Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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:

ARTICLE IV.

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, now teacher of a private Classical School, Newton Centre, Ms.—[Concluded from p. 435.]

§ 622. It is here said that *contingit mihi* is *frequently* used with the infinitive. This is true in general, but not in regard to Cicero, who had but once used this construction, viz. in the passage quoted from pro Arch. III. Stürenburg, therefore, endeavored to correct the reading. Cf. his Latin edition, p. 45—50, and his first edition of de Officiis, preface, p. 9, 10. Yet he has returned in the German edition of the oration to the authority of the manuscripts. Also *Lambinus* thought the construction not classical. Although it is common with poets and later writers yet it is not used by any good prose writer.

§ 623. Our author has in § 600 explained the regular construction of *necesse est;* thus *necesse* should here either be stricken out, or at least it should be said, that it, as being very rare, is not to be imitated.

In the passages with *verisimile est, ut,* it is to be observed, that in all of them *non* is added. Further are two of a *hypothetical* nature, as the imperfect tenses, by which it is followed, show.

§ 625. The subjunctive after *necesse est* (and *oportet*) is not to be put in the same category with the accusative and infinitive, unless with some restrictions; for although the present follows those phrases, yet the imperfect is entirely against the use of Cicero. Necesse *est me facere* and necesse *est faciam* are both equally good, but necesse *erat facerem* is not good Latin; we must always say in this *me facere.*

But the expression *mihi necesse est* with the infinitive, so frequent with Cicero, ought to have been quoted. Cf. ad Famm. II. 16. 2 : mihi necesse est esse ; de Fat. IX : homini necesse est mori.

§ 626. The difference between quod and the accusative before the infinitive is particularly clear in Cic. pro Sext. XXXVIII. 80: An haec ipsa vis est *non posse emori?* an *illa,* quod Tribunus plebis templum cruentavit? an, *quod,* quum esset ablatus, primumque resipisset, non se referri *jussit?* The first sentence expresses a general thought, both the following refer to a certain person and event.

§ 629. There are still other different constructions which often occur, of which we only mention *si* and *cur* after *miror* and *mirum* est (as the Greek θαυμάζω εἰ). Cf. Cic. pro Sext. L 1 : *miretur* potius, *si* quem—viderit (in the beginning of the chapter there is : si quis *mirabatur, quid esset, quod —*) ; de Senect. XI. 35 : quid *mirum* igitur in senibus, *si* infirmi *sunt.* Further, de Orat. II. 13 ; pro Rosc. Amer. XLV. 131 ; ibid. VIII. 22 ; Cic. ad Famm. VII. 27. 1 : *miror, cur* me accuses. *Si* is especially frequent with Cicero.

§ 632. It is a very true remark of Klotz in Jahn's NN. GG. für Phil. und Pädag. 14. Jahrg. 4 Band. 3 Heft. p. 243, 258 (Review of Krebs's Antibarbarus), that according to the use of Cicero the perfect participles of the deponents, when used passively, have regularly the perfect participle of an active verb with them. This remark would be in place in a school grammar.

§ 635. Rem. In the phrase, *domum reversus,* litteras tuas inveni, *reversus* should be stricken out as in the *highest degree rare* in writers of authority. It is only found in Caesar de B. G. VI. 42, and with Cic. Phil. VI. 4. 10 : ut retractus, non *reversus* videretur. By this is our author's remark § 209 at the end, that although *reversus* is often used as a participle it rarely occurs with *esse,* corrected ; for *reversus* is here not a mere participle, because *esse* is omitted. Very instructive is Cic. ad Famm. VI. 6. 11 : ut in eam civitatem boni viri et boni cives, nulla ignominia notati, non *revertantur,* in quam tot nefariorum scelerum condemnati *reverterunt.*

§ 639. The use of the future participle active without esse is very properly ascribed to the Silver age, yet the participle of esse, *futurus,* should have been excepted ; it is so frequent with Cicero that there is no need of reference to passages.

