

## ARTICLE IX.

## REVIEW OF TYLER'S TACITUS.

By Charles Short, M. A., Roxbury, Mass.

*The Histories of Caius Cornelius Tacitus: with Notes for Colleges, by W. S. Tyler, Professor of Languages in Amherst College. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1849. 12mo. pp. 453.*

BORN in the reign of Nero and living till the death of the emperor Trajan, amid the corruptions which attended and hastened the fall of Rome, corruptions as gross as they were universal, and infecting alike literature and morals, Tacitus stood preëminent and almost alone in courage, integrity, and virtue. By his writings he won for himself a name among the Annalists of the *Eternal City*, worthy to be compared with those of Virgil and Horace, Rome's greatest poets of her proudest days. Educated partly at Massilia and partly at the capital, he adopted the profession of law and was elevated to civil dignity by Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian. In the reign of Nerva he was made *consul suffectus*, and on the occasion of the death of his predecessor in that office pronounced an oration, in allusion to which Pliny (Ep. 2, 1) says of Virginius Rufus: *laudatus est a consule Cornelio Tacito; nam hic supremus felicitati ejus cumulus accessit, laudator eloquentissimus*. Under the emperor Nerva, we find him engaged in conducting the prosecution of Marius, proconsul of Africa, in which he made a manly and able reply to his sagacious opponent, Salvius Liberalis. He was the chosen friend of the Younger Pliny, his associate at the bar and in his study, and the cherished companion of his lighter hours. We have the highest testimonial of his private excellence in the fact that he was deemed worthy to be the son-in-law of the great and good Agricola. His early studies at the Hellenic Massilia must have rendered him very familiar with the literature of the Greeks, and his mind naturally comprehensive, profound, and acute, would have inclined him to an acquaintance with their philosophy, a predilection fostered and strengthened, beyond doubt, by the study of the admired Seneca.

In the sixth year of the reign of Vespasian, when Tacitus had hardly attained the age of manhood, the dialogue entitled *De Oratoribus, sive De Causis corruptae Eloquentiæ*, was written. If this treatise be rightly ascribed to Tacitus, which the learned now concede, it was his *earliest*

work, and this circumstance and the nature of the theme will account in a great measure for the peculiar style of this book, which is easy and diffuse when compared with that of his other writings. About the time of Trajan's accession to the throne, his two treatises, *De Situ, Moribus et Populis Germaniae* and *De Cn. Julii Agricolaë Vita*, were published.<sup>1</sup> The *Historias*, his next production, was composed at some time after the death of Nerva, which happened A. D. 98. This work comprised the period of twenty-seven years, from the second consulship of Galba, A. D. 68, to the death of Domitian, A. D. 96. The task of recording the events of the reigns of Nerva and Trajan, he had reserved for a maturer age—*senectuti seposuit*—a work he did not live to accomplish. Of the *Historias* there are extant only four books complete and the first part of the fifth. As these remains comprehend only the events of about one year, it is inferred that the entire work was very large. Express testimony in regard to the original number of its books is wholly wanting, if we except the allusion of Jerome, who (Comm. ad Zachar. 16.) says: *Cornelius Tacitus, qui post Augustum usque ad mortem Domitiani vitas Caesarum triginta voluminibus exaravit*. His last work, the *Annales*, treated of the time from the death of Augustus, A. D. 14, to the death of Nero, A. D. 68, a space of fifty-four years. It was divided into sixteen books, of which we now have the first four, a small portion of the fifth, the sixth, nearly all the eleventh, from the twelfth to the fifteenth inclusive, and the first part of the sixteenth. If in his words adduced above, Jerome referred to the *Historias* and the *Annales*, as *one continuous work*, then the number of the books of the *Historias* in its complete form, may be gathered from his statement.

We learn from internal evidence what were some of the sources, from which Tacitus derived the materials he employed in composing his historical works, with which this paper is more particularly concerned. In Ann. 15, 74, he refers to the *Acta Senatus*; in Ann. 4, 53, to the *Memoirs* of Agrippina; in Hist. 3, 28, and Ann. 1, 69, to the *History* of Caius Plinius; to that of Cornelius Sisenna in Hist. 3, 51; Fabius Rusticus, Ann. 13, 20, and in the same place to Cluvius Rufus. He must have obtained much information from the learned friends and admirers, who, as we are told by Pliny (Ep. 4, 13), were accustomed to visit him. The *Historias*, it will be borne in mind, treated of his own times, and of a period in which he himself shared in the administration of civil affairs, and had favorable opportunities to become intimately acquainted with public life. The *Annales*, too, were

<sup>1</sup> For a notice of Prof. Tyler's edition of the *Germania* and *Agricola*, see a former number of this Journal, Vol. V. p. 180, Feb. 1848.

the records of what occurred during the half century immediately preceding his own age, and of which many eye-witnesses or persons more or less directly connected with them, were probably still living in the time of the Historian.

The character and ability of Tacitus were a surety that he would use his materials in an honest, impartial, and skilful manner. A moral dignity and rectitude, of an almost martial severity, have left an impress on his works as deep and enduring as that of his intellectual power. He had a love of truth and virtue equalled only by his hatred of what was false and vicious. To a singularly exact knowledge of the human mind and a profound insight into the motives of men, he added a disposition kind and considerate. His fixed aim was to register and explain human conduct just as he had learned and as he understood it, unbiassed by his relations to the actors or by their position, whether his own friend or foe, whether emperor or subject. If his regard for truth constrained him to censure the meanness, dissimulation, and cruelty of a Domitian, he also obeyed the prompting of gratitude to leave a record of the favors he had received at the hand of his imperial patron. If in his allusion to the Christians, he did not give them their true character, his well known candor and integrity forbid the belief that he was guilty of a wilful misrepresentation. His judgment of the Jews, it must be considered, was that of a Roman and a Pagan concerning a people deprived of the free sympathies and direct acquaintance of all other nations, by a civil and an ecclesiastical polity exclusive to the last degree. Of his practical wisdom, Tacitus has given us perhaps the strongest proof in his willingness to participate in the administration of the government at a time when it was so weak, unsteady, and corrupt; and in his efforts for the public good, when to be virtuous was to be singular, and to be truly patriotic had, in so many instances, been to incur opposition, insult, and death. But much as Tacitus loved his country, he would have loved her more, had she been purer and better. If he speaks of her vices with severity, we are yet sure that he would more gladly have spoken of her virtues. He who could gain the friendship and high admiration of Pliny and write a fitting memorial of the universally lamented Agricola, could hardly have failed to do justice to his country; and if Rome, great in her rise, still greater in her fall, was fortunate that she had a Livy to throw his magic charm about her earlier days, she was more fortunate to have such an Annalist to record the story of her crimes and her misery in her majestic decline.

In his life of the emperor Tacitus, Vopiscus one of the writers of the Augustan History, states that the emperor claimed a descent from the

historian, and ordered his works to be placed in the libraries, and ten copies to be made annually at the public expense and deposited in the archives (Tac. Imp. Vit. c. 10). From this precaution of his illustrious descendant, we may perhaps safely infer, that Tacitus was not a general favorite. Indeed, the philosophic element entered so largely into his writings—he being designated as *the father of philosophic history*—and his style, in which the Roman language seems condensed to its utmost, was so concise and elliptic, that his intelligent and discriminating readers must have been very few, and by other classes he would scarcely ever have been read. Added to this was the circumstance, that the enemies of freedom and virtue, whose hostility he had excited by his exposure and condemnation of wrong and oppression, would naturally have labored totally to suppress his works. How great a portion of his historical writings have been lost by accident or destroyed by infuriate hands, we have already stated. Yet it is well known, that of the immense work of Livy, originally consisting of 142 books, only 35 have come down to our times, notwithstanding the fascinations of his easy and graceful diction. Tacitus is seldom quoted by the historians who followed him, and never by Suetonius, Dion Cassius, or Plutarch; still his writings were a source from which others perhaps drew, and his name was an authority to which on occasion they would have appealed. Amid the subsequent fortunes of the city, for centuries, alas! too much like the gloomy changes of the historian's own age, he must have been read with earnest thought and deep feeling by the wise and good quite down to the period when Rome herself had forgotten her native accents.

