

XIV.—The Meaning and Use of *Sed Enim*

JOSEPH FONTENROSE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Enim has its usual causal or explanatory force in *sed enim*; but in most cases there is no ellipsis. The *enim* is anticipatory, and its clause explains the thought that lies ahead. In some cases *enim* is not conjunctive, but is used to strengthen a causal or explanatory idea.

Two words could hardly be more alike in range of meaning and use than Latin *enim* and Greek γάρ. They agree even in their postposition, both usually occurring in second place in the sentence and occasionally later.¹ Such a thoroughgoing correspondence is seldom found between words of different languages even when they are etymologically related, as *enim* and γάρ are not. Moreover, it is seldom found between words that are classed as particles. In ἤδη and *jam* we have another example of a nearly identical pair of different etymological origin; but *jam* has a transitional use not shared by ἤδη,² and this is a much greater difference than any that can be found between *enim* and γάρ.

Hence it was inevitable that the same disagreement should arise over *enim* as over γάρ, between those who maintain that it is always causal or explanatory and those who resort in certain cases to an alleged asseverative or affirmative or confirmatory meaning, rendering it "certainly," "really," "in fact," or the perennial favorite "indeed." Paul Shorey used to assert emphatically that γάρ always means "for," and never hesitated to assume an ellipsis in ἀλλὰ γάρ and καὶ γάρ. His position was strengthened by Miss Misener's

¹ In this respect is found the only shade of difference. Both early and late *enim* is occasionally found in first position; see page 192 and note 53 below. *enim* appears to have the same origin as *nam* (see the authorities cited in note 55 below), which has the same range of meaning, but is usually placed first in the sentence. My remarks about *enim* when used alone will in general apply to *nam* too; but *nam*, of course, is not used in combination with *sed* as *enim* is. P. O. Barendt, "Ciceronian Use of *Nam* and *Enim*," *CR* 16 (1902) 203–209, discusses the shades of difference between these two conjunctions, coming to the conclusion that "ENIM corroborates and appeals. NAM qualifies and corroborates" (208). To me the main difference appears to be that *nam* is heavier and more formal, while *enim* is lighter and more casual. For an admirable short essay on Latin particles see N. W. DeWitt, "The Semantics of Latin Particles," *CJ* 33 (1938) 450–456, especially 454 (on *nam* and *enim*).

² See *jam* in Cic. *Off.* 1.42.150.

study of γάρ,³ which, to me at least, is a convincing demonstration that all occurrences of γάρ are to be referred to its causal and explanatory uses, that it does, in truth, always mean "for."

Miss Misener has distinguished four uses of γάρ which may be called causal (in the strict sense), explicative, motivating, and corroborative.⁴ *enim* too is used in the same four ways.⁵ Also a twofold division of the uses of *enim* (and of γάρ) may be made according to whether the *enim* sentence gives the cause of a stated fact or justifies a statement, that is, whether it gives a reason for facts or for words.

However, I must leave the whole subject of the meaning of *enim* to another time or to other people. My purpose at present is to study *enim* in combination with *sed*; for *sed enim* is a stronghold of those scholars who maintain that *enim* is sometimes purely adverbial with a force like "indeed." *sed enim*, like ἀλλὰ γάρ, is baffling at first sight. How, one asks, can a statement be adversative and causal at the same time in relation to the same antecedent statement? Hence many are glad to adopt the suggestion that in this case *enim* means "indeed;" it is an easy way out.

At first scholars explained *sed enim* as they explained ἀλλὰ γάρ, by assuming an ellipsis of the adversative idea;⁶ that is, they would say, *sed* indicates an unexpressed objection to the preceding statement; the objection is immediately explained by the following sentence; and the explanation is marked by *enim*, which is usually, though not always, placed immediately after *sed*. But the doctrine of ellipsis has not been liked by some scholars, who find it artificial or far-fetched.⁷ So they have come to the conclusion that *enim*

³ *The Meaning of Γάρ*, University of Chicago dissertation (Baltimore, 1904).

⁴ *Ibid.* 13-25. The fourth use is called "confirmatory" by Miss Misener, but I have avoided the word, since it is often used to designate the "indeed" that is invoked for nearly every particle. H. W. Smyth distinguishes between γάρ as a causal conjunction and as a confirmatory adverb, which he translates "in fact;" *A Greek Grammar for Colleges* (New York, 1920) sects. 2803-2820. He also sees "confirmatory" uses of ἄρα, ἄρα, γοῦν, καὶ μὴν, οὖν, sects. 2787, 2800, 2830, 2921, 2955f. J. D. Denniston, *Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1934) 56-114, assumes an affirmative use of γάρ in certain combinations with other conjunctions such as καὶ and ἀλλὰ (see 105f.). But the examples cited by Smyth and Denniston are not conclusive.

⁵ E.g., (1) Causal: Cic. *Sen.* 4.10; (2) Explicative: Cic. *Off.* 3.19.77; (3) Motivating: Cic. *Cat.* i, 7.16; (4) Corroborative: Cic. *Cat.* ii, 1.1.

⁶ See A. Draeger, *Historische Syntax der Lateinischen Sprache*², 2 (Leipzig, 1881) 99. On this page Draeger comments on all four occurrences of *sed enim* in the *Aeneid*.

⁷ Yet ellipses, whether conscious or unconscious, are of everyday occurrence in languages. Our English "as if" is an elliptical expression in which the speaker is

was originally a confirmative adverb that developed into an explanatory or causal conjunction, but which continued to appear at times in its original sense. To support their contention they cite a number of passages in which they find it difficult to interpret *enim* as "for;" and they assert that it is this original *enim* that appears in *sed enim* and often in *neque enim*.⁸

Before the Silver Latin period *sed enim* is almost entirely confined to the works of Vergil and of Ovid. Hence we find editors of the *Aeneid* and *Metamorphoses* in disagreement about *sed enim*. A few consistently interpret *sed enim* as elliptical, with *enim* retaining its usual force. But Lemaire's *Variorum* edition of the *Metamorphoses*, dated 1826, already interprets *sed enim* as *at vero*. Since then most editors have followed some form of "confirmative" interpretation.⁹

But when a word has a constant and well-recognized range of meaning, it is dangerous to assign it a different sort of meaning to suit a residue of occurrences where the usual meaning does not seem to fit at first glance. I have protested against this easy-

certainly not aware of leaving something unsaid, though he could never deny that he intended the completed thought. That is, when a man says of another, "He acts as if he were king," he means in full, "He acts as he would act if he were king."

⁸ See Lewis and Short, *s.v. enim* 1; Raphael Kühner and Carl Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache* II, 2 (Hannover, 1914) 78; W. M. Lindsay, *The Latin Language* (Oxford, 1894) 603f.; Jacqueline de La Harpe, *Étude sur Tamen Conjonction et son Passage au Sens Causal avec Remarques Comparatives sur les Particules Sed, Autem, Nam, Enim* (Lausanne, Faculté des Lettres, 1923) 64f., 82-91 (71-82 on *nam*); Stolz, Schmalz, Leumann, Hoffmann, *Lateinische Grammatik* (Munich, 1926-28) 680f. (678f. on *nam*).