§ 647. This use of the ablative absolute is to be found in a few passages as early as with Cicero. Cf. Acadd. II. 11. 33 : Quo enim omnia judicantur, *sublato,* reliqua se negant tollere ; de Finn. II. 27. 85 : *Perfecto* et *concluso,* neque virtutibus neque amicitiis usquam locum esse —, nihil praeterea est magno opere dicendum ; de Officc. II. 12. 41 : *Adjuncto* vero, ut iidem etiam prudentes

haberentur, nihil erat, quod homines iis auctoribus non posse consequi se arbitrantur.

§ 651. Our author professes to have quoted all the places where *a* with a future participle passive is found in Cicero, but in this he is mistaken. Cf. pro Sext. XVIII. 41: Sed tamen et Crassus *a* consulibus meam caussam *suscipiendam* esse dicebat, et —; ad Famm. XV. 4. 11: tamen admonendum potius te *a* me, quam *orandum;* ibid. III. 11. 3: de testibus—*a* suis civibus *notandis;* pro Sulla VIII. 23: Sed tamen te *a me* pro magnis caussis nostrae necessitudinis monendum esse etiam atque etiam puto —; ad Famm. IX. 3: *a me* scribenda putabam.

§ 659. The construction of a substantive with *est* and the infinitive depends entirely on the double signification of *est.* *Est* is either an *adjective verb* (= exists) when it has the emphasis and the following verb must be put in the genitive of the gerund; or it is a *substantive verb* (= copula) and then it simply connects the subject to the predicate, it has no emphasis and the following verb stands in the infinitive. Without paying regard here to common connections, as officium est, we quote here (as rare) Cic. pro Caecina V. 15: nullam esse *rationem amittere* ejusmodi occasione. Acadd. II. 6. 17: nec esse ullam *rationem disputare.* Ibid. II. 23. 74: nulla fuit *ratio persequi.* So with adesse. Cic. in Verr. II. 17: capit *consilium*—non *adesse.* But compare what our author has said in the note to § 597.

The most important phrase of this kind is *tempus est*, partly, because it occurs so very frequently with the infinitive, partly, because the difference of its meaning as used in connection with the infinitive or in connection with the gerund, is so great and manifest. *Tempus est, with the infinitive,* is regularly accompanied by *nunc* or *jam,* and means, *it is* (just) *now time.* So it occurs most frequently. Cf. Cic. de Orat. II. XLII. 181: *tempus est jam* de ordine argumentorum et de collocatione aliquid *discere.* We abstain from quoting other passages, because it would be unnecessary. *Tempus est, with the gerund,* means, *there is time* (enough). The phrase is not often used in this way. When tempus est corresponds with our, *there is* A *time,* the gerund also must be used. Cf. Cic. pro. Mil. IV. 9: Atque si *tempus est* ullum jure hominis *necandi.*

Here we may remark, that if the infinitive has its own subject, this must be put in the accusative; so that *tempus est* in this case governs the accusative before the infinitive. Cf. Cic. ad Atticum IV. 5, extr.: sed jam *tempus est me ipsum* a me amare.

The genitive of the gerund in the signification of the phrase first explained, is used by Cicero by way of exception. Acadd. II. 48. 147 : Verum quoniam non modo nauta significat, sed etiam Favonius ipse insusurat *navigandi* nobis *tempus esse.*

§ 676. So *imperium* is put for *consules.* Cic. pro Sext. XI. 25 : *innocentia* for *innocentes ;* Cic. de Orat. I. 46. 202 : *splendor ;* Cic. pro Ligar. XI. 33.

§ 677. *Nihil* is used, especially with the comparative, rather frequently with reference to persons. Cf. Cic. ad Famm. IV. 4. 2 : Victoria vitio, *quo nihil* erat moderatius ; ad Famm. XIV. 3. extr. : mihi te *carius nihil* esse.

§ 678. The substantives *vir* and *homo* stand very often for demonstrative pronouns. Cf. Cic. ad Famm. I. 6. 14 : nosti hominis tarditatem ; pro Sext. XLI. 88 : tanta moderatio fuit *hominis.*

Our author has taught in § 92, that the plural animae is used in reference to the ferocia of *one man ;* here he limits animae to *several.* Cic. pro Sext. XLI. 88 : fractae erant *animae* hominis. Here animae has not the meaning of ferocia.

