

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

ARTICLE III.
PHILOLOGICAL STUDIES.

§ 1. *The Latin Negation.*

THE negation is of frequent occurrence in human language. To understand its nature and various forms is important for the grammarian and the philosopher.

The idea of negation, being a simple idea, is clear and distinct in itself. It is properly an affection of the predicative syntactical relation (see Dr. K. F. Becker on the three syntactical relations), through which it modifies the attributive relation, and also the subjective or subjunctive, interrogative, and imperative moods. This statement we suppose to embrace the whole circuit of the negation.

The appropriate form of the negation, when fully developed in language, is the negative predication, which constitutes the negative proposition. This presupposes the idea of an affirmative predication, without which the negative one would be unintelligible, and with which it is wanting neither in clearness nor intelligibility. Thus the negative predication: "rosa non floret," presupposes the affirmative one: "rosa floret."

It is admitted by logicians (see Mill's *Logic*, vol. i., p. 106) as well as by grammarians (see Weissenborn, p. 174; Kühner, vol. ii., p. 162), that a negative proposition is not strictly or simply the affirmation of a negative predicate (as held by Hobbes), but the actual denial of the connection between a predicate and subject; that is, that the negation falls on the predication, and not on the predicate. The negation runs parallel to the affirmation, and the negative mood to the affirmative or indicative mood.

In the negative proposition, however, the negation, for the sake of emphasis, or for some purpose not easily defined, often appears to fall on the predicate itself, on the subject, or on an object, either complementary or supplementary. But

these negative predicates, subjects, and objects, are evidently nullities.

1. Thus in reference to the negative predicate, the negation falls on the predication; as, "Caesar non-mortuus est," can only mean "Caesar mortuus non-est."

2. So in reference to the negative subject; as, "nemo vidit Deum," can only mean "homo non-vidit Deum."

3. So in reference to the negative complementary object; as, "Caius neminem occidit," can mean only "Caius hominem non-occidit."

4. So in reference to the negative supplementary object; as, "homo nunquam vidit Deum," can only mean "homo non-vidit unquam Deum."

But the other negations are modifications of, or developments from, the negative proposition.

The negative attribute, like the positive attribute, has lost the *moment* (momentum) of asseveration which belonged to the predication: it is not so much a negative, as a privative (see in a — d below), and, by an easy transition, passes into the antithetic or opposite idea (see in e, f).

a Non existentis nulla sunt jura.

b Non entis nulla sunt attributa.

c Alter alterius ignarus iniit.

d Evasit illaesus.

e Litterae tuae mihi non injucundae fuerunt.

f Quum in me tam improbus fuit.

NOTE. The privative, in many languages, takes a vowel before the negative element *n*; comp. Sansk. *an* privative; Gr. *ἀνόσιος*, unholy; Lat. *intonsus*; Eng. *unholy*.

The negation, like the affirmation, is affected by the moods subjective or conjunctive, interrogative, and imperative, with which it may be joined.

1. The negative subordinate proposition, which is employed *in conjuncto sermone*, and is merely subjective, as it really affirms nothing, is to be regarded as a negative *subposition*. The subject and predicate are united for the purposes of language.

Hoc te rogo, ne demittas animum.
Cicero timebat, ne Catilina urbem incenderet.

2. The negative interrogation seems to defy or challenge a negative answer. An affirmative answer is expected.

Nonne putas?
Quid? nonne canis similis est lupo?

3. The negative imperative or optative, as it proceeds from the will, and not directly from the intellect, is a prohibitive rather than a negative.

Ne time,
Ne sim salvus, si aliter scribo ac sentio.

The accumulation of negatives in the same proposition is easily explained. According to the doctrine now held, every negative has its proper force. See Ern. Lieberkühn and R. Klotz in *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* (1849), vol. lvii. p. 116.

Hence a double negation, or the negation of a negation, is equivalent to a strong affirmation; for the two negatives in the same clause, acting reciprocally on each other, destroy the negation, and the mechanical weight of the particles gives emphasis or intensity.

Nemo non benignus est sui iudex.
Sapiens nunquam non beatus est.

Hence also when the negation is repeated, or re-assumed, as sometimes in Latin with *neque, nec, ne quidem*, the force of the negation falls on a new clause, and the whole negation is rendered more emphatic.

Nunquam Scipionem, ne minima quidem in re, offendi.
Nego hanc rem, neque mihi, neque tibi, gratam esse posse.

NOTE. This principle is to be applied to the accumulation of negatives in Greek and in Anglo-Saxon.

In the coördinate compound proposition, the negation occasions no special difficulty. Each negative, as it falls on

a different member of the whole compound, has its natural significance.

The negation is sometimes attached to the copulative conjunction, and forms negative conjunctions; as *neque*, and *nec*, a contraction of *neque*.

We have here, as in affirmative propositions, three constructions: (1) the syndetic, where the two propositions are unemphatic, as in a; (2) the asyndetic, where the two propositions are both emphatic, as in b; and (3) the polysyndetic, where the emphasis lies on the combination of the propositions, as in c.

a Non imperium, neque divitias petimus.

b Non hoc dicet Chrysippus, non Thales.

c Neque consilium mihi placet, neque auctor probatur.

