

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

AND

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

NO. XV.

AUGUST, 1847.

ARTICLE I.

ZUMPT'S LATIN GRAMMAR.

A Grammar of the Latin Language, by C. G. Zumpt, Ph. D., Professor in the University, and Member of the Royal Academy of Berlin. From the ninth edition of the original, adapted to the use of English students by Leonhard Schmitz, Ph. D., late of the University of Bonn. London, 1845.

By Charles Siedhof, Ph. D., late Rector of the Gymnasium at Aurich, in the Kingdom of Hanover.

In order to examine this valuable work from a proper point of view, and to form an estimate of it not merely as a grammar, but also as an indication of the rate of progress made in classical learning, it will be necessary to direct our attention first to other works of a different character, though of a similar design, which preceded it. At a time when nothing was required of the Latin scholar but an ability to write and speak the language as it had been in common use for centuries in the literary world, a lifeless and uniform method, as represented in the Grammar of J. Lange, of which not less than forty-two editions appeared, would meet the demand in elementary instruction. The circle of knowledge was then exceedingly narrow; and besides, the Germans, at that time, possessed no independent national literature. Consequently, reading was rather oft repeated than widely extended; and thus a great intimacy was contracted with the Roman classics, which compensated, in great measure, for the deficiency in

grammatical training. But an age of independent inquiry succeeded; the trammels of tradition were by degrees thrown off; and scholars were disposed to look into the nature of things, each for himself, more fearlessly and searchingly. Now Basedow made his appearance. With a keen glance, he discovered and exposed the defective character and bad influence of a merely mechanical system of education; but by maintaining that nothing except what was of direct practical utility should be studied by the young, he fell into the opposite extreme, which, in the end, would necessarily produce a reaction. According to his view, since language was but the mere expression of thought, it could best be acquired orally. Consequently grammars should be banished from the schools. From this point of view, the venerable Campe could say that the inventor of the spinning wheel deserved to be held in higher estimation than the author of the Iliad and the Odyssey. It was in allusion to this school that Ernesti said, "the mother-tongue (*Fras* Muttersprache), becoming proud of her new distinction as mistress, threatens to turn the Latin out of doors." Here, as in all controversies, there were violent partisans on both sides, fighting desperately for existence, and a third class who acted the part of mediators. The philologists of the old school looked with a friendly eye upon these last, whose aim was not to neglect ancient learning, but to exchange its cumbrous and unseemly dress for one of more comeliness and grace. By this means the popular favor, which was beginning to be lost, could be recovered and secured.

The first who attempted a reform of the old system of grammar was Scheller the lexicographer, a very industrious scholar, whose labors will always be regarded with respect, notwithstanding the disposition of later critics, particularly Reisig, to speak disparagingly of them. Bröder's work, with its brief rules and well-chosen examples, was much more successful. His peculiar method of treatment had the effect not only to facilitate the labor of committing to memory, a practice which universally prevailed at that time, but to secure, in his view a much higher end, namely, to allure the student to habits of reflection. After him, Wencck made the first direct attempt to arrange the grammatical materials of the Latin language, not according to arbitrary rules, but according to philosophical principles. The attempt was not very successful, though the elder Grotend,¹ who had the supervision

¹ To be distinguished from the younger Grotend, whose Latin Grammar has recently been edited anew by Krtger.

of the later editions of Wenck, had the confidence to say, in a preface, that he believed he had now brought the grammar of the Latin language to its highest degree of perfection. The work, however, had but a limited circulation. It was at this time that Zumpt first made his appearance as a Latin grammarian; and certainly no book of the kind ever published, was more deserving its reputation than this has been; a reputation which it still continues to enjoy. The principal aim of the author seems to have been to devise a logical system of grammar, and in this he has been unusually successful. He has accurately distinguished the different periods in the history of the language, and also the different kinds of composition employed by the various classes of writers, and then has presented the whole in a simple and perspicuous style. In this last respect, his Grammar is the rival of the Greek Grammar of Buttmann, which, as to style and manner of execution, is universally regarded as a model. Like Buttmann, he is willing to appear before the public in the character of a learner. Every successive edition gave evidence of the author's diligence in study.

Ramshorn, who next appeared before the public as a Latin grammarian, though he wrote in different journals disparaging reviews of the work of his predecessor, could effect no more for himself than to secure undue praise for his merit as a collector of original examples to illustrate the rules of grammar. These examples, on which his fame chiefly rests, are often taken from false readings, or from passages misinterpreted by him, and besides not unfrequently fail to establish the point for which they are adduced. A work so artificial in its arrangement, so overloaded with minute divisions and refinements, so erroneous in its rules, followed as they were by a multitude of examples, which, instead of illustrating a principle often perplex one by their obscurity, could never be generally adopted as a guide in teaching the young.

About this time, a new epoch in respect to Latin grammar was introduced. The influence of the Hegelian philosophy did not indeed directly affect this department of study. But the grammatical researches of Grimm, which brought to light such treasures of knowledge hitherto unknown, could not fail to extend their influence to the Latin language. With him commenced a process of historical inquiry so illimitable in its extent and so astonishing in its results, that the cultivators of Latin philology desired to apply the same method to their own department, and see if

they could not arrive at similar results. At the same time, the comparative study of languages in connection with the Sanscrit, as prosecuted by Bopp and others led to the discovery of general laws, by which many isolated facts could be explained that had hitherto baffled all the learning and ingenuity of the grammarians. Meanwhile Becker has brought out a system in respect to the German language, according to which the language appears to have within itself a perfect organization. This development is, to the best of our knowledge, more perfect than any which has been made in respect to other languages. Various writers, as Weissenborn, A. Grotefend, Feldbausch, and, at length, Kühner have endeavored to apply the system of Becker to Latin grammar, while others have given the preference to other methods. Among the latter, Biloth deserves the first place, whose early death all unite in deploring. He had been trained in the Hegelian school of philosophy ; and he retained the discipline and exactness of method which that school imparts to its disciples, while he abandoned its peculiar doctrines. There is no grammatical work on the Latin language, whose design and plan are so perfect as that of the School Grammar of Biloth, recently edited by Ellendt. The arrangement is so systematic and the rules so clear and precise, that, had the author given as much attention to the details of the language as to the method of treating it, scarcely anything more could be desired. Otto Schulz has also won general respect on account of the logical accuracy and the perspicuity which characterize his Latin Grammar. Reuscher, from Reissig's school, has attracted less notice. Reissig's lectures on Latin grammar, edited after his death by Haase, give abundant evidence of the high aims of their author, but they also betray his defects. In themselves considered, they are a singular compound of seriousness and frivolity, of ingenuity and prejudice ; while for the *present age* they are rendered truly valuable by Haase's ample and critical notes. Though these latter are very rich, and accurate in the examples collected, the *results* cannot always be trusted, on account of the occasional incompleteness of the collections made.