⁹ I have made use of the following editions, hereafter cited by the names of the editors only, in my study of *sed enim* in the works of Vergil and Ovid. *Aeneid*: C. G. Heyne and G. P. E. Wagner (Leipzig—London, 1832-33); C. Anthon and F. Metcalfe (London, 1856); J. Conington and H. Nettleship (London, 1876); A. Sidgwick (Cambridge, 1890); T. L. Papillon and A. E. Haigh (Oxford, 1892); H. S. Frieze and W. Dennison, Books I-VI (New York, 1902); E. Norden, Book VI (Leipzig, 1903); H. R. Fairclough (London—New York, 1916); H. E. Butler, Book VI (Oxford, 1920); F. Plessis and P. Lejay (Paris, 1920); H. R. Fairclough and S. L. Brown, Books I-VI (Chicago, 1926); R. S. Conway, Book I (Cambridge, 1935); F. Fletcher, Book VI (Oxford, 1941). *Metamorphoses*: Cnippingius, *Variorum* (Amsterdam, 1702); Lemaire, *Variorum* (Oxford, 1826); H. Magnus (Gotha, 1885-86); M. Haupt, O. Korn, H. J. Müller, R. Ehwald (Berlin, 1903); R. Merkel and R. Ehwald (Leipzig, 1915); F. J. Miller (London—New York, 1916). *Fasti*: R. Merkel (Berlin, 1841); G. H. Hallam (London, 1881); H. Peter (Leipzig, 1889); R. Ehwald and F. W. Levy (Leipzig, 1924); J. G. Frazer (London, 1929). I have also used D. A. Slater, *Towards a Text of the Metamorphoses of Ovid* (Oxford, 1927).

going practice in respect to $\sigma\upsilon\pi\omega$ and $\omega\varsigma$.¹⁰ The advocate of an unusual meaning, I have observed, has usually failed to understand the word in relation to the whole context. It is my conviction that this is the case in all occurrences of *enim* where scholars have recourse to "indeed."

Since *sed enim* is my immediate subject, I shall first examine the passages of Vergil's and of Ovid's poems in which the combination occurs, to discover just what they mean by it and how they use it. Then I shall turn for comparison to earlier and later authors, observing not only occurrences of *sed enim*, but also other relevant occurrences of *enim* (and of *nam*). I present the quoted passages without punctuation, since the relations of the parts may then be seen without prejudice.

1. *Aeneid* 1.19:

- hic currus fuit hoc regnum dea gentibus esse
 si qua fata sinant jam tum tenditque fovetque
 progeniem sed enim Trojano a sanguine duci
 20 audierat Tyrias olim quae verteret arces
 hinc populum late regem belloque superbum
 venturum excidio Libyae sic volvere Parcas
 id metuens veterisque memor Saturnia belli
 prima quod ad Trojam pro caris gesserat Argis
 25 necdum etiam causae irarum saevique dolores
 exciderant animo manet alta mente repostum
 judicium Paridis spretaque injuria formae
 et genus invisum et rapti Ganymedis honores
 his accensa super jactatos aequore toto
 30 Troas reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli
 arcebat longe Latio multosque per annos
 errabant acti fati maria omnia circum

Anthon and Metcalfe translate, "But (there was an obstacle to this), for she had heard." Frieze and Dennison say, "but (she feared for Carthage), for she had heard," though they direct the student to render *sed enim* with "but yet," "but indeed." But other editors have no use for such ellipses. Sidgwick translates "yet indeed," "however," and adds in a parenthesis "like $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$." Fairclough and Brown translate "but indeed" and deny an ellipsis. Conway translates "but in truth," "but we know that," and adds that it "shows the old Latin use of *enim* as a particle of asseveration

¹⁰ "On the Particle $\pi\omega$ in Homer," *AJPh* 62 (1941) 67f.; "Varia Critica," *Univ. Calif. Publ. Class. Phil.* 12 (1942) 218.

not necessarily giving a reason."¹¹ But I should like to ask whether "indeed" or "in truth" is at all suitable in this context. Does it make much sense to say, "It was her cherished hope to make Carthage capital of the nations; but indeed she had heard that a brood was springing from Trojan blood?"

The interpretation of *sed enim* in this passage is made more difficult by complex sentence structures. Lines 21f. are a continuation of indirect discourse after *audierat*. The sentence begun with *id metuens* in 23 is broken by a four-line parenthesis (25-28) and is resumed with *his accensa* in 29. The basic structure yields the following thought sequence:

A. Juno had great designs for Carthage.

B. She had heard that descendants of the Trojans would destroy Carthage.

C. She persecuted the Trojans in fear and rage and kept them from Latium.

That is, Juno had great designs for Carthage, but since she had heard that descendants of the Trojans would destroy Carthage, she persecuted the Trojans. B offers an explanation for C, while *sed* sets off the entire thought BC from what precedes and also contrasts Juno's love for Carthage with her hate for the Trojans. Hence, while Anthon-Metcalf, Frieze-Dennison, and the grammarian Draeger¹² appear to be right in understanding this *enim* as "for," they did not need to assume an ellipsis. For the *enim* in this case is anticipatory and the thought is complete. Notice that there is no conjunction at line 23 to connect C with B. The *enim* statement is virtually a subordinate clause. A subordinating causal conjunction might have been used instead of *enim*, and most probably would have been in prose. Compare Cicero, *De Officiis* 3.1.3:

*sed quia sic ab hominibus doctis accepimus non solum ex malis eligere minima oportere, sed etiam excerpere ex his ipsis si quid inesset boni, propterea et otio fruor, . . . nec eam solitudinem languere patior, . . .*¹³

This too is a fairly complex sentence.

¹¹ In the same note Conway refers to *neque enim* in *Aen.* 1.198, which, he says, "is always a compound particle meaning 'verily not, indeed not, not indeed.'" But a glance at the passage shows that *enim* is parenthetical, anticipatory, and corroborative. The complete thought is "since we have experienced many ills in the past, I am justified in saying that you have faced worse dangers than this."

¹² *Loc. cit.* (see note 6).

¹³ See also *Off.* 3.3.12 (*sed cum*).

2. *Aeneid* 2.164. Sinon says:

- omnis spes Danaum et coepti fiducia belli
 Palladis auxiliis semper stetit impius ex quo
 Tydides sed enim scelerumque inventor Ulixes
 165 fatale adgressi sacrato avellere templo
 Palladium caesis summae custodibus arcis
 corripuere sacram effigiem manibusque cruentis
 virgineas ausi divae contingere vittas
 ex illo fluere ac retro sublapsa referri
 170 spes Danaum fractae vires aversa deae mens
 nec dubiis ea signa dedit Tritonia monstribus

Here again Fairclough and others call for "but indeed," while Draeger and Anthon-Metcalf hold to the elliptical interpretation. But on this occasion they supply a clause for *enim* rather than for *sed*: *hi enim sceleris auctores erant*. However, the more usual assumption of an ellipsis of the *sed* sentence could be made: i.e., "But (the Danaans no longer have her support), for, etc." At first glance an ellipsis seems required, since we do not, as in 1.19, have a sentence expressed for both *sed* and *enim*. That is, we seem to have B without C, unless one maintains that the *enim* sentence ends with *spes Danaum* in 170 and explains *fractae vires*, which seems better taken as a second member of a series. But before we make a decision, let us glance at the thought sequence:

- A. Danaan hopes depended entirely on Pallas's aid.
- B. Diomedes and Ulysses stole and defiled the Palladium.
- C. Pallas is now hostile and Danaan hopes have vanished.

In this sequence B explains C. But the relation of the thoughts is already indicated in these lines by the correlatives *ex quo . . . ex illo*. Still, it is interesting to observe that *enim* is inserted in the *ex quo* clause, which contains the explanatory thought. We shall see other cases in which *enim* appears to mark or reinforce the causal or explanatory idea in a clause whose relation to the supported statement is shown by another connective word.

3. *Aeneid* 5.395. Entellus answers the taunt of Acestes:

Ille sub haec non laudis amor nec gloria cessit
 pulsa metu sed enim gelidus tardante senecta
 sanguis hebet frigentque effetae in corpore vires (394-396)

The sentence beginning in 397 could hardly be looked upon as a

supported statement, i.e., the statement for which the *enim* sentence (395f.) gives the reason. Hence, if *frigentque . . . vires* is interpreted as a second member of the *enim* sentence, we have an example of elliptical *sed enim*, granting that *enim* means "for." So Draeger takes it, paraphrasing: *sed jam non sum qui fui olim, senectus enim me tardat*. This is acceptable under the conditions mentioned; for here too I would say that an asseverative particle is superfluous.

