assuming, as seems plausible, that the ut in all complementary clauses of desire is purely formal, (F. N. 3.

Hale and Bück), a superfluous addition borrowed from clauses of purpose, we may expect the "ut ne" construction to appear with comparatively less frequency than in purpose clauses in which the "ut ne" was the original expression employed to express negation. These is in reality the case, according to the figures which Bennett gives in his "Syntax of Early Latin: The Verb". He cites 384 examples of ne (ut ne) in "substantive" clauses of desire, of which I found 29, or 8-%, to be ut ne. From 278 expressions of purpose, however, there are 24, or 9-% instances of ut ne to 254 of ne alone. Very similar are the relative percents for Ciceros' Letters. Out of 347
complementary clauses of desire, containing ne (ut ne), 26 or 7%, employed "ut ne"; 32I, ne alone. Of the 182 negative purpose clauses, however, in which ne (ut ne) was used, 14 or 8% show "ut ne"; 168, ne alone.

From an examination of the examples of ut ne, which appear in Cicero's Letters, however, I have decided that there were other factors which had far more weight in determining whether or not ut ne was to be used by Cicero. Allen and Greenough says that one of these factors is the presence of a verb of caution or effort before the dependent clause, implying, it would seem, that the ut ne had a special predilection for appearing in such a context. Out of all Bennett's 29 examples of ut ne after governing verbs in "The Syntax of Early Latin; The Verb", there are only two preceded by a verb of caution or effort (as A. and G. seems to interpret caution and effort). Those two were "curo" and "prospicio." In Cicero's Letters, ut ne was represented by 6 examples after verbs of caution or effort (curo, operam dare, provida) from a total of 26 instances of ne (ut ne) in complementary clauses of desire.

The use of "ut ne" instead of, then, it would appear, not governed by the presence or absence of a verb of caution or effort.

Sloman, as he has been previously quoted, believes that Cicero used "ut ne" especially in sentences of "contemplated Result". I object to dividing purpose clauses into those of real purpose and those of "Contemplated Result;" because every purpose clause expresses a looking forward to the achievement of some aim or desire. What does purpose mean except the contemplation of some result to be secured in a time future to that in which the contemplation is indulged in?
Sloman, then, has failed to find out what determined the use of ut ne. (F.N.I. I failed to refer to what he said regarding euphony in the example quoted from Cicero in the beginning of this discussion. I agree with him that euphony did cause Cicero to use ut non in one of two parallel clauses and ut ne in the other. But, I also agree with him, that such an example is "unusual". We must therefore find some other explanation for the use of "ut ne").

There are certain characteristics revealed, however, in Cicero's use of "ut ne" in the Letters, which lead me to think that there is an explanation for this usage, at least. These facts are:-

I. Out of the 40 examples of ut ne in purpose clauses and complementary clauses of desire, in 19 instances the position of the ne is immediately before the verb, which it seems especially to modify. In four of the nineteen passages, moreover, there is a clear idea of contrast. The examples are:-

**Purpose.**

a. At ego abii postridie a villa ante lucem, ut me omnino illi ne viderent quid enim erat in tribus cohortibus? Att. X.xvi. 36.

b. Hoc ut tui necesarii sciant, hoc me animo erga te esse, velim facias eos per litteras certiores ut, si quid tibi opus sit, ne dubitent mihi iure suo denuntiare. Fam. XIII.LXXVI. I.16

c. Tu ita fac cupidus mei videndi sis, ut istimne te ne moveas tam infirma valetudine, nisi --. Fam. V.xxI. 5.9.

d. Dedito autem a me et ut a magistris ne abducam et quod mater Porcia non discedit; Q.fr. III.IX. 9.2.
e. Eus tamen nisi ad te exemplum, ut, si minus placeret, ne mitteres. Att. XII.XVIII. 28.

f. Sed pergo praeterita, verum tamen ob hanc causam, ut, si quid agetur legem illam, in qua popularia multa sunt, ne tangatis. Att. III.XV. 83.

Complementary Clauses of Desire.

g. Peto---ut---operamque des,--, ut socrus adolescentis rea ne fiat. Fam. XIII. 9.

h. Opera datur, ut indicia ne fiant. Q.fr. III.II. 3.7.

i. Tu illud admoneo, ut, si hoc plene vitare non potes, quod ante occupatur animus ab iracundia, quam providere ratio potuit, ne occuparetur, ut te ante compares-. Q.fr.I.I.38.I7.

j. Attalus Hypaepenus mecum egit, ut se ne impedires, quo minus----. Q.fr.IV. I4.2.

k. Trebatio-que mandavi, ut, si quid tu eum velles me mettere, ne recusaret. Fam. IV. 2.II.

l. Quidquamme me putas curare -, nisi ut ei ne desim?
Att. XIII.XX. 4.8.

m. Rogavit, ut.eam ne oppugnarem. Fam. I.IA. 9.22.

n. Te hoc nunc rogo ut explores ad quam diem hic ita possim esse ut ne opprimar. Att. XII.XXXII. I.

