## V.—*Repudiative Questions in Greek Drama, and in Plautus and Terence*

By Professor ANDREW RUNNI ANDERSON

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

No reader of Latin Comedy fails to notice the frequency with which the thought of one person is echoed by another. The echo-clause is in the form of a question, and its speaker in effect questions or repudiates the thought which he echoes. The Latin construction has been made the subject of several studies[1] and offers a rather complex problem. None of them, however, consider the Greek construction ; in fact, Schlicher, *op. cit.*, 70, if I understand him correctly, denies the existence of corresponding evidence in Greek. However, the construction does occur in Greek, and because of the close connection between Greek drama and Plautus and Terence I have thought it worth while to present the evidence.

### GREEK

Phrynichus in Bekker's *Anecdota*, 1, 40, 32, quoting Aristophanes, *Ran.* 1133 f., has the following important note : —

ἐγὼ σιωπῶ τῷδε · Ἀριστοφάνης ταύτην ἐσχημάτισε τὴν σύνταξιν · καθ᾽ ὑπόκρισιν δέ · λέγει γάρ

⟨ΔΙ⟩ Αἰσχύλε, παραινῶ σοι σιωπᾶν · εἰ δὲ μή,
πρὸς τρίσιν ἰαμβείοισι προσοφείλων φανῇ.
εἶτ᾽ ἀποκρίνεται Αἰσχύλος
ἐγὼ σιωπῶ τῷδε ;
βούλεται γὰρ λέγειν καθ᾽ ὑπόκρισιν · εἶτα ἐγὼ τούτῳ σιωπήσομαι ; οἷον
ἄξιόν ἐστιν ἐμὲ τῷδε ὑποστέλλεσθαι καὶ ὑπείκειν λόγοις ;

[1] H. Kraz, *Die sogenannte unwillige oder missbilligende Frage mit d. Conjunctiv*, u. s. w., Stuttgart, 1862; G. Müller, *Über die sog. unw. od. missb. Fragen im Lat.*, Görlitz, 1875; W. Guthmann, *Über eine Art unwilliger Fragen*, Nürnberg, 1891; A. Dittmar, *Studien zu lat. Moduslehre*, Leipzig, 1897, p. 79 f.; J. J. Schlicher, *The Moods of Indirect Quotation*, AJP. XXVI (1905), 60 f.; see also Bennett, *SEL.* 186 f.

I cite now in their chronological order the other instances in which the construction occurs:[2] —

*Aves*, 1689.            HP. βούλεσθε δῆτ' ἐγὼ τέως
        ὀπτῶ τὰ κρέα ταυτὶ μένων; ὑμεῖς δ' ἴτε.
        ΠΟ. ὀπτᾷς[3] τὰ κρέα; πολλήν γε τενθείαν λέγεις.
        οὐκ εἶ μεθ' ἡμῶν;

This is the most interesting of all the examples. Heracles practically asks Poseidon to command him to roast the meat while the others (P. *et al.*) are away. Poseidon, however, knew the size of Heracles' appetite (cf. Starkie's note to *Vesp.* 60), and wisely repudiated the suggestion by commanding him to come along with the crowd.

*Lys.* 529.            ΛΥ. σιώπα.
        ΠΡ. σοί γ' ὦ κατάρατε σιωπῶ 'γώ, καὶ ταῦτα κάλυμμα φορούσῃ
        περὶ τὴν κεφαλήν; μή νυν ζῴην.

*Thesm.* 27.        ΕΥ. σίγα νυν.    ΜΝ. σιωπῶ τὸ θύριον;
        ΕΥ. ἄκου'.    ΜΝ. ἀκούω καὶ σιωπῶ τὸ θύριον;

Here the absurd misapplication which Mnesilochus (sic) makes of Euripides' commands opens the way for their rejection.

Eur. *Bacch.* 1184.
        ΑΓ. μέτεχε νυν θοίνας.    ΧΟ. τί; μετέχω, τλᾶμον;

So the passage is read by Hartung, Wilamowitz, Murray; the Mss. have τί μετέχω τλάμων; Whether the emended reading shall stand or not will depend upon our answer to the question, Are the chorus sufficiently sober to understand and consequently to reject the awful feast they are invited to share? To my mind the emended reading is far superior. I take the liberty of quoting here three instances from Eurip-

---

[2] Kühner-Gerth, § 394, p. 222, and Stahl, *SGV.* 365, cite Arist. *Ran.* 1134, and *Lys.* 530; the latter passage is cited also by Gildersleeve, *SCG.* § 380. In these instances the subjunctive verb form is the same as the indicative. Unequivocal forms like *Ran.* 1229; Cephisodorus, 3 K; Menand. *Epitrep.* 178, are not cited.

[3] None of the authorities quote any instance of a *sentence-question* in the subjunctive second person singular. Hence the particular value of this instance for the Greek.

ides in which the verb — almost certainly in the subjunctive — is to be supplied : —

*Iph. Aul.* 831.

> ΚΛ. μεῖνον, τί φεύγεις ; δεξιάν τ᾽ ἐμῇ χερὶ
> σύναψον, ἀρχὴν μακαρίαν νυμφευμάτων.
> ΑΧ. τί φῇς ; ἐγὼ σοὶ δεξιάν (scil. συνάψω) ; αἰδοίμεθ᾽ ἂν
> Ἀγαμέμνον᾽, εἰ ψαύοιμεν ὧν μή μοι θέμις. See also 731–2.

*Hel.* 805.

> ΕΛ. μή νυν καταιδοῦ, φεῦγε δ᾽ ἐκ τῆσδε χθονός.
> ΜΕ. λιπὼν σέ (scil. φεύγω) ;

The latter passage belongs chronologically before *Lys.* 529, quoted above. The next three passages I shall quote are especially significant, since in them the subjunctive form is not equivocal with the indicative. (Arist. *Ran.* 1133, quoted by Phrynichus belongs here ; see above, p. 43.)