But the clause *frigentque . . . vires*, though obviously parallel to *gelidus . . . hebet*, may at the same time be looked upon as explained by it. That is, Entellus says, "but since old age chills my blood, my strength is also chilled and diminished." In *gelidus sanguis hebet* lies the cause of *frigent vires*; for Vergil probably believed that the state of the muscles depended upon the state of the blood.¹⁴ The fact that the clauses are connected by *que* may appear to be an obstacle to taking *enim* as anticipatory. But this may be another case in which *enim* is inserted in a statement to mark its causal nature, though the clause is otherwise connected with the supported statement. I shall discuss this use of *enim* thoroughly later; for we shall find clearer examples of *sed enim* followed by two statements that are connected by *que* or *et* or an equivalent, of which the first can be considered explanatory of the second.

4. *Aeneid* 6.28, on the labyrinth at Cnossus:

hic labor ille domus et inextricabilis error
magnum reginae sed enim miseratus amorem
Daedalus ipse dolos tecti ambagesque resolvit
caeca regens filo vestigia (27-30)

Norden and Butler have long notes on verse 28 to prove that *enim* is here asseverative. Both liken it to Greek $\delta\eta$. But what is the thought sequence?

- A. The structure was an ingenious and unsolvable maze.
- B. Daedalus took pity on Ariadne in her love for Theseus.
- C. He showed Theseus how to find his way through the maze.

The reason for *dolos ambagesque resolvit* lies in *miseratus amorem*. *enim*, we see, stands just before *miseratus* and within the explanatory expression B. Hence we may say that line 28 is not a participial phrase but a clause, in which *est* is to be understood with

¹⁴ See Cicero's discussion of the blood in *N.D.* 2.55.137f.

miseratus; and a comma may be placed after *amorem*. *sed* has reference to *inextricabilis*. Draeger apparently took this verse as I have; for he paraphrases: *sed ipse Daedalus, miserabatur enim amorem reginae, dolos resolvit*. The *enim* clause is somewhat parenthetical.

This interpretation of line 28 is supported by *Aeneid* 6.317f. After describing Charon and the souls on the farther bank, Vergil says:

*Aeneas miratus enim motusque tumultu
Dic ait o virgo quid vult concursus ad amnem*

Aeneas's question is motivated by his wonder and emotion on seeing the throng. Obviously *enim* is anticipatory; *est* is to be understood with *miratus* and *motus*, and commas may be put after *Aeneas* and *tumultu*. Yet Butler cites 6.317 in support of asseverative *enim*.¹⁵

5. *Metamorphoses* 1.530, in the story of Apollo and Daphne:

*auctaque forma fuga est sed enim non sustinet ultra
perdere blanditias juvenis deus utque monebat
ipse amor admisso sequitur vestigia passu (530-532)*

While Lemaire interprets *sed enim* as *at vero*, and Magnus as "aber freilich," "aber fürwahr," F. J. Miller, who elsewhere usually uses "but in truth" and the like, supplies an ellipsis in his translation: "But the chase drew to an end, for the youthful god, etc." But Haupt (or Ehwald) sees an anticipatory *enim* in these lines; for he

¹⁵ Butler also cites *Geor.* 2.509 and *Aen.* 8.84 in support of his affirmative *enim*. In the former we should understand *geminatus enim* as a parenthetical clause: the orator stands open-mouthed and enraptured, because the applause has doubled. The second case is more difficult. After Aeneas has seen the white sow, foretold to him by Tiberinus, the poet says: *quam plus Aeneas tibi enim tibi maxima Juno/ mactat sacra ferens et cum grege sistit ad aram* (84-85). The difficulty is not helped by translating "to thee, Juno, even thee." Rather, it seems to me, this is a two-in-one sentence. In full, we would have something like: *quam Aeneas tibi mactat, Juno, tibi enim mactat (or mactare debuit)*. That is, "Aeneas sacrifices it to thee, Juno, for it is to thee that he makes sacrifice (or had to make sacrifice)." The words refer back to 60-62, spoken by Tiberinus, in which he advises Aeneas to supplicate Juno and to leave his own (i.e., the river-god's) honors until after Aeneas's victory. The *enim* motivates the apostrophe to Juno. We find *enim* or *nam*, usually proleptic, used frequently with formulae of address. See, e.g., *Aen.* 1.65: *Aeole, namque tibi, etc.*; 1.198: *O socii, neque enim, etc.*; and especially Ovid, *Met.* 15.581: *Rex, ait, o salve: tibi enim tibi, Cipe, tuisque/ hic locus et Latiae parebunt cornibus arces*. The *enim* clause obviously motivates the use of *rex* in addressing Cipus. Notice the likeness to *Aen.* 8.84 in *tibi enim tibi* followed by a vocative.

paraphrases: "Apollo folgt der Daphne auf dem Fusse (ihren Tritten, *sequitur vestigia*); denn er erträgt es nicht länger, seine Schmeichelworte vergebens an sie zu wenden." With this view I agree; for we have the following thought sequence:

- A. Daphne's beauty is enhanced by her flight.
- B. Apollo decides to waste coaxing words no longer.
- C. He quickens his pace.

The supported statement C, I believe, begins with *admisso*. The *ut* clause is a second subordinate thought following upon the *enim* clause, which is virtually subordinate. "Her beauty was enhanced by her flight; but since the young god would no longer put up with wasting his coaxing words, and as his very passion advised him, he pursued with quickened pace."

6. *Metamorphoses* 5.636. Arethusa is telling of her adventure with Alpheus:

in latices mutor sed enim cognoscit amatas
amnis aquas positoque viri quod sumpserat ore
vertitur in proprias ut se mihi misceat undas (636-638)

Here the thought sequence is:

- A. I turn into water.
- B. Alpheus recognizes me in the water.
- C. He returns to his own watery form.

B obviously gives the reason for C. However, C is joined to B by *que*, and after a *quod* or *quia* or causal *cum* clause, the main sentence is never introduced by a copulative conjunction. Latin has no apodotic *δέ*. For the moment let it be sufficient to observe that though the two clauses are connected by *que*, the one that contains *enim* is explanatory of the other.

7. *Metamorphoses* 6.152, said of Niobe:

multa dabant animos sed enim nec conjugis artes
nec genus amborum magnique potentia regni
sic placuere illi quamvis ea cuncta placerent
ut sua progenies et felicissima matrum
dicta foret Niobe si non sibi visa fuisset (152-156)

- A. Niobe had many reasons for pride.
- B. Nothing pleased her so much as her children.

C. She would have been known as happiest of mothers, if she hadn't thought so herself.

B gives the grounds for the conditional sentence expressed in C. The *et* of 155 may be taken adverbially: Niobe would have also been known as the happiest of mothers; that is, she would have had this glory in addition to the others. The *sed* indicates that though she had many reasons for pride, she failed to have that glory which she most coveted. But perhaps the *et* connects the clauses as does *que* in 6.

8. *Metamorphoses* 10.323, Myrrha's soliloquy:

di precor et pietas sacrataque jura parentum
 hoc prohibete nefas scelerique resistite nostro
 si tamen hoc scelus est sed enim damnare negatur
 hanc Venerem pietas coeuntque animalia nullo
 325 cetera dilectu nec habetur turpe juvencae
 ferre patrem tergo fit equo sua filia conjunx
 quasque creavit init pecudes caper ipsaque cuius
 semine concepta est ex illo concipit ales
 felices quibus ista licent humana malignas
 330 cura dedit leges et quod natura remittit
 invida jura negant

In 323 *negaret* is read by the first hand of M (Codex Marcianus), eleventh century, one of the two most authoritative manuscripts, and this reading was adopted by Merkel and Ehwald.¹⁶ With Miller and others I prefer *negatur*, the reading of all other manuscripts and of the second hand of M, since the verbs of the parallel clauses (324–328) are all indicatives.

Miller, Korn, and Magnus agree that this *enim* is "for," "denn," and interpret *sed enim* elliptically. Miller translates: "But I am not sure, for piety refuses, etc." But the thought sequence shows that there is no need for ellipsis; the *enim* is anticipatory:

A. May I be kept from this sin, if it be a sin.

B. There is precedent in nature for incestuous love.

C. It is human convention that has devised such malicious inhibiting laws.

B gives the grounds for the conclusion expressed in C, which begins with *humana* (329), a word that is made significant by its initial

¹⁶ See Ehwald's critical apparatus.

position in the conclusion. *enim* introduces a series of clauses, which are followed by a parenthesis *felices . . . licent* before the supported statement (the conclusion) begins.