§ 681. Introitus *Smyrnam* by Cic. Phil. XI. 2. 5 ; Conventus *ad Marcellos, ad Pompejum,* Cic. in Ver. III. 18 45 ; *in Capitolium* adscensus, *domum* reditus, Cic. pro Sext. XLIII. 131.

§ 684. *Ciceroniana Simplicitas* has Pliny, Historia Naturae, Pref. § 22. But the word is not found at all in Cicero in either of its significations. He uses circumlocutions for it, as *simplex ratio,* or the Greek, λιτότης, e. g. ad Famm. VII. 26. 2 : lex sumptuaria, quae videtur λιτότητα attulisse.

§ 685. Although it is true that the neuter of the adjectives here quoted used as substantives, is not to be imitated, yet it is found occasionally even with the best writers. Cf. Caes. de Bel. Gall. VI. 26 : ab ejus *summo,* sicut palmae rami, late diffunduntur ; with Cic. ad Famm. VII. 16, init. *In equo Trojano* scis esse *in extremo,* which is somewhat remarkable.

§ 686. Here the remarks would have been in place that we, for instance, must render, *they were the first who did this,* by illi *primi* hoc fecerunt, never with esse and qui.

§ 689. Here the attention should have been particularly directed to the fact, that with Cicero also, *ut with the superlative and a tense of posse,* very frequently occurs. Cf. de Finn. V. 4. 9 : *ut brevissime potuit ;* de Divin. II. 1. 1 : *ut maxime potuimus,* and in very many other places.

Drakenborch has, indeed, collected in the passage here quoted many examples from Livy, but by no means all, as would appear from our author.

Tantus is sometimes also by Cicero omitted before *quantus.* Cf. Cic. pro Flacco. XVI 38: Vociferarer et, *quantum maxime possem,* contenderem.

§ 690. *Magis quam* with the positive is the more frequent use with Cicero.   So it is found, e. g. Tusc. I. 17. 41 ; de Orat. I. 42. 100 ; Brut. LXVIII 241 ; ad Attic. X. 1. 4 : pro Plan. XV. 37.

§ 691. *Charles Beier,* in his remark on the passage, Cic. de Amicit. 1, here quoted, doubts whether unus, if not connected with a substantive, can be used for strengthening a superlative. Although Klotz (cf. page 85 and 86 of his edition) quotes Cic. pro Sext. LXVII. 141: qui *unus* omnium *justissimus* esse traditur ; yet this usage must be characterized as very rare.

Here is the place where it might have been said, that the superlative is often followed by a comparative denoting a still higher degree. Cf. Cic. ad Famm. XIV. 3. 1 : Ego autem hoc *miserior* sum, quam tu, quae es *miserrima* ; de Off. III. 34, extr. : tibique persuade te quidem mihi *carissimum,* sed multo fore *cariorem.*

§ 692. In Cic. pro Sext. XXVII. 59, is *sexcenti* used of *very few* in opposition to the whole Roman people, so that it corresponds with our, *a handful.* Cf. Garatoni on this passage.

§ 693. Somewhere in the following remarks on the pronouns, the attention should have been called to the fact that the demonstrative pronouns, and usually also the relative *qui,* with Cicero, stand *in the same case* with the substantive *numerus,* and not in the genitive plural according to our usage.   *Stürenburg,* whose remark on Cic. pro Arch. XII. 31. (page 185, 288) contains a rich collection of examples, knows only *two* exceptions of the demonstrative pronouns in Cicero, namely : de Orat. II. 13. 56 : Atqui ne nunc quidem, quamquam est in re publica versatus, *ex numero* accepimus *eorum,*—and in Vatin. XVII. 41 : in *illorum* enim *numero* mavult T. Annius esse —.   Here belongs also Cic. pro Sext. III. 7 : illo—aspectu instead of illius.