Contrast in Purpose Clause.

0. Contra mehercule meum judicium et contra omnimun antiquorum auctoritatem, nec tam ut illa adivuem, quam ut haec ne videam cupio discedere. Att. IX.VII. 47.

Contrast in Complementary Clauses of Desire.

p. Contendo ut Ciceronem meum nedimittas tecumque deducas.
I.IX. 2.2.
q. Cupio iam vigiliam meam, Brute, tibi tradere, sed ita, ut ne desim constantiae meae. Fam. XI.xxiv. i.10.

r. Sed tamen te rogo, ut ne intermittas scribere ad me, quidquid erit, eosque, qui, mihi tam crudeler inimici sunt, si odiose non potes, accuses tamen -. Att. xi.x.23.

s. Te oro, ut, quibus tui mei indigebunt nostris, ne desis. Att. III.xxvii. 3.

2. Of the remaining 21 examples of ut ne, the ne stands immediately before the indefinite quis, qua, quid (qui, quae, quod) in I6. They are:-

a. Epistulas non solum ea causa est ut ne quis a me dies intermittatur -. Att. viii.xii. 7.

b. Ut ne quis propter exercitus cupiditatem Alexandram vellet iri. Fam. i.iv. 2.4.

c. Nam de puero Clodeo tuas partes esse arbitror-ut eius animum tenerum, quem ad modum scribis, iis opinionibus imbraxas, ut ne quas inimicitias residere in familias nostris arbitretur. Att. xiv.xiii. 4.4.

d. Et, ut ne quid praetermittam, Caesonius ad me litteras misit, postumiam - venisse. Att. xii.xi.

e. Quam plurimis de rebus ad me velim scribas, ut prorsus ignorem. Att. III.xi. 29.

Complementary Clauses of Desire.

f. Quia semper animadverteri studiose te operam dare, ut ne quid meorum tibi esset ignotum, -. Fam. xiii.xi. 1.2.

g. velim ut eo sis animo, quo debes esse, id est, ut ne quid tibi praecipue timendum putes; Fam. iv.xiv. 4.1.
h. In illam igitur curam incumbe, Mi. Plance, ut nequae scintilla taeterrimi belli relinquatur; Fam. X.\textsuperscript{XIV}. 2.5.

i. Satis mihi provisum est, ut ne quid salvis auspiciis aut legibus aut etiam sine vi agere possent. Fam. I.IV. 2.1.

j. Hoc videmur esse consecuti, ut ne quid agi cum populo aut salvis auspiciis aut salvis legibus aut denique sine vi possent. Fam. I.II. 4.7.

k. Si modo etiam nunc effic potest, ut ne qua singulari adficiare calamitate et iniuria. Att. XI.II. 29.

l. Faciam ego illud quod rogatus sum, ut eorum, quae temporis huius sint, quae tua\textsuperscript{++} audivi, ne quid ignores. Fam. IX VI. 6.6.

m. Amoris nostri causa rogo, rei publicae causa hortor, ut ne cui quidquam iuris in tua provincia esse patiare atque ut omnias referasad dignatatem,--. Fam. XII.XXII. 3.9.


o. Cui scis intercessum esse ut ne quis omnino regem reduceret. Fam. I.VII. 4.7.

p. Ita velim ut ne quid properes. Fam. XVI.IX. 3.

3. In each of the remaining 5 examples of ut ne, the ne seems to exert its force especially on some special word or phrase. Following are examples:-

Purpose.

a. Quod scribis te ad Tertiam sororem scripisse, ut ne prius ederent ea quae gesta a Cassio essent, quam mihi visum esset, video te veritum esse id, ne --. Brut. II.IV. 5.2/
b. Quo magis erit tibi videndum ne quid novi decernatur, ut hoc nostrum desiderium ne plus sit annum. Att. V.I. I.

Complementary Clauses of Desire.

c. Perfice ut ne minus res publica tibi quam tu rei publicae debeas. Fam. X.XII. 5.

d. Petivit-que a me, ut eam ne ambitiose corrigerem antequam ederet. Att. XV.I. 2.5.

e. Caput autem est hoc, quod te diligentissime percipere et meminisse voleam, ut ne in libertate et salute populi Romani conservandi auctoritatem senatus exspectes nondum liberi, ne et tuum factum condemnes, et adolescentem vel puerum potius Caesarem iudices temere fecisse, ei.

Fam. XI.VI. 4.