Before we pass to an examination of the work before us, it seems to us necessary to premise a few observations on the nature of grammar in general, and on the method of the grammar of a given particular language in particular. We may thereby not only avoid a direct collision with the respected author,—which would be of no use here where we are concerned with principles

alone,—but we may have more space for the discussion of the necessary details. We have directed our attention, with intense interest, for a series of years to the grammar of Zumpt, and made it the basis of our study of the Latin language, and especially of the language of Cicero, whose entire works we have perused fourteen times for grammatical purposes, and may therefore, perhaps, indulge the hope of being able to contribute something from this source to the improvement of that valuable work. It will, of course, be impossible to incorporate in this review all the results of the investigations which we have thus made. We must, therefore, content ourselves with producing only so much as a regard to the practical influence of this work as a school-book requires.

If language is the form which thought assumes, grammar is one department of the philosophical treatment of that form. Lexicography is the other. Grammar treats of the connection of single forms of thought in constituting a sentence. Now as every man has an individual character peculiar to himself, so has every nation its peculiar character. Although the individual thinks according to the same general law as the nation, and even the race, still, if he have a marked character, he will express his thoughts in a peculiar way. This constitutes his style, by which nothing is meant but his peculiar mode of expressing his ideas. Precisely the same is true of a nation as such. Its language has different characteristics from those of any other nation. Even when several languages have one common descent, the offspring have a family resemblance. But they nevertheless differ from each other like different children of the same parents.

For authors of grammars, it was a happy era when men were unsuspecting enough to regard grammar as a statute-book, which regardless of legal principles, was a mere record of positive enactments. At that time, all grammars of the various languages were of the same stamp. The grammatical observations of most of the Dutch philologists on particular authors would fit one author just as well as another. When this comfortable manner had had its day, an attempt was made to substitute in its place what was called philosophical grammar. To this class belong the grammatical works of Vater and Sylvester de Sacy. It could not, however, but become evident in a short time, that nothing could come of such a method but definitions; and even these were defective because they were not the result of historical investigation. At present, this method is merged in the logical, founded on the

analysis of thought, which Becker, Herling and their numerous followers have adopted.

It is, to be sure, possible to sketch an image of an individual, by stating and illustrating the nature of man in general, and then pointing out how that nature is modified in the case of a given person. But this is a long and circuitous way, in which one is in danger of losing sight of the direct object of his pursuit. Again, all the grammars of languages the most various would, by such a procedure, come to have the same features. This method is correct only when one applies it to his mother tongue, which in this way alone can be thoroughly comprehended; for the investigator then sees in it his own spirit embodied in a distinct form, and thus the laws of the language are laid open to him.

If two grammars of two distinct languages resemble each other more than the languages themselves do, or—to retain the figure formerly employed—more than two individuals do, either one or both of them are constructed on false principles. The true principle is to be found only in the nature of the language, as the form which thought assumes, that is, in the form as such. The key to the peculiar character of a people is furnished by this form or mode of expression, not by the thought or thoughts as such, which, in particular circumstances might, for anything that appears to the contrary, belong to many nations. But how differently are the same thoughts expressed in different languages!

The grammarian must first acquire a view of the character of a people by studying separately and distinctly and then classifying the facts of its language and history, which together constitute, as it were, its soul and body. Hereby will he obtain a true image of the nature of the human mind as it is modified in the particular type before him. Then can he with the greater certainty, trace the individual traits, and show how these, when combined, must produce the general features as a whole.

We cannot here follow out this train of thought, or give more particularly the grounds for characterizing the Latin as the language of rigid law, the Greek, as the language of art unconsciously representing ideal beauty, and the German as the transition from the former to the latter, or rather the combination of what is authoritative and objective in the former with what is spontaneous and subjective in the latter. We have discussed these points in another place.¹ We are here concerned, not so much with these views, as with the right apprehension of the principle on

¹ Otto Wigand's *Vierteljahrsschrift*, Vol. I. No. 1, 1845.

which every grammar of a foreign language must be founded, namely, that of the particular form of such language. The principle on which a grammar of one's mother tongue is to be prepared, must, indeed, always be that of logical analysis.

Our author was the first to construct a grammar thoroughly on the latter principle. At the same time, his talent for nice observation, and his habits of careful investigation tended, in the course of several successive editions, to render that principle a secondary, and the perfecting of the several rules, a primary object. This the author himself confesses in his various prefaces, though not without side glances and an unfriendly mien at the method of later grammarians. We can easily imagine that a man who has accomplished what Zumpt has done, may become so attached to his work as to be shy of those who would improve upon the principle on which it is founded. We are far from wishing to cast reproach upon him, or upon any other person, for such a cause; for we recognize in this a necessity of nature from which no one is exempt, and least of all any one who, with great effort and devotedness to his task, has, for his times, accomplished it in a manner worthy of all imitation.

Being unable to compress into a single article any thorough examination of so broad a subject as that of Latin grammar in its whole extent, and having elsewhere¹ reviewed the etymological part of this same work, we shall restrict ourselves, in the present instance, to that part of the grammar which treats of the Syntax of the Latin tongue. We shall follow our author section by section, making such corrections and additions as seem to us necessary.

It may be proper here to remark, that the ninth edition of this Grammar does not differ essentially in its character from the eighth. The changes introduced relate not to the plan or tendency of the work, but consist in additions, improvements and corrections; and these are to be found on almost every page. The sections from 804 to 812, vary indeed in their order slightly from those of the preceding editions; but no great inconvenience to those who wish to combine the use of the last with any other edition will arise from so trifling a change.

We begin with § 363. In this section, according to the most recent investigations, a larger range is given to the use of the adjective as a substantive than was given in the former edition. Even before that edition Klotz had proved, in a remark on Cioe-

¹ Mager's Pädagogische Revue, 1845, Nos. 1 and 2.

ro de Amicitia V. 17. page 115, that docti and indocti are very often used as substantives. Hand's remark in his Lehrbuch des lateinischen Stils, p. 160, in which he expressly denies that an adjective is ever used as a substantive, is quite unaccountable. For further evidence compare Cic. pro Sextio XXVII 58: Multa acerba, multa turpia, multa turbulenta. Also phrases, as, dementis est Cic. de Officiis I. 24. 83: Sunt enim ignorantis Cic. Tusculan. I. 33. 80. A collection of all the passages in Caesar and Cicero where adjectives are employed substantively, is much needed.