In modern days, Tacitus has seldom been read except by mere scholars and students of philosophic history. The demand he makes on his readers is still too great to be often answered. He can be understood and enjoyed only through patient and profound study, and such study will make his harsh style seem easy, and his obscurities give place to thoughts great and beautiful as well as clear. Like other superior writers, he is difficult to be appreciated because he himself so fully comprehended his subject and treated it even in its deepest and most subtle relations. He has been studied but little by American and English scholars. In America the *Annales* have never been printed; only four separate works on this author have, to our knowledge, appeared in this country, and three of these have been published within the last two years. England has produced no valuable independent work on Tacitus. All the complete editions of his writings issued there, have been entirely or almost entirely the results of foreign scholarship. "The London Catalogue" for the period from

1814 to 1849, gives but *sixteen* distinct works on Tacitus, as published in the United Kingdom during that time ; elsewhere we are able to find the titles of but *seven* more works ; and when, some four years ago, an edition of the *Germania* and *Agricola* appeared with notes from *Ruperti*, *Passov*, and *Walch*, together with the first book of the *Annales*, it was stated in the preface, that the *Germania* and *Agricola* were the only parts of Tacitus which, up to that time, had been published in England with explanations in the vernacular tongue for the use of schools. Some idea of the amount of labor expended on this author by the Germans, may be formed from the fact that in Engelman's Catalogue of the Ancient Classics and works connected with them, brought down to the year 1847, the mere titles of the books on Tacitus fill *eleven octavo pages*. Since that time, an edition by Orelli, in two vols. imp. 8vo. has appeared from the press at Zurich, and the great work of Prof. Ritter of Bonn, has been published simultaneously in England and Germany.

Of the German editions, scholars have been best satisfied with those of an earlier date, and Lipsius still remains a favorite authority. The edition by Imm. Bekker, in two vols. 8vo. Leipzig, 1831, contains the valuable labors of Lipsius, Gronovius, Ernesti, and Wolf, and is furnished with good indexes. Ruperti's *Index Verborum* and *Index Latinitatis* afford good aid in the study of Tacitus, and are perhaps the least exceptionable portion of his voluminous and ill digested work. The best and most recent edition is that by Prof. Ritter, which we have mentioned above. It is in four vols. 8vo. and being intended for purposes of exact study, is accompanied with ample *prolegomena*, various readings, notes critical and explanatory, and two useful indexes, one of proper names and the other grammatical. During the last year, also, the second and last volume of the edition by the lamented Orelli came forth, the text of which was based on a revision of the Florentine MSS. by his friend and associate, Prof. Baiter. This work appears in a form of singular beauty ; and in addition to the views of the learned editor it is enriched with notes from the most judicious commentators, including as well the earlier as the later. It is the text of this edition, which Prof. Tyler has, for the most part, followed in his work on the *Historiæ* before us, and which we now proceed to examine.

Prefixed to the work is an "Essay on the Style of Tacitus," of which it is said in a marginal note : *abridged from the Prolegomena of L. Doederlein to his edition of Tacitus, tom. II. Halle, 1847, and translated from the Latin by Mr. Marshall Henshaw, A. M. Tutor in Amherst College.* The first two chapters of the original, which con-

stitute the introduction, are given in full. The translation of this Essay is very unequally done, some portions of it adhering so close to the Latin, that they can scarcely be understood without consulting the original, while other parts are faithfully rendered into easy and idiomatic English. There are also several errors relating to single words.

At the close of the first chap. in *breve illud dicendi genus, quod ut proprium ac peculiare huic scriptori admiramur*, where *proprium* and *peculiare* must be nearly synonymous, these epithets are rendered "appropriate and peculiar," and thus the first word is deprived of a pertinent meaning.

In c. 2d, p. 9th, *sermo—quasi natus erat, was naturally adapted*, is translated: "was made, and, as it were, born;" and just below, the fine thought of Doederlein in *brevitatis quasi imperatoriae*, is missed in the words: "of — brevity and, as it were, of authority." Near the end of the same page, we have: "nor while I am pursuing this subject, do I entertain any fear of seeming to depreciate the ability of Tacitus, as if it were the mark of a weak and narrow mind in so earnest a narration of the most important events, to choose his words with a sort of scholarlike care and anxiety." The Latin is fuller and very intelligible, and adds a thought not given in the translation: *Quas dum persequor, non vereor ne sinistre cuiquam judicare videar de Taciti ingenio, tanquam angusti et pusilli animi fuerit, si eum inter tam intentam maximarum rerum commemorationem scholastica quadam cura et sollicitudine verba elegisse arguam, ut scilicet quam brevissima haberetur oratio*. Unless the translator intended to render this passage with great freedom, he must have misapprehended the connection of the words *tanquam—fuerit*. On p. 10, near the beginning of the second paragraph, *praeter longitudinem, sc. substantivorum in tio exeuntium, etiam jejuni aliquid et aridi habent*, is translated: "besides their length, they often seem meager and jejune." In c. 5. p. 11, we read: "It," i. e. the dignity of the Latin language, "is increased when nouns follow nouns or verbs directly, so that the idea seems to be evident from the simple force of the words." The original of the last clause is: *ut meris ponderibus constare videatur sententia*; and concise as this is, it relieves the obscurity of the English. At the end of the 13 c. of the translation, p. 19, "and so to Rome," is, in the Latin, *vel adeo Romam*. The next chapter begins: "Since now such a studied brevity seems to involve an excess of freedom, and to favor an abundance of materials, rather than to subserve the beauties of style." The precise import of this, the reader could hardly ascertain without referring to the original: *Tale igitur brevitatis studium cum soluti aliquid nonnunquam habere et rerum copias potius quam orationis decori inservire videatur.*—

Here *soluti aliquid* should have been rendered by, *a violation of common usages, a departure from the ordinary style*, or by something equivalent; and *inservire* in connection with *rerum copia*, should have been translated, *is adapted to, is suitable for*. On the same page below, in the words, "in his boldness approaching nearer to the austerity of philosophers than to the ornament of poets," the term "ornament," *decori*, being contrasted with "austerity," should have been *grace*. Near the end of c. 16, Doederlein is made to say of Tacitus: "Rejecting *asylum*, he says *subsidium*," and then a few lines further: "he admits some such words as *tropaea, asylum, etc.*" In the Latin, however, there is no such contradiction; the first words there being: *In the Annales 3, 36, he says subsidium, avoiding asylum*; the author here referring to a particular instance. At the beginning of the 17 c., we find: "He hesitated not to revive ancient words and forms of words —believing that there is more brilliancy in that which savors of antiquity." This last clause, in the original, is: *ipsi antiquitatis saporis plurimum splendoris inesse ratus*, where the rhetorical term *splendoris* should have been rendered by some word suiting the context: *thinking that in the very savor of antiquity there was the greatest excellence*. The meaning of the words, "the brilliancy in that which savors of antiquity," is not obvious.