From all these facts which have been presented in I,2, and 3 my conclusions are: Whenever the combination "ut ne" was used instead of ne in Cicero's Letters, the ne invariably has a purely adverbial force. Further, it always modifies especially some word or phrase which is usually, either the verb or some indefinite pronoun or adjective, such as quis, a, id (i,ae,od).

2. Ut Non versus Ne.

In Cicero's Letters, to 183 examples of ne in purpose clauses, and 347 in complementary clauses of desire, there are 10 and 17 respectively of non, following ut, some other relative, or as in two examples, one after a vellem; one after a mallem, with no connective. Grammarians (F. N. I. Lane 1947, Gildersleeve 545, R. 2. Bennett 2821; See Hale and Buck 464, I. At. G. 531, I, note 2. Burton 813). universally agree that non in such
instances exerts its force upon a single word or phrase. This agreement is justified by the 27 examples to be considered, in which non was used. In every instance the negative modifies some word or phrase especially, often expressing a contrast. The examples:

**Purpose.**

1. Sin illa te res cruciat, quae magis amoris est, ut eorum qui occiderunt, miserias lugeas, ut ea non dicam, quae saepissime et legi et audivi nihil mali esse in morte, hoc tamen non dubitans confirmare possum. Fam. V.XVI. 4.6.

The non in this parenthetical ut clause might be explained as due to the fact that it is a sort of stereotyped expression, without real volitive feeling. There is, also, however, a contrast between the verbs in the "ut non dicam" and the "hoc tamen non dubitans confirmare possum" clauses, which would justify the negative.

2. In hoc autem mihi illud occurrit: "quid tu igitur, si affuisses?" "rem probassem, de tempore, nihil te invito nihil sine consilio egissem tuo. Vides sudare me iam dudum laborantem, quomodo ea tuear, quae mihi tuenda sunt, ut te non offendam; leva me igitur hoc onere; numquam enim mihi videor tractrasse causam difficiliorem. Fam. III.XII. 3.5.

The contrast here is between the ideas contained in "ut te non offendam" and Leva me igitur", especially on the verbal ideas.

The force of the non in this clause is expended on the "sine causa" phrase.

4. -, sed a me it-a sunt acta omnia, non ut ego illi assentiens levior, sed ut ille me probans gravior videretur. Reliqua sic a me aguntur et agenter, ut non committamus ut ea, quae gessimus, fortuito gessisse videamus: - Att. I. XX. 3.2.

There is a contrast here between the past action and purpose expresses in the "sed-----videretur" clauses, and the present and future action and purpose in the "Reliqua - committamus, -".

5. Velim domum ad te scribas, ut mihi tui libri pateant non secus ac si ipse adesses, - Att. IV. AIV. 5.

The non modifies, not the verb, but the "secus ac si" phrase.


A clear contrast is expressed between the verbs "praesset" and "interessest".

7. Sed haec, quae supra scripta sunt, eo spectant, ut et horter et suadeam: reliquae sunt quae pertinent ad rogandum, ut tu non solum tua causa tibi consilium me dare putes, sed etiam quod mihi opus sit, me a te petere et rogare. Fam. XIII. IV. 3.4.

A contrast exists between the "me dare" and the "me petere et rogare", phrases.


10. Est mihi gratissimum tanti a te aestimatum consuetudinem vitae victusque nostri primum ut eam domum sumeres, ut non modo prope me, sed plane mecum habitare posses, deinde ut migrare tanto opere festines. Fam. VII. 23.4. Contrast.

II. Quae nunc saltem ad illos calculos revertamur, quos tum abieicimus, ut non solum gloriosis consiliis utamur, sed etiam paulo salubrioribus. Att. VIII.XII. 38.

Complementary Clauses of Desire.

I2. Scis enim Clodium sanxisse, ut vix aut omnino non posset nec per senatum nec per populum infirmari - sua lex. Att. III.XXIII. 24. Contrast.

I3. Quaesu, ut scribas quam saepeissime, non modo si - audieris, sed etiam si quid suscipabere. Att. VII.XII.

The negative belongs not with "scribas" but with the dependent si clause, and expresses contrast.

I4. Atque a me postulat, primum ut clam colloquatur mecum vel Capuae vel non longe a Capua; Att.XVI. VIII. I. I2. "Non" modifies "longe"


I7. Rogo te et etiam oro, ut totum hoc negotium, ita conficias ut, id tu nos obtinuisses non modo facile patiare, sed etiam gaudeas. (Reference lost.) Contrast.

I8. Peto a te, ut id non modo neglegentiae meae, sed ne occupatione quidem tribuas; Att. IV. 2.2. Contrast.


20. De hortis etiam atque etiam te rogo; omnibus meis eorumque, quos scio mihi non defuturos, facultatibus-, sed potes meis - enitendum mihi est. Sunt etiam, quae vendere facile possim; sed, ut non vendam, eique usuram pen
deam, a quo emero non plus annum, Att. XII.XXII. 3.5.