§ 696. At the end of this paragraph our author indicates what is very true, that Cicero is inclined to put ipse in the same case with the subject, although he otherwise approves the rule given by Ernesti concerning this word.   We may consider it an exception when ipse is put in the same case with the object.   In the first passage quoted by our author from Cic. pro Lege Man. XIII. 13 : Non potest exercitum is continere imperator, qui te *ipsum* non continet, the Codex Erfurtensis reads *ipse,* which reading, doubtless, deserves the preference.   Graevius was al-

ready of this opinion. See Wunder in Varr. lectt. Cod. Erfurt. p.
LXIX. He there tries to elicit the sense: non potest is exerci-
tum continere imperator, qui alios quidem continet, se vero non
continet, which of course would be absurd. Therefore he pre-
fers ipse.

If ipse *precedes* the personal pronoun, *then it must always stand
in the nominative.* Cf. Cic. de Finn. V. 10 28 : si quis *ipse* sibi
inimicus est, and immediately after inimicus *ipse* sibi putandus
est.

§ 699. If a name or a word is to be repeated with an addition
to it which limits or modifies the thought, there is not only in
Latin et quidem, but more frequently merely et, and more rarely
atque. Cf. Cic. pro Sext. XL. 86 : Laudas Milonem *et* jure *laudas;*
ibid. XXIV. 54 : gener *et Piso gener.* This is *so* very frequent.

Our author should have mentioned here the peculiarity accord-
ing to which *is* after an inserted relative sentence continues that
sentence; which however only takes place with a copulative
particle and then when *is* stands in another case than that in
which the relative stands. Cf. Cic. Orat. II. 9 : quam intuens, *in
eaque* defixus, ad illius similitudinem artem et manum dirigebat,
—and thus not unfrequently.

§ 701. *Ille* denotes contempt. Cic. pro Sext. XI. 26 : nam alter
ille horridus et *severus* (Piso) — ; ibid. VIII. 20 : habeo quem
opponam *labi illi* atque *coeno.*

§ 709 and 709 b. Every careful reader will be struck with the
inconsistency and contradiction, which are found in this as in
nearly all other grammars, in respect to the words *quisquam* and
ullus as distinguished from *aliquis* and *quidam.* The reason of it
is that the distinction made is merely external, and not according
to etymology and usage, philosophically ascertained.

Our author says :

1. *Quisquam* and *ullus* are found in negative sentences.

2. But this rule does not extend to the particles *ne* and *neve*,
after which *quis* only is used. The exception, here made, is
owing to the use of *quis* after conjunctions.

3. *Quisquam* and *ullus* are sometimes used after *si*, not in a
negative sense, but only to increase the indefiniteness.

Nothing need be said of the inconsistency of this statement.
We will only observe in respect to No. 2, that *quisquam* and *ullus*
after *ne* and *neve* occur not unfrequently in Cicero; and that the
author errs in supposing that only *quis*, and not *quisquam* follows
ne and *neve.* The following examples will confirm what has now

been said ; Comp. Cic. pro Sextio XLI. 89 : Ne reus adsit, ne citetur, ne quaeratur, *ne* mentionem omnino *cuiquam* judicum aut judiciorum facere liceat; pro leg. Man. XXIV. 69 : Deinde ne hortor, ut auctore populo Romano, maneas in sententia, *neve cujusquam* vim aut minas pertimescas ; pro Balbo V. 11 : *ne* forte, quod ille in tabulas publicas retulisset, dubitasse quisquam—videretur ; Tuscull. III. 84. 84 : *ne ulla* unquam possit exsistere ; and so in many other cases.

Caesar also uses it, de Bel. Gal. VII. 40, at the end : Iter eorum moratur atque impedit interdicitque, *ne quemquam* interficiant. So the other classic writers. That this pronoun is sometimes used without a foregoing conjunction and after *dum*, the author himself has shown by examples.