‡ 365. The former too great restriction of the use of the adverb in connection with esse is relinquished. Yet the rule is not now sufficiently comprehensive. It is well known that satis est occurs very frequently. Cf. Cic. ad Famil. IX. 14. 2: quam satis est; and in a great many other places: Parumne est. Cic. pro Sext. XIV. 32.

‡ 366. In the example taken from Cic. pro Archia XII: qui est ex eo numero, etc. the preposition ex is to be stricken out; for it is not to be found, even as a doubtful reading, in that passage; but it is erroneously retained in all the editions of this Grammar.

‡ 367. It is true that with Cicero the singular of the verb follows uterque, quisque, etc. But the author should have noticed such passages as Cic. de Finn. III. 2. 8. quod quum accidisset, ut alter alterum necopinato videramus statim. Cic. ad Fam. III. 13, uterque nostrum—devinctus est, as the singular always must be used after uterque in connection with the genitive plural, and never, as one might suppose, can the form uterque nostrum devincti sumus be used. Exceptions; the Codex Erfurtensis has in Cic. pro l. Man. II. init. after alter—alter arbitrantur, which also according to Bennecke on this passage and according to Wunder in Varr. lectt. Cod. Erfurt, seems to deserve the preference.—De Inventione I. 3. 4. reads quisque cogereantur.

‡ 371. With id quod, when it relates to a whole clause, reference is made by Zumpt only to the nominative and accusative. For examples of the ablative, cf. de Invent. I. 26. 39: id quo. Liv. XXI. 10: id de quo.

‡ 372. The example haec fuga est, for which Zumpt has given no authority, is found indeed in Liv. II. 38, but Drakenborch has there according to the best Codd. hoc.

‡ 373. It should have been mentioned in this section, that the singular always follows pondo. Cf. Liv. XXVI. 14. 8: Pondo auri septuaginta fuit. Liv. XXVII. 10. 18.

† 374. Under the remark upon the singular of the verb after *aut—aut*, might also have been adduced, Cic. pro Planc. XXIX. 70: *aut Metellum Pium aut patrem ejus facturum*.

† 377. A clear example for the neuter of an adjective referring to a masculine or feminine noun, as the name of a *thing*, is found in Cic. de Ami. XXVII 100; *sive amor sive amicitia. Utrumque enim dictum est ab amando*.

† 380. On *videri* it ought to have been observed, that it is *always* used personally, even when *found in an intermediate clause* with *ut*, Cic. ad Famill. XVI 4: *teque, ut mihi visus est, diligit*. See the examples quoted by the author to show this.

† 381. There is in this paragraph an omission. We must add, that in such infinitive sentences as can be translated by the indefinite nominative, *one*, or the word *on* in French, the common adjective pronoun *his* is also in Latin expressed by *suis*. Cic. in Pisone XX. extr.: *Quid est aliud furore, non cognoscere homines; cruentare corpus suum leve est; major haec est vitae, famae, salutis suae vulneratio*.

† 384. To the verbs here cited should be added *legare*, Cic. pro Sext. XIV. 33: *legatos, quos—legasti*. In Vatin. XV. 35: *legati—legarentur*.

† 388. Freund in his Latin Lexicon states that *profugio* was not used with an accusative till after the Augustan age; but this is a mistake; for Cic. pro Sext. XXII 50, has: *Quum vim profugisset*. But this is perhaps the only example to be found in Cicero's writings. It would have been better, however, if our author had not inserted, without any further explanation, this with the class of verbs that are commonly followed by the accusative.

† 389. Rem. 2. Add after the words, *rem cum re*; e. g. Cic. Brut. XXXVII 138: *cum Graecorum gloria—copiam aequatam*.

† 389. Rem. 3. It should have been remarked here, that *aemulare* is used with the dative of a person in a bad sense only, as Cicero explains it, Tuscul. IV. 26; in a good sense always with the accusative. Of the former use only a single example is furnished by Cicero, Tusc. I 19. 44: *quod iis aemulemur*. The remark that it is used with the dative might better have been omitted.

† 394. Among the examples cited for this use of the ablative no one is taken from Cicero, so that one might suppose it was unknown to this writer. But cf. Cic. Phil. IX. 7: *Quoniam cum Dolabella, hostile decreto, bellum gerendum est; ad Fam. VII.*

30: *quo mortuo nunciato* (renunciato). Further, for the vocative, Propert. II. 15. 2: *lectule deliciis facte beate meis*.

To the words named in remark 3. of the same paragraph should be added the verb *probare*. Cic. pro Milone XXIV. 65: *mirabar vulnus pro ictu gladiatoris probari*. In Verr. V. 29. 78: *quem pro illo vellet probare*. De Invent. I. 48: *pro vero probatur*. It stands also elsewhere in the same sense, cf. Cic. pro Sext. XXXVIII. 81: *qui pro occiso relictus est*.

‡ 396. The passage: *Eodem castra promovit*, etc. is not to be found in Caesar de Bello Gallico I. 48, but de Bello Civili I. 48.

‡ 410. When the author speaks concerning *amicus*, *inimicus*, and *familiaris*, which are used as adjectives as well as substantives, passages might have been quoted where both usages are combined, cf. Cic. pro Sext. VII. 15: *multo acrius otii et salutis inimici*.

‡ 411. *Sacer* should have been noticed here. It is not connected with the dative by Cicero, as it often is by other writers. The genitive is found Cic. in Verr. Act. II. 1. 18. 48: *illa insula eorum deorum sacra* putatur. The same is true of *vicinus*.

It is very surprising that the author retains the old distinction in respect to the use of *similis* and *dissimilis* founded on the idea of *external* and *internal* resemblance. If Cicero be read with a moderate degree of attention the untenableness of this will sufficiently appear. *Similis* and *dissimilis* referring to *persons* (men and gods) are used only with the genitive, cf. Cic. de Rep. I. 43: *qui in magistratu privatorum similis esse voluit*; referring to *things*, indiscriminately, with the genitive or dative. Examples are hardly necessary. Still, cf. Cic. de Nat. Deorr. I. 35. 97: *canis nonne similis lupo?* The passages which seem to contradict this are so few in number that we are compelled to question the correctness of the text. So Cic. in Verr. Act. II. 3. 53. 124: *Verris similem futurum*. Here the final *s* of *Verris* could easily have been absorbed by the following word *similis* in the manner of writing used by the ancient Romans. From the time of Livy the dative prevails; in the poets of the Augustan age the genitive perhaps never occurs, cf. Madvig ad Cic. de Finn. V. 5. 12.

‡ 413. *Cedo tibi locum, regnum, mulierem*. Never did a Roman of the classical period speak thus. Cicero used only the accusative of an adjective in the neuter, e. g. *multa*, cf. Cic. de Off. II. 18. 64.