§ 2. On Interrogative Words in the Indo-European Languages.

Interrogative words in the Indo-European languages exhibit themselves in different phases, which, from their analogy to the logical categories, may be termed *grammatical categories*.

These grammatical categories are as follows: (1) substantive of person; (2) substantive of thing; (3) adjective of preference; (4) adjective of quantity; (5) adjective of number; (6) ordinal adjective; (7) adjective of quality; (8) adjective of the country; (9) adverb of place where; (10) adverb of place whither; (11) adverb of place whence; (12) adverb of place by or through which; (13) adverb of time; (14) adverb of manner; (15) adverb of cause or reason; (16) adverb of intensity or degree. But no one language exhibits all these categories.

It is a remarkable fact that one interrogative element, with slight phonetic changes, pervades the different Indo-European languages.

The original form of the Indo-European interrogative element, according to the latest view (see Prof. M. Rapp's *Grundriss der Grammatik*, Stuttg. 1855. Band II. Part ii p. 39), was *kw*, or, when vocalized, *kwa*.

In Sanskrit we have the following interrogatives : (1) *kas*, m. ; *ká*, f. ; with their inflections, who? (2) *kim* (anciently *kat*), n. ; with its inflections, what? (3) *kataras*, whether? (4) *kiyat* (accus. *kiyantam*), how great? (5) *kati*, how many? (7) *kídriç*, of what quality? (9) *kva* and *kutra*, where? (11) *kutas*, whence? (13) *kadd*, when? (14) *katham*, how?

Here the middle letter of the interrogative element has fallen out (except in *kutra*, *kutas*), and the *a*, although generally retained, is sometimes attenuated into *i*, as in *kim*.

In Zend we have: (1) *kaç*, *ko*, m. ; *ká*, f. who? (2) *kat*, n. what? (3) *kataras* (*katar*), whether? (4) *tshvans* (accus. *tshvantēm*), how great? (5) *kati*, now used to signify which? (9) *kva*, where? (10) *kuthra*, whither? (13) *kudat*, *kudd*, *kudo*, when? (14) *kutha*, how? The resemblance of these interrogatives to the Sanskrit is very marked.

In the Persian cuneiform inscriptions we have: (1) *kas*, *ká*, m. who? (2) *kat*, n. what? The finding of these forms in the ancient cuneiform inscriptions, is an interesting circumstance.

In Persian we have: (1) *keh* or *kih*, who? (2) *tsheh* or *tshih*, what? (3) *kodám*, whether? (4) *tshend*, how great? Here *k* of the interrogative element sometimes becomes *tsh* by assibilation which had already commenced in the Zend.

In Slavonic we have: (1) *kto* or *kŭto*, who? (2) *tshito*, what? (3) *kotorŭi*, whether? (7) *kolikŭ*, how great? *koji*, m. ; *koja*, f. ; *koje*, n. of what kind? *kakovŭ*, of what kind? (10) *kamo*, whither? (11) *kongdu*, whence? (13) *kogda*, when? (14) *kako*, how? Here *k* has preserved itself, except in *tshito*, what? where it has assibilated.

In Lithuanian we have: (1) *kas*, who? (3) *katras*, whether? (4) *koks*, *koley*, how great? (9) *kur*, where? (10) *kur*, whither? (13) *kada*, when? (14) *kaipo*, how? The form *katras*, whether? in this uncultivated dialect, is very remarkable.

In the Greek we have: (1) *τίς*, who? (2) *τί*, what? (3) *πότερος* (Ion. *κότερος*), whether? (5) *πόσος* (Ion. *κόσος*), how great? (8) *πηλίκος*, how great? *ποιός* (Ion. *κοίός*), of

what kind? (8) *ποδαπός*, of what country? (9) *ποῦ* (Ion. *κοῦ*), where? (10) *ποῖ*, *πόσε*, whither? (11) *πόθεν* (Ion. *κόθεν*), whence? (12) *πῆ*, *πᾶ*, (Ion. *κῆ*), which way? (13) *πότε*, *πόκα*, (Ion. *κότε*), when? (14) *πῶς* (Ion. *κῶς*), how?

The interrogative element in Greek has three forms, viz. : initial *τ*, which is found alone in the first and second categories; initial *κ* and *π*, which are found together in each of the other categories, and probably once existed in all of them. The oldest of these forms is *κ* or *κο*, which is retained in the Ionic dialect, and is found abundantly in the other Indo-European languages. A second form is *π* or *πο*, which seem to have usurped the place of *κ* or *κο* in all the Greek dialects except the Ionic. A third and later form is *τ*, which is now found in the first and second categories; as, *τίς*, who? *τί*, what? comp. Lat. *quis*, *quid*.

In Albanian we have: (1) *kush*, who? (2) *tshjǔ*, *tshe*, *tshdo*, what?