9. *Metamorphoses* 11.13, the attack of the Thracian Bacchantes upon Orpheus:

- 10 alterius telum lapis est qui missus in ipso
aëre concentu victus vocisque lyraeque est
ac veluti supplex pro tam furialibus ausis
ante pedes jacuit sed enim temeraria crescunt
bella modusque abiit insanaque regnat Erinys
15 cunctaque tela forent cantu mollita sed ingens
clamor et infracto Berecynthia tibia cornu
tympanaque et plausus et Bacchei ululatus
obstrepere sono citharae tum denique saxa
non exauditi rubuerunt sanguine vatis

Verses 12–14 are rejected by Postgate, and Slater reports that 13 is in the margin of manuscript U, Urbinas 341, eleventh or twelfth century.¹⁷ Whether genuine or not, verse 13 contains *sed enim*, which must be explained. The thought sequence is as follows:

A. Orpheus's music charmed the missiles thrown at him.

B. The Bacchantes' fury and din kept growing.

C. The stones could no longer hear Orpheus's music, and they began to do him harm.

B gives the reason why the stones at last hurt Orpheus. *enim* introduces a series of three clauses (13f.). Accepting the text as given above, we then have a parenthesis (15–18) in which the thought of the preceding lines is expanded. The supported statement begins in 18 with *tum denique*.

10. *Metamorphoses* 12.516. The Centaurs heap trees on Caeneus:

- obrutus inmani tumulo sub pondere Caeneus
515 aestuat arboreo congestaque robora duris
fert umeris sed enim postquam super ora caputque
crevit onus neque habet quas ducat spiritus auras
deficit interdum modo se super aëra frustra
tollere conatur jactasque evolvere silvas
520 interdumque movet veluti quam cernimus ecce
ardua si terrae quatiatur motibus Ide

¹⁷ See the critical apparatus of both Ehwald and Slater.

exitus in dubio est alii sub inania corpus
 Tartara detrusum silvarum mole ferebant
 abnuit Ampycides medioque ex aggere fulvis
 525 vidit avem pennis liquidas exire sub auras

Merkel rejected 518–521. There is some reason to do so; for the picture of the hero's heaving about under the load of trees does not fit very well into the context. Ovid has said in 517 that Caeneus can no longer breathe; immediately thereafter *exitus in dubio est* would be much more effective than it is in the above text. In any case we can look upon 518–521 as parenthetical, an amplification of the *postquam* clause. Hence we have the following thought sequence:

- A. Caeneus is buried beneath a heap of trees.
- B. There is disagreement about his fate.
- C. Some say that he was driven into the ground, others that he became a bird.

The *enim* sentence begins with a subordinate *postquam* clause, which repeats the substance of A, only adding that the pile became too much for Caeneus. The main *enim* clause is *exitus in dubio est*, which motivates the mention of two different opinions about Caeneus's fate. The *sed* is transitional, marking a change in the train of thought from description of Caeneus's battle to consideration of his fate. Nestor means to say, "But since there is doubt about Caeneus's end, I cannot tell you for sure what happened to him, but only the two opinions that men have, which are, etc." Compare *Metamorphoses* 14.696–698:

quoque magis timeas, etenim mihi multa vetustas
 scire dedit, referam tota notissima Cypri
 facta, . . .

11. *Metamorphoses* 13.141. Ulysses speaks against Ajax:

nam genus et proavos et quae non fecimus ipsi
 vix ea nostra voco sed enim quia rettulit Ajax
 esse Jovis pronepos nostri quoque sanguinis auctor
 Jupiter est totidemque gradus distamus ab illo (140–143)

- A. We can hardly claim credit for our ancestry.
- B. Ajax has mentioned that he is grandson of Jupiter.
- C. Jupiter is my grandfather too.

Here *quia* is used to introduce Ulysses's motive for mentioning his own ancestry. *enim* is placed immediately before *quia*, and at first sight, if we take it as "for," we would assume that it introduces *nostri . . . ab illo*. In that case, this *sed enim* must be elliptical. I suggest, however, that *enim* reinforces *quia*. *quia enim* is used by Plautus, both words belonging to the same causal idea, e.g., *Captivi* 884:

HEGIO. Quid tu per barbaricas urbis juras? ERGASILUS. Quia enim item asperae sunt, etc.¹⁸

quod enim is used by Varro, and by Apuleius, e.g., *Metamorphoses* 11.19:

. . . religiosa formidine retardabar, quod enim sedulo percontaveram difficile religionis obsequium. . . .¹⁹

Such expressions were no doubt colloquial. Older English "for that" is roughly analogous.

12. *Metamorphoses* 14.641, Vertumnus to Pomona:

quid non et Satyri saltatibus apta juventus
fecere et pinu praecincti cornua Panes
Silenusque suis semper juvenalior annis
640 quique deus fures vel falce vel inguine terret
ut poterentur ea sed enim superabat amando
hos quoque Vertumnus neque erat felicior illis
o quotiens habitu duri messoris aristas
corbe tulit verique fuit messoris imago
652 denique per multas aditum sibi saepe figuras
repperit ut caperet spectatae gaudia formae

A. All the rural deities loved Pomona in vain.

B. Vertumnus surpassed all in love for her, though just as unsuccessful.

C. He took all sorts of disguises so as to have a chance to see her.

B explains why Vertumnus tried so many devices to win sight of Pomona. C represents all of lines 643–653, though the essential thought is summed up in the final two (652f.).

¹⁸ See also *Bacch.* 50, *Mil.* 834.

¹⁹ See also *Met.* 9.11, 25 and 10.23; and Varro, *R.R.* 1.13.4: alteram enim partem (stercilini) fieri oportet novam, alteram veterem tolli in agrum, quod enim quam recens quod confracuit melius.

13. *Fasti* 2.751. Lucretia says to her handmaids:

sint tantum reduces sed enim temerarius ille
 est meus et stricto qualibet ense ruit
 mens abit et morior quotiens pugnantis imago
 me subit et gelidum pectora frigus habet (751–754)

- A. I wish that our husbands would come back from war.
- B. My husband is rash and rushes in anywhere.
- C. I nearly die whenever I think of him in battle.

As often in everyday language, the thought is compressed; all the logical steps are not filled in. Lucretia means, "Since my husband is reckless, I'm afraid that he won't come back, and the thought of that nearly kills me."

14. *Fasti* 5.529. Hyrieus tells his divine guests of the vow he made to his wife never to marry again:

et dixi et servo sed enim diversa voluntas
 est mihi nec conjunx sed pater esse volo (529f.)

- A. I have kept my word.
- B. I have a different desire.
- C. I want to be a father.

The thought is greatly compressed. Hyrieus means to say, "I want to have a son, but I won't marry again because of my oath. But since my real wish, after all, is not to be a husband but a father, that's what my choice will be, to become a father." The *nec* of 530 may be considered adverbial,²⁰ but it is much more likely that we have another instance of the phenomenon seen in 6 above (*Met.* 5.636–638)—the joining of B and C by a copulative conjunction with *enim* present in B to mark the causal nature of the thought.

15. *Amores* 3.2.73. The favored charioteer loses:

favimus ignavo sed enim revoke Quirites
 et date jactatis undique signa togis (73f.)