There is a contrast between "vendere" and "vendeam".


Contrast exists between "non potuisti - non mitteres", and "non mallem esse missam."

22. Vellem non solum salutis meae, sed etiam virium

23. His ille rebus ita convaluit, ut nunc in unociivi
spes ad resistendum sit, qui mallem tantas ei vires non
dedisset, quam nunc tam valenti resisteret. Att.VII. 3.4. Contrast.

25-26. Rerum hoc natura et civilium temporum non patietur, nec manevs nec mutata radio fieret, primum ut non in causa pari eadem sit et condicio et fortuna omnium, deinde ut in eam civitatem boni viri et boni cives nulla ignominia notati non revertantur, in quam tot nefariorum scelerum condemnati reverterunt, Fam. Vi. 6. II.

The non in the first instance modifies eadem and produces a contrast with "in causa pari". In the second, there is a contrast between "boni viri - non revertantur" and the following "condemnati - reverterunt." The meaning of "patior", however, makes it impossible that it be completed by a ne clause. An act may be allowed "to be done" or "to be undone." In any case the negation must rest upon some single word or phrase, not the whole clause. In all Cicero and Caesar, as would be expected, there is no example of a ne clause dependent upon "patior", but there are three of "ut non" after a negative "patior" in Cicero, the two in the Letters and one in Lac. 87; "is pati possit, ut non anquirat aliquem apud quem;" and one in Caesar, B.G.VIII. 8. I. "neque suam pati dignitatem ut tantis copiis tam ex iquam manum -- adoriri non audere.

27. Ac mihi persuaseram fore ut omnia placarentur inter vos, non modo sermone ac disputatione, sed conspectur ipso congressuque vestro. Att. I. 17. 2.
3. Ne Non versus Ut.

In Cicero's Letters, there was only one example of a purpose clause, containing "ne non". The non in this passage modifies the verb directly and gives a slightly different meaning to the clause from what it would have had with "ut", for it implies an attitude of fear on the part of the one whose purpose was expressed, that his desire might be accomplished: "tantum addi placuit, quod erat coss. solum, ut esset Praett. Tribb. Pl. Senatui, ne illi non proferrent eas quae ad ipsos missae essent." (Att. XVI.IV. I.I4), "in order that they might not fail to publish those things which had been sent to them.

In complementary clauses of desire "ne non" is represented by 28 examples: one after providendum, one after cavendum, one after cogitandum, 2I after expressions of fear. The clauses dependent upon providendum, cavendum, and cogitandum afford examples of the non used as the negative of a single word or phrase, other than the verb. They are as follows:-

1. Communicat - vehementer esse providendum me opprimatur ---nobilitate inimica, non aequo senatu. Q. fr. 2. 3. 4.

2. In quo cavendum est, ne, si negligenter fueris, non solum tibi parum consuluisse, sed etiam tuis invidisse videaris. Q. fr. I.I. 44.7.

3. Caput illud est, ut, si ista vita tibi commodior esse videatur, cogitandum tamen sit, ne tutior non sit. Fam. IV.IX. 4.7.

Grammarians have little to say concerning the use of "ne non" except after expressions of fearing or the verb vide (videndum). Allen and Greenough (Allen - Greenough, F.N.I.
Hale and Buck (Hale and Buck 502, 4 and note a) make no attempt to distinguish between the meaning of "ne non" and "ut" after verbs of fearing, or the context in which they are used. Burton (Burton 838), however, Gildersleeve (Gildersleeve 550, 2), Lane (Lane, I957), and Roby (I652 I) agree that "ne non" is regularly used instead of ut when the main verb is negatived. Burton adds that the "ne non" is rarely used otherwise; Gildersleeve that the "ne non" is very rare in early Latin, but becomes more frequent from Cicero on. Bennett (Bennett 296, 2a) says that "ne non" sometimes occurs instead of ut especially where the verb of fearing has a negative, or where the writer desires to emphasize some particular word in the dependent clause."

Not one of these statements seems exactly to agree with the facts, as they were found in the Letters, in which there were 8 examples of ut after positive expressions of fear to I9 of ne non; no example of ut after negative expressions of fear to 2 of ne non. Of the I9 examples of ne non dependent upon a positive expression of fear, I3 employ the non in the negation of a single word or phrase, often in producing contrast. They are as follows:

1.-2. Non quo vereor, ne tua virtus opinioni hominum non respondeat, sed mehercule ne, quum veneris, non habeas iam quod cures. Fam. II.V. 2.5. Contrast.

3. Digressum vero non tulisse atque etiam id ipsum, quod tu scribis, metuebam, ne a me distrahi non posses. Q.fr. I. III. 4.II. Contrast.