As it respects the signification and use of the pronouns *quis*, *aliquis*, *quispiam* and *quisquam*, it is obvious that they are all of the same etymology ; and that the shades of meaning depend wholly on the prefixes and suffixes. We will limit our remarks here to the word quisquam. Being compounded of *quis* and *quam*, it means literally *any one as*, i. e. *any one although*. *Quam* cannot of itself stand for a clause in Latin ; therefore we must conceive of it as reduplicated (*quamquam*), in order to form a concessive particle equivalent, in sense, to a concessive clause (*although*), which stands in contrast with *quis* (quam) ; e. g. Nego hoc fecisse *quemquam*, is said in opposition to a previous assertion of some other person ; thus : Nego hoc fecisse *quem, quam* (quam) affirmatur. In English the force of the expression will be best given by emphasizing the word *I*, as the subject of the sentence, thus : *I* say, no one has done it, although it has been affirmed by another.

If *quisquam* comes after *si*, the same thing is true, except that the contrast cannot be expressed by *affirmatur*, because it is not of a negative character, but by *negatur*. The sentence contains an opposition to an implied preceding negation. Si quisquam, ille sapiens fuit, means (no one is wise, but) if any one is wise, he was so. Si quis doctus fuit (*quam*) [quam] hoc negatur, *quem* fuisse doctum), ille fuit.

Whenever the clause following *ne* refers to an implied preceding affirmation, *quisquam*, and not *quis* must be used, as appears in the preceding examples. As this does not often take place with *ne*, quis commonly follows *ne*. If one says, *Ne quis scribat*, this is simply a command, the right of the one, and the obligation of the other being presupposed. Ne quisquam scribat, means, *I*

command that no one write (although another has commanded that one should write). See Stürenburg ad Cic. de Officiis. p. 213 and 214, 1st ed.

§ 710. In the German edition, corrected in the English translation, *quisque* does indeed stand distributively after ordinals; still the translation of *quinto quoque anno*, every five years (as it stands in the German edition) may be so misunderstood as to mean, once in every five years (no matter in which of the five). Comp. *Scioppius* de stylo historico, p. 226: Fugit Muretum ratio, quum pro *singulis quinque annis* dicendum putat *quinto quoque anno*. Nec enim eadem utriusque dicti est sententia. Si quidem fiat, quod *quinquennio* seu *singulis quinque annis semel*, nihil necesse est, id *quinto* semper *anno* fieri, cum etiam *primo, secundo* aut *quocunque quinquennii* anno factum intelligitur.

§ 710 b. *Quisque* with the superlative in the connection here specified is used only with the neuter plural. The exceptions are very few, as Cic. de Amicit. X. medio—*in optimis quibusque* (masc.) honoris certamen et gloriae. Hase, in his 362nd note on Reisig, Vorlesungen, p. 351, appears not to be aware of any exceptions.

§ 718. It might have been mentioned here that instead of the perfect passive, a participle of the same word which precedes that of a synonymous verb is not unfrequently used. Comp. Cic. pro Rosc. Amer. XI. 32: Patrem—*jugulastis, occisum* in proscriptorum numerum retulistis; Ibid. XII. 34: Caussam *explicemus* atque ante *expositam* consideremus.

§ 722. 2. In the passage Cic. de Amicit. II. 6, *multa ejus* vel *provisa prudenter* vel *acta constanter* vel *responsa acute*, this rule is well illustrated, because the participles not only have an adjective and a genitive, that is, are used as real substantives, but they also have adverbs or are used as real participles.

§ 723. The author still maintains that *tum—tum* are equivalent to *partim—partim*, notwithstanding Stürenburg ad pro Archia XII. pp. 164—180 has demonstrated that *tum—tum* refer only to time. Even the two examples presented by Zumpt can very easily be explained in this way.

§ 724. Here *non—sed* might have been mentioned; e. g. Cic. pro Sextio XXVIII. 62: *Non* illi ornandum Catonem *sed* relegandum, *nec* illi committendum illud negotium, *sed* imponendum putaverunt —.

§ 724 b. Here, after the words *sed ne—quidem*, it might have been added in a parenthesis, that *verum* ne — quidem very rarely

occurs. It is found, for example, in Cic. pro Rosc. Amer. XIX. 54: quod planum facere non modo non possis, *verum* ne coneris quidem; Cic. de R. P. III. 30. 42.

§ 736. Add after *contra*, "and still more remarkable. Cic. de Finn. II. 21. 68: sed tamen et *in* corpore et *extra* esse quaedam bona."