This is plainly not a case of anticipatory *enim*. If it is not to be taken as adverbial *enim* with affirmative intent—and I cannot see that a word meaning "indeed" or "surely" would be of any use in

²⁰ See *Ciris* 270: cui Parcae tribuere nec ullo volnere laedi. It is always adverbial in *neque enim*.

the sentence—then we must regard this *sed enim* as elliptical. An imperative is very rare after a causal conjunction, but there are examples. In Vergil's *Georgics* 3.70 we find one:

semper erunt quarum mutari corpora malis:
semper enim refice ac ne post amissa requiras
anteveni et subolem armento sortire quotannis. (69–71)

Though this is often cited as an example of affirmative *enim*, I see no reason why Page's comment cannot be accepted:

“‘for always be renewing.’ The argument is this—‘you will always be wanting to change some of your old cows for young ones, *for* continual renewal is essential to prevent a herd degenerating.’ Instead, however, of writing *semper enim reficienda (corpora matrum)*, Virgil vigorously writes *semper enim refice*.”

In Greek a causal conjunction is occasionally found with an imperative, as in Plato's *Republic* 346a, ἐπεὶ τοσόνδε εἰπέ.²¹

So in this passage of the *Amores* we can understand *enim* as justifying an unspoken objection. Ovid's intention is: “We've favored a nincompoop. But don't be hard on him, citizens, because it's better to show good nature by calling him back.”

The current texts also show *sed enim* in *Metamorphoses* 9.248 and 11.401. In both places the surrounding text is uncertain, so that the thought relations present cannot be worked out with confidence.²² As the texts stand, *sed enim* must be understood elliptically.

In all fifteen passages quoted above we see that *enim* accompanies a clause that presents a reason or explanation or motive for an expressed or unexpressed thought. Of the fifteen examples,

²¹ Compare the use of simple γάρ to introduce wishes, as in Dem. 19.285, μὴ γὰρ οὕτω γένοιτο.

²² *Met.* 9.248: obligor ipse tamen sed enim nec pectora vano/ fida metu paveant istas nec spernite flammas (Ehwald's text). In 248 both *ne* and *nec* are found in the manuscripts, and the text of 249 is very uncertain. As the text stands, we have another case of *enim* introducing an imperative idea. *Met.* 11.401: Thetis hanc pro conjuge supplex/ accepit veniam. sed enim revocatus ab acri/ caede lupus perstat dulcedine sanguinis asper/ donec . . . / marmore mutavit. In 401 *in agris* is found in M, and Merkel adopts *in acri*. *revocatus* is difficult; it must be interpreted as a concessive participle; and *irrevocatus* occurs as a variant. Then the nymph Psamathe must be understood as subject of *mutavit*, though two main clauses with different subjects have intervened since she was last mentioned. Possibly something has dropped out of the text. On both passages see the apparatus of Ehwald and Slater.

In the Vergilian corpus *sed enim* appears as a correction in *Ciris* 13. But the text is hopelessly corrupt.

only one (15) is certainly elliptical, while another (3) may be. In all the other cases, the thought is completed; the supported sentence, which properly belongs to *sed*, follows the *enim* clause. Hence *enim* is usually anticipatory in these occurrences of *sed enim*. We have a reversal of the usual order of *sed* clause and *enim* clause, as seen in Cicero's *De Officiis* 3.6.30:

sed communis utilitatis derelictio contra naturam est, est enim injusta.

In all fifteen passages given above no one would fail to recognize causal *enim* if the usual order were followed (we may leave metrics out of account and speak of these as prose sentences). For example the thought of 5 above could be expressed as follows: *sed vestigia admisso passu sequitur, blanditias enim perdere ultra non sustinet.*

While ordinarily the *enim* sentence follows the statement that it supports, occasionally it precedes, as γάρ sentences sometimes precede. There are several occurrences of anticipatory *enim* or *nam* in the *Aeneid*, e.g., 1.261, where Jupiter says to Venus:

hic tibi, fabor enim, quando haec te cura remordet,
longius et volvens fatorum arcana movebo,
bellum ingens geret Italia. . . . (261–263)

The *enim* clause runs to *movebo*; it presents a conversational sort of explanation or justification for giving Venus specific information about Aeneas's future. See also 1.643:

Aeneas, neque enim patrius consistere mentem
passus amor, rapidum ad naves praemittit Achaten,

and an example of anticipatory *nam* in 3.374, where Helenus says to Aeneas:

Nate dea, nam te majoribus ire per altum
auspiciis manifesta fides, sic fata deum rex
sortitur volvitque vices, is vertitur ordo,
pauca tibi e multis quo tutior hospita lustres
aequora et Ausonio possis considerare portu
expediam dictis; . . . (374–379)

The sentence that is motivated by the *nam* clause begins in 377 and is separated from the *nam* clause by a line and a half in which the motivating thought is expanded, a somewhat complex pattern such as we observe in 1, 8, and 9 above.²³

²³ See also *Aen.* 1.65; 1.198; 4.20; *Met.* 3.336; 12.383; 14.695; 14.841; *Fast.* 1.659; 4.358.

In nine cases (1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13) the *enim* is employed where the author might have used a subordinating causal conjunction such as *quod*, *quia*, *quoniam*, or *cum*; for there is asyndeton between the two sentences. The *enim* clause is logically, though not grammatically, subordinate. For in two examples (6, 14), though the first sentence that follows *sed enim* explains the second, the two are connected, as we have seen, by a copulative conjunction. We may understand this better by observing that *sed* alone is often followed by two sentences of which the first is more or less explanatory of the second, a structure that is natural in both popular and poetic speech. See *Metamorphoses* 11.376:

sed mora damnosa est, nec res dubitare remittit,

which could be expressed: *sed res non dubitare remittit, mora enim damnosa est*; and *Metamorphoses* 12.567f.:

nec grave vulnus erat; sed rupti vulnere nervi
deficiunt motumque negant viresque volandi,

which could be: *sed nervi motum viresque negant, rupti enim vulnere deficiunt*.²⁴ The same structure is found in English after "but": Edward Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chapter 4:

"But the words of the assassin sunk deep into the mind of Commodus, and left an indelible impression of fear and hatred against the whole body of the senate."

Ernest Hemingway, *Death in the Afternoon*.²⁵

"If the husband has no contracts he does not make a living. But at each contract he risks death and no man can go into the ring and say that he will come out alive."²⁶

In each case *sed* or "but" introduces both statements, but is perhaps more closely related in thought to the second than to the first. Now in a structure of this sort in Latin, it appears that *enim* may be inserted in the first sentence to bring out its explanatory nature.

²⁴ See also *Met.* 2.445f.; 10.408-410; 11.446-448. An example with asyndeton occurs in *Met.* 3.354f.: *sed fuit in tenera tam dura superbia forma, / nulli illum juvenes, nullae tetigere puellae*.

²⁵ (New York—London, 1932) 104.

²⁶ See also R. W. Emerson, essay on *Intellect*, "But our wiser years still run back to the despised recollections of childhood, and always we are fishing up some wonderful article out of that pond."

Hence *enim* loses its conjunctive, though not its causal, nature when used in this way.

Vergil once uses simple anticipatory *enim* in a clause that is joined by *que* to the supported statement, *Aeneid* 10.873f.:

atque hic Aeneas magna ter voce vocavit.
Aeneas agnovit enim laetusque precatur.

The prayer follows. Editors construe this, too, as an affirmative *enim*.²⁷ But Aeneas's recognition of Mezentius explains his joy and the prayer that he makes.

We have already seen another situation in which *enim* is non-conjunctive and also reinforces a causal idea; namely, where it is joined to *quia*, as in example 11, or to some other causal word. Close to this is its use in example 2 with *ex quo*. Thus *enim* is used somewhat as *quippe* is, which is usually a coordinating causal conjunction, but may be used to emphasize the causal idea in a clause that is otherwise connected; *quippe cum* and *quippe qui* are very common.²⁸ *enim* is joined to *namque* by Commodianus; while Cicero uses *quippe enim* four times.²⁹ *enim* and *quippe* in the causal field are employed like *tamen* in the adversative field when it is used after *sed* or *at*.