4. Vereor ne, si nihil ad te scripserim, debitum euis virtuti videar testimonium non dedisse. - Fam. V.XVII. 4.2.
Non modifies the dependent infinitive, not the verb.

5. Si manet, vereor, ne exercitum firmum habere non possit, sin discédit, quo aut qua, aut quid nobis agendum sit, nescio. Att. VII.XII. 13. Contrast.

6. Ex his rebus hoc vereor ne, Caesar nullus honos a senatu habeatur, dum hic nodus expediatur, non putet senatus nos antequam successum sit, oportere decedere nec-legatos praeesse. Att. V.XXI. 25. Contrast.


8. Equidem illud molior, quod tu mones sperasque fieri posse, ut mini Caesar concedat, ut absim, quum aliquid in senatu contra Gnaeum agatur; sed timeor ne non impetrem. Att. IX.VI. 49. Contrast.


II. Mihi Arpinum eundum est: nam et opus est constitui a nobis illa praediola et vereor, ne exeundi potestas non sit, quum Caesar venerit, Att. XIII.IX.2.6. Contrast.


In the six remaining passages containing ne non after a positive verb of fearing, ut, it would appear from the 8 examples by which it was represented, might have been used with no appreciable difference in meaning. I desire to call attention especially to these 2 examples of ut and ne non, which are closely parallel in context and meaning:

1. Ut:-
   Accepi enim a te litteras, quibus videris, vereri, ut epistulas illas acceperim. Att. XI.XXII. 3.

1. Ne:-
   Accepi tuas litteras, quibus intellexi te vereri, ne superiores mihi redditae non essent. Fam.XIV.III. I.7.

The other examples of ut and ne non appear to be equivalent in meaning. They are:-


5. Vereor, adduci ut nostra possit, Att. V.IV. II..


Ne Non.

2-3. Aiviam tamen scito desiderio tui mortuam esse et
simul, quod verita sit, ne Latinae in officio non maneret et in montem Albanum hostias non adduerent: Att. I.II. I.

4. Illud timebam, quod profecto accidisset, ne a me digredi non posset. Att. III.IX. I2.

5. Sic enim intellexi, nihil aliud esse, quod dubitationem afferret, ei, penes quem est potestas, nisi quod veretur ne tu illud beneficium omnino non putares; Fam.IV.VII. 3.I6.

6. Equidem malueran quod erat susceptum ab illis, silentio transiri, sed vereor, ne non licear; Att. 2.I9.

The two examples containing ne non following a negative expression of fear indicate that the non in such context exercises no special force on any one word or phrase. They are:

I. Non enim sum vereor ne non scribendo te expleam; Fam.II.I.I5.

2. Neque enim sum veritus, ne sustimere tua in me innumerabilia beneficio non possem, Fam. II.VI. 2.7.

According to all these examples, then, of ne non and ut after expressions of fear;

I. Ne non is regularly used instead of ut if a single word or phrase is to be negated, especially in contrast.

2. Ne non and ut are used with equivalent meaning in Cicero's Letters with almost equal frequency.

3. Ne non is always used instead of ut after negative expressions of fear.

There remain four examples of ne non used after vide, videte and videndum. In speaking of this construction Gildersleeve(548,N.4.) says "vide ne (ne non) 'see to it lest' is often used as a polite formula for dubito an." Roby (I652 d and I654) expresses a similar view, "A thing about which fear is felt is expressed by a sentence with ut, if it is wished-------.
Ne non is also used for ut especially when the principal sentence is negative,-----.

Similarly "vide ne non sit", 'vide ut sit', 'perhaps it is not', vide ne sit, 'perhaps it is.'"

The four examples in the letters clearly imply that there is a feeling of fear, combined with a desire that something may come to pass. The examples are:--

I. Vide, ne, quum velis revocare tempus omnium servandorum quum qui servetur, non erit, non possis. Fam. V. iv. 2.14.

2. Vos videte, quid aliae faciant isto loco feminae, et ne, quum velitis, exire non licet: Fam. XIV. XVII. 2.3.

3. Tibi ad me venire, ut ostendis, vide ne non sit facile; Att. XII. XVIII. 35.

4. Te animo magno et forti istam rem agere existimo, sed diligentius nobis est videndum, ne distracti pares esse adversario non possimus, Att. VIII. XII. C. 8.

Unfortunately no record was kept as to the occurrence of ut with vide (videndum) so that a final conclusion can not be safely drawn as to the comparative effect of ut and ne non. The most that can be said is that after these verbs when fear along with a desire for fulfillment of a wish is ne non may be used with the same effect which ut or ne non has after a verb of fearing.