‡ 414. For the different meaning of *metuo* with the dative and

the accusative a proof passage is found in Terence Andr. I. 3. 5 : Si illum relinquo, ejus *vitae* timeo ; sin opitulor, hujus *minas*.

†416. It is known that *inesse* is construed by Cicero always with *in* and the ablative never with the dative. The only passage, de Off. I. 42. 161 : *quibus* autem *artibus* aut prudentia major *inest* aut non mediocris utilitas quaeritur, does not prove much, because it is so easy and natural for the following quaeritur to have an influence upon the construction. Incumbere is never construed with the dative by Cicero but with *in*, in a figurative sense, with *in* and *ad*. To connect *assuescere*, *consuescere* and *insuescere* with the dative or *ad* is a later use ; in the time of Cicero they govern the ablative. The few exceptions cannot affect the rule, e. g. Caes. de B. G. VI. 28 : Uri *assuescere* ad homines ne parvuli quidem possunt.

†417. It should be remarked that Cicero rarely used *desperare* with the *dative* or with *de*. He construes the verb regularly with the accusative. Here it is to be observed that the difference of meaning presented by our author does not depend upon the difference of construction. Cic. pro Sext. XL. 89 : Desperabat *judicii turpitudinem*.

†419. As is well known, there are very many examples of the construction *probatur a*, which might have been noticed ; e. g. Cic. pro Mil. XIII. 6 : Causa Milonis a Senatu probata est ; de Finn. IV. 8. 19 : ab ea non sit probatum.

†420. Rem. The Graecism here mentioned, *aliquid mihi volenti est*, is found not only in Sallust and Tacitus, but also in Livy, XXI. 51 : *quibusdam volentibus* novas res fore.

†421. Rem. The name also, with Cicero, stands in the accusative after *nomen imponere*, Acad. II. 47. 145 : etiam *nomen est rei*, quod ante non fuerat, *κατάληψιν* imposuit.

†423. *Taedium* is neither a word of Cicero nor of Caesar.

†426. In this paragraph it should have been stated, that if the *genitive of an attribute stands in apposition*, still another substantive is to be added ; e. g. Cic. maximi ingenii *homo*, not merely maximi ingenii. Although the *genitive alone* is occasionally found in Livy, it is very rare with Cicero. It is found so in Livy, e. g. XXII. 60 ; XXVIII. 22 ; XXIX. 31 ; XXXVII. 7 ; XXX. 26 ; XXXV. 31 ; XLII. 65. With Cicero it occurs Phil. III. 15. 38 : *quodque* provinciam Galliam *certiorum, optimorum et fortissimorum virorum, amicissimorumque reipublicae civium*, — retineant ; pro Sext. LVI. 126 : summus artifex et mehercule *partium* in re publica tamquam in scena, *optimarum*.

‡ 429. A Graecism should have been mentioned here, which is found, for instance, in Cic. pro Sext. XLIII. 93: *quum sciat duo illa reipublicae paene fata, Pisonem et Galbinum, alterum haurire—innumerable pondus auri,—alterum pacem vendidisse.* Cf. Lucian. D. D. 16: *οἱ δὲ σοὶ παῖδες ἧ μὲν ἀνείων ἀφῆρυνῃ,* etc. as is very common in Greek.

‡ 433. The connection of an adjective of the second and one of the third declension in the genitive used as nouns, occurs even in Cicero, cf. Cic. de Nat. Deor. I. 27. 75: *nihil solidi, nihil expressi, nihil eminentia.* The use in this example has its ground in concinnity.

‡ 434. After *tum, temporis* should have been added; “but Cicero uses *id temporis*,” e. g. pro Milone X. 28; XX. 54.

‡ 435. Here could have been quoted some examples from Cicero; e. g. ad Fam. II. 18, extr. *Superioris lustris reliqua*; pro lege Man. III. *insignia* with the genitive; but also de partit. orat. XXI; in Verr. I. 38. II. 59, and Acad. II. 11. 36, *insigne*; pro Balbo V. *Sola terrarum*; Lael. IV. 14: *extremum* disputationis.

‡ 437. Rem. 2. The remark concerning *plenus* and *refertus* might give the impression that Cicero not only *commonly*, but *always*, used *refertus* with the ablative and *plenus* with the genitive. But this is not true. Cf. ad Attic. III. 14: *plenus expectatione*; pro Planc. XLI: *Cognovi refertam esse Graeciam sceleratissimorum hominum ac nefariorum*; pro lege Man. XI. 31: *referto praedonum mari.* But compare remark 462. To the passages on *consciis* with the dative might have been added pro Cluent. XX; in Verrem IV. 58.

‡ 446. The verb *incusare* is not Ciceronian; for Cat. Maj. V. 13, is *incusem* without manuscript authority. Rem. 1. If the prepositions are mentioned, *inter* should be enumerated with the rest. Cf. Cic. pro Rost. Amer. XXXII. 90: *qui inter Sicarios et de beneficiis accusabant*; Phil. II. 4. 8: *quo modo sis eos inter sicarios defensurus.* *Quaestio* is to be understood in the simplest way.

‡ 451. It should be remarked that *natus* when used figuratively is always to be put with the preposition. Cic. pro Sext. VII. 15: *nefarius ex omnium scelerum colluvione natus*; *ibid.* XXII. 50: *Marium—ex iisdem radicibus, quibus nos, natum.* The number of passages where this construction is found are extremely numerous; on the other hand the use of *natus* with *ex*, though connected with the father, is not rare. Cf. Cic. de Finn. II. 19. 61; Lael. VIII. and others.

† 455. Although it is true that if *men* are the instruments, in general the verb is not often placed with the bare ablative, yet the use in *particular* cases is to be observed. Cf. Caes. de B. G. I 8: Caesar *ea* legione, quam secum habebat, *militibusque*, qui ex provincia convenerant,—morum fossamque perducit; Cic. Tusc. I 1: non quia philosophia graecis et litteris et *doctoribus*, percipi non posset. Expressions, especially, which signify soldiers are usually placed thus in the ablative without the preposition; these are then regarded as mere instruments in the hand of the commander. Cic. pro Sext. XXXV. 75: Quum forum—*armatis hominibus* ac *servis plerisque* occupavissent; *ibid.* XLIV. 95: qui stipatus *sicariis*, septus *armatis*, munitus *inducibus* fuit; Id. pro Leg. Man. XI 30, twice: *magnis* oppressa hostium *copiis*, and, *legionibus nostris*—iter—patefactum est: Id. in Vat. XVII. 40: Milonem—*gladiatoribus* et *bestiariis* obsedissem rempublicam; Id. pro Sext. XXIV. 54: erat expulsus vi, *servitio* denique *conciato*.