*Ran.* 1227.

> ΔΙ. ὦ δαιμόνι᾽ ἀνδρῶν, ἀποπρίω τὴν λήκυθον,
> ἵνα μὴ διακναίσῃ τοὺς προλόγους ἡμῶν. ΕΥ. τὸ τί ;
> ἐγὼ πρίωμαι τῷδε ;

Through lack of closer date I quote here Cephisodorus, 3 (i, 800 K) :[4]

> Α. ἔπειτ᾽ ἀλείφεσθαι τὸ σῶμα μοι πρίω
> μύρον ἴρινον καὶ ῥόδινον, ἄγαμαι, Ξανθία.
> καὶ τοῖς ποσὶν χωρὶς πρίω μοι βάκχαριν.
> Β. ὦ λακκόπρωκτε, βάκχαριν τοῖς σοῖς ποσὶν
> ἐγὼ πρίωμαι ; λαικάσομ᾽ ἄρα βάκχαριν ;

Menand. *Epitrep.* 177.   ΣΥ. τὸν δακτύλιον θές, ἄθλιε.
> ΟΝ. τὸν ἡμέτερόν σοι θῶ ;[5]

---

[4] Lysias, xxi, 4, shows that a choregus for Cephisodorus won the prize in the archonship of Eucleides, 403.

[5] No clear instance of a negative echo, *i.e.* of a prohibition, occurs, but the negative was unquestionably μή. Cf. Xen. *Mem.* i, 2, 31–38, where the Thirty had commanded Socrates (31) λόγων τέχνην μὴ διδάσκειν, (33) τοῖς νέοις μὴ διαλέγεσθαι, (35) μηδὲ σὺ διαλέγου νεωτέροις τριάκοντα ἐτῶν. Socrates in answer asked (36) μηδ᾽, ἐάν τι ὠνῶμαι . . . ἔρωμαι ὁπόσου πωλεῖ ; and μηδ᾽ ἀποκρίνωμαι οὖν, ἄν τί με ἐρωτᾷ νέος, ἐὰν εἰδῶ, οἷον ποῦ οἰκεῖ Χαρικλῆς ; ἢ ποῦ ἐστι Κριτίας ; Socrates kept his temper, and asked an interpretation of the command in ordinary subjunctive questions. Had he lost his temper, his answers would have shown the full-fledged repudiative subjunctive.

The important points of Phrynichus' note may now be stated as follows : —

1. He translates σιωπῶ, which a comparison with other passages shows to be the subjunctive, (*a*) by the future indicative strengthened by an indignant εἶτα; and (*b*) by a question expressing propriety, ἄξιόν ἐστι κτλ . . . ;

2. The subjunctive is used by way of answer, καθ' ὑπόκρισιν.

3. It was Aristophanes who ἐσχημάτισε this construction, by which he probably means that it was Aristophanes who gave it literary form. In the following pages it will be established in confirmation of Phrynichus that while Aristophanes systematized the construction, he was merely availing himself of the full power of the subjunctive as the mood of will, and that what he did was to introduce into literature what may very reasonably be held to have existed in popular speech. What Phrynichus' note omitted to state was that it was used only by way of answering a command or its equivalent. Here it may be pointed out that the example quoted by Phrynichus from Aristophanes was not chronologically the earliest, that distinction belonging to *Aves*, 1689, and it is not impossible that if we had Aristophanes' works entire, examples would be found antedating even that from the *Aves*. It is interesting to observe that the doubtful passage, *Bacch.* 1184, as well as the three other Euripidean ones there cited, are all later than the above-quoted example from the *Aves*. May not the suppression of the verb in these three instances (*Hel.* 805; *Iph. Aul.* 731, 831) indicate that Euripides was feeling his way ? Gildersleeve's definition of the interrogative subjunctive, *SCG.* 379, makes it easier to understand the repudiative : " The subjunctive question expects an imperative answer . . ." The repudiative question is a question hardly more than in origin and form, and the speaker uses the form of question chiefly for appearances' sake. It differs further from the ordinary subjunctive question in coming *after* the command, καθ' ὑπόκρισιν. It may be defined as the specialized and restricted function of an interrogative subjunctive that asks for the interpretation of a command,

and for the limits within which that command is to be carried out.[6]  Cf. Arist. *Acharn.* 142.

Here may be cited a number of interrogative subjunctives following commands, but differing from the above in being word-questions rather than sentence-questions : —

Arist. *Nub.* 87 (cf. *Vesp.* 760–1),

   ΣΤ. ὦ παῖ πιθοῦ.  ΦΕ. τί οὖν πίθωμαι δῆτά σοι;

[*Nub.* 111.

   ΣΤ. ἐλθὼν διδάσκου.  ΦΕ. καὶ τί σοι μαθήσομαι;]

*Aves,* 163 f.

   ΠΙ. ἦ μέγ' ἐνορῶ βούλευμ' ἐν ὀρνίθων γένει

   καὶ δύναμιν ἣ γένοιτ' ἄν, εἰ πίθοισθέ μοι.

   ΕΠ. τί σοι πιθώμεσθ';  ΠΙ. ὅ, τι πίθησθε;

*Thesm.* 243.

   ΕΥ. θάρρει.  ΜΝ. τί θαρρῶ καταπεπυρπολημένος;

*Thesm.* 938 f.

   ΜΝ. χάρισαι βραχύ τί μοι καίπερ ἀποθανουμένῳ.

   ΠΡ. τί σοι χαρίσωμαι;

Soph. *Phil.* 816.