In no case that I have quoted are *sed* and *enim* separated (but see 22 below). However, Ovid uses *at . . . enim* twice in much the same way as he uses *sed enim*; see *Metamorphoses* 3.336:

at pater omnipotens, neque enim licet inrita cuiquam
facta dei fecisse deo, pro lumine adempto
scire futura dedit poenamque levavit honore. (336-338)

and *Metamorphoses* 14.25: Glaucus appeals to Circe:

At Circe, neque enim flammis habet aptius ulla
talibus ingenium, seu causa est huius in ipsa
seu Venus indicio facit hoc offensa paterno,
talìa verba refert . . . (25-28)

In the first passage the *enim* clause explains why Jupiter did not restore his sight to Teiresias; in the second the *enim* clause explains

²⁷ E.g., Page and Papillon-Haigh.

²⁸ See Allen and Greenough, *New Latin Grammar* (Boston, 1903) sects. 535e, note 1, and 549, note 1; and the passages cited by Lewis and Short, *s.v.*, 4, 5.

²⁹ Commod. *Instr.* 2.8.8: *namque fatebor enim unum me ex vobis adesse*; Cic. *Caec.* 19.55; *Fin.* 4.3.7; *Or.* 2.54.218; *Att.* 6.3.1.

the nature of Circe's reply. Notice that these are clear cases of anticipatory *enim*.

It may be said that *sed enim* was used by Vergil and Ovid for its metrical convenience in the dactylic hexameter. This may be true, but it does not mean that the poet threw in *enim* because he needed two syllables after *sed*, with the intention that *enim* should be meaningless. For that would be impossible. The Roman could not hear *enim* without understanding it in some familiar way. Words with a connotation cannot be used meaninglessly.

Now we must ask whether these results of the analysis of *sed enim* in Vergil and Ovid hold true for other writers and other periods. There is no certain occurrence of *sed enim* in Cicero's works. It appears in manuscripts at *Pro Caelio* 24.60, where *etenim* is a variant reading that is generally accepted by editors, and in *Ad Atticum* 6.1.11, where it is questioned by editors.³⁰ In both cases it is elliptical, if genuine.

However, Cicero uses *at enim* several times.³¹ He uses it mainly to introduce an opponent's objection to his argument. See *De Officiis* 3.20.79:

At enim cum permagna praemia sunt, est causa peccandi.

"But (that is not the whole truth, someone may object), for when the rewards are very great, there is reason to transgress." In *De Officiis* 1.40.144 *at enim* introduces the speaker's objection, though it does not appear to be meant seriously. Thus, Cicero's *at enim* differs from the *sed enim* of Vergil and Ovid.

Among other contemporaries of Vergil and Ovid, Cornelius Severus and Germanicus offer one instance of *sed enim* each.

16. Cornelius Severus: ³²

oraeque magnanimum spirantia paene virorum
in rostris jacuere suis sed enim abstulit omnis
tamquam sola foret rapti Ciceronis imago
tunc redeunt animis ingentia consulis acta
jurataeque manus, etc. (1-5)

Though we do not have the whole context, his use of *sed enim* appears to agree with Vergilian and Ovidian usage: all the great

³⁰ *Att.* 6.1.11: *sed enim οἰκονομία* si perturbator est, tibi adsignato; te enim sequor *σχεδιάζοντα*. This would be another case of an imperative after *enim*. Possibly the second *enim* has affected the reading.

³¹ For citations see Barendt, *loc. cit.* (see note 1) 208f.

³² Corn. Sev. *Fr.* 13.2 (Baehrens).

deeds of Cicero's life were recalled at this time; for his death overshadowed all other sorrowful events.

17. Germanicus, *Aratea* 653. Orion offends Diana:

- 650 devotus poenae tunc impius ille futurae
 nudabatque feris angusto stipite silvas
 pacatamque Chion dono dabat Oenopioni
 haud patiens sed enim Phoebi germana repente
 numinis ultorem media tellure revulsa
 655 scorpion ingenti maiorem contulit hostem
 parcite mortales numquam levis ira deorum
 horret vulnus adhuc et spicula tincta veneno
 flebilis Orion et quamquam parte resecta
 teli paene fugit tamen altis mergitur undis
 660 scorpius ardenti cum pectore contigit ortus

A. Orion was clearing Chios of wild beasts at the time he offended Diana.

B. Diana raised a monstrous scorpion against him.

C. He still fears the scorpion and runs from it.

That is, Orion vanquished many fierce beasts, but he met his match in the scorpion, which he still dreads; for Diana sent a scorpion to kill him.³³ The main point in this part of the *Phaenomena* is that Orion, the mighty hunter, is terrified of the scorpion,³⁴ ὃς καὶ ἐπέρχομενος φοβέει μέγαν Ὠρίωνα (636). Aratus makes clear the contrast between the other wild beasts and the scorpion, speaking of the former as θηρία πάντα (638), of the latter as θηρίον ἄλλο (641). Though he introduces the second thought in the sequence with δέ only, he introduces the third with τοῦνεκα, which marks it as a consequence of the second.

In pre-Ciceronian Latin *sed enim* occurs but once. It is used in an oration by the elder Cato,³⁵ who is speaking on the Roman victory over King Perses.

18. sed non Rodienses modo id noluere sed multos populos atque multas nationes idem noluisse arbitror atque haut scio an partim eorum fuerint qui non nostrae contumeliae causa id noluerint evenire sed enim id metuere ne si nemo esset homo quem vereremur quidquid luberet faceremus ne sub solo imperio nostro in servitute nostra essent libertatis suae causa in ea sententia fuisse arbitror.

³³ Line 656 is a parenthetical exclamation.

³⁴ See *Phaen.* 636–646.

³⁵ *A p. Gell. N. A.* 6.3.16 (Jordan 2, p. 23).

The reading *metuere ne si* is uncertain, but Cato appears to be saying, "Many people didn't want us to win, though it was not in contempt of us that they were against our victory; but since they were afraid that we would do whatever we pleased if we had no one to fear, they took this attitude for the sake of their freedom." The *enim* sentence ends with *faceremus*; the second *ne* clause is subordinate to the conclusion. Thus Cato uses *sed enim* just as Vergil and Ovid usually do: the *enim* is causal and anticipatory, and the thought is completed.

Plautus and Terence appear to use *verum enim* as Cato and the Augustan poets use *sed enim*.

19. *Cistellaria* 80, Syra Lena to Selenium:

Matronae magis conducibilest istuc mea Selenium
unum amare et cum eo aetatem exigere quoi nuptast semel
verum enim meretrix fortunatist oppidi simillum
non potest suam rem obtinere sola sine multis viris (78-81)

"It's best for a *wife* to love and live with one man, but seeing that a *strumpet* is like a rich city, she has to share her wealth with many men." *enim* introduces a corroborative generalization.³⁶

20. Terence, *Adelphoe* 201. Sannio complains that Aeschinus not only treats him badly, but wants the girl at cost price too; then he says:

verum enim quando bene promeruit fiat

"But since he's deserved well, let it be." *enim* reinforces *quando*, a case like example 11 above. In the other two occurrences in Terence *verum enim* is elliptical.³⁷

There are many occurrences of *sed enim* in the Silver Latin period, both in poetry and in prose, though Quintilian calls the expression an archaism.³⁸

sed enim occurs twenty times in the *Punica* of Silius Italicus.

³⁶ Also *Mil.* 293, where the connection of thought is loose, as is proper in a slave's speech: "seeing that if the gods loved you, you wouldn't touch that story, you're bringing woe upon yourself by using it." At *Poen.* 874 the text is very bad. *Capt.* 999 has *verum enimvero*, which appears to fit the same formula. But *enimvero* is a subject in itself.

³⁷ *Eun.* 742; *Phorm.* 555.

³⁸ *Inst.* 9.3.14.

Sixteen have completed formulae, four are elliptical.³⁹ In the former group the connection of thought sometimes lacks logical precision, and the force of *enim* may not be plainly understood at first glance, though it can, I think, always be felt.⁴⁰

21. *Punica* 12.104. Virrius has just spoken to Hannibal:

Virrius haec sed enim ductor numerabat inertes
atque actos sine Marte dies ac stare pudebat
ingemit adversis respectansque irrita tecta
urbe Dicarchea parat exsatiare dolorem (104–107)

That is, since Hannibal felt ashamed of his inactivity, he decided to attack Puteoli. The *sed* is transitional.