† 460. The verb constipare is to be stricken out, because it never occurs with an ablative.

† 462. We have, in section 437 above, the construction of *refertus*. Here it is to be remarked, that Latin writers prefer to construe it with the genitive when used with reference to persons. Cf. Cic. de Orat. II 37. 154: nam et *referta* quondam Italia *Pythagoreorum* fuit; pro lege Man. XI 31: *referto praedonum* mari; pro Planc. XLI 98: *refertam* esse Graeciam *sceleratissimorum hominum*; pro Fonte. I 1, (according to the former division of the oration, not that employed since Niebuhr's discovery of some parts of this oration before lost,) *referta* Gallia *negotiatorum* erat; ad Attic. VIII 1. 3: etsi propediem video *bonorum*, id est, *lautorum* et *locupletium*, urbem *refertam* fore; *Ibid.* IX. 1. 2: urbem *refertam* esse *optimatum*; sometimes also the ablative of persons is connected with it. Cic. pro Rege Dejotar. XII 33: *armatis hominibus refertum* forum (compare remark 2. † 455); Phil. II 27. 67: *aleatoribus referta*; pro Varr. II 1. 52: domus erat—*praetoria turba referta*; Orat. XLI 140: *quibus referta* sunt omnia.

† 463. There is also another passage in which *impleo* is construed with the genitive, viz. Cic. in Verr. Act. II 46. 119: Itaque L. Piso multas codices *implevit earum rerum*.

† 467. Rem. *Dignus* is often put without either the ablative or qui and the subjunctive, if that of which one is worthy has already been mentioned or may be understood from the connection. So Cic. pro Rosc. Amerino V. twice (*indignissima* and *indigniora*); pro Planc. III 8; pro Mil. VII 19; Phil. XIII 21. 48; in

Verr. II. l. V. bb. 170; pro lege Man. XVII. 52. Compare Stürenburg pro Archia, page 57—59 (Latin edition).

‡ 471. The following ablatives are remarkable: Cic. in Verr. II. l. 3. 90. 210: qui *tantis rebus gestis* sunt; Phil. VI. 5. 12: quis *tantis rebus gestis* fuit; Famm. IV. 6. 6: qui—clarum virum et magnis *rebus gestis* amisit; pro Archia XII: hominem *caussa hujusmodi*; Tusc. I. 35. 85: Metellus *honoratis quatuor filiis*. There is a reading in this last passage which has *honoratus*, but it is of no authority.

‡ 476. If *duration* is expressed before *ante*, the accusative is always used, not the ablative. Cf. Cic. pro lege Man. XVIII. 54: At Hercule *aliquot annos continuos ante legem Gabiniam*—caruit; Phil. V. 19. 52: *triennium ante legitimum tempus*.

‡ 477. Cic. Brut. VII. 27: *Post hanc aetatem aliquot annis*.

‡ 480. The example here quoted from Caesar de B. G. I. 48, and which is found in ‡ 478 of the former edition, does not occur in de B. Gallico, but de B. Civili. I. 48.

‡ 482. There is indeed a very great number of passages in which *totus* is joined with *in*; Cic. pro Ligar. III. 7: *in toto imperio*; Lael. II. 6: *in tota Graecia*; Verr. IV. 32. 72: *tota in Sicilia*; in the same section *in Sicilia tota*, and in sec. 2, *in tota provincia*; ad Famm. III. 8. 38: *in tota nostra amicitia*; de Orat. III. 25. 96: *in toto corpore*; Phil. II. 8: *tota in oratione*. All examples of this character must be classified, because they differ from each other in nature. But we omit that here, and reserve it for another occasion.

‡ 483. Here it should be stated that after *malo* and *praestat*, *ut* is better, the thing compared must be introduced by *quam*. Cf. Cic. ad Att. VII. 15: Cato jam *servire, quam pugnare* mavult; pro Sext. LXIX. 146: *praestat recidere, quam importare*. This is very frequent, as is well known.

There is with Cicero a no inconsiderable number of examples in which the ablative is put instead of *quam* with the accusative. It occurs, as is known, very often everywhere. Here we may set down a single case, Cato Maj. XII. 14: *nihil mente praestabilis dedisset*.

‡ 490. Among the verbs which are followed by *in* with the ablative, *imprimere* should have been mentioned. Although this verb occurs in ‡ 416, yet the example given in that section appears rather strange and out of place *there*, because it is put down without any explanation of its peculiar use. Cf. Cic. de legg. I. 10. 30: *in animis imprimuntur*, and in the same place immedi-

ately after: *in omnibus* imprimuntur; Nat. Deor. I. 16. 42: quod *in omnium animis* eorum nationum impressisset ipsa natura; de Fato XIX. 43: imprimet et quasi signabit in animo; but this passage is not clear on account of signabit which follows imprimet; Acad. post. I. 11. 41: *in animis* imprimerentur; Phil. XIII. 15. 30: vestigium *ubi* imprimas, and in many other places which the lexicons indicate.

† 493—516. The exposition of the tenses and of their consecution which is given in this part of the grammar is not so clear and satisfactory as one might expect. But we are unable here, for want of space, to attempt another exposition; we shall rather continue to furnish corrections and additions for the single paragraphs.

† 512. A very large number of passages, which are apparently but not really irregular, might be added to the remark under this section. We would call special attention to the thirty-eighth chapter of Cicero's oration pro Sext. because a multitude of such examples are concentrated in this chapter.

In section eighty-second of this chapter is found: At vero illi ipsi parricidae, quorum effrenatus furor aliter impunitate diuturna, adeo vim facinoris sui *perhorruerant*, ut, si paullo longior opinio mortis Sextii fuisset, Gracchum illum suum, transferrendi in nos criminis caussa, occidere *cogitarint*. From this example as well as from those quoted by the author, viz. Cic. Brut. LXXXVIII. and Cor. Nepos Arist. I. and from many other examples, it becomes manifest, that *ut*, denoting a result, can be followed by any tense which the nature of the thought either makes necessary or permits. *Tantus fuit, ut omnes eum admirarentur* means, he was so great that all are still admiring him (though he may have died long since). *Tantus fuit, ut omnes eum admirarentur*, means, that all admired him *then* (i. e. when he was living). *Tantus fuit, ut omnes eum admirati sint*, means, that all have once admired him. *Tantus fuit, ut omnes eum admiraturi sint*, means, that all will at some time admire him. Thus *perhorruerant* in the above example agrees very well with *ut—occidere cogitarint*. In the same chapter, † 83, is found: Ac, si tunc P. Sextius, iudices, in templo Castoris animam, quam vix retinuit, *edidisset, non dubito*, quin, si modo esset in republica senatus, si majestas populi Romani revixisset, aliquando statua huic ob rempublicam interfecto in foro *statueretur*; further, in the same oration, chapter XXIX. 62: Quod ille si *repudiasset, dubitatis*, quin ei vis *esset alata*, quum omnia acta illius anni per illum unum labefactari vide-

rentur?—ad Fam. XIII. 1. 5: *dubitat quin ego—consequi possem, etiamsi aedificaturus essem.* These examples, which might be multiplied, show that, especially after *non dubito*, a conditional clause is placed without any regard to this phrase.