This treatise by Doederlein on the style of Tacitus, though brief, is very valuable. Prof. Tyler has shown his estimation of it by his frequent references to it in his commentary, references which are commonly very apposite and highly explanatory of the peculiarities of the historian. A study of the essay, in its original and unabridged form, gives a more favorable and just idea of its merits. The questions which naturally arise in an inquiry into the style of Tacitus, as indeed of any writer, admit, in many cases of answers at once various and just. These are here treated in a laborious and ingenious manner, and for the most part very satisfactorily. The two passages on p. 16, quoted by Doederlein as marked instances of the figure *zeugma*, will bear, as the reader will see, a close version involving but little harshness. The citations are: *ἔλεν δ' Οἰαμάου βίαν παρθένον τε σύννερον*, from Pindar, and: *Εὐρυτόν δ' ἔλοι Τήν θ' ὑπίστρυγον Οἰχαλίαν*. from Soph. Trach. 353 et seq. At the end of the same page, Doederlein says: "Frequently also adverbs or ablatives, datives or accusatives used like adverbs, bear some attributive either adjective or participle, as it were, concealed in them. This is evidently contrary to Cicero's custom, who preferred to call his work *libri de officiis scripti*, rather than to omit the participle." What Cicero's *prevailing* usage in this particular may be, we have not ascertained; but turning to

his works on reading this statement of Doederlein, we soon found the three following passages, in which Cicero omits the participle in such a connection : *Hunc librum de senectute ad te misimus*, Cat. Maj. 1 ; *Hortor, mi Cicero, ut — hos etiam de philosophia libros — legas*, de Off. 1, 3 ; *libro, quem ad me de virtute misisti*, de Fin. 1, 3. The essay will seem most deficient in the account of Tacitus's use of Greek constructions, though the translation before us has in the chapter treating of these, c. 18 (c. 19 of the original), only one omission, which consists of two references to the *Annales*. Such *Grecisms* as, *ceteris remanere volentibus fuit*, Hist. 3, 43, and the similar construction in Agric. 18, which Prof. Tyler has well explained ; and the use of the adverb instead of an adjective, as in Hist. 1, 65 *multae invicem clades*, and 5, 4, *longam olim famem*, ought to have been mentioned by Doederlein. On p. 17, c. 11 (c. 12 in the Latin) he refers to the absolute use of *navare* for *operam navare*, in Hist. 5, 25, *Si Vespasiano bellum navaverint*, as if it were peculiar to Tacitus. But even Cicero thus uses this word, as in Ep. ad Att. 15, 4, *Quam vellem, Bruto studium navare potuisses!* and in Ep. ad Diversos 3, 10, 2, *ut — nostram in te benevolentiam navare possimus*.

The parts omitted in this abridgment would all be very useful and suggestive to the diligent student. They consist chiefly of references to the works of Tacitus, especially the *Annales*, and make us acquainted with the author's method of deciding between different readings by an appeal to the usages of Tacitus. The 9th c. of the Latin, on the use of the figure *apostrophe*, is wholly left out in the English. We regret that this essay was not given entire, and as it would hardly be consulted except for critical purposes, those inclined to study it, would prefer to read it in the language in which the author himself wrote it. But if the version here made shall induce any one to become acquainted with the original, who might otherwise have remained ignorant of it, or have been repulsed by its scholastic garb, the translator will have rendered exact study a good service by this effort.

The *Chronologia Historiarum*, by Zumpt, is copied from the edition of Orelli, and this is followed by the *text*, which occupies two hundred pages. The *Remarks Preliminary* to the notes consist of fifteen closely printed pages, which we are sure no fit reader will pronounce too long. Being composed with care, they contain valuable information, and admirably answer the purpose for which they were written, which was, as the editor informs us in the Preface, *to introduce the student into a familiar acquaintance and lively sympathy with the author and his times, and with that great empire, of whose degeneracy and decline in its beginnings he has bequeathed to us so profound and instruc-*



tive a history. The *Remarks* form an appropriate and able introduction to the historical writings of Tacitus, to the *Historiæ* in particular, and merited, we think, a more conspicuous place in the volume. The *commentary*, which succeeds, is comprised in 192 pages. We here add some observations on such portions of it as we marked in our reading.

Book I, c. 1, p. 246. "*Consules* means *colleagues* (those who go together, *con* and *sul*, root of *salio*), or joint presidents of the Roman republic." So Forcellini. The same origin of the word *consul* is given in Dr. Smith's *Antiquities*, and the words *exsul* and *praesul* are there adduced as formed analogically from the same root. But *exsul*, *exsul*, may well be referred to *solum*, as the editor himself has done on 5, 24, p. 436. *Salio* means not to go, but to spring, to leap, like its etymon in Greek, ἄλλομαι. *Praesul*, in early use, denoted the chief of the *Salii*; and as it was his business to lead them in the dance, the term is correctly traced to *salio*, *salio*. The word *consul*, according to the ancient etymologists, came from *consulo*. Varro quotes: *Qui recte consulat, consul cluat*; and in Cic. de Orat. 2, 39, we find: *Sin ex vocabulo, ut Carbo; si consul est, qui consulit patriæ, quid aliud fecit Opimius?* It is manifestly allied to *consulo*, *consilium*, *consus*. With *consul*, *consulo*, compare προβουλος, προβουλευω. — "*Post conditam urbem*. Observe the concrete form of expression. The Latin language is very deficient in such abstract words as *foundation*, *constitution*, etc. The people were marked for *action*, and their language deals in *facts*." This needs some qualification. Speculative inquiries and the study of Greek philosophy gradually introduced into the Latin many abstract terms. Up to the time of Cicero, philosophy had been little studied by his countrymen, but his writings in this department gave a new character to the language in this respect; and as the Romans became more literary and studious, those additions were made to the stock of abstract words, which were naturally demanded to express the new ideas, whether original or derived from the Greeks. In the age of our author, a strong tendency to form and use abstract terms was even a characteristic of the language. Many of these new words of the post-Augustan times, and forms first used by Tacitus, the editor himself has pointed out in the succeeding pages; as, *superventus* 2, 54; *diffugium* 1, 39; *diversitas* 1, 62; *relatus* 1, 30. His use of the abstract noun instead of the concrete is sometimes very remarkable, as *expectatio* 1, 17; and *consilium* 1, 87. In frequent instances both in the present work and in his other writings, he employs the neuter singular of the adjective limited by a noun in the genitive, instead of directly qualifying the noun by the adjective

in concord with it, according to the earlier usage; as, *obscurum noctis* 2, 14; *humido paludum* Ann. 1, 61; the adjective being thus nearly equivalent to an abstract noun. He sometimes prefers, however, the concrete form to the abstract; as, *clarus egerat* 3, 44; *citus aderat* 2, 40. This happens chiefly in his descriptive passages where he aims to be graphic, and it is one of his many imitations of poetic style. It was indeed true of the *early* language of the Romans, that it was deficient in abstract words, as from the very laws that govern the development of mind, it must have been; but their common use of certain abstract terms instead of the concrete is worthy of notice; as, *exercitus, fructus, copiae, sectio*.

Ch. 9, p. 256. "*Quieto milite* = *quum quieti erant milites*," for = *quum quieti essent milites*.

Ch. 10, p. 257. "*Prope ab*. A peculiar Latin idiom. Cf. *protinus ab*, G. 43, note." Consulting this reference to the *Germania*, we find: "*Protinus deinde ab, next in order, reaching to the ocean*. We should expect *ad*." This reference does not seem parallel to the case in question, *Protinus* here not modifying *ab*. If, however, it be taken in immediate connection with *ab*, the phrase,—*directly on from*,—is not opposed to our idiom, by itself, but only as introduced by *deinde*. Thus construed, *next directly on from the ocean*, like *prope ab, near from*, it will be at variance with our idiom; and this mode of expression arises from the fact, that the Romans here viewed the object following the preposition as *the starting point*, while we contemplate it as *the end*; such differences of conception are very common in different languages, and however diverse they are, they yet may all be natural. The last words of the editor in our quotation above, seem to overlook this fact.

Ch. 15, p. 262. "*In domo, sc. sua*, which is omitted to make *in domo* correspond with *in republica*." Were *in domo* not followed by *in republica*, *sua* could not agreeably to usage be expressed with it in the ablative. When *the place where* is to be designated, and is to have the possessive adjective joined to it, *domi* is used rather than *in domo*. Zumpt, Lat. Gram. § 400.