Silius presents the only case that I have found of *sed . . . enim*.

22. *Punica* 10.289: Paulus refuses to leave the battlefield of Cannae:

ille ego sed vano quid enim te demoror aeger
Lentule conquestu perge atque hinc cuspidē fessum
eripe quadrupedem propere (289–291)

“I—but get away as fast as you can; for why should I delay you with futile complaint?”

Of the sixteen completed formulae only four are coordinative, that is, have the explanatory sentence attached to the supported sentence by means of a coordinating conjunction in the manner of 6 and 14 above. The following passage is very interesting.

23. *Punica* 15.211:

non solum ante alios sed enim mirabile dictu
ante suos it victor equus currumque per auras
haud ulli durant visus aequare volentem (211–213)

³⁹ Completed: 1.33; 2.180; 7.177, 506; 10.289, 481; 11.46; 12.104, 306, 435, 627, 719; 14.425; 15.123, 211, 609. Elliptical: 10.592; 12.332; 17.116, 346.

⁴⁰ Compare *Pun.* 11.46: *sed enim interea temeraria pubes/delicta augebat pollutio ipsa senectus*. The old men, who should have been models of discipline, could actually be called more corrupt than anyone, since the youth multiplied their vices unchecked by them. The manuscripts read *pubes*; there is no need to change to *pubis* as editors do. A comma should be placed after *augebat*, but not after *ipsa*. *Pun.* 12.627: *ambustus sed enim ductor Sidonius armis/ sistebar socios et caecum e nubibus ignem/ murmuraque a ventis misceri vana docebat*. Hannibal told his frightened soldiers that the storm was merely lightning and thunder; he told them this, because he was trying to rally them. Here, I think, *et . . . que* is to be taken as “both . . . and.” *sistebar* should be taken as conative imperfect. In *Pun.* 12.719: *sed enim aspice*, the real content of the *enim* sentence lies in the indirect questions that follow. The supported statement is expressed in 725.

sed enim is substituted for *sed etiam*, but keeps its proper force. "The horse not only runs ahead of other horses, but since he runs ahead of his yoke-fellows, the eye cannot keep up with the chariot." In 15.611 the connective is *nec*. The other two cases are somewhat different; *at* or *ast* is used to resume the *sed* when the anticipatory *enim* clause has come to an end.⁴¹

Among the four elliptical cases Silius twice uses *sed vero sed enim*, which appears to be a variation of *sed enimvero*.⁴²

Manilius uses *sed enim* once elliptically; ⁴³ Valerius Flaccus and Statius employ it in completed formulae.⁴⁴

The prose writers do not differ from the poets in their usage.

24. Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 14.2.10. Gellius was advised to acquit a certain defendant. He continues:

sed enim ego homines cum considerabam . . . nequaquam adduci potui ad absolvendum jussi igitur diem diffindi atque inde a subselliis pergo ire ad Favorinum philosophum, . . .

"But since on contemplating the men I couldn't bring myself to acquit, I therefore ordered a postponement and went to see Favorinus." Notice the resumption with *igitur*, of which there is another example in Gellius (1.6.5). The *sed* is somewhat obscured after a long *enim* clause, and the frequent correlation of causal and inferential conjunctions takes over. In another place Gellius resumes the *sed* with *autem* (1.7.18).⁴⁵

Fronto and Apuleius use *sed enim* in completed formulae.⁴⁶ Fronto uses *igitur* once to continue after the *enim* sentence.⁴⁷ Apuleius uses elliptical *sed enim* at least once.⁴⁸ The legal writers too occasionally make use of *sed enim* in what I interpret to be completed formulae.⁴⁹

⁴¹ *Pun.* 2.183; 14.427.

⁴² The other two cases, *Pun.* 17.116 and 346, are more like the usual ἀλλὰ γάρ. In 346 *enim* introduces an imperative.

⁴³ *Astr.* 2.166.

⁴⁴ Val. Fl. 1.228; Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.123; 3.3.76; *Theb.* 3.601; 9.22. I do not know whether I have found all occurrences in Statius.

⁴⁵ Gellius also uses *sed enim* complete at 1.11.8; 17.1.3. The text is uncertain at *praef.* 18.

⁴⁶ Fronto, *Epist. ad Marc.* 1.5.1; 2.5; 2.8; Ap. *Pol.* 77.1; *Met.* 1.24. The text is corrupt in Fronto, *ad Ver.* 2.1.17.

⁴⁷ *ad Marc.* 1.5.1.

⁴⁸ *Apol.* 25.6.

⁴⁹ See *Dig.* 5.3.11; 6.1.1.3; 26.8.5.2. These passages require careful study, but it seems to me that an anticipatory *enim* is present in each. In *Dig.* 34.3.20 and

Finally, the Christian writers continue to employ *sed enim* according to the pattern of earlier writers.⁵⁰

25. Tertullian, *De Anima* 16.2. We should not ascribe both the rational and irrational parts of the soul to nature, and therefore to God:

sed enim a diabolo immissio delicti irrationale autem omne delictum igitur a diabolo irrationale, . . .

"But since it is the devil who puts wickedness into the soul, and all wickedness is irrational, therefore the irrational is from the devil."

Augustine uses both *sed enim* and *at enim* formulae to meet objections,⁵¹ much as Cicero uses *at enim*.

26. *De Civitate Dei* 1.11.1:

Sed enim multi etiam Christiani interfecti sunt . . . hoc si aegre ferendum est omnibus qui in hanc vitam procreati sunt utique commune est.

"But since (someone may object that) many Christians too have met death, such (I may reply) is the common lot of mortals." When the answer immediately follows as here, the *enim* may be considered anticipatory.

This survey of *sed enim* from Plautus to Augustine shows a consistent meaning and use. The following table presents the distribution of completed and elliptical formulae as used by those authors for whom I have complete data.⁵²

	Total	Elliptical	Complete
Cato	1	0	1
Vergil	4	0 (or 1)	4 (or 3)
Ovid	11	1	10
Cornelius Severus	1	0	1
Germanicus	1	0	1
Manilius	1	1	0
Silius Italicus	20	4	16
Valerius Flaccus	1	0	1
Statius, <i>Silvae</i>	2	0	2
	—	—	—
	42	6 (or 7)	36 (or 35)

45.1.63 Mommsen questions the reading *sed enim*. In the latter his emendation *etenim* is certainly right.

⁵⁰ Tert. *Anim.* 16.2; Aug. *Civ. Dei* 1.11.1; 13.24.17.

⁵¹ *at enim* in *Civ. Dei* 1.10.6; 1.12.1.

⁵² I do not include those passages whose texts are uncertain.

Hence, while *sed enim* may involve an ellipsis of the adversative thought, the first sentence after it usually explains the second.

In only one case, we have seen, is *enim* separated from *sed*; this is in contrast to the frequent ἀλλὰ . . . γάρ. It may be objected that if in the juxtaposed *sed enim* we suppose that each conjunction introduces a separate thought, we then have an initial *enim*, whereas *enim* should be postpositive in its own clause. But *enim* is an unemphatic word that can easily slide into the position immediately after *sed*. Moreover *enim* is not always postpositive. Both early and late it occasionally occurs at the beginning of a clause and in this position has provoked a variety of non-causal interpretations.⁵³ But it is obviously causal, answering the question *quid?* in *Miles Gloriosus* 429:

SCELEDRUS. Metuo maxime,
PALAESTRIO. Quid metuis? SC. Enim ne <nos> nosmet per-
diderimus uspiam.

Sometimes initial *enim* is used elliptically in dialogue, as is γάρ (postpositive) in Greek comedy. In *Adelphoe* 168 Aeschines says to Bacchis: "I intro nunciam tu." Sannio then speaks up: "Enim non sinam." No doubt he moves to prevent her, and his words explain his action: "(No,) for I won't let her."