§ 737. *Atque etiam*, like *atque adeo*, is used, as is well known, to indicate a climax. Cic. pro Sext. XXIV. 53: Ipso die — die dico! immo hora *atque etiam* puncto temporis. See Hand's Tursellinus I. 507. *Atque* standing alone, is used in the same way. Compare Cic. Orator XVI. 52: rem difficilem, dii immortales! *atque* omnium difficillimam.

§ 738. The use here pointed out of *nec, quisquam, ullus, usquam*, instead of *ut nemo*, etc. has its exceptions even in Cicero. Cf. pro Sext. II. 3: nihilque ab eo praetermissum; in Vat. XI. 28: nihil que maximus fecit, where Orelli, however, reads *nihil* without *que*.

§ 739 Frequently, after a parenthetic clause, which interrupts the sentence, the sentence is *not carried forward by a conjunction*, but is *resumed by the repetition of one or more words*. Comp. Cic. in Vat. VIII. 19: Quaero illud etiam ex te, conatusne sis, volueriane, denique *cogitaris* (est enim res ejusmodi, ut, si tibi modo in mentem venit, nemo sit, qui te ullo cruciatu indignum putet) *cogitarisne* —; pro Sext. XIX. 42: *Haec ego quum viderem—haec quum viderem*—; pro Archia VIII. 18: *Quoties ego hunc Archiam vidi—quoties ego hunc vidi* —. Sometimes after such a parenthetic clause, the sentence proceeds without either a conjunction or a repetition, for example, Cic. pro Lege Man. II. 4 and 5: Equitibus Romanis, honestissimis viris, adferuntur ex Asia quotidie litterae,—quorum magnae res aguntur in vestris vectigalibus exercendis occupatae —; *Bithyniae vicos exustos esse complures.*

§ 743, 4. Sometimes, after *qui*, not the *same* substantive but a *synonym* of it is repeated. Comp. Cic. p. Rosc. Am. XIII. 37: Nefarium *facinus* atque ejusmodi, quo uno *maleficio* —; pro Sext. XI. 26: Erat Senatus in *aede* Concordiae, quod ipsum templum —.

In some place when treating of pleonasm, it should have been remarked that, as εἷς μόνος in Greek, so sometimes *unus solus* in Latin is used. Comp. Cic. p. Sext. LXII. 130: Atque ita in his rebus *unus* est *solus* inventus —. Ibid. XIX. 43: qui hac *una* mediana *sola*, and elsewhere not unfrequently.

§ 750. On pleonasm in words expressing *thought, reflection*, etc. see Cic. pro Planc. XXVI. extr. hac *spe* decedebam, *ut—putarem;* pro Rosc. Amer. XXII. 6: ea *spe* venisse, *quod putaret.*

§ 767. This section has, indeed, been extended by a remark, in which *hic* and *ille* are considered; still it needs to be corrected and completed. The very beginning of the section in the German edition, viz. " When we use the article alone in German instead of repeating the foregoing substantive," etc. is incorrect; for what the author calls the article is not an article, but a demonstrative pronoun. In the sentence, " I read the (die) comedies of Plautus, but not those (die) of Terence, the second *die* has the emphasis, which is proof that it is not an article. The author probably was thinking of the Greek when he penned this remark. The English translator has very properly corrected this error.

With Cicero only the pronouns *hic* and *ille* are used in this way before the genitive.

If *hic* is used, the genitive is a mere *apposition*, which expresses the same thing in substance. So pro Archia XI. 28 : Nullam enim virtus aliam mercedem laborum periculorumque desiderat praeter *hanc* (i. e.) laudis atque gloriae. So in the very same passage as found in Phil. V. 13. 35 : Neque enim ullam mercedem tanta virtus praeter *hanc* (i. e.) laudis gloriaeque desiderat; Brut. LVIII. 211 : et neptes Licinias, quas nos quidem ambas, *hanc* vero Scipionis etiam tu, Brute, credo, aliquando loquentem.