Ch. 17, p. 264. "*Publica expectatio*. Abs. for conc. = *populus impatienter expectans*." This is an Anglicism. *Avidissime* expectans would have been good Latin. Cic. 14 Phil. c. 1.

Ch. 23, p. 270. "*Agnoscere* refers to persons and things previously known, *cognoscere* to those not previously known." Cicero uses *cognoscere* of things previously known; as, Or. in Cat. 3, 5, *Tum ostendi tabellas Lentulo; et quaesivi cognosceretne signum, Annuit*. So Plautus, *Video et cognosco signum*. Pseud. 4, 2, 45; and Livy,

*Praeda omnis—militi concessa est: et pecus exceptum est, quod intra dies triginta domini cognovissent*, 24, 16. In *Aen.* 6. 340, 452, Virgil uses, in the first passage *cognoscere*, and in the second *agnoscere*, of what was previously known, thus employing these words without distinction. "*Eniterentur*. It is subjunctive because *cum* = *since*, denoting a causal connection." If *cum* did not here mean *since*, it would still, according to usage require the *subjunctive* after it. When *cum* is used with this mode, sometimes the idea of *cause* predominates, sometimes that of *time*. In this case it is the former.

Ch. 26, p. 272. "*Postero iduum dierum*. *The day after the Ides days*. The expression is unusual. It seems to be like the Greek ὑστέρᾳ εἰδῶν." *Ernesti* says he knows of *no other* instance of this form of expression in a notation of time. He adds that it may have been formed after the analogy of the Greek, which would be ὑστέρᾳ εἰδῶν, but he does not cite those words as actually occurring. — "*Ut quisque—oblatus esset*. *Ut* gives an indefinite sense to *quisque*, and is accordingly followed by the subjunctive." *Ut* is here a relative adverb and as such governs nothing, but is joined with the indicative or subjunctive as the nature of the sentence requires. Cf. Zumpt § 531, note, and § 710. Below, in ch. 29, we have the indicative after *ut quisque*: *ut quisque obvius fuerat*; and also in 4, 59, *ut quisque flagitium navaverat*. In the first case, the writer wishes to express the thought as *contingent*, and therefore uses the *subjunctive*; in the two others, which we have just cited, he wishes to state facts, and so employs the indicative, using *ut*, however, with *quisque* alike in both connections. It is the nature of the idea as *contingent* or *absolute*, which determines the mode of the verb. The strict meaning of *ut* here, is *as, according as*; the correlative *ita* being omitted. *Ut quisque* followed by an adjective or an adverb in the superlative degree, with *ita* expressed in the corresponding clause, is very common. Zumpt § 710.

Ch. 29, p. 275. "*Pro gradibus*. *From the steps*. Cf. Z. 311." Zumpt, in the section here referred to, says: "*pro* also signifies *at the extreme point of* a thing, so that the person spoken of is *in* or *upon* the thing." Hence in this and the kindred passages, *pro* is more exactly given by *on*.

Ch. 33, p. 279. "*Cunctatione* = *hesitation, literally waiting to collect everything* (from *cunctus*)." The verbal *cunctatio* is derived directly from *cunctor*, which Doederlein refers to *conor*. According to this view, *cunctor* properly denotes *to be trying to do* something, and, by implication, *not to do* it. Cf. ὁ μέλλων, a *loiterer*, from μέλλω, *to be going to do* something. *Cunctus* is best regarded as an abbreviated form of *conjunctus*: compare with *cunctus* its synonym *uni-*

versus, the strict import of these two words being very nearly the same.

Ch. 39, p. 284. "*Plerique*, many; a sense peculiar, though not confined to Tacitus. Cf. Agric. 1, note." Consulting Prof. Tyler's edition of the *Agricola*, as here referred to, we find: "*Plerique*, not most persons, but many, some: 'a sense peculiar to Tacitus,' says Dronke. But it is found, though less frequently, in earlier writers: cf. Facciolati and Forcellini." On 2, 73, p. 345, the editor also gives: "*Plerumque* = sometimes." This weak sense of *plerique* and its adverbial form *plerumque*, some, sometimes, a sense opposed alike to its etymology and the common use of the word, must not be assigned to it without necessity. The adjective *plerique*, is not given at all by Forcellini with the import *some*; and in but a single passage from an author earlier than Tacitus, with the signification of *many*; namely, Nepos, Timoth. 4: *Timothoi moderatas sapientisque vitas cum plerique possimus proferre testimonia, uno erimus contenti*. The word in this passage not only bears the meaning *many*, but as it is evidently contrasted with *uno* in the last clause, the rendering *very many* suits the context still better. Instead of *plerique*, Weise here reads *plura*. We know of no passage in Tacitus which plainly requires this weak meaning to be given to *plerique*. In regard to such examples as 1, 86, *Rapti a publico plerique, plures in tabernis et cubilibus intercepti*; and 4, 84, *plerique Jovem, plurimi Dilem patrem—conjectant*, we may say, that if in the former we render *plures*, *more*, and in the latter *plurimi*, *most*; thus giving them their usual signification, even then *plerique* may have in both cases its common meaning of *very many*. So too of the adverb *plerumque*; the weakest sense in which it is cited by Forcellini is that of *often*, except in two instances; one from Quintilian, which critics now explain by *persaepe*; and the other from Paul. et Ulpian. Dig., which Freund renders *often*, the same meaning which he gives to this adverb in several passages from Tacitus, and which, he says, is a later use of the word. Where *plerumque* is employed alone, we must insist on its ordinary force; and the cases adduced by grammarians, where it is used with other adverbs, all show that it uniformly retains in a greater or less degree its intensive meaning; in Livy 40, 46, it stands opposed to *interdum*; and in Cicero, Orat. 51, 170, even to *saepe*.

Ch. 44, p. 287. "*Mens* (from Gr. *μένος*) is properly *the intellect*; *animus* (from Gr. *άνεμος*) *the spirit, the feelings*." This is indeed the meaning of these terms respectively in Latin, but their import they have acquired from Roman usage, not from their sources in Greek; the word *μένος* never strictly designating *the intellect*, and *άνεμος* signifying only *wind, a storm*.

Ch. 53, p. 295. "*Inter [paganos] corruptior*, sc. quam in castris. Our word *pagan* comes from *paganus*. 'The earliest Christian churches were in the cities, while yet *the inhabitants of the country villages* were unconverted. Compare *heathen* from *heath*.'" This statement in regard to the ecclesiastical use of the word *paganus*, *pagan*, is not sufficiently full and exact. When the control of the empire passed into the hands of Constantius after Constans's death, A. D. 350, all sacrifices to the heathen gods were first prohibited on pain of death. In Rome and Alexandria, this law could not be fully carried out; but everywhere else, from this period, heathen worship was obliged to conceal itself in the country, in remote corners; and hence the terms *pagani*, *paganismus*. The expression, in its new and religious sense, is first found in a law of Valentinian, A. D. 368: Codex of Theodosian, l. 16, tit. 2. Gieseler, Eccl. Hist. Vol. I, p. 307 et seq. Edinb. ed. In respect to the word *heathen*, Germ. *heiden*, if it be derived from *heath*, Germ. *heide*, then, following the analogy of *paganus*, it must be assumed that *heide*, *heidenen*, meant the country as opposed to the city. This explanation, offered by Voss, is ingenious, but without foundation. The word is, beyond question, of Southern origin, and directly from *ethnici* of the Vulgate, Greek *ἔθνηκοί*, which is from *ἔθνη*, the designation of the heathen in the LXX. from the Hebrew *גוים*, *nations*. Compare with this the ecclesiastical use of *gentiles* from *gens*. The correspondence between the Germ. *heiden*, *heathen*, and *heide*, *heath*, is probably accidental, as many of the coincidences of form in language are acknowledged to be.