Soldan, ad Sic. pro Ligar. XII. 34: An potest quisquam *dubitares* quin, si Ligarius in Italia esse *potuisset*, in eadem sententia *fuert* (all. *fuisse*) futurus, makes a distinction between the periphrastic conjugation and the regular tenses of the verb, and claims for the former alone the usual consecution of tenses. But this is as unsatisfactory as what Bennecke says, in a comment on that passage, that hypothetical sentences have no dependence on the leading verb. An example of the periphrastic conjugation besides the one quoted, is also to be found in Cic. pro Planc. XXIX. 71: *si voluisses, non dubito, quin—si conversura fuerit.* A discriminating examination of the particular phrases to be found in the language relating to this subject is much needed. Here we only remark further, that tenses which do not correspond to each other are also found in *imperfect* conditional sentences, especially in interrogations and exclamations; Cic. pro Cluent. VIII. 25: *quis est, qui illum absolvi arbitraretur?*—de Legg. III. VI. 14: *qui vero utraque re excelleret, ut et doctrinae studiis et regenda civitate princeps esset, quis facile praeter hunc invenire potest?*

‡ 518—519. The explanation of the use of the indicative in a conditional sentence has been very much improved in the new edition. We add here only two examples, the first of which makes the difference between the indicative and subjunctive very clear. Cic. pro Rosc. Am. XXXII. 91: *Erucius, haec si haberet in caussa, quae commemoravi, posset ea quamvis diu dicere, et ego possum;* the other has the protasis expressed by the ablative absolute and the apodosis by the indicative. Cic. pro Mil. XII. 32: *Atque Milone interfecto—Clodius hoc assequeretur, ut—* which means, *if Milo had been killed, Clodius would have effected that, etc.*

‡ 519. In the middle of the section our author has construed incorrectly the example taken from Cicero in Vatini. I. 2: *Eterim debuisti, Vatini, etiamsi falso venisses in suspicionem P. Sextio, tamen mihi ignoscere, because he has not quoted the passage in full; for after ignoscere follows: si in tanto hominis de me optime meriti periculo et tempore ejus et voluntati parere voluissem.* This makes it clear, that the clause, *etiamsi—venisses*, has no relation whatever to *debuisti*. *Si—voluissem* forms rather the hypothetical protasis to it. The same mistake is found in the preceding editions.

‡ 522. The example, *sive tacebis, sive loquere, mihi perinde est*, should have been stricken out from the former editions, because it is not correct Latin. *Perinde est*, in the sense given to it by modern writers, *it is all the same to me*, is entirely unclassical. Cf. Stürenburg ad Cic. de Off. p. 133-4 (first edition, Lips. 1834), and Hand in Turselin. IV. 461.

The principle, so simple in itself, which regulates hypothetical sentences, often appears, in the various school-books obscure only for this reason, because the authors have failed to form a perfectly clear idea, how many kinds of conditions, and consequently, of conditional sentences there may be. In endeavoring briefly to set forth our views, we must, on account of our limited space, content ourselves with a mere outline, but we hope in the meantime to contribute some little to the simplification of our school grammars and of the mode of oral teaching in this respect. Hereby shall we be enabled the more easily to apprehend the nature of the imperfect tense which is the subject of this paragraph, and which is by no means to be considered as similar to the Greek imperfect.

There are three kinds of conditions, and consequently, of conditional sentences.

1. The first is where there is an absolute uncertainty as to what is said. E. g. *Si habeo pecuniam, tibi dabo*, that is, "I will give you money, if I have it," but I do not know whether I have it or not. The probability on either side is equal. The antithesis must always be *sed nescio*; and the mode, the indicative.

2. The second is where there is a mere possibility, but not a probability as to what is said. E. g. *Si habeam pecuniam*, etc. "If I should have money," but I doubt whether I shall have it; it is more probable that I shall not have it. The antithesis is, *sed dubito*, and the mode subjunctive in any tense except the imperfect and the pluperfect.

3. The third is where a complete denial of what is represented is implied. E. g. *Si haberem pecuniam, tibi darem*, "If I had money, I would give it you." The antithesis with the imperfect subjunctive, must be in the present indicative of the verb used in the first clause, preceded by *sed non*, e. g. *sed non habeo*, (therefore I cannot give it you); with the pluperfect subjunctive, the antithesis must be in the perfect indicative with *sed non*. The mode is the subjunctive, the imperfect for present, and the pluperfect for past time. If the sentence ran thus, *si habuissem pecu-*

niam, tibi dedissem, the antithesis would be, *sed non habui pecuniam, (ergo tibo non dedi).*

In these conditional sentences of the third class, the imperfect subjunctive never expresses past time, but is merely an imperfect as to its form. In reality, it has the force of the present, as the conditional pluperfect subjunctive has that of the perfect.

It frequently happens, however, that the imperfect subjunctive in conditional sentences, has not the force of the present, but of a proper imperfect, which implies that an act was continued during another past act. The antithesis is, in such cases, always *sed non* with an imperfect indicative. If the conditional clause is introduced with *nisi* the antithesis is, of course, formed with *sed* without *non*.

Here is to be explained the peculiarity to which the author refers in section 525.

Let us examine the first example adduced by our author, taken from Cicero pro Milone XVII 45: *Quos clamores (Clodius), nisi ad cogitatum facinus appropararet, nunquam reliquisset.* The antithesis here is, *sed approperabat facinus* (namely, quum clamores reliquit). We can, indeed, express this by the pluperfect subjunctive in English; but then the two parts of the sentence would stand in no immediate connection with each other, whereas the Latin imperfect expresses simultaneousness with that which is expressed by the pluperfect in the following clause. We can hereby perceive how much more precise the Latin is in such expressions, than the English.

For the rest, the expression of the author is either obscure and equivocal, or incorrect, viz. that "completed actions of the past times are often transferred, at least partly, to the present, by using the imperfect instead of the pluperfect." The imperfect has nothing in common with the (real) present; it designates only a present, which was *such* when a PAST act was taking place.

As in the protasis, so also in the apodosis the imperfect subjunctive is very frequently used instead of the pluperfect. But this is to be explained precisely in the same way as that mentioned in the foregoing paragraph.