   ΦΙ. μέθες με μέθες με.  ΝΕ. ποῖ μεθῶ;

*O.C.* 213.   ΧΟ. αὔδα.  ΟΙ. τέκνον, ὤμοι, τί γεγώνω;

Eur. *Orest.* 1022 f.

   ΟΡ. οὐ σῖγ' ἀφεῖσα τοὺς γυναικείους γόους

   στέρξεις τὰ κρανθέντ';  .  .  .  .  .  .

   .  .  .  .  .  .  .  .  .  .  .  .

   ΗΛ. καὶ πῶς σιωπῶ;

Cf. Theocr. 22, 54 f.

   ΠΟ. χαῖρε ξεῖν', ὅτις ἔσσι.  τίνες βροτοὶ ὧν ὅδε χῶρος;

   ΑΜ. χαίρω πῶς, ὅτε γ' ἄνδρας ὁρῶ τοὺς μὴ πρὶν ὄπωπα;

Some of these have repudiative force, *e.g. Thesm.* 243. The chronological development of this form seems to be

---

[6] Sometimes what seems equivalent to a command in the future indicative is echoed by the future indicative : —

*Aves,* 1205,  ΠΙ. ταυτηνί τις οὐ συλλήψεται

  ἀναπτόμενος τρίορχος;  ΙΡ. ἐμὲ συλλήψεται :

Here, however, the echo is not really a repudiation, but an expression of horror that the command is to be executed; cf. *Plut.* 128; Menander, *Sam.* 108, and the Latin instances quoted on p. 57.

parallel to that of sentence repudiatives previously con-
sidered, and on the basis of our literary remains here, too,
Aristophanes seems to be the pioneer. Perhaps, however,
allowance should be made for the difference between comic
and tragic diction.

The repudiatives so far considered repudiate commands,
and are expressed by the same tense of the subjunctive as
that of the imperative in which the command was given.
Theoretically at least, the future indicative could have been
used. The same verb need not be used in the repudiation
that was used in the command, cf. *Thesm.* 27; *Ran.* 1229,
where Meineke's 'ποπρίωμαι is thus shown to be unneces-
sary; *Nub.* 111. The next class of examples to be consid-
ered will be found to differ from that just considered in
having present rather than future force, and in questioning
or rejecting, not a command, but a statement, or what in-
volves a statement, and therefore in being expressed by the
indicative, not by the subjunctive : —

Aesch. *Prom.* 971 [992].

    EPM. χλιδᾶν ἔοικας τοῖς παροῦσι πράγμασιν.
    = χλιδᾷς, ὡς ἔοικε, κτλ.
    ΠΡ. χλιδῶ; χλιδῶντας ὧδε τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἐγὼ
    ἐχθροὺς ἴδοιμι.

I am not aware that any one has conjectured χλιδᾶν, which
would exactly echo the antecedent form.

Eur. *Alc.* 806.         HP. μὴ λίαν

    πένθει· δόμων γὰρ ζῶσι τῶνδε δεσπόται.
    ΘΕ. τί; ζῶσιν; vulg. τί ζῶσιν; I have punctuated so as
        to show that τί does not go directly with ζῶσιν. Cf.
        *Ion,* 1407 f. ; Arist. *Lys.* 875 f.

*Ran.* 23.                ΔΙ. τοῦτον δ' ὀχῶ,

    ἵνα μὴ ταλαιπωροῖτο μηδ' ἄχθος φέροι.
    (D's contention is that Xanthias οὐκ ἄχθος φέρει.)
    ΞΑ. οὐ γὰρ φέρω 'γώ; Cf. *Acharn.* 594; *Vesp.* 515.

*Plut.* 369.

    ΧΡ. σὺ μὲν οἶδ ὃ κρώζεις · ὡς ἐμοῦ τι κεκλοφότος
    ζητεῖς μεταλαβεῖν. ΒΛ. μεταλαβεῖν ζητῶ; τίνος ; (cf. 899 f.).

Other tenses of the indicative in the antecedent clause are treated on the same principle as that we have just seen illustrated for the present indicative (for the future indicative, see n. 6, above); *i.e.* the same tense and mood is expressed or understood in the echo clause that was used or implied in the antecedent clause, the only change, if any, being the necessary adjustment of person; cf. Arist. *Aves*, 466; *Thesm.* 742; Soph. *Trach.* 427 f.; Eur. *Cycl.* 260 f., 639 f.; *Hipp.* 800 f.; *Ion*, 338 f., 951 f.; *Hel.* 566 f., 674 f.

The results of the above investigation may be summarized as follows: Assuming that the equivocal forms in *Prom.* 972, χλιδῶ, *Alc.* 807, ζῶσιν, *Plut.* 370, ζητῶ, are indicatives, we are justified on the basis of Greek literary remains in accepting the testimony of Phrynichus that Aristophanes introduced into literature the construction typified by *Ran.* 1133. Accordingly Euripides and Cephisodorus, his contemporaries, as far as they used it all, used it following his lead, and from these authors it passed to Menander and the New Comedy. In the use of this, as of other exclamatory forms, *e.g.* the exclamatory infinitive (cf. *CP.* IX [1914], 74 f.), Greek authors, unlike their Latin brethren, showed great self-restraint.

The above analysis sets up no new theory of the subjunctive; rather by showing that the repudiative subjunctive is a development of the volitive-deliberative, it accords with the commonly accepted view that the subjunctive was essentially a mood of will.[7] The Greek mind, ever logical, clearly recognized that will could be repudiated only by will, and since the imperative *qua* mood could not readily be used interrogatively, recourse was had, when a command was to be repudiated, to the only mood of will that could assume interrogative form in all persons, especially the first; cf. Goodwin, *GMT.* § 291.

[7] So A. W. McWhorter, "A Study of the So-called Deliberative Type of Question," *TAPA.* XLI, 157 ff., esp. A, 7; B, III, 1, (a); "The 'Mood of the Question' and the 'Mood of the Answer,'" *PAPA.* XLIII, xliii ff. It is hoped that Professor McWhorter will publish his investigation in fuller form, with illustrative material.