Also in later Latin we now and then find an initial *enim*. It occurs three times in Apuleius' *Apology*, e.g., 18:

Idem mihi paupertatem opprobavit, acceptum philosopho crimen et ultro profitendum. enim paupertas olim philosophiae vernacula est.

The *enim* sentence obviously justifies the words *acceptum* . . . *profitendum*.

However, I do not think that the *enim* of *sed enim* is truly initial, but that it is postpositive *enim* that has slipped illogically into the place after *sed*; for *sed* is a strong word and is looked upon as introducing the whole of the following thought, and *enim*, a light word, has a liking for second place in the sentence. The speaker made no pause after *sed*, but immediately said *enim* and launched into his explanatory statement.

We should notice also that *enim* is not the first word of its own clause in 1, 2, 4, and 17 above. Rather it is *sed* that has been placed within the sentence. *Aeneid* 1.19, if the metre allowed it, could be: *sed progeniem enim*, etc.⁵⁴

⁵³ See Plaut. *Capt.* 592, *Mil.* 429, *Trin.* 1134; Ter. *Ad.* 168; Ap. *Apol.* 18, 98, 99.

⁵⁴ See also Sil. *Pun.* 12.627; Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.123; 3.3.76.

In all the examples given *enim* appears to mark the causal or explanatory relation of one thought to another. Hence *sed enim* does not give very good support to the theory that *enim* was sometimes merely a particle of emphasis. This is not to say that *enim* did not descend from an emphasizing particle. But the origin of a word can tell us little about what it meant to those who used it in later times. *enim*, like *nam*, is said to descend from a pronominal root **eno-*, **ono-*, **no-*.⁵⁵ There is actually little to indicate that in Latin there was a period of asseverative meaning between the original demonstrative meaning and the later causal meaning. *quod* is also a pronoun in origin, but certainly went through no intermediate stage of asseverative meaning. In any case, the only question can be, what did *enim* mean to the Latin speakers who used it after 240 B.C.?

It is true that the grammarian Priscian says that *enim* does not always have a causal meaning:

invenitur tamen etiam completiva quando δὴ significat Graecam conjunctionem (he then quotes *Aeneid* 1.19f.). invenitur eadem etiam pro affirmativa ut Terentius in *Andria* (206, where *enimvero* occurs).⁵⁶

Priscian himself, however, always uses *enim* and *nam* in a clear causal sense.⁵⁷ Since he lived at a time when the Latin of classical authors was no longer spoken (500 A.D.), it may be that, like later scholars, he was perplexed when *enim* was used elliptically or loosely. This is indicated by his statement that *enim* is sometimes expletive. He makes the same statement elsewhere about not only *enim* and *nam*, but also *vero*, *autem*, *quidem*, *equidem*, *quoque*, and Greek γάρ.⁵⁸ After quoting a sentence with *vero*, he says that the meaning of the sentence remains intact if *vero* is removed. Such a procedure would, of course, deprive any conjunction or particle of meaning. He thinks that *enim*, *nam*, and γάρ may be expletive or affirmative, but it is the expletive use that he emphasizes. He appears to think that a writer could divorce these words from all meaning and use them as fillers. And that, we can be sure, could no more be done than a poet could use "for" as a

⁵⁵ For the etymology of *enim* see A. Walde and J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*³, 1 (Heidelberg, 1938) 404f.; A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Latine*² (Paris, 1939) 301f.; Lindsay, *loc. cit.* (see note 8).

⁵⁶ *Instr. Gram.* 16.15.

⁵⁷ E.g., *ibid.* 16.14.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 16.13; 18.170, 173.

meaningless filler. Priscian says "abundat γάρ" after quoting *Iliad* 15.739; and he quotes *Iliad* 1.525 and *Odyssey* 1.33 for expletive or affirmative γάρ. But he is surely in error; the γάρ of each of the latter two verses, in any case, is obviously causal. And Priscian is certainly not right in saying that δὴ is an expletive word, if he means that it carried no significance of its own when it was placed in a sentence. Hence Priscian bases his case for non-causal *enim* on arguments that will not stand examination.

Now Priscian's alleged non-causal *enim*, as we have seen, is usually expletive and sometimes affirmative. He never says that it is adversative or copulative or inferential. Yet the claim is made that *enim* was frequently adversative or transitional in late Latin not long before Priscian's time.⁵⁹ Miss de La Harpe sees *enim* acquiring an adversative meaning from the combination *sed enim*. Löfstedt holds that *nam* and *enim* came to have the force of δέ (not δὴ as Priscian had it). However, I do not find it credible that a word which was generally used causally could adopt an adversative meaning whenever it suited the speaker. It is as though one should say "for" and ask that it be understood as "but." Of course, the relation of one thought to another may be viewed in more than one way; where one man sees and expresses a causal relation, another may see and express an adversative relation or may content himself with "and." Of interest in this regard is the Hebrew conjunction *kî*, which is usually causal, though it may also express temporal or declarative relations (like *ὥς*). After a negative statement, *kî* is often translated "but;"⁶⁰ e.g., Genesis 17.15, *lô-thiqrâ eth-shəmâ sārâi kî sārâ shəmâ*. In the King James version this is translated, "thou shalt not call her name Sarai, but Sarah shall her name be." But *kî* is not in itself adversative; this is one of its "for" uses. The literal translation is, "you shall not call her name Sarai, for Sarah is her name."

Occurrences of the alleged adversative *enim* are pointed out as early as Plautus, e.g., in *Mercator* 251, where Demipho is telling about his dream. A he-goat comes up to him:

infit mihi praedicare sese ab simia
capram abduxisse et coepit inridere me:
ego enim lugere atque abductam illam aegre pati. (249-251)

⁵⁹ See de La Harpe and Stolz, Schmalz, *loc. cit.* (see note 8); Einar Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zu Peregrinatio Aetherae* (Uppsala—Leipzig, 1911) 34f.; Joachim Durel, *Commodien* (Paris, 1912) 262.

⁶⁰ See F. Brown, S. R. Driver, C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Oxford, 1906) s.v. 3e (p. 474).

Since it appears that Demipho began to lament when he heard the goat say "capram abduxi," it is likely that the *enim* clause explains why the goat began to ridicule him.

But late Latin writers are most frequently quoted for the alleged adversative and copulative *enim*. Sister Aetheria, author of the *Peregrinatio ad Loca Sancta* in the late fourth century, frequently uses *nam* or *enim* to introduce sentences, and Löfstedt interprets her usage as purely transitional. For example, 4.1 (34):

. . . cepimus jam et descendere ab ipsa summitate montis Dei in qua ascenderamus in alio monte qui perjunctus est, qui locus appellatur in Choreb: ibi enim est ecclesia. nam hic est locus Choreb ubi fuit sanctus Helias propheta . . . nam et spelunca ubi latuit sanctus Helias in hodie ibi ostenditur. . . .

But the *enim* clause explains why they went up the second mountain. The first *nam* sentence explains why there is a church there, and the second *nam* sentence is meant to prove that this was really the Choreb of Saint Elias. Aetheria overused *nam* and *enim*, no doubt, but she used them to explain or corroborate, though loosely. This was perhaps common in the popular language that she writes. It is a phenomenon like the "I mean that" which many people overuse today and which is also explanatory, or, to pass to continuative words, like the "so" that begins many sentences in popular speech.

In English no one would deny that the conjunction "for" always has some sort of causal or explanatory meaning. If, as sometimes happens, it is not clear why a person has used "for," we still assume that he had some causal connection in mind; and if we inquire, we can usually discover the expressed or unexpressed thought that his "for" clause was meant to explain; we never say that his "for" was meant affirmatively or adversatively for the nonce, no matter what relations other than causal may be present in the thought sequence. Likewise, in at least ninety-nine per cent of all cases, *nam* and *enim* have obviously the same range as the English "for." In the remaining handful we should not lightly assume that they are being used non-causally, but we should first look into the context carefully to see whether there is not something present in the thought sequence for which the *enim* or *nam* clause can serve as reason or explanation. When *enim* can be interpreted as "for," no other interpretation should be adopted.