Ch. 63, p. 299. "*Temperavere—refrained*. The radical idea of the word is that of *separation* (*tempus*, *τέμνω*)."  
Whatever be the primary meaning of *tempus*, the various significations of its derivative *tempero*, can best be drawn from the import of *tempus* as fixed by usage. Thus *tempero* would strictly mean *to regulate as to time*.

Ch. 68, p. 302. "*Urbs* is properly *the capital*; *civitas* the whole body of *citizens*." More definitely, *urbs* denotes *the place*, of which *civitas* designates *the citizens*, as a civic body. Cf. Cic. *Sest.* 42, 91, *conventicula hominum, quae postea civitates nominatae sunt; domicilia conjuncta, quas urbes dicimus*. Freund. So too in Greek, *ἄστυ*, a city in a *local* sense; *πόλις*, in *political* relations.

Ch. 72, p. 304. "The word *forum* is allied to *foras*, and signifies properly *an open place*." *Forum* may be traced to *fero*, thus strictly meaning *a place* where things are *borne, carried*; hence *a market*, and, by usage, *a place for the transaction of public business in general*. Cf. the Gr. *ἀγορά*, which is from *ἀγείρω*, *ἄγω*.

Ch. 76, p. 306. "*Primus—addidit*. *First gave*. The Latins use the

adjective where we use the adverb of time." This use of adjectives denoting *order* as well as those of *time*, is idiomatic in Latin; and some of the adverbial relations of *place* also are expressed by adjectives. Cf. Zumpt § 685, 686. — "*Auditus* is a post-Augustan substantive." This word may be found in Cic. De Nat. Deor. 2, 57, and in Auct. ad Herenn. 2, 5.

Ch. 81, p. 310. "*Celebre*. Properly crowded (from *cello*, κέλλω [κέλλω]);" and on 2, 28, p. 328, the editor gives: "Columen. Our word *columnn*, a pillar. From *cello*, to drive." Our word *columnn*, we have directly from *columnna*, not from *columen*. *Columen*, *culmen*, and *columnna*, are allied forms from *cello*, which appears not as a simple word, but only in compounds, as *ex-cello prae-cello*, and from which come also *celer*, *celsus*, *collis* (Gr. κολώνη). All these words are from κέλλω, with the radical idea of *to move*, and the special sense of *to raise*. Thus *celeber* will strictly mean *moved upwards*; then tropically, *eminent*, *distinguished*.

Ch. 82, p. 311. "*Invidia*, primarily, the averted look of hatred and envy (*in* negative, and *video*)." *In* negative, is not often prefixed to verbs, but to adjectives and participles used as adjectives, as *injustus*, *infiniteus*; to words formed from such adjectives and participles, as *injustitia*, *infiniteus*; and to adjectives formed from substantives, as *informis*. Cf. Zumpt § 328 and Schmitz's Lat. Gram. § 226. Both Zumpt and Schmitz seem to pass over the use of this prefix with nouns, as in the common word *injussu*, and in *inapparatio*, which is found in Auct. ad Herenn. 2, 4, 7, though *inapparatus* does not occur. On the origin of *invidia*, we have in Cic. Tusc. Quaest. 3, 9: *nomen invidiae; quod verbum ductum est a nimis intuendo fortunam alterius*. In accordance with this, Freund interprets the word *invideo* thus: I. *to look at something*; II. *to look at something with envy*. So too εἰσοῶ signifies *to look at longingly*, in Soph. Antig. 29 et seq., ed. Dindorf:

ἐὼν δ' ἄκλαυτον, ἀταφον, οἰωνοῖς γλυκὸν  
θησαυρὸν εἰσορῶσι πρὸς χάριν βορᾶς,

Ch. 87, p. 314. "*Habitos in custodiam*. Observe the accusative after *habitos in*. — *Habeo* (from ἄνω [ἈΨΩ], ἄπτω) strictly implies *motion*, and hence may be followed by *in* with the accusative." This mode of accounting for this construction is too subtle. We find *in* with the accusative after even the verbs *esse* and *manere* in good writers. As these verbs in usage imply no motion, we must explain the regimen on some general principle. Boetticher, according to Prof. Tyler, makes *Habitos in custodiam* by *zeugma* equivalent to *in custodiam da-*

*tos et in ea habitos.* Freund, in the same way, explains the regimen of *habere* in this and in kindred passages. This use of *in*, however, is limited in Latin. Cf. Zumpt § 316. In Hellenistic and Classic Greek, *ἐν* and *εἰς* often interchange by *zeugma*.

Ch. 89, p. 315. "*Haud* is the Greek *οὐδ'* [*οὐδ'*]. The ancient grammarians maintained that this particle was derived from the Gr. *οὐ*; and the final *d* led some to refer it to the apostrophized form of the double negative, *οὐδέ*. But after stating the objections to such an origin of this difficult word, the philologist Hand remarks: "Si quae [qua] etymologica vestigia hic remanent cognata esse videntur a negativum et *haud*."

Bk. 2, ch. 1, p. 317. "Corinthi—[Achaiae] urbe. [*At Corinth*]. This use of the genitive is explained by some as an old form of the ablative (Corinthoi, Gr. *Κορίνθοι* = *Κορίνθῳ*); by others as an ellipsis of *urbe, loco*, or some other ablative, which, like the dative in Greek, is the proper *where-case*. Zumpt § 393." There was no old form of the ablative ending in *oi*. But the dative of the second declension still retains an *i* in some words, as *alter, alteri, nullus, nulli*, etc., while the common ending of this case is *o*. Thus both these forms have their prototype in Greek, the first in the early dative, as *ἄλλος, ἄλλοι οἱ*; and the second in the later and usual form, *ἄλλος, ἄλλοι φ*. The form of the second declension in Latin, called *the genitive denoting the place where*, may well be referred to the first *ἄλλοι οἱ*, and the ordinary termination of the dative of this declension, *o*, is from the last *ἄλλοι φ*, in which, as the orthography should seem to indicate, the *i* had ceased to be sounded, or at most was faintly uttered. It is mentioned in Zumpt l. c., that once Grammarians regarding the form ending in *i* as really *the genitive*, accounted for it by the ellipsis of *in loco*. Zumpt says nothing of an ellipsis of *urbe* in this connection, and such an ellipsis would be contrary to the usage of the Latin. Cf. Zumpt § 399. We here avail ourselves of the occasion to remark, that in the section, to which we have just referred, there is a contradiction in Dr. Schmitz's translation of Zumpt. "The "invariable" apposition of the names of places with *urbs, oppidum, locus*, etc., when the latter with the preposition precede the former, is stated to have some "exceptions."

Ch. 8, p. 320. "*Super*, when followed by the ablative, always means *concerning*." *Huic navi alteram conjunxit, super qua turrim effectam ad introitum portus opposuit*, Caes. B. C. 3. 39. *Ensis cui super cervice pendet*, Hor. Od. 3, 1, 17. *Requiescere fronde super viridi*, Virg. Ecl. 1, 80. Cf. Freund. The note by the editor, given above, is followed by a reference to Zumpt, where we find: "*Super* has, in prose, the ablative only, when used in the sense of *de, concerning, or in respect to*." Gram. § 320.

Ch. 13, p. 322. "*Cum*. Causale = *since*, hence followed by the subjunctive." We quote the whole passage from the text: *Auxit invidiam praeclaro exemplo femina Ligus, quae filio abdito, cum simul pecuniam occultari milites credidissent, eoque per cruciatus interrogarent, ubi filiam occuleret, utrum ostendens latere respondit.* If *cum* be *causale* here, it must introduce a reason either for *auxit invidiam* or for *interrogarent*. It cannot do the former, for that is done by the clause *quae—respondit*, of which *cum—occuleret* is a subordinate part; if it assigns the cause of *interrogarent*, then this relation is expressed both by *cum* and by *eo*, the use of the connective *que* becomes absurd, and the mode of *interrogarent* cannot be accounted for. *Cum*, therefore, must here be *temporale*. Both verbs, *credidissent* and *interrogarent*, are in the subjunctive under its regimen, and its office as a relative word here is to connect *credidissent, eoque—interrogarent* with *respondit*.