## LATIN

The fact that the Greek subjunctive was not the result of syncretism, nor in any sense the mood of indirect quotation, but essentially the mood of will, makes Greek of greater value for comparative purposes than German (used by Schlicher) in the analysis of repudiative usage in Latin — in which the so-called subjunctive was a composite of both optative and subjunctive forms, and exercised optative and potential, as well as volitive functions. In Latin the repudiative is found fully developed in all its forms in our earliest literary remains, and no Phrynichus was in a position to tell us when the construction took shape; but through the help of Greek it can be stated with much confidence that the original form was the same for both languages; *i.e.* the subjunctive was used in such questions only when an expression of will was rejected. The fact that the Latin subjunctive was the result of syncretism makes a broader statement desirable; for if will can be repudiated only by will, ought it not to be expected that an expression of wish could be repudiated only by an expression of wish, a potentiality by a potentiality, and so on, the repudiative clause in each instance being a question based in its general form upon that of the antecedent clause? But the repudiator might not be inclined to adhere to the antecedent form; *e.g.* in Plaut. *Men.* 1023,

> si recte facias, ere, med emittas manu. : :
> liberem ego te?

where Menaechmus does not deny his *power* to set Messenio free, but his *will* to do so; cf. Arist. *Av.* 164–5 (p. 47); or, the repudiator might deny what had been stated as a *fact* (indicative) by questioning its *conceivability* or *possibility* (subjunctive); cf. *Most.* 13 f.,

> absentem comes. : :
> nec ueri simile loquere nec uerum, frutex ;
> comesse quemquam ut quisquam apsentem possiet?

Half a century ago Kraz,[8] *op. cit.*, 21, established (1) that the rejection was expressed, not by the subjunctive, but by the interrogative form (and even the interrogative form does not necessarily express rejection, cf. *Cist.* 285, p. 53, since the context also must be considered); (2) that when the subjunctive was used in a repudiative question, it was subjunctive in its own right, and not through any principle of indirect quotation.

The negative of repudiative questions is *non*, except in word-questions introduced by *quid* or *quippe*, with both of which it is *ni*. This has led some investigators to see in deliberative and repudiative questions a development of the potential rather than of the volitive. While some potential influence may frankly be admitted, this was not of sufficient extent to explain the negative *non;* for although *ne* and *ni* were the original negatives for the Latin volitive, the deliberative and repudiative may early have come to be felt as a new and distinct type. Very similarly the negative of the Homeric subjunctive when used as equivalent to a future indicative was *οὐ*, even though in all probability it also was a development of the volitive.

The enclitic *-ne* often occurs in repudiative questions, and inasmuch as in these questions the *-ne* did not seem in all cases equally interrogative, but often to have intensive force, the question arose whether after all this was the interrogative particle. Accordingly Warren, *AJP.* 11 (1881), 55 f., concluded that what we had here was an "affirmative" *-ne*, which thus added greater emphasis and emotion to the repudiation. Warren's view was accepted among others by Dahl, *die Lat. Part. VT*, 299 f. That *-ne* often had intensive power cannot be doubted; cf. Plaut. *Asin.* 93 f. : —

---

[8] " Indem ich mit der reinen Conjunctivfrage beginne, schicke ich voraus, dass die ' Missbilligung,' welche die Grammatik durch diese Frage ausgedrückt sein lässt, nicht im Conjunctiv sondern in der Fragform liegt.  Der Conjunctiv behält auch hier seine Grundbedeutung, Ausdruck des bloss Gedachten zu sein; die Conjunctivfrage hat es mit Vorstellungen zu thun, welche durch die Fragform verworfen werden."

me defrudato. : : maxumas nugas agis :
nudo detrahere uestimenta me iubes.
defrudem te ego? age sis, sine pennis uola.
*ten* ego defrudem, quoi ipsi nihil est in manu
nisi quid tu porro uxorem defrudaueris?

I have tried to show elsewhere, *CP.* IX (1914), 174 ff., esp. 180 and 183, that interrogative *-ne* through its use in emotional questions developed confirmative or intensive functions, as seen, *e.g.*, in repudiative questions, exclamatory infinitives, and even in confident assertions where all interrogative force had been lost.

Chronologically the latest form to develop repudiative power was that introduced by *ut.* This *ut* — with which may be compared ὡς, ὅπως, ὥστε — was not in itself interrogative. While the indefinite force cannot entirely be dissociated from it, it was predominantly relative, as may be gathered from the fact that *-ne* was sometimes joined to it, cf. *Epid.* 225; *Mer.* 576; *Rud.* 1063; *Hec.* 66, 199; *Phorm.* 874; Horace, *S.* II, 5, 18. For with the exception of *quin*, in which *-ne* had its original negative force, and *qualine*, *Trin.* 1095, *-ne* was never joined to an interrogative pronominal form in early Latin. Ter. *H.T.* 954, *itane . . . ut . . . eiecerit?* seems to show that *ut* reproduces *ita* in relative form (cf. Mueller, *op. cit.*, XIII), and is therefore identical with *ut* consecutive.[9] Sometimes, however, the *ut* is not consecutive, but volitive, *e.g. Poen.* 316; *Hec.* 66.

The original type of the construction *audi.* : : *ego audiam?* σιώπα. : : σιωπῶ 'γώ; was paratactic, but it might easily develop hypotaxis. Theoretically, but not practically, the *ut*-forms present hypotaxis. For to make them really hypotactic would be to put the stress of the interrogation upon the main clause, variously supplied as *fierine potest*, or the like, by Krüger, Madvig, Dahl, or as an interrogative verb of commanding, *e.g. imperasne*, by Kraz.[10] What makes these

---

[9] When Dittmar, *op. cit.*, p. 87, and Schlicher, *CP.* II, 79, propose to develop consecutive clauses with *ut* out of *ut*-repudiatives, it would seem that they are reversing the order of development.