In Latin we have: (1) *quis*, m. *quae*, f. who? (2) *quid*, n. what? (3) *uter* for *quater*, whether? (4) *quantus*, how great? (5) *quot*, how many? (6) *quotus*, what in number? (7) *qualis*, of what kind? (8) *cujas*, of what country? (9) *ubi* for *quabi*, where? (10) *quo*, whither? (11) *unde* for *quande*, whence? (12) *quā*, which way? (13) *quando*, when? (14) *quomodo*, *qui*, *quam*, *ut* for *quat*, how? (15) *cur*, *quare*, why? (16) *quam*, how?

The Latin presents the most beautiful system of interrogatives. The interrogative element is uniformly *qu*.

In Meso-Gothic we have: (1) *hvas*, m.; *hvó*, f. who? (2) *hva* for *hvata*, n. what? (3) *hvathar*, whether? (7) *hveleiks* or *hvileiks*, of what kind? (9) *hvar*, where? (10) *hvadre*, *hvad*, or *hvath*, whither? (11) *hvathro*, whence? (13) *hvan*, when? (14) *hvaiva*, how? (15) *hve*, why?

The Meso-Gothic system of interrogatives is nearly as complete as the Latin. The interrogative element is uniformly *hv*.

In German we have: (1) *wer*, who? (2) *was*, what? (3) *weder*, whether? now used only for *neither*. (7) *welcher*, of what kind? (9) *wo*, where? (11) *wann*, whence?

(13) *wann*, when? (14) *wie*, how? The German has lost the guttural of the interrogative element altogether.

In Celtic we have: (1) *co*, m.; *cia*, f. who? (2) *ciod*, what?

In Armenian, an Indo-European family which has but lately received due attention from philologists, we have: (1) *i*, who? (2) *o*, *ov*, what? with loss of initial consonant altogether. Comp. Lat. *uter*, *ubi*, *unde*.

In our vernacular tongue we have the following interrogative categories: (1) *who*? (2) *what*? (3) *whether*? (7) *which*? now used as a pure pronoun. (9) *where*? (10) *whither*? (11) *whence*? (13) *when*? (14) *how*? (15) *why*? *wherefore*?

The interrogative element in English, although inverted in writing, sounds uniformly *hw* or *hu*.

In Scottish we have *qhwaat*, what? with preservation of the guttural.

Thus the interrogative element, which we utter on so many occasions, pervades, with slight phonetic changes, the different families of the Indo-European stock, as the Sanskrit, Iranian, Slavonic, Lithuanian, Greek, Latin, Teutonic, and Celtic; binds them together into one whole, and shows them to have been originally one language.

We have noticed, thus far, only the coincidences of form in the interrogative element with which these words commence. There is sometimes, also, an etymological coincidence in the other component part of the word; as,

Sansk. *kas*; Zend, *kaq*; Lithuan. *kas*; Lat. *quis*; Meso-Goth. *hvas*, who? where the final *s* is an expression of the personal nominative in five distinct languages.

Sansk. *kat*; Zend, *kat*; Lat. *quid* or *quod*; Meso-Goth. *hvata*; Eng. *what*; Celtic, *ciod*, what? where the final *t* or *d* is an expression of the neuter nominative.

Sansk. *kiyant*; Zend, *tshvant*; Pers. *tshend*; Lat. *quantus*, how great?

Sansk. *kati*; Zend, *kati*; Lat. *quot*, how many?

But the most remarkable instance is where we have three etymological elements combined in one word and in the

same order, namely, the interrogative element, the sign of the comparative degree, and the sign of the personal nominative, and that to express the same logical idea ; as,

Sansk. *kataras* ; Zend, *kataras* ; Slav. *kotorŭi* ; Lithuan. *katras* ; Greek, *κόρεπος* ; Lat. *uter* for *quater* ; Meso-Goth. *hvathar* ; Eng. *whether*, whether ? The sign of the personal nominative, to wit, the final *s*, shows itself in four of the Indo-European families of languages.

Whence did this wonderful coincidence arise, but in the original unity of the languages concerned ?

ARTICLE IV.

ON THE DESCENT OF CHRIST INTO HELL.

BY REV. JOSEPH MUENSCHER, D. D., MT. VERNON, OHIO.

“He descended into hell.”—*The Apostles' Creed.*

THAT formulary of Christian faith which has been handed down to our times under the name of the Apostles' Creed, has rightfully obtained, from its antiquity, scripturalness, simplicity, perspicuity, brevity, and comprehensiveness, the assent and veneration of the Universal Church. With respect to its author or the time of its composition, we possess no very satisfactory information. Its title and a general tradition of early date, would lead us to assign its authorship to the apostles themselves. Thus Ambrose in the fourth century declares, that “the twelve apostles as skilful artificers assembled together, and made a key by their common devices, i. e. the Creed.” Rufinus, in the same century, asserts, that the Christians of the period in which he lived, “had received by tradition from the Fathers that, after the ascension of our Saviour, and the effusion of the Holy Spirit, but before the apostles separated from each