Ch. 55, p. 338. "*Cessisse*. *Cedo* is followed by the dative of the person and accusative or ablative of the thing. Cf. Zumpt § 413. Tacitus uses it here and in some other places without either, *vita* being understood." The absolute use of *cedo* occurs elsewhere in Tacitus, as well as in the best writers, in the sense *to yield*; but in no other instance in Tacitus, that we know, with the ellipsis of *vita*. Even in the present passage, manuscripts are found which read *cessisse vita*, and thus Forcellini and Freund quote this place. Tacitus uses *concedo* with an ellipsis of *vita* in Ann. 4, 38 and 13, 30. — Ch. 56. "*Obnoxiiis—ausis*. *The generals being liable to be called to an account for their own crimes (ob—noxam), and therefore not daring to forbid the crimes of others.*" This should be: *The generals being liable to be punished (strictly, exposed to harm, from ob i. e., ἐπι, and noxa) sc. for their own crimes, and therefore, etc.* In the editor's translation, the meaning of *obnoxiiis* is exhausted by the words "liable to be called to an account," and what he gives as the translation of this adjective is, in fact, implied, not expressed.

Ch. 58, p. 339. "*Utramque* Mauretanium. *Uterque* is plural in its meaning, but seldom used in a plural form. Cf. Zumpt § 141, n. 2." This note does not accord with Zumpt as here referred to. The plural of *uterque* is *necessarily* employed in certain circumstances. Cf. l. c.

Ch. 64, p. 341. "*Onerabat*. *Rendered more odious*; akin to our word *aggravate*." The precise import of this last remark is not obvious. The roots of *onerare* and the English *to aggravate* are allied in sense; and there is a use of the word *aggravate*, chiefly in colloquial language among us, with the meaning of *to annoy*; but this use, we believe, is hardly sanctioned by good authority, though it is given in American Dictionaries.



Ch. 87, p. 350. "*Calones* were, properly, wood-carriers (from *cala*, old Latin for *fustis*)."  
*Cala* is the Greek *κάλα*; strictly, *fire-wood*.

Ch. 99, p. 354. "Expediri. Alii, *expedire*. But without MS. authority. Cf. Ann. 15, 10, *expediri—jussit*; also Virg. Aen. *flammas inter et hostes expedior*." In the text the active form *expedire* stands, and in the note on 1, 10, p. 257, the active is given in a quotation of this passage. With regard to the voice of this verb, we find the Active in 1, 10, *quotiens expedierat, magnas virtutes*, on which Freund says: absolute for *expedire se, to prepare one's self for battle*. We find the Active used absolutely also in 1, 88, *multos—Otho—secum expedire jubet*. In the passage in the *Annales* 15, 10, the connection requires the verb to be rendered as *the passive*, and the words cited from Virgil (Aen. 2, 632 et seq.) being preceded by *ducente deo, expedior* may well be regarded there also as a real *passive*.

Bk. 3, ch. 1, p. 355. "*Advenisse [mox cum] Vitellio. Had just arrived on the side of Vitellius, not with him, for he was at Rome. Cf. ch. 36, below. But it is an unusual sense for cum; and mox in the sense of just now, a little before, is, so far as I know, without a precedent in Tacitus or any other writer before Columella.*" The sense here given to *mox* is at variance with the use and etymology of the word (on its origin, cf. Hand, sub voce). The passage from Columella, where this particle is said to occur in the sense of *just now*, is given by Forcellini as follows: *de altero, quod mox proposueram nihil dubito, quin* etc. 3, 20, 24. Forcellini states that Statius also uses this word in the same manner, Theb. in fine:

*Mox tibi, siquis adhuc praetendit nubila livor,  
Occidit.*

One more place has been adduced, in which this meaning has been assigned to *mox*; it is: *mox dicta finierat, multitudo omnis—consensit*, Ammian. Marcell. 14, 10, 16. In the passage from Columella, we see no objection to considering this word as an adverb of order, and we would render it, *next, in the next place*. In a similar sense Tacitus uses it in 4, 3, and 3, 72; and in the *Annales* 11, 22, we find: *primum—deinde—mox—post*. So Livy 40, 48, 6. The form *occidit*, in the quotation from Statius, is regarded as corrupt. Its import in the words from Ammian. Marcellus above, it is difficult to settle. Ernesti's explanation is, perhaps, the most natural. He understands it, in the sense of *vixidum*, and accordingly it is nearly equivalent to the formulas *mox quum, mox ubi, as soon as*. Cf. Livy 38, 41: *eundem mox, quum jam—manum cum hoste conseruisset, terrorem ab tergo praebuisse*; and Plaut. Casin. 2, 2, 39: *mox magis quum otium mihi et tibi erit, igitur tecum loquar*.

In the passage before us, *advenisse mox cum Vitellio*, we would make *mox* an adjunct of *cum Vitellio*, and thus both *mox* and *cum* may here retain their usual meaning. Translate, *Had come soon to be with Vitellius*. For this ellipsis of *futura*, compare Virgil, *Aen.* 5, 116 et seq. :

Velocem Mnestheus agit acri remige Pristim,  
*Mox Italus* Mnestheus, genus a quo nomine Memmi.

In *Georg.* 1, 24, Virgil uses the word with the future participle expressed :

Taque adeo, quem *mox* quae sint habitura deorum  
Concilia incertum est.

The conciseness of the expression is in the manner of Tacitus, and, as we have shown, agreeable to the usage of Virgil. Doederlein and Bekker offer nothing on this passage; and Ruperti, considering it as corrupt, suggested, as Prof. Tyler states, a change in the text.

Ch. 8, p. 358. "*Claustra annonae*. Egypt was the Roman granary for corn." A reference to ch. 48 should have been given here, which is moreover a qualification of the above statement. Cf. Cic. *Pro Lege Manil.* c. 12 : *Siciliam—Africam—Sardiniam—haec tria frumentaria subsidia reipublicae*.

Ch. 23, p. 363. "*Magnitudine eximia*. Ablative of quality. The *ablative* (not the genitive) is always used to denote an *accidental* quality. Cf. Zumpt § 471, note. The genitive expresses only the inherent." The ablative is never used to denote the accidental qualities which relate to time and measure, but may be used to denote other qualities, whether inherent or accidental; the genitive is always used to express the accidental qualities of time and measure; but, with this exception, it is commonly used of inherent qualities. Cf. Zumpt, as above, and Krebs, *Latin Comp.* §§ 141, 193.

Ch. 24, p. 364. "*Cur*. Interrogative particle = *cui rei*. Zumpt § 276." In the section to which reference is here made, Zumpt says : "*cur*, probably formed from *quare* or *cui rei*," giving *quare* the precedence. It would have been more consistent in the editor to have followed Zumpt in this, since on p. 293 he himself refers *cura* to *quaero*, and by the analogy *cur* should be referred to *quare*.

Ch. 28, p. 366. "*Degenerare* non solum a bono, sed et a vitiis Latini dicunt, ut Cic. *Verr.* 3, 68. Bipont." This use of the word *in utramque partem*, is in accordance with its etymology. The note implies the contrary. — Ch. 29. "*Testudine* [laberentur] for a *testudine*. Cf. Essay [on the Style of Tacitus], p. 11." Virgil uses *labi* with *stie*

ablative without a preposition, as Ecl. 1, 64; Aen. 11. 588. So too Ovid. Met. 3. 699.

Ch. 33, p. 368. "*Faces in manibus*. Accusative after *habentes* understood." If the ellipsis here be supplied, *gerentes* would be the classical term, and this Doederlein gives in *the Essay*, p. 17. But even then the expression will be *poetic*; the *prosaic* form being *cum* with its case, as Cic. In Cat. 1, 6, *stetisse in comitio cum telo*. Cf. Krebs, Lat. Comp. § 209.