[10] A *mere verb of saying* is never to be regarded as constituting the ellipsis in

clauses repudiative, however, is principally the fact that they are themselves interrogative. So, although an ellipsis may be psychologically desirable, the context and the delivery would sufficiently indicate the force of the *ut*, and the construction was rarely found outside of dialogue or colloquial Latin — the drama, Cicero, Livy, and Horace in his *musa pedestris*.

## CLASSIFICATION OF REPUDIATIVE QUESTIONS IN PLAUTUS AND TERENCE

Questions with *-ne* are marked *; those with *ut* are marked †; only *sentence-questions* are listed, and these only when they are an echo.

### A. THE SUBJUNCTIVE

I. PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE,[11] echoing an antecedent.

*a. Present or Future Imperative :* —

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Plaut. *Asin.* | 93, 94,* | see above, p. 52. |
| | | compara labella cum labellis. : : |
| | 669,* | ten osculetur, uerbero ? |
| | | meum collum circumplecte. : : |
| | 697,* | ten complectatur, carnufex ? |
| *Aul.* | 82, | intus serua. : : ego intus seruem ? |
| | 829, | redde aurum. : : reddam ego aurum ? |
| *Capt.* | 139,* | ne fle. : : egone illum non fleam ? egon non defleam talem adulescentem ? |
| *Cist.* | 285, | loricam adducito. : : loricam adducam ? This shows the type out of which the repudiative was developed. |
| *Curc.* | 119,* | salue. : : egon salua sim ? |
| | 183, | tace. : : quid, taceam ? |
| | 554, | uale. : : quid, ualeam ? |

this construction. An interesting example where *iubesne* seems to be understood, and where the *infinitive* is equivalent to a repudiative subjunctive, is *Hec.* 613 : —

    ita ut iubes faciam. — : : hinc abire matrem ? minime.

[11] Forms that might be either present subjunctive or future indicative are classified as subjunctive, *e.g. Aul.* 829. Two instances of the future indicative are added at the end of *a*.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Mer.* | 727, | dic igitur. : : dicam? |
| | 749, | abi. : : quid, abeam? : : abi. : : abeam? |
| *Mil.* | 496, | ausculta. : : ego auscultem tibi? |
| *Most.* | 579, | abi. : : abeam? 620 iube. : : iubeam? |
| | 633,* | dic te daturum. : : egon dicam dare? |
| *Pers.* | 188,* | da hercle pignus. : : egon dem pignus tecum? |
| *Poen.* | | cedo sis dexteram. : : |
| | 316,† | ut quidem tu huius oculos inlutis manibus tractes aut teras? |
| *Pseud.* | 1315,* | onera hunc hominem. : : egone istum onerem? |
| | 1327,* | ⟨i⟩. : : egone eam? |
| Ter. *And.* | 384,* | dic te ducturum. : : egon dicam? |
| | 894, | audi. : : ego audiam? |
| *Eun.* | 797, | Pamphilam ergo huc redde. : : tibi illam reddat? |
| *Phorm.* | 1001, | tu narra. : : scelus, tibi narret? |

The above examples represent the original type as was pointed out by Mueller, *op. cit.*, VI; cf. Guthmann, *op. cit.*, 8; this is still further confirmed by the examples I have quoted from the Greek. While all three persons occur, the first naturally predominates. Only one instance with *ut* occurs, *Poen.* 316, the type which Kraz, *op. cit.*, 27, erroneously held to be the normal one.

When the future indicative was differentiated in form from the present subjunctive, the former retained for a time some traces of its power to express the volitive function, *e.g.*: —

Plaut. *Men.*　　　salta sic cum palla postea. : :

198,　ego saltabo? sanus hercle non es.

Probably also

Plaut. *Mer.*　916,　paullisper mane. : : quid, manebo?

*b. Present Subjunctive Expressing Will, Wish, or Potentiality; or, a Development or Periphrasis of Any One of These:* —

This division might have been very much subdivided; *e.g.* the volitives, cf. *Bacch.* 1190, belong logically under I, *a*, while expressions involving futurity, cf. *Capt.* 208, might have been grouped under I, *c*.

Plaut. *Asin.*     (mihi lubet) hunc hercle te uerberare. : :

      628,* tun uerberes qui pro cibo habeas te uerberari?

  *Aul.*          hau causificor quin eam

      756,* ego habeam potissumum. : : tun habeas me in-
uito meam?

               nunc uolo me emitti manu. : :

      824,* egone te emittam manu?

*Bacch.* 1176, sine, mea pietas, te exorem. : : exores tu me?

     1190,* potes. : : egon ubi filius corrumpatur meus, ibi
potem?

  *Capt.* 208, at fugam fingitis. : : nos fugiamus?

  *Cas.*      ego uix reprimo labra . . . quin te deosculer. : :

      454, quid, deosculere?

  *Epid.*     ut . . . aduenienti (matri) des . . . osculum. : :

      574,* egone osculum huic dem?

  *Men.* 1024, see p. 50.

  *Mer.* 567, ut illo intro eam. : : itane uero, ueruex? intro
eas?

          tu quidem animum meum gestas (= uolam os-
culari). : :

      575, senex hircosus tu osculere mulierem?

  *Mil.*   497,* expurigare uolo me. : : tun ted expuriges?

    1275,* (uolt) ad se ut eas. : : egon ad illam eam quae
nupta sit?

  *Pers.* 135,* tum tu me sine illam uendere. : : tun illam
uendas?

     294,* nisi te hodie, si prehendero, defigam in terram
colaphis. : :

         tun me defigas?