In the view here given, we have omitted the consideration of the clause following after the conditional clause. These invariably form sentences *by themselves*, and have no direct grammatical dependence on the foregoing clause. It is, however, natural that an indicative in the one should be followed by an indicative in the other, etc.; but it is not *necessary*. It is the simplest way

to supply, where such a dissimilarity occurs, a corresponding clause. But we cannot here enlarge upon this subject.

† 528. At the close of this section, it is said, that *Quis putaret, quis arbitraretur, etc.* are more rarely used in the sense of, "who would have thought, who would have believed; and it would seem from the connection as if the examples there taken from Cicero were the only examples which occur with this writer. Our author did not probably mean to assert this, because the construction is very frequent indeed. Cf. Cic. ad Fam. II. 13. 13: *quis putaret?*—Ibid. XV. 15, med.: *quis putaret?*—pro Sext. XLII. 89: *quid ageret?*—pro Sext. IX. 20: *quis—arbitraretur?* and very often elsewhere. The words of our author: *The third person is more rarely used in this manner*, should be changed to: *Also the third person is very often used thus.*

† 533. Our author is not quite correct in making no difference between *metuo* and *timeo* with the infinitive and *vereor* with the infinitive, although the former is very rare with Cicero. Madvig, in the remark † 376 of his grammar, maintains that in good prose only *vereor* is found with the infinitive, and Freund, in his lexicon on the word, says expressly that *timeo* with the infinitive is not Ciceronian. But cf. Cic. pro Rosc. Comaed. I. 4: *quo nomen referre in tabulas timeat.* *Metuo* with the infinitive and with the accusative before the infinitive is found only with the poets.

† 535. *Neve* cannot stand after *timeo*, but either *et* or *aut* must follow this word. *Timeo ne legat et scribat, or aut scribat.* In the former, it is indicated that we fear both; in the latter, either one or the other.

† 536—7. Klotz, ad Cic. Tusc. II. 26. 64, explains the distinction between *non quo* and *non quod*, by saying, *non quo* means always, *with the intention, non quod, in the view (opinion) that* —. As all the passages have not been critically examined upon this point, we pass it by with adducing a few examples. Cic. ad Fam. XVI. 6. 1, *quia precedes quo.* The words are: *Tertium ad te hanc epistolam scripsi eadem die magis instituti mei tenendi causa, quia nactus eram, cui darem, quam quo haberem, quid scriberem;* Cic. pro Sext. XLIII. 93: *quo fortissimum ac summum civem in invidiam homo castus ac non cupidus vocaret,* without a comparative; Ibid. XXVIII. 61: *non quo periculum suum non videret, sed — putabat,* without any causal particle, and with a change of construction; Cic. de R. P. p. 22 (ed. Heinrich): *qui—cordatus fuit, et ab Eanio dictus est non quod ea quaerebat, sed quod ea respondebat,* where the reason for the indicative is clear.

In the example taken from Livy XXX. 27, the author is doubtful whether *non quia* with the indicative in the protasis, is according to good usage. Compare Cic. pro Planc. XXXII 78: *non quia multis debeo,—sed quia* saepe concurrant; Horat. Sat. II. 2. 89: *non quia* erat, sed —.

‡ 541. Our author mentions the example in Cic. ad Att. VII. 1. which is corrected in punctuation by Bremi. But there is another passage in Cicero pro Flacco, XXXIII extr. (where it is to be found in the ed. of Orell.); *quid? nos non videbamus habitare una? quis hoc nescit? tabulas in Laelii potestate fuisse, num dubium est?* Here also the punctuation presents the means of making the correction. Here it is to be thus punctuated; *quis hoc nescit, tabulas in Laelii potestate? num dubium est?* so that the accusative before the infinitive is dependent on the clause, *quis hoc nescit*, not on *num dubium est*; Cic. ad Fam. XVI. 21: *Gratos tibi optatosque (rumores) esse —, non dubito*, writes Cicero the son. In the words: “Yet after *dubito* and *non dubito* at the beginning of the second paragraph;” the first *dubito* must be stricken out; for what classic author ever uses *dubito* thus without a negative particle?

‡ 551. The indicative is found, Cic. pro Planc. XXX. 73: *quod ejus in me meritum tibi etiam ipsi gratum esse dicebas. Quod* is construed with *negare* as well as with *dicere*. Cic. ad Fam. VII. 16: *quod — negant*. Cf. Cic. pro Arch. XII. 31: *quod expetitur esse videatis*.

‡ 553. Add after *nescio quomodo, nescio quo pacto*. Cic. de Amicit. XXVI. 100: *nescio quo pacto* deflexit.

‡ 561. The different significations of the indefinite and general expressions and the constructions appropriate to them are not pointed out with sufficient clearness in this paragraph. *Quis est qui* may be the paraphrase of the question with *quis*. In this case the subjunctive is used only when other reasons make it necessary. Cf. Cic. ad Fam. VII. 12. 21: *Quis enim est, qui facit nihil sua causa?*—ad Attic. XVI. 1. 2: *sed quid est, quaeso, quod agripetas Buthrosi concisos audio?*—pro Cluent. LXIV. ext. *quid est, quod minus probabile proferre potuistis?*—Acadd. postt. I. 4. 13: *quid est, quod audio?* This is rendered manifest by the addition of the pronoun *illud*. E. g. Cic. pro Sext. LVI. 120: *quid fuit illud, quod — summus artifex — egit?* This use is very frequent with Plautus and Terentius. *Quid est, quod* has two other significations. It serves, first, for a (negative) exclamation, usually but improperly marked as an interrogation. In this case *qui*

is followed by the subjunctive. If, in the second place, it expresses inquiry for the *reason* or *occasion* of a thing, in which case it is often changed into *quid est cur*, or *quid est quamobrem*, the subjunctive likewise follows. It would be unnecessary to cite examples which everywhere occur.

‡ 563. The example, *sunt enim permulti optimi viri, qui valetudinis causa in his locis conveniunt*, where the author, by a slip of the memory, has substituted *in his locis conveniunt* for *in haec loca veniunt*, Cic. ad Fam. IX. 14. 1, is in direct contradiction to the teaching of our author respecting the construction of *convenire in locis* ‡ 489. The statement should therefore be altered.

‡ 564. The subjunctive also follows *qui* when it has the signification *although*, in which case *tamen* follows very often. Cf. Cic. de Orat. I. 32. 145: *quin etiam, quae maxime propria essent maturae tamen his ipsis artem adhiberi videram*; Ibid. I. 18. 82: V. Matthiae ad Cic. pro Rosc. Amer. VIII. 23.