Ch. 49, p. 374. "*Ex facili* = *facilia*. Cf. Agric. 15. = *faciliter*." The form for the adverb should have been *facile*, according to the usage of Tacitus, cf. cc. 28, 78, Agric. 9, *De Orat.* 35; and good writers universally. *Faciliter* is unclassical. Cf. Zumpt § 267, n. 2. In regard to *ex facili* in the present connection, it may be equivalent to *facilia* or *facile*, according as we supply the *copula* or a *transitive verb* with *cetera*.

Ch. 52, p. 375. "*Volentia. Pleasing*. Taken passively." *Volo* means, primarily, *to be willing* (*βούλομαι*, to which it is allied); then, *to wish* (*θέλω*). It is here used *tropically* of things, and in the former sense, *willing*; hence, *favoring*; then by Metonymy of cause for effect, *pleasing*. The word cannot be "taken passively," unless it is rendered *pleased*, a meaning it never bears. Perhaps the editor intended to say, *taken intransitively*.

Ch. 58, p. 377. "The word *superstitio* properly denotes a sentiment, rite, or usage, that has *survived* (from *supersto*) and been handed down from an earlier age." The strict meaning of this word according to its apparent etymology, has never been settled. Freund says: "*superstitio*, super—sto, primarily, the act of *standing over*, by something; *being amazed at something*, *awe*; hence, generally, *awe of what is divine*. Cic. *De Nat. Deor.* 2, 28, thus explains it: *qui totos dies precabantur et immolabant, ut sui sibi liberi superstites essent, superstitiosi sunt appellati; quod nomen postea latius patuit*. Still different explanations are given by other Roman writers. Cf. Lactant. 4, 28, and Quint. 8. 3.

Ch. 76, p. 384. "[*qui non egredi moenia—audabant*]. For the case of *moenia*, cf. Andrews and Stoddard's Lat. Gram. § 233, R. 1. It is peculiar to the age of Tacitus to use the accusative after verbs compounded with *e* or *ex*. Sallust and Livy use the ablative; Cicero, the ablative with *ex* repeated. Cf. Zumpt § 396." We find in Caesar, B. C. 3, 52 *munitiones egredi*; in B. G. 1, 44, *multa praedicavit—exercitum—provincias fines egressum*: in Sallust, B. J. 110, *flumen Mulucham—egrediar*: and in Livy 1, 29, *Egredi urbem*, which form of expression Livy repeatedly uses. *Eccedo* as well as *egredior* is regularly

construed with the accusative in the sense of *to transgress, to go beyond*. Cf. Schmitz § 250, 4.

Bk. 4, ch. 1, p. 388. "*Nec deerat—prodere*. *Prodere* depends on *deerat*.—*deesse* usually takes after it either an infinitive or a dative or a predicate nominative to limit its meaning. Cf. 3, 58, *deerat elicere*." *Deest* when construed with nouns, has the thing wanting in the nominative, and the person to whom it is wanting in the dative; as, Caes. B. G. 4, 26, *Hoc unum Caesari defuit*; or in whom it is wanting, in the ablative; as, Cic. De Orat. 3, 4, *Ut—in Antonio deesset hic ornatus orationis*: or, the person wanting is expressed by the nominative, and the object in respect of which, by the dative; as, Cic. Ep. ad Attic. 7, 17, *Non deero officio neque dignitati meas*. But the construction with the infinitive, as here and in 3, 58, is *poetic* and *post-Augustan*. The earlier form of expression would have been *nec deerat—quominus proderet*, cf. Cic. Rep. 3, 30; which construction Tacitus himself uses in *Ann.* 14, 39, *nec defuit—quominus—incederet*. The editor has given no examples, in which "*deesse* is followed by a predicate nominative to limit its meaning," and we know of no such form of expression as these words describe. He may have had in mind such passages as the following: *nos—consules desumus*, Cic. in Cat. 1, 1. But here *consules* is exegetical of *nos* and *desumus* is used absolutely. So too our author, in the *Annales* 15, 59, *miles deesset*. Cf. Freund, sub voce II. β.

Ch. 7, p. 391. *Suffragia*. Observe the etymology of the word. Cf. Leverett's Lexicon." Under this word, in Leverett, we find "*(sub and frango) a broken piece, a shard, a potsherd, with which the ancients used to vote in the assemblies of the people. Hence a vote.*" Of this word Smith, in his Dict. Gr. and Rom. Antiquities, says: "The etymology is uncertain; for the opinions of those who connect it with *φράσσειν* or *fragor*, do not deserve notice. Wunder thinks it may possibly be allied with *suffrago*, and signified originally an *ankle-bone* or *knuckle-bone*. On the passing of the *Leges Tabellariae*, the voting with *stones* or *pebbles* went out of use." Freund is inclined to adopt the view of Wunder.

Ch. 33, p. 400. "*Quisque* with superlative = omnes. Cf. Zumpt § 710, b." This should have been: — *in general = omnes with the positive, but adding the idea of reciprocal comparison among the persons denoted by quisque*. The editor has well treated of this form of expression on 1, 46, p. 289; and on Agric. 19, p. 158, he has given it in English by the definite article and the superlative, which seems to be the nearest approach to it our idiom allows.

Ch. 42, p. 402. "*Senatoria aetate*, i. e. 25." as fixed by Augustus,

should here have been subjoined; in earlier times the required age being at least 32 years.

Ch. 49, p. 405. "*Alienato erga. Alienated in respect to. We say from.*" This note might mislead, as implying a difference in idiom, whereas *alieno a, alienatus a*, is the common construction in Latin, with which our own use of the derivatives, *to alienate, alienated*, agrees. The use of *erga*, in the present passage, of an *unfriendly* relation, deserved notice. The earlier writers commonly employed it to denote *friendly* relations; Tacitus uses it in both connections. Cf. 2, 55, *additæ erga Germanicum exercitum laudes gratesque*; and again as above in Agric. 5, *sinistra erga eminentes interpretatio*. — Ch. 52. "*Nutabat. Was balancing, as it were, on a pivot.*" This is incorrect, if it was intended as an exact explanation. For the strict meaning of the word, cf. Gr. *νέω*, Lat. *NUO*, whence *numen, nutus*, and the present word *nuto*, which coincides in meaning with *νέω*.

Ch. 58, p. 407 "[*pro vobis sollicitior aut pro me securior*] *Pro me. Pro me = de*, cf. Agric. 26, note." The reason for this deviation from the usual construction should have been suggested here. *PRO ME securior* seems to have been used instead of *DE ME securior* (cf. Agric. as referred to) for the sake of conformity to the preceding words.

Ch. 59, p. 408. "*Flagitium navaverat. Praegnanter for operam in flagitio perpetrando navaverat.*" If this expression be filled out, it should be: *AD FLAGITIUM faciendum operam navaverat*. Cf. Livy, 9, 16, *Certatum est, ut AD RECONCILIANDAM pacem—opera navaretur*. But for the *absolute* use of *navare*, consult the references given above in the remarks on the *Essay on the Style of Tacitus*.

Ch. 69, p. 410. "*Periculo ac metu. Fear of danger.*" and on ch. 72, p. 412. *periculum aut metus* is rendered, by Hendiadys, *the fear of danger*. It is better not to resort to this figure in explaining these passages, but to allow the *particles* their usual force, as connecting different ideas, which the editor has done on 1, 88, p. 315, and made a good defence of the interpretation. Cf. Cic. *Pro Lege Manil. 6: provincia—non modo a calamitate, sed etiam a metu calamitatis est defendenda*.

Ch. 72, p. 411. "*A metu. From, i. e., through fear.*" The Latins more commonly omit the preposition." The connection in which these words stand, is: *Cerialis a metu infamias, si licentia saevitiaque imbuere militem crederetur, pressit iras*: and in this instance the preposition seems to have been expressed for the sake of perspicuity, *licentia* and *saevitia* so soon following in the same case, but in a different relation.