General statements regarding ne non in dependent clauses of desire:

I. Ne non is used in dependent clauses of desire when a particular word of phrase is to be employed.
2. Ne non is used in dependent clauses of desire whenever an idea of fear is expressed or implied.

3. Ne non is always used instead of ut after negative expressions of fear.

4. Ut nemo etc. versus ne quis etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Purpose:Desire:Result:Subject</th>
<th>Purpose:Desire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ut nemo</strong></td>
<td>0  0  II  I4</td>
<td>Ne quis 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quispiam I 7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quisquam I 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ut nihil</strong></td>
<td>3  2  46  59</td>
<td>Ne quid I6 I6 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quidquam 2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aliquid 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ut nullus</strong></td>
<td>2  0  23  35</td>
<td>Ne nullus I 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aliquis 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qui aest 7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ut num quam</strong></td>
<td>0  0  5  I0</td>
<td>Ne num quam I 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ut ne quidem</strong></td>
<td>3  5  I6  I6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These statistics show indisputably that in the Letters nemo, nihil, nullus, neuter, numquam, which were common in other dependent clauses was avoided in dependent clauses of desire, and that in their place Cicero used ne quis, ne quid, nullus, ne numquam. Gildersleeve,(543.4) and Allen and Greenough, (538) both have statements to this effect, but Hale and Buck, (464.I.a), says that nihil, numquam, nemo, nullus and ne-quidem are used with
all sorts of modal ideas. It is true that they are so used, but, with the exception of nihil in the perfect prohibitive subjunctive, they appear very seldom in clauses of desire. An examination of Merquet's Lexikon of the philosophical writings and speeches of Cicero revealed a condition similar to that of the Letters, regarding the comparative frequency of ut nemo versus ne quis in clauses of the latter type. To 55 examples of ut nemo in result clauses, there were 4, or 7% as many, in clauses of desire - 2 purpose, 2 complementary desire. To these 4 examples of ut nemo there were 85 examples of ne quis - 28 purpose, 57 complementary desire. Miss Ruth Timmons, Miss Mary J. Bennett, and Miss Alice Johnson, my colleagues in the graduate school of the University of Kansas 1914-1915. secured similar figures for other negatives, which unfortunately are not now available.

5. Conjunctions used Within Dependent Clauses of Desire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Comp. Desire</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ut - neve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ut - neque</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ut - et non</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ut aut - aut ne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ut neque - et-(et)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ut et - et ne</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ut neve - neve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ut neque - neque-(neque)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne aut - aut</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne - aut ne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne - neve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne - et ne</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ut neque, ut - neve, ut - et non, ut aut-aut ne: Emory B. Lease in "Livy's Use of Neque and Neve with an imperative or subjunctive," Classical Philology, Vol 3, has this to say regarding neve and neque in dependent clauses of desire: 

In final clauses neve is the appropriate particle to be used whenever a choice of alternatives is to be given. Where, however, the second clause is to be added as a continuation of the first we should expect "et ne", and failing that, "neque". In the oratorical and philosophical words of Cicero, he says, ut neque was used in final clauses 6 times with 2 verbs except in 1 example, ut neve 4 times. He does not give any figures for et ne. In the Letters I found that there were 3 examples of ut neque with 2 verbs, I with I verb, 4 of ut neve with 2 verbs, and 2 of et (que) non. If there is any choice of alternatives" in those passages in which neve is used, I fail to see it. They are as follows: 

1. In qua extrema scriptum erat, ut ad ludos omnia pararet neve committeret, ut frusta ipse properasset. Att. XIII.XLV. I.6.

2. Obtestorque te, ut Quintum fratrem ames, neve quid eum patiare graviis consulere de se, Att. III.XXIII. 21.

3. Tamen hoc animo esse debes, ut nihil hoc reicias neve in rebus tam subitis tamque angustiis a senatu consilium petendum putes. Fam. X.XVI. 2.3.

In the only instance in which a choice of alternative actions was expressed, by a positive negative clause, Cicero used ut aut, aut ne:— ut aut quo dem posthac litteras, sciam, aut ne dem frustra. Att. V.V. I5.

The examples containing neque or et (que) non as a connective between two verbs invariably expressed an idea of contrast:—

Neque.

1. Quare da te in sermonem et perseca et confoce et ita cum Palla loquire, ut te cum illo Scaeva loqui putes nec existimes eos,—, remissuros; Att. XIII.XXIII. 3.I4.

2. Ut te orém et obsecrem, animo ut maximo sis nec ea solum menineris,—, sed illa etiam, quae—. Fam. IV.XIII. 7.2.

3. Quare fac, ut quam primum vemaas neque in Apuliam tuam accedas,—. Fam. I.X. II.


Et (que) non.


2. Non occupatione,—, sed parvula lippitudine adductus sum, ut dictarem hanc epistolam et non, ut ad te soleo, ipse scriberem. Q.fr.II.II. I.3.

