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 Stedhof, Ph. D., late Rector of the Gymnasium at Aarich, 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
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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 (Frau 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 cumbersome 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, Wenck 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 Grotefend,1 who had the supervision

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

Rams horn, 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, G. Grotefend, Feldbusch, 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, Bilroth 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 Bilroth, 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, per-
haps, 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. Lex-
icography is the other. Grammar treats of the connection of sin-
gle 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 ac-
cording 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 differ-
cent 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 enact-
ments. 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 grammatic-
al 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 characterising 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

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 elsewhere 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 Kloz had proved, in a remark on Cicero--

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, demenstis est Cic. de Officiis I. 24. 83: Sunt enim ignorantia 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 Famill. 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—devinitus 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. alter—alter arbitrantur, which also according to Bennecke on this passage and according to Wunder in Varr. lect. Cod. Erfurt, seems to deserve the preference.—De Inventione I. 3. 4. reads quisque cogerentur.

§ 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.
Remarks and Corrections.

† 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. Utsumque 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 mibi vinius 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 adjectival pronoun his is also in Latin expressed by suus. Cic. in Pisonem XX. extr.: Quid est alius furone, non cognoscere homines; cruentare corpus suum leve est; maior 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—legentur.

† 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 acquam.

† 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, Tuscul. 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, hoste decreto, bellum gerendum est; ad Famm. VII.
30: *quo mortuo nunciato* (renunciato). Further, for the vocative, Propert. II. 15. 2: lectule delicis *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 oti et salubris* 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. 38. 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: *Verr* similis 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 relinquuo, ejus vitae timeo; sin opinitor, hujus minus.

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 iste 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 essusere, consuescere and inessere 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 essusescere 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 judicium 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: Caussa 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, κατάληψις imposuit.

423. Tadéium 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 opposition, still another substantive is to be added; e.g. Cic. maximis ingenii homo, not merely maximis 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. 55. With Cicero it occurs Phil. III. 15. 38: quodque provinciam Galliam certeriorum, optimorum et fortissimorum virorum, amicissimorumque reipublicae civium, — retineant; pro Sext. LVI. 126: summus artifex et mehercule partium in republica tamquam in scene, optimarum.
429. A Graecism should have been mentioned here, which is found, for instance, in Cic. pro Sext. XLII. 93: *quum sciat duo illa reipublicae paene fata, Pisonem et Galbinum, alterum haurire —innumerabile pondus auri,—alterum pacem vendidisse.* Cf. Lucian. D. D. 16: *οἱ δὲ σὺναιδὸς ὃ μὲν αὐτῶν ἀδίκειτο, 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 *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 Famm. II. 18, extr. Superioris lustri *reliqua*; pro lege Man. III. *insignia* with the genitive; but also de partit. orat. XXI; in Verr. I. 38. II. 39, and Acad. II. 11. 36, *insignis*; pro Balbo V. *Sola terrarum*; Lael. IV. 14: *extremum disputationis.*

436. The remark concerning *plebex and refertu* might give the impression that Cicero not only *commonly,* but *always,* used *refertu* with the ablative and *plebex* with the genitive. But this is not true. Cf. ad Attic. III. 14: *plebus expectatione;* pro Planc. XLI: *Cognovi refertum esse Graeciam secellatisimo-rum hominum ac nefariaorum*; pro lege Man. XL 31: *referto praedonum mari.* But compare remark 462. To the passages on conscius with the dative might have been added pro Cluent. XX; in Verrrem IV. 68.

446. The verb *incusare* is not Ciceronian; for Cat. Maj. V. 13, is *incusem* without manuscript authority. Rem. 1. If the *positions* are mentioned, *inter* should be *euenumerated 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 defensusus.* 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 et 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* is connected with the father, is not rare. Cf. Cic. de Finn. II. 19. 61; Lael. VIII. and others.
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 ex legione, quam secum habebat, militiaeque, qui ex provincia convenirent,—murum fossamque perductit; Cic. Tusc. I. 1: non quia philosophia graecis et litteris et doctoribus, peripi non possit. 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 occupavistis; ibid. XLIV. 95: qui stipitas securari, septus armatis, munitus indicibus fuit; Id. pro Leg. Man. XI. 30, twice: magnis oppressa hostium copiis, and, legionibus nostri—is iter—patetur factum est: Id. in Vatin. XVII. 40: Milonem—gladiatoribus et bestiariis obseciisse rempublicam; Id. pro Sext. XXIV. 54: erat expulsus vi, servitio denique concitato.