  *Pseud.*   surruperes patri. : :

     290,* egon patri surrupere *possim* quicquam, tam
cauto seni?

     318, mea fide, si isti formidas credere (= crede
mihi). : : tibi ego credam ?

     486, paritas ut a me auferas. : : aps ted (ten?) ego
auferam?

   516,*† iam dico ut a me caueas. : : egon ut cauere
*nequeam ?*

   1226, saltem Pseudolum mihi dedas. : : Pseudolum
ego dedam tibi?

*Rud.* 1063,*† Gripe, animum aduorte ac tace (while Trachalio
   speaks). : :
   utin istic prius dicat?

*Trin.*   eam cupio, pater, ducere uxorem sine dote. : :
  378,*† egone indotatam te uxorem ut *patiar?*
   edoceam ut res se habet.
  750,† sed ut ego nunc adulescenti thensaurum indi-
   cem?
   (Callicles rejects his own suggestion.)

*Truc.* 276,* ne attigas me, : : egon te tangam?

Ter. *And.* 270,* timet ne deseras se. : : hem, egon istuc conari
   *queam?*
  271,* egon propter me illam decipi miseram sinam?
   (Cf. 274.)
  382, inuenerit aliquam causam quam ob rem eiciat
   oppido. : : eiciat?
  649, habeas. : : habeam?
  900, sine . . . illum huc coram adducam. : : adducas?

*H.T.* 784,*† ut (dare) simulares (= desponderes). : :
   egon quoi daturus non sum ut ei despondeam?
  1050,† sine te exorent (= ut bona des). : : mea bona
   ut dem Bacchidi?

*Eun.* 798, tu eam tangas? : : ego non tangam meam?

*Phorm.* 419, actum ne agas . : : non agam?
  431,* ut amici inter nos simus. : : egon tuam expetam
   amicitiam?
   haud scio hercle, . . . an mutet animum. : :
  775, hem, mutet autem?

*Hec.*   ne te quoiusquam misereat. : :
  66,*† utine eximium neminem habeam?
  342, non uisam? : : non uisas ?
  671, ut alamus nostrum. : : ego alam?
   nihil enim (dones). : :
   egon qui ab orco mortuom me reducem in
   lucem feceris
  853,* *sinam* sine munere a me abire?

*Ad.* 654,† ut secum auehat. : : uirginem ut secum auehat?
   hanc te aequomst ducere. : :
  934, me ducere autem?
  939, ego . . anum decrepitam ducam?

Schlicher, in *AJP*. xxvi, 73 f., explains the subjunctive in
*Bacch.* 1176, and *Mil.* 497, as due to the indirect quotation of
a thought "foreign" to the mind of the speaker. That these
and similar passages have the subjunctive in their own right
as volitive, or an extension of the volitive, and not through
the pressure of indirect quotation, is made certain by Arist.
*Av.* 1689 f.

*c.  Future Indicative or Equivalent : —*

Plaut. *Asin.*　　　　dabitur pol supplicium mihi de tergo uostro. : :
　　　　　　482,　tibi quidem supplicium, carnufex, de nobis
　　　　　　　　　　detur?
　　　　　　　　　uehes pol hodie me, si quidem hoc argentum
　　　　　　　　　　ferre speres. : :
　　　　　　700,* ten ego ueham (si quidem hoc argentum ferre
　　　　　　　　　　sperem = feram).
　　　　　　700,*　　　　: : tun hoc feras hinc argentum?
　　*Cas.*　　　　quando ego eam mecum rus uxorem abduxero. : :
　　　　　　111,* tun illam ducas?
　　*Curc.*　494,* mancipio tibi dabo (= accipies a me). : : egon
　　　　　　　　　　ab lenone quicquam
　　　　　　　　　　mancipio accipiam?
　　*Pers.*　　　　uenibis tu hodie (= uendam te). : :
　　　　　　338,* tuin uentris caussa filiam uendas tuam?
Ter. *Hec.*　　　　ego me rus abituram esse decreui. : :
　　　　　　589,　tu rus habitatum migres? (Cf. *Pers.* 294, under
　　　　　　　　　　I, *b*).

For the future indicative, expressing a somewhat similar,
but probably not identical, force, cf. : —

　　*Pseud.* 509, sumam. : : sumes?
　　*Cas.*　672,* deierauit occisurum eum. : : men occidet?
　　*And.*　617, expediam. : : expedies?

*d.  Interrogative Present Indicative that may = Command : —*

1) With *non* or *nonne :*

　　*Bacch.* 627, non taces? : : taceam?
　　*Pers.*　747,* nonne antestaris? : : tuan ego causa, carnufex,
　　　　　　　　　　quoiquam mortali libero auris atteram?
　　*Eun.*　676, non uides? : : uideam? obsecro quem?

> *Phorm.* 988,   non taces? : : taceam?
>> 992,*† non mihi respondes? : : hicine ut tibi respon-
>>       deat?

2) With *nil*:

> *Eun.*                         nil respondes? : : pessuma,
>> 153,* egon quicquam cum istis factis tibi respondeam?

3) With *-ne*:

> *Eun.*   389,   iubesne? : : iubeam? cogo atque impero.

4) Without particle:

> *H.T.*          confitere? (*or* confitere.)
>> 1016,* egon confitear meum non esse filium, qui sit
>>        meus?

5) With *quin*:

> *Pseud.* 204,   quin una omnes peste hac populum hunc liberant?
>> 205 *b*,* illine *audeant* id facere?

6) With *quid*:

> *Pseud.* 626,   quid dubitas dare? : : tibi ego dem?

At *Eun.* 389 and 676, the subjunctive may be one of in-
direct question. This division is distinct from I, *a*, only in
matter of form; indeed, *H.T.* 1015 might have been classed
there even in form.