Here the case is not precisely the same as in the two preceding passages, although Scipionis is in apposition with *hanc*. In English, it would be expressed by the words, but this,—(I mean, or viz.) that of Scipio."

If *ille* is used, the genitive is also here a mere apposition, and *ille* is then either indicative of something which is observable by the senses, or of something else that is well known.

Of the first description is the passage, Phil. V. 5. 13 : In foro L. Antonii statuam videmus, sicut *illam* (i. e.) Tremuli (to which I point with the finger.—It was in the forum).

Of the second description are the following passages; de Orat. III. 48. 184 : Neque vero haec tam acrem curam diligentiamque desiderant, quam est *illa* poëtarum ; Divin. in Caecil. XI. 36 : quum omnis arrogantia odiosa est, tum *illa* ingenii atque eloquentiae multo molestissima; Brut. XXI. 83 : At oratio Laelii de collegiis non melior, quam de multis quam voles, Scipionis, non quo *illa* Laelii quicquam sit dulcius —; ad Famm. IX. 15. 2 : Accedunt non Attici, sed salsiores quam *illi* Atticorum, sales.

Finally a pronoun is used *when it is separated from the genitive by a relative clause.* Comp. Cic. in Verr. Act. II. 4. 37. 61 : Quae cognatio studiorum et artium propemodum non minus est con-

juncta quam *ista*, qua vos delectamini, *generis* et *nominis;* de
Orat. II. 24. 101: dum inertiae vituperationem—contemnunt, as-
sequuntur etiam *illam*, quam magis ipsi fugiunt, *tarditatis.*

It were better that the author had stricken out the quotation
from Curtius. IX. 26, or substituted another in its place, on ac-
count of the unclassical use of the word *valet.* We have already
remarked upon that under § 612. In a work of such high merit,
even the smallest errors are blemishes.

§ 771. Remark. At the end it should have been said that the
words *nihil aliud nisi* are connected only with a following prepo-
sition, that is, with verbs which may either govern the accusative,
or be construed with *de*, though in another sense, as dicere, cogi-
tare, agere, loqui referre; for with these verbs, that double con-
struction occurs with other words than nihil aliud nisi. Cf. Cic.
pro Reg. Dejot. VIII. 22 .* *De exercitu* breviter dicam, ut *caetera.*

§ 779. Inasmuch as many imagine that in the construction, *tan-
tum abest* ut—ut there is a special elegance, and inasmuch as this
form of expression is so frequently introduced in books for writing
Latin, the author should have observed that with Cicero its use
is comparatively rare. It is found in Cic. pro leg. Man. XXIV.
71; de Orat. XIX. 104; Tuscull. V. 5; Brut. LXXX; Phil. XL.
3; ad Att. VI. 2; ad Att. XIII. 21; de Off. L 14; Tuscull. L 31;
de Nat. Deorr. II. 63; Tuscull. II. 2; Tuscull. V. 6; Orat.
LXVIII; ad Famm. XII. 15; Lael. XIV. 51; ad Att. VII. 3.

If the addition *ab eo* is found after *tantum abest*, the construc-
tion must always be, *tantum abest ab eo, ut.*

§ 781. The example, An Scythes Anacharsis potuit, etc. is not
found in Cic. *de Fin.* V. 32, but in Tusc. V. 32. This error has
been repeated through many editions of the grammar before us.
The example, as it here stands, is not well chosen; because the
construction non facere poterunt must appear strange to the pupil.
Orelli has properly expunged the word *facere*, which Roth had
previously included in brackets.

The contrast appears especially when, in the example here
given and elsewhere to be found, the same verb is used twice,
once with a negative, and once without it. In English when the
Latin word is repeated with a negation, we omit the verb, and
employ merely the words, "but not." *Neque* is found in Cic. pro.
Reg. Dej. X. 28: Quodsi saltatorum avum habuisses neque eum
virum, for et non.

§ 782. The words *huc* et *illuc, ultro* et *citro, hic* et *illic*, are al-
ways connected, as here, by *et*, and are never without the copu-

lative conjunction, as the modern Latin writers commonly have it, after the example of the poets and of the later Roman authors.