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

We have, in section 437 above, the construction of referro. Here it is to be remarked, that Latin writers prefer to construct it with the genitive when used with reference to persons. Cf. Cic. de Orat. II. 37. 154: nam et referro quondam Italiam Pythagoreorum fuit; pro lege Man. XI. 31: referro praedonum mari; pro Planc. XLI. 95: referret esse Graeciam sceleratissimorum hominem; pro Fontei. 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,) referat Gallia negotiatores erat; ad Attic. VIII. 1. 3: etsi propediem video bonorum, id est, lautorum et locupletiunm, urben referentis fore; Ibid. IX. 1. 2: urbem referre esse optimatum; sometimes also the ablative of persons is connected with it. Cic. pro Rege Dejotar. XII. 33: armatis hominis referentum forum (compare remark 2. § 466); Phil. II. 27. 67: ascalatoribus referro; pro Varr. II. 1. 52: dominus erat—praetoria turba referre; Orat. XLI. 140: quibus referro sunt omnia.

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 impellit earum rerum.

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 Bosc. Amerino V. twice (indignissima and indignissima); pro Planc. III. 8; pro Mil. VII. 19; Phil. XIII. 21. 48; in Vol. IV. No. 16.
Verr. II. I. V. bb. 170; pro lege Man. XVII. 52. Compare Stä-
renburg pro Archia, page 57—59 (Latin edition).

§ 471. The following ablatives are remarkable: Cic. in Verr.
II. I. 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 causa hu-
jusmodi; Tuscul. 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—
curit; Phil. V. 19. 52: triennium ante legitimum tempus.


§ 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 Si-
cilia; in the same section in Sicilia tota, and in sec. 2, in toto pro-
vincia; ad Famm. III. 8. 38: in tota nostra amicitia; de Orat.
III. 25. 96: in toto corpore; Phil. II. 8: tota in oratone. All ex-
amples 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, it
is better, the thing compared must be introduced by quam. Cf.
Cic. ad Att. VII. 16: 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 praesta-
bilius dedisset.

§ 490. Among the verbs which are followed by in with the ab-
latives, imprimere should have been mentioned. Although this
verb occurs in § 416, yet the example given in that section ap-
ppears 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-
Corrections of Zumpt's Syntax.

§ 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 altitute impunitate diuturna, adeo vim facinoris sui pertoruerant, ut, si paullo longior opinio mortis Sextii fuisset, Gracchum illum suum, transferrendi in nos criminis causa, 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 perhoruerant in the above example agrees very well with ut—occidere cogitarint. In the same chapter, § 83, is found: Ac, si tunc P. Sextius, judices, 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 interfecito in foro statueretur; further, in the same oration, chapter XXIX. 62: Quod ille si repudiasset, dubitatiss, quin ei vis esset aliata, quum omnia acta illius anni per illum unum labefactari vide-
rentur?—ad Fam. XIII. 1. 5: dubitat quin ego—consequi posseμ, etiamsi aedificaturus esseμ. 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 posissent, in eadem sententia fuerit (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 Pianc. XXIX. 71: si voluisisses, 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 absolvit arbitretur?—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: Eruciμ, 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 interfecro—Clodius hoc assequebatur, 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 Vatin. 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 meritis periculo et tempore ejus et voluntati parare voluisses. This makes it clear, that the clause, etiamsi—venisses, has no relation whatever to debuisti. Si—voluisses forms rather the hypothetical protasis to it. The same mistake is found in the preceding editions.
Three kinds of Conditional Sentences.

§ 522. The example, sive tacebis, sive loquere, mihi perinde at, 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 necio; 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 (Clodium), 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.

† 628. At the close of this section, it is said, that Quis putaret, quis arbitrararet, 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 Famm. II. 13. 13: quis putaret?—Ibid. XV. 15, med. : quis putaret?—pro Sext. XLII. 99: quis ageret?—pro Sext. IX. 20: quis—arbitrararet? 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.