Ch. 73, p. 412. "*Teutonisque.*" This word contains the element of

the modern name of the Germans, sc. *Deutsche* (D is pronounced like our T)." D in German, when it is *final*, has the power of the English *dt.* but elsewhere it is nearly equivalent to our *d.* A nearer approximation to *Deutsche* is found in the forms *Theuthoni*, *Theothoni*, which are other modes of writing *Teutoni*, found in MSS. Cf. Benecke on Cic. Pro Lege Manil. 20.

Ch. 76, p. 413. "*Adolescentuli [verba et conciones quam ferrum et arma] meditantis. Quam. sub. magis.*" We think there is no ellipsis of *magis* in this passage, but that *quam* is here an adverb of degree, and, like other relative words, implies its correlative *tam*. Thus the precise meaning will be: *words and harangues as well as the sword and arms*, and from the prominence given to *verba et conciones*, they are emphatic, and so the expression becomes equivalent to the formula *magis—quam*. Cf. Ann. 1, 58, *Pacem quam bellum probabam*, where by the same view *quam* is tantamount to *magis—quam*. So also Plautus, Rud. 4, 4, 70: *Tacita bona est mulier semper, quam loquens*. In 5, 5, *Corpora*—Tacitus is here speaking of the custom of the Jews—*quam cremare, e more Aegyptio, quam* undoubtedly means *than*, and therefore *magis* or *potius* must be supplied. But *quam*, even in the sense of *than*, may in the condensed style of Tacitus imply its correlative comparative, and so *in itself* have the power of *magis—quam*. Most of the passages cited by the commentators as instances of the omission of the comparative can be satisfactorily explained without recourse to *such an ellipsis*. Cf. Orelli's references on the use of this word in Ann. 1, 58.

Ch. 84, p. 416. "*Versus animi. Changeable in his feelings, wanting in decision of character.*" The perfect passive participle, the editor has here rendered as a verbal adjective in *bilis*. The participle has this meaning in very few instances, and then only by implication or by Metonymy of the effect for the cause. *Monstratus* in the sense of *monstrabilis* is found in Germ. 31 and in Hist. 1, 88; though Prof. Tyler does not point out this peculiarity in his notes on those passages. Freund says this use of *monstratus* is *Tacitean*. In Agric. 33, and in Sallust B. J. 91, we have *coercitus* with the meaning of *qui coerceri potest*. The citation from Sallust is: *genus hominum mobile, infidum ante, neque beneficio neque metu coercitum*, where *infidum* and *coercitum* with their adjuncts are explanatory of the verbal adjective *mobile*. The use of some perf. pass. participles with the negative prefix *in*, having the force of forms in *bilis*, is common; as, *invictus, infinitus*. So *infectus* in Sallust B. J. 76; and *inexhaustus*, Germ. 20; to which last word the editor has referred on 5, 7, p. 425. Cf. Zumpt § 323.

Prof. Tyler seems to add the interpretation of Walther—"versus equivalent to *eversus, crazed*"—as being different from his own; whereas if *versus animi* be rendered as the editor has done, this meaning can be reached only through the interpretation of Walther, thus: *changed, impaired*; then *undecided, wavering, changeable*, as the result of insanity of some degree. *Versus* in the sense of *changed*, occurs in Ann. 1, 4, *verso civitatis statu*; and in Hist. 2, 54, *versam partium fortunam*. In Ann. 3, 36, *abolitas leges et funditus versas*, it has the meaning of *destroyed*. Of the many explanations given of this difficult passage, we know of none which better suits the context or may more fairly be defended than that which Prof. Tyler has offered. We adduce as kindred examples, Livy 22, 51, *miles ira in rabiem versus*, and Virgil Ecl. 8, 66 et seq., *magis sanos avertere sacris Ekepariar sensus*.

Bk. 5, ch. 11, p. 428. "Duo colles"—of Jerusalem—"Four in all, but two principal ones." *Three* hills only, *Zion, Moriah, and Akra* are commonly mentioned, cf. Jahn, *Bibl. Archaeol.* § 335; but a *fourth* and even a *fifth, Bezatha and Ophel*, are described in Robinson's *Researches in Palestine*, Vol. I, p. 383.

We have remarked, in several instances, a want of that accuracy, which is so important in works that are professedly prepared and used as instruments of exact as well as polite culture. On p. 261 we find: "*adhibito*, literally *being had in*"; p. 296, "*Dirumpunt, di* gives emphasis"; p. 363, "*Vacuo atque aperto. From a place open and clear, sc. of arbutus*"; p. 319. "*Statim, at hand, from sto*"; p. 378. "*Ab-surdus*. Always used with a negative, like, etc." There are also some important omissions of authorities, illustrations, and explanations. On the origin of the military term *manipulares*, Ovid might have been quoted on p. 271; and the use of the word *sinus* in the sense of "plunderer," on p. 393, could have been explained by a reference to the Roman costume. A conjecture on the origin of the expression *descendere in causam*, is given on p. 355, and an explanation of *supplicium* in the sense of *capital punishment*, on p. 282, but no authority or illustration is added to enable the student to judge of their correctness. In regard to the English of the volume, a good degree of care seems to have been taken. But on p. 298 and elsewhere the word *locate* is used for *place, station*, etc.; on p. 246, and in several other cases, the passive form, *was being* written, etc. is employed instead of our active form, *was writing*, which, according to a fixed idiom of our language, may be used in a passive sense; on p. 380, we find *quite* in its colloquial connection; on p. 285, we have *transpire* in the sense of *occur*, a meaning which has arisen from carelessness, and which critics with good

reason disallow ; on pp. 333, 309, we find *technic* instead of *technical term*.

The geography of the volume is well treated, though the editor does not intimate what authority he has followed in this department of his commentary, as he had done in his previous book, the *Germania* and *Agricola*. So far as we have examined this portion of his notes, he seems to agree with *Murphy* and *Doederlein*. The present work is much superior to its predecessor in respect both of its contents and its outward form. The commentary is fuller and more valuable. It seems, in general, to have been prepared according to the best principles, and to be well adapted to the immediate and urgent wants of the student. Most of the subsidiary works used by the editor, are recent and decisive authorities, though in this matter he appears not always to have exercised due discrimination. On questions relating to antiquities as well as on merely literary points, he has, with great propriety and consideration, referred to such books as are within common reach, and which the student may be supposed to have read. His frequent quotations from Virgil, Livy, Cicero, and Horace, are very appropriate, and will tend to sustain and increase an interest in these authors, with whom most readers will be acquainted before they proceed to Tacitus. The comparisons of the Latin with the Greek are, in almost every instance, happy, and those who are occupied at the same time with the study of both languages, will only wish that these had been instituted to a greater extent. The brief remarks which, on occasion, are made concerning the manners and spirit of the times of the *Historiæ*, are just and often acute, and will enable the reader much better to appreciate his author. A tone of enlightened and severe morality pervades the commentary, which seems most fitting. No one, indeed, who does not cherish serious views of human conduct, and has not a profound sense of human right and obligation, could well interpret the *morale* of Tacitus.

The *text* as well as other portions of the book, is printed in an elegant and very correct manner. Except in the Greek citations, we have discovered but few typographical errors. On p. 16, l. 10, we find "Brittanicum" for *Britannicum*, and on p. 22, in the quotation from Horace, "Rediderit" for *Reddiderit*.

We hope that the editor, in answer to a demand for his labors, will give us new and revised editions of the volumes he has already published ; and that, at some future day, the *Annales* too may be welcomed from his hands to an honorable place among kindred works ; and then, adding the dialogue *De Oratoribus*, he will have prepared the first American edition of the complete writings, as now extant, of the greatest of the Roman historians.