   *e. Present Indicative or Equivalent:* —

> *Amph.* 813,   mi uir. : : uir ego tuos sim?
> *Asin.*  838,   an tu me tristem putas? : : putem ego?
> *Cas.*   114,   mea praedast illa. : : tua illaec praeda sit?
> *Most.*  14,† see p. 50.
>> 301,* qur exprobras? : : egon id exprobrem?
> *And.*   915,   bonus est hic uir. : : hic uir sit bonus?
> *Eun.*          edico tibi ne uim facias ullam in illam.
>> 808,* tun me prohibeas meam ne tangam? : :
>>        *prohibebo* inquam (*prohibeo E G* Donat. in
>>        lemm. See Wessner, who nevertheless reads
>>        *prohibebo* in lemm.).
> *Phorm.* 260,* an id suscenses nunc illi? : : egon illi non sus-
>>        censeam?
> *Hec.*   524,   mi uir —. : : uir ego tuos sim?
>>        tu uirum me aut hominem deputas adeo esse?

The following are not really parallels to the above to the extent of showing the infinitive in competition with the subjunctive in indirect discourse : — *Men.* 514-5.

> *Most.*  331,  madet homo. : : tun me ais mammadere?
> (Cf. 965.)
>
> *Truc.* 586-7,  inpudens mecastor, Cyame, es. : : tun ais me inpudentem esse?

Rather are we to regard the subjunctives as due to the repudiator's own choice of form : he repudiates the fact underlying the antecedent clause by repudiating the very conception of it. This conception lies in the future time-sphere. See above, *Eun.* 808, where *prohibeas* is interpreted by *prohibebo.*

## II. IMPERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE.

As the present subjunctive in repudiative questions seems always to contain an idea of futurity from the point of view of the present, so the imperfect subjunctive in this construction always contains an idea of futurity from a past point of view. The use of tenses is well illustrated by the following : —

> Ter.  *Ad.*  933,  hanc te *aequomst ducere.* : :
> 939,  ego . . . anum decrepitam *ducam?*
> 674 f.,* haec, mi pater, te *dicere aequom fuit.* : :
> ridiculum : aduorsumne illum causam *dicerem* quoi ueneram aduocatus?
>
> Plaut. *Most.* 182 f.,
> SC.      ita Philolaches tuos te *amet,* ut uenusta es. : :
> PHILOL.  quid ais, scelesta? quomodo adiurasti? ita ego istam *amarem?*
> *Cas.*  366,  Casina ut uxor mihi daretur. : : tibi daretur illa?
> *Curc.*      stultior stulto fuisti qui is tabellis crederes. : :
> 552,* nonne is crederem? (Cf. *Bacch.* 198.*†)
> *Mil.*       ingenuan an festuca facta e serua liberast? : :
> 962,*† egone ut ad te ab libertina esse *auderem* internuntius?
> *Pseud.*  288,  surruperes patri. : : surruperet hic patri, audacissume?
> *Rud.*  843,  caperes . . . lapidem. : : ego quasi canem hominem insectarer lapidibus nequissumum?

Trin.  133,  non ego illi argentum redderem? : : non red-
deres.

954,  an ille tam esset stultus qui mi mille nummum
crederet?

957,  mihi concrederet, nisi me ille et ego illum
nossem probe? : :

961,* eine aurum crederem?

Ter.  And.  282,  ut memor esses sui. : : memor essem?

584,* ne faceres idem. : : egon istuc facerem?

Phorm.  non ei pater ueniam daret? : :
ille indotatam uirginem atque ignobilem

121,  daret illi? numquam faceret.

Ad.  num sineres uero illum tuom

396,  facere haec? : : sinerem illum?
(Cf. Cic. *ad Quint. Fr.* I, 3, quoted below.)

III. PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE.

In the four following instances *ausim* has the force of
merely an aoristic future : —

Mer.  palpo percutis. : :

154–5,* egon *ausim* tibi usquam quicquam facinus fal-
sum proloqui ?

Most.  at enim ne quid captioni mihi sit, si dederim
tibi. : :

923,* egone te ioculo modo *ausim* fallere . . .?

924,* egone aps te *ausim* non cauere . . . ?

Poen.  si auctoritatem postea defugeris,
ubi dissolutus tu sies, ego pendeam. : :

149,* egone istuc *ausim* facere, praesertim tibi?
(Cf. *Mer.* 301).

Here "special emphasis leads to the separation of the will
and the repudiation . . . *faciam* is expanded into *ausim
facere* [12] to make the repudiation stronger." — Morris, in *AJP*.
XVIII, 288.

---

[12] For other forms of *audeo* similarly used, cf. *Pseud.* 205 *b*; *Mil.* 962; cf. the
use of *patiar*, *Trin.* 318; *sinam*, *And.* 271, 274; likewise the repudiation may
be strengthened by separating the possibility and the repudiation; cf. *Most.* 15;
*Pseud.* 290, 516; *And.* 270; *Hec.* 139; cf. esp. Cic. *ad Q. Fr.* I, 3, 1 : Ego tibi
irascerer? tibi ego *possem* irasci?

Before citing the next example of the perfect, let me by way of illustration cite an instance of the treatment of its closely related form, the future perfect indicative : —

> *Cas.*  110–1,* quando ego eam mecum rus uxorem abduxero. : :
>   tun illam ducas?

Here the echo, *ducas*, shows that *abduxero* still retained its aoristic function, and that it had the force of a simple and not of a completed future.  In the following passage both *uiceris* and *uicerim* may express completed action, *Truc.* 625 : —

> emoriere ocius, ni manu uiceris. : : quid, manu uicerim?