Permanent conclusion can not safely be based on a few statements. Judging by the use in the letters, anyone might assume that neque, or et (que) non, as a connective between 2 verbs after ut, always expressed a contrast.
Such is not true of neque, however, as for instance in Cic. Caecil I.6.5.2. qui si te recte monere volet, suadebit tibi ut hiæc discedas neque mihi verbum ullum respondeas,,or Verr. II.2.I7.41. Illi eum commonefaciunt ut utatur instituo suo nec cogat ante hoymam decimam de absent'e secundum praesentem indicare; impetrant.

This much, however, can be said:-

I. Ut (verb) neve (verb) may be used in dependent clauses of desire when one verb is to be added as a continuation of another, and in the Letters is the invariable form of expression, which is so used. (except in the combination ut et - et ne). See examples below in 2).

2. Ut (verb) neque (verb) in the Letters is used only when a contrast is to be expressed. In others of Cicero's works it is used apparently as the equivalent of neve.

3. Ut (verb) et (que) non (verb) is used in the letters only to express contrast.

2.) Ut neque - et-et, ut et-et ne.

In the Letters, Cicero has one example of ut neque(verb) et (verb) et (verb),-Att. III.XV. 100 ex eo quibus statuam, in tuosne agros confugiam, ut neque videam homines, quos nolim, et te,-, videam et proprius sim; and three examples of ut et (verb) et ne (verb):-


2. Tu cura ut valeas et te istinc ne temere commoveas.

Fam. VI.XX. 3.9.

The combinations ut et - neque and ut et ne - et were not found in the letters at all.

The use of ut et - et ne and the failure to use ut et ne-et suggests the use of "et - et non" versus "et non - et", discussed on pages 18 and 19. It was observed there that Cicero employed "et - et non" 21 times, but "et non - et" only 5 times. Instead of "et non - et", he preferred "neque - et" which appeared 39 times. Lease, as he was quoted at the beginning of (I) page 76, says that the "et ne" is what we should expect, when a negative dependent clause of desire is to be added to a positive. It is true of Cicero's Letters, however, only when the correlative et is used with the preceding verb.

3. Ut neque-neque, ut neve-neve, ne aut-aut.

Of these three combinations, "ne aut-aut" is the most frequently used, appearing as it does II times: - 7 with 2 verbs (Att. III.I38; 2. Fam.I.V.a.32; 3. Att.IX.IX.56; 4.Att. III.X. I8; 5. Att. IX.VII. 20; 6. Fam. XV.XIII. 2.13; 7. Q.fr. II.III. 2), 4 with 2 nouns (I.Fam.VII.I. 4; 2. Att. III.XVII. 21; 3.Fam.III.VIII. 9.4; 4.Fam. IV.I. 3.13); 7 in purpose clauses three times after verbs of fearing, once with the verb cures. Ut neque-neque was found 6 times - 3 with 2 verbs(I.Fam.IX.II. 33; 2. Att.XV.AI11. I.3; 3. Fam. IX.XVI. 7); 3, with one verb (I.Att.XV.XII I. 2. Fam.I.IX. I7.4; 3. Att. VIII.XId. I04); 2 in purpose clauses, I in a complementary clause of desire after assentior, I after enitor, I after per-

ficiam, I placeret. Ut neve-neve was used twice, in both in-

stances with one verb, one of which was in a quotation of a
decree of the senate after consultum, the other after peto (I.Att.V.XXI. 12.8; 2.Fam.I.IX. 19.13).

There is no distinction in the general meaning of "ne aut-aut" and "ut neque-neque" with one verb or two, or "ut neve-neve" with one verb. Lease in the article previously referred to, says that the reason "ne aut-aut" was preferred to "ut neve-neve", (he should have said "ut neque-neque" also), was that the ne served to indicate the nature of the following clause at the start, and the "ut neve-neve" type was more clumsy. Bennett, (Cornell Studies, Vol. IX), says that "neve-neve" never acquired correlative power with verbs, and his statement is borne out by the facts. Lease found no instances of such use in Cicero, or Caesar, or Livy.

4.) Ne - neve, ne - aut ne, ne - et ne.

Ne in the Letters as throughout classical Latin literature was not followed by neque. Instead of using that negative to add one verb to another following a ne, et ne might be used as in one example in Cicero:-

Sed mehercule in incipiendo refugi, ne, -, iniuriam illus faciam inlustrem, si quid scripsero, et simul ne \( \beta \varphi \varepsilon \varphi \varepsilon \\) mea -, in scribendo sit occultior et aliquid satisfactio levitatis habere videatur. Att. IV.VI. 33.

There were three examples of ne - neve with two verbs and two of ne - aut ne. The latter combination is used apparently, when the coordinate members are not so closely related as in the ne - neve type. The examples are:-

Ne neve.