No sentence can be closed with the conjunction *que*, whether the last word be a verb, as Reisig § 233 maintains, or not. See' Cic. Orator. LXX. 233, cited by Nauck in Jahn's Neuen-Jahrbüchern, Supplement, No. 7. pp. 466—470. Still *que* is so used, though very rarely, especially in epistolary writing. Cic. ad Fam. XIV. 3. 1: nec meae miseriae magis excruciant quam tuae vestrae *que*.

§ 799. In respect to *non* in connection with *posse*, the proper explanation should have been given here. The rule commonly given, and *in general* correct, is that *non* must stand immediately before *posse*. Still *non* is often found before the dependent infinitive, where the sense requires it. Thus, Loqui non possum, means, "it is not possible for me to speak;" possum non loqui, it is possible for me not to speak." Comp. Cic. Tuscull. III. 28. 66: Si enim deponi potest (dolor), etiam *non suscipi potest*. Voluntate igitur et judicio suscipi aegritudinem confitendum est; pro Cluent. XLI. 113: jam *potuit* aliquis ab initio *non sedisse;* pro Milone XXX. 81: quamquam qui *poterat* salus sua cuiquam *non probari!*—pro Fontej. VI. 11: *Potest* igitur judex testibus *non credere.* Cupidis et iratis et ab religione remotis non solum *potest*, sed etiam *debet* (*non credere*). It occurs so very frequently in Cicero. Strange is Cic. ad Famm. VII. 15. 2: Quod vero in C. Mattii, suavissimi doctissimique hominis, familiaritatem venisti, *non dici potest*, quam valde gaudeam.

That *nego* is regularly used for *non dico*, is correct; but not so, when *non dico* means, "I will not say." See § 724.

Perhaps it would have been well to add something more in this place respecting the position of words in certain phrases. So Klotz has often remarked in his various writings, that *eam ob rem* never occurs, though *hanc ob rem* frequently does, the ground of which may lie alone in the disagreeable sound, which would be occasioned by the elision of the syllable *am*, so constantly occurring in the conversation of the Romans. But *eamque ob rem*, which gives no harsh sound, is used.

The same critic has warned us against the use of *medius* before the preposition *in*, a favorite, but faulty form of expression with modern writers. It must always be written, in media urbe, etc.

So likewise *potest esse* is so common with Cicero, that deviations (esse potest), as Tusc. I. 46. 100, are very rare. The same is true of *necesse est esse.*

There are very many such points, which a frequent perusal of Cicero's works for some definite purpose brings to view; but we must forego the presentation of them at present, lest we transcend the limits proper for a review.

§ 808. *Neque tamen* is, indeed, the ordinary form of expression; but there are places where *non tamen* must stand, and where *neque tamen* would be impossible. So Cic. de Fin. V. 22. 62: Quis contra in illa aetate pudorem, constantiam, etiamsi sua nihil intersit, *non tamen* diligat. *Non tamen*, where this reason does not exist, is more natural in the following passage. Cic. Acad. II. 20. 60.

We conclude with expressing the wish that the author will recognize in our remarks the high respect which we sincerely feel for him. He has effected, and still continues to effect, what few have the power to accomplish. The work contains a real treasure of the nicest observations; it well deserves the correcting hand of its distinguished author to bring it still nearer to perfection.

The translation of Schmitz is reprinted in New-York, corrected and enlarged by Professor Anthon.

ARTICLE V.

THE PREACHING BY CHRIST TO THE SPIRITS IN PRISON.— REMARKS ON 1 PETER III. 18—21.

By John Brown, D. D. Professor of Exegetical Theology to the United Secession Church, Edinburgh, Scotland.

PART I.

"Ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἔπαθε, δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων, ἵνα ἡμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ, θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκί, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ τῷ πνεύματι· ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν, ἀπειθήσασί ποτε, —.[1]

THE Bible has often been represented as a book full of obscurities and difficulties; by infidels who wish to disprove its divine

---

[1] The Author has read with much interest a critical disquisition on this passage, in the American Biblical Repository for April, 1842, by the Rev. Thomas H.