‡ 568. The construction which follows *dignus* and *indignus* depends entirely on the sense. So *quod* follows, Cic. pro Rosc. Amer. L. 147: *nisi hoc indignum putas, quod vestitum sedere in judicio vides*; so the Acc. c. Infin. also in the same, III. 8: *sum vel hoc indignissimum est, vos idoneos habitos*. Also in Verr. II. 24. 58; Cic. pro leg. Man. XIX. 57, and in other places. *Eximius qui* is construed like *dignus qui* in Cic. Div. in Caec. XVI. 52: *te illi unum eximium, cui consuleret, fuisse*.

‡ 574. *Quamquam* with the subjunctive is very frequent in Cicero if one regard merely the words without searching for the reasons. Cf. de Orat. III. 26. 101: *quamquam illa ipsa exclamatio—sit velim crebra*; pro Planc. XXII. 53: *quamquam ne id quidem suspicionem coitionis habuerit*; pro Sext. XXX. 64: *quamquam quis audiret?*—in Vatin. XIV. 33: *quamquam id ipsum esset novum*; pro Mil. XXXIII. 90: *quamquam esset miserum*, and in many other places. As the mood does not depend upon the conjunction, but rather the conjunction upon the mood; *quamquam* stands with the subjunctive if the sentence requires the subjunctive irrespective of *quamquam*. But grammarians do best where they make the manner of thinking and of expressing thought prevailing with a people their rule and standard.

‡ 575. It should have been remarked, that *donec* with Cicero is exceeding rare. It is nowhere found in *Caesar*. Our author should have noticed this distinction according to his usual custom.

‡ 579. Rem. The distinction between the conjunctions *quum* and *si* appears quite manifest in Cic. pro Rosc. Amer. XXXV.

100 : *S*i prodierit atque adeo *quam* prodierit (scio enim proditurum esse), audiet.

‡ 590. It would seem from this paragraph as if *satis est* and *satis habeo* occur with the infinitive perfect only in the silver age. This is however not true. Cf. Cic. de Inven. I. 20. 28 : *quia satis fuit dixisse*, and a little before, *si cujus rei satis erit dixisse*, and elsewhere. Still it is not frequent in Cicero.

‡ 599. Rem. Here it should have been remarked that the *historical infinitive* of the passive is exceedingly rare. Although Sallust delighted in this construction, as our author rightly observes, yet the passive with him occurs only in the following few places : Cat. XXVII (fatigari) ; Jug. XXX. (agitari) ; Ibid. LX. (ferri) ; Ibid. LXXXIII (trahi).

‡ 607. There are some other interesting examples of the personal construction of several verbs in the passive voice. Cic. pro Sext. LIV. 95 : *hic accusare eum non est situs*.

Rem. We may still ask, how *dicitur* is to be construed when it is not translated by, *he is said*, but by, *it is asserted*, or in a similar way. Cf. Cic. de Finn. III. 18. 60 : *Sed quam ab his omnia profiscantur officia, non sine causa dicitur ad ea referri omnes nostras cogitationes*, and with a proleptic demonstrative pronoun, Cic. de Finn. V. 24. 72 : *Atque hoc ut vere dicitur, parva esse ad beate vivendum momenta ista corporis commodorum, sic — ; in Verr. IV. 18. 38 : De hoc (Diodoro) Verri dicitur, habere eum perbona torenmata. Dicitur must always be followed by an accusative before an infinitive, if a dative is connected with it. De Orat. I. 33. 150 : *Vere etiam illud dicitur, perverse dicere homines perverse dicendo facillime consequi* ; pro Mil. V. 12 : *Sequitur illud, quod a Milonis amicis saepissime dicitur, caedem—senatum judicasse contra rempublicam esse factam*, although the accusative before the infinitive is here to be considered as depending on *sequitur*. The nominative before the infinitive, after *dicitur*, is also to be found, e. g. in Cic. pro Sext. XVII. 39 : *C. Caesar—inimicissimus esse meae saluti ab eodem quotidianis concionibus dicebatur*.*

Here two passages may be given containing compound tenses. Cic. Orat. IX. 29 : *qui—ab Aristophane poeta fulgere dictus esset*, and Ibid. IX. 27 : *ii sunt existimandi Attice dicere*.

‡ 612. In the sentence, *non vales, non audes esse uxor*, the unclassical *vales* should be stricken out. Moreover *nescire* frequently occurs thus with Cicero, as we may learn from ‡ 610. Cf. pro Mil. XXII. 75 : *nescis inimici factum reprehendere*. So

also *scire*, e. g. de Orat. II. 22. 91: *sed tamen ille nec deligere sci-
vit*; and *discere*, e. g. de Orat. II. 16. 70: *etiamsi haec nunquam
separatim facere didicisset*, and *perdiscere*; Ibid. 69: *qui hominis
figuram pingere perdidicerit*. An example of a peculiar use of an
infinitive after *possum* may here be mentioned. Cic. pro Caecina
XVII. 50: *Potest pulsus, fugatus, ejectus denique; illud vero
nullo modo potest, dejectus esse quisquam*. This whole passage af-
ter the proleptic *illud* is very peculiar.

† 613. *Cupio* is not followed by *ut* in Cicero. Here also belongs
cogito in this sense. Cf. Sic. pro Sext. XXXVIII. 81: *siquidem
liberi esse cogitaretis*; Ibid. 82: *ut—Graecum illum suum—occi-
dere cogitarint*; pro Mil. XX. 53: *qui ipsius loci spe facere impe-
tum cogitarat*.

Various peculiarities might be mentioned here, but we must
limit ourselves to the citation of one passage which renders the
distinction of the different constructions after *concedere* very clear.
Cic. pro Rosc. Amer. XIX. 54: *Verum concedo, ut ea praeteras,
quae, quum taces, nulla esse concedis*.

† 614. *Nihil antiquius habeo* is followed by the infinitive in Cic.
ad Fam. XII. 29. 3: *Nihil ei fuisset antiquius, quam ad Capito-
nem—reverti*.

† 615. *Suadeo* with the accusative before the infinitive is
found in Cic. pro Arch. VI. 14; pro Caecina V. 10; with the in-
finitive only de Finn. II. 29. 96: thus *admonere* in Verr. I. 24;
monere de Finn. I. 20. 66.

[To be concluded.]

ARTICLE II.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

By Daniel E. Goodwin, Professor of Languages, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.

[Concluded, from No. XIV. p. 323.]

[It is due to the writer of this Article, and to the readers of the
Bibliotheca, to say, that the whole of the Essay was prepared
some months before the publication of the former part, and for a
destination quite different from its appearance in this Review.
If therefore the following portion should seem when taken by