As was pointed out under I, the time-sphere of the present subjunctive seems practically always to be the future ; even so that of the perfect subjunctive, when the latter had ceased to be merely aoristic, acquired (like the Greek aorist subjunctive in subordinate clauses) future perfect force ; *i.e.* of a present perfect used deliberatively, *e.g. Amph.* 748 : —

> audiuistin tu me narrare haec hodie? : : ubi ego audiuerim?
> " where shall I have heard it ? " " where am I to have heard it ? "

This form, therefore, repudiates what has been stated as occurring in the past, by challenging the future to confirm it. This may be true for several of the following examples ; note *reperies*, *Men.* 683 : —

> *Amph.* 818,*  tecum fui. : : tun mecum fueris?
> *Epid.*          (induta erat induculam) inpluuiatam. : :
>   225,*† utin inpluuium induta fuerit?
> *Men.*          tibi dedi equidem illam (pallam) . . . et illud
>                   spinter. : :
>   683,† mihi tu ut dederis pallam et spinter?   numquam
>                   factum reperies.
> *Most.*          quod . . . hic tecum filius
>   1017,† negoti gessit. : : mecum ut ille hic gesserit?
>   1026 *d,* de te aedis. : : i ⟨tane? de me⟩ ille aedis emerit?
> *Pers.*          hic leno neque te nouit neque gnatam tuam. : :
>   132,† me ut quisquam norit?
> *H.T.* 954,† itane tandem quaeso, Menedeme? ut pater
>                   tam in breui spatio omnem de me eiecerit ani-
>                   mum patris?

The close connection between repudiative and consecutive *ut* becomes evident in the foregoing passage. The transition from potentiality and tendency to reality and actuality involves no real difficulty in either construction.

> *Hec.*   136,†   nocte illa prima uirginem non attigit;
> quae consecutast nox eam, nihilo magis. : :
> quid ais? cum uirgine una adulescens cubuerit
> plus potus, sese illa abstinere ut potuerit?

## IV. PLUPERFECT.

Instances like *Phorm.* 380, " quasi non nosses. : : nossem ? " belong with the imperfect. The pluperfect was a late and rare development in this construction — a completed imperfect. Cf. Cic. *ad Att.* xv, 11, egone ut beneficium accepissem contumeliam?

In Plautus and Terence there occur about fifty instances of the indicative in echo-questions. Since the context here also is of great importance, no general statement can cover all cases, but the following principle of division may be helpful : When the antecedent clause states as a fact something that the speaker of the echo-clause in the very nature of things cannot have personal knowledge of, his question expresses mere surprise, doubt, bewilderment, or horror ; when, however, the antecedent clause states as a fact something in regard to which the speaker of the echo-clause may be presumed to know the real truth, his question, expressed by the indicative, may be regarded as absolutely repudiative, as no subjunctive really could be.[13]   Such repudiatives are generally in the first person singular, or, if not that, they deal with something in regard to which the speaker may be presumed to have knowledge or over which he may be presumed to have control. Such repudiatives are likely to be found in passages involving mistaken identity; cf. *Men.* 301–5 below, or passages in which a character to remain faithful to the *rôle* he plays must deny what may be a fact, cf. *Capt.* 611.

[13] Schlicher, *op. cit.*, 78, in holding that the indicative expresses an attitude inclined toward full acceptance, seems to me to have missed the real force of this category.

### *B.* INDICATIVE

I. PRESENT.

Plaut. *Capt.*  611,  quid mi abnutas? : : tibi ego abnuto?
     *Men.*         neque te quis homo sis scio. : :
          302,  non scis quis ego sim, qui tibi saepissume
                 cyathisso apud nos, quando potas? : :
         305,* tun cyathissare mihi soles, qui ante hunc diem
                 Epidamnum numquam uidi neque ueni?
     *Mer.*  305,* amo. : : tun capite cano amas, senex nequissume?
                (See Morris, *AJP.* x, 426.)
     *Most.*  595,  non dat, non debet. : : non debet?
                heus senex, quid tu percontare ad te quod nihil
                 attinet?
         940,  nihil ad me attinet?
Ter.  *And.* 910 f. SI. tun hic homines adulescentulos . . . in fraudem
               inlicis?
              sollicitando  et  pollicitando  eorum  animos
               lactas? . . .
              ac meretricios amores nuptiis conglutinas? . . .
         921,  CR. ego istaec moueo aut curo?

Crito knew well that Simo's charges against him were baseless, and so his repudiation of them could not but be absolute and final.

Ter.  *Eun.* 162,*  nunc times. : : egon timeo? so *Phorm.* 999.*
     *Phorm.* 389,  temptatum aduenis. : : ego autem tempto?
              (Cf. *H.T.* 587.)   To have used *ego autem*
              *temptem* would have been both evasive and
              cacophonous.

II. FUTURE.

Since the future does not deal with certainties, it is to be grouped rather with the subjunctive, see pp. 54 and 57.

III. PERFECT.

     *Aul.*       nisi refers . . . quod surrupuisti meum. : :
         761,  surrupui ego tuom?  (*surripio* read by some
              editors following *BDE* is pointless.  Acidalius
              here made a brilliant transposition.)

*Men.*          qur igitur me tibi iussisti coquere dudum
                   prandium? : :
       389,* egon te iussi coquere?
              med amisisti liberum. : :
     1058,  liberum ego te iussi abire?
*Ad.*           si satis iam debacchatus es, leno . . . : :
       185,* egon debacchatus sum autem, an tu in me?

The above classification shows that as in Greek, so in Latin, the mood of the repudiative clause was generally determined by the character of the antecedent clause. In view of the great number of instances in which indicative is echoed by indicative, the infractions of the rule seen under A. I, *e* (p. 58 f.), and under A. III (p. 61 f.) cannot be regarded as typical. In so large a number of instances these are rather to be regarded as illustrations of the manner in which the repudiator might exercise his prerogative of choosing his own form.