† 633. 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: quae nomen referre in tabulam timeat. Metuo with the infinitive and with the accusative before the infinitive is found only with the poets.

† 635. 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.

† 636—7. Klotz, ad Cic. Tusc. II. 26. 64, explains the distinction between non quo and non quod, by saying, non quod 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 adding a few examples. Cic. ad Famm. XVI. 6. 1, quas precedes quo. The words are: Tertiam ad te hanc epistolam scripsi, cadem die magis instituti mei tenen- di causa, quae nactus eram, cui darem, quam quo habarem, quid scriberem; Cic. pro Sext. XLIII. 93: quo fortissimum ac sum- mam eivem in invidiam homo castus ac non cupidus vocaret, without a comparative; Ibid. XXVIII. 61: non quo periculum sum non vidisset, 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 Itanio dictus est non quod ea quaere- bat, 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 quis* with the indicative in the protasis, is according to good usage. Compare Cic. pro Planc. XXXII. 78: *non quis multis debeo,—sed quis saepe concurrunt*; Horat. Sat. II. 2. 89: *non quis 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.); *qui? no* non videbamus habitate una? *quis hoc nescit? tabulas in Leelii 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 Leelii 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 Famm. XVI. 21: Gratios 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 *dicebere.* Cic. ad Famm. VII. 16: *quod—negant.* Cf. Cic. pro Arch. XII. 31: *quod expetitum 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 Famm. VII. 12. 21: *Quis enim est, *qui facit nihil sua causa?*—ad Attic. XVI. 1. 2: *sed quid est, quaeso, quod agriptas Buthrosi concivos audio?*—pro Cluent. LXIV. ext. quid est, *quod minus probable proferre potuisse?*—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 *quis*
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 conveniunt, 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 significance although, in which case tamen follows very often. Cf. Cic. de Orat. I. 32. 145: quin etiam, quae maxime propria essent matruae tamen his ipsis artem adhiberit; Ibid. I. 18. 62: V. Matthiae ad Cic. pro Rosc. Amer. VIII. 23.

§ 565. The construction which follows dignus and indigus 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 habitis. 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 consularet, fuisset.

§ 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—et velim crebra; pro Planc. XXII 63: quamquam ne id quidem suspicum 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 conjuctions quam and si appears quite manifest in Cic. pro Rosc. Amer. XXXV.
100: Si proderit atque adeo quum proderit (scio enim profitarum 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 frui 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. (trahe).

§ 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 situa.

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 quum ab his omnia proficiscantur 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, parvo esse ad beate vivendum momenta ista corporis commodorum, sic —; in Verr. IV. 18. 38: De hoc (Diodoro) Verri dicitur, habere eum per bona teneamata. 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 salutis eodem quotidianiis concionibus dicebatur.

Here two passages may be given containing compound tenses. Cic. Orat. IX. 29: qui — ab Aristophane poeta fulgere dixisse est, 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 dixisset, and perdiscere; Ibid. 69: qui hominis 
figuram pingere perdiderit. An example of a peculiar use of an 
infinite after possum may here be mentioned. Cic. pro Caecina 
XVII. 50: Potest pulsus, fugatus, ejectus denique; illud vero 
mullo modo potest, dejectus esse quasquam. This whole passage 
after the proleptic illud is very peculiar.

1613. Cupio is not followed by ut in Cicero. Here also belongs 
agito in this sense. Cf. Sic. pro Sext. XXXVIII. 81: siquidem 
liber esse cogitaret; Ibid. 82: ut—Graecum illum suum—occi-
dere cogitarint; pro Mil. XX. 63: qui ipsi loci spe facere imple-
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 Roes. Amer. XIX. 54: Verum concedo, ut ea praetereas, 
qua, quam taces, nulla esse concedis.

1614. Nihil antiquius habeo is followed by the infinitive in Cic.
ad Famm. XII. 29. 3: Nihil ei fuisse antiquius, quam ad Capito-
num—reverti.

1615. Rem. Suadeo with the accusative before the infinitive is 
found in Cic. pro Arch. VI. 14; pro Caecina V. 10; with the in-
finite only de Finn. II. 29. 95: 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. 353.]