I. Ut operam des efficias, ne quid mihi fiat iniuriae neve quid temporis ad meum annum munus accedat; Fam XV.XII. 2.9.
2. Tamen te penitus rogo, ne te tam longae navigationi et viae per hiemem nisi bene firmum committas neve naviges nisi explorate. Fam. XVI. VIII. 2.1.


Ne - aut ne.


2. Ne ingrati aut ne omnia velle nobiscum una interire videamur, hoc omitto; Att. III. XXV. 6.

According to these facts, then, we may say that when one negative clause of desire was to be added to another introduced by ne, the conjunctions neve, aut ne, or et ne were used, but not neque. The distinction between the use of neve and aut ne seems to be that the latter was employed when the coordinated members were not so closely related in thought to each other.

In concluding this study of the negatives used in Cicero's Letters, I desire to present briefly in review the chief conclusions that have been reached, regarding each of the negatives discussed.

I. The negatives used in statements of fact and corresponding assumptions and questions, in the indicative and the subjunctive, are non, neque, nihil, nullus, nemo, neutron, nequisquam, nihilum, nondum, nequid, nusquam,
numquam, neutiquam, haud, ne - quidem.

I. Non, the negative most frequently used in these types of expression, serves to modify either a single word or phrase, or a whole clause.

a. It appears frequently in combinations of the non (modo) (solum) - (sed) (verum) (etiam) (ne -quidem) type - especially in the phrases non modo - sed etiam, and non solum - sed etiam.

b. It is used with the subjunctive of desire to negate a single word or phrase - often in contrast.

Note: - After an expression or an implication of fear, (ne) non is frequently used with the force of ut.

2. Neque is used as a connective instead of et non.

a. Et non, however, is preferred to neque in case the negative applies to a single part of the clause rather than the whole, as in contrast. Rarely it is used apparently as a substitute for neque.

b. Neque is used with the perfect subjunctive in prohibitions, contrary to the general rule for expressions of desire. When a contrast is intended, it is used also with a dependent clause of desire, which is to be connected with a preceding ut clause. Neque - neque, moreover, is regularly found as a correlative phrase in dependent expressions of desire.
3. Nihil, nullus, nemo, numquam, nusquam are used instead of non quicquam, non ullus etc, unless a contrast is to be expressed or the verb is to receive a special negative force, or the negative and indefinite ideas are to be made vivid.

   a. Neque quisquam etc, is used instead of et nihil etc except when a contrast is intended, or an et precedes. In the latter case, neque, tho' often used, is proportionately less common.

   b. Nihil umquam, nemo, umquam etc, is used far more frequently than numquam quicquam, numquam quisquam etc, which rarely appear.

   c. Nihil etc was replaced by ne quicquam etc in clauses of desire, aside from commands in the perfect subjunctive, in which nihil was used instead of ne quicquam.

4. Nondum, necdum, nihildum were also used with the Indicative and the Subjunctive in statements of fact and corresponding questions and assumptions.

   a. Necdum was used instead of et nondum; nihildum instead of nondum quicquam.

5. Haud is used sparingly, and usually in connection with adjectives or adverbs expressing quantity, kind or manner.

6. Ne-quidem is used to give prominence to some word, phrase, or clause, included between the members ne and quidem. It exercises a negative force over its whole clause, but, when used with another negative
of general force does not combine to produce a positive,
but strengthens the negative idea with some special
word, or group of words.

II. The negatives ne and neve are peculiar to expressions of
desire.

I. Ne, the negative most often used with such expressions,
serves either as an adverb with independent clauses, or
as a conjunction with dependent clauses.

a. When ut ne appears in place of ne in dependent con-
structions, the negative belongs directly either
with the verb, or the indefinite quis, or rarely
with an adjective.

b. Ne, when used to introduce clauses, complementary
to expressions of fear, is translated "that". In
connection with non, it has the meaning of "that not",
and is used interchangeably with ut in this
signification. If a single word or group of words,
however, is to receive special negative force, ne
non must be used instead of ut.

c. The imperative is seldom modified by a negative.
Instead of that, a prohibition is expressed by
noli with the infinitive, cave with the present
subjunctive, or the present or perfect subjunc-
tive of command.

2. Neve, "and not", is the connective used in dependent
expressions of desire. (See page 78, (I.2,b.) as to when
neque may be used in such clauses).
a. After *ne*, the conjunctions, *neve*, *aut ne*, or *et ne* must be used instead of *neque*.

b. *Aut ne* appears in place of *neve*, when the coordinated members are not closely related in thought.

c. *Neve - neve*, "neither - nor" is not used as a correlative phrase with verbs, but is so employed with other words and phrases in clauses of desire.