



PA
2213
PA 2213 -
The Latin Iconoclasts

**Southern Branch
of the
University of California
Los Angeles**

Form L 1

PA
2213
MAG

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below

Form L-9-15nc-10,'25



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation



THE LATIN PRONOUNS.

THE LATIN PRONOUNS

IS : HIC : ISTE : IPSE

A SEMASIOLOGICAL STUDY

BY

CLARENCE LINTON MEADER, PH.D.,
INSTRUCTOR IN LATIN IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

LONDON: MACMILLAN CO., LTD.

1901

All rights reserved

COPYRIGHT, 1901, BY
CLARENCE LINTON MEADER.



ANN ARBOR PRINTING COMPANY
"THE INLAND PRESS"

PA
2213

M46

TO
PROFESSOR EDUARD VON WOELFFLIN

THIS WORK IS
RESPECTFULLY AND GRATEFULLY
DEDICATED. *

PREFACE.

123
The general plan of the following book¹ was outlined and the collection of material begun in Munich, in the summer of 1898. By June 1899 such progress had been made, that I found it possible to state my results in a form sufficiently definite to enable Professor Wölfflin to make an abstract of the same for publication in the eleventh volume of the *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik*. Since my return to America in the fall of 1899, I have devoted such spare time as the duties of my position have allowed, to the further investigation of the subject, and have been able not only to add important new results to those already obtained, but to extend and illustrate still more fully by varied citations the results set forth in the printed abstract.

1000
The original plan of the work provided for a chapter on *ille* and one on *idem*. These would have formed chapters II and III, the present chapters II, III, IV and V becoming IV, V, VI and VII. As they are not yet in a suitable form for printing, they are omitted for the present. The results thus far obtained in the study of the two pronouns are partly given in chapter V.

¹ In the summer of 1900 chapter I and Section A. of chapter II were submitted to the classical faculty of the University of Michigan as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

The present work contains the results of a line of investigation, in the conduct of which the historical method has been followed. In this particular it differs from all others that have been written on the subject. The most important of the modern treatises, that of Joseph Bach, extensive as it is (270 pages), makes no effort to discuss the pronouns from this point of view. It is confined almost entirely to the usage of the ante-classical period, and has for its main object the establishment of the thesis, that in the *scriptores prisci* the three demonstratives *hic*, *iste* and *ille* correspond to the three persons of the verb respectively. The only attempts of a historical nature that have hitherto been made are in the form of brief notices, to be found, for example, in Schmalz's *Lateinische Syntax* and in various monographs on the Latinity of particular writers. These rarely exceed a page or two in extent, and from the nature of the case make no claim to being anything else than fragments. Such works are, to be sure, of very great value, and without them an historical grammar in the proper sense of the word would be impossible. Yet they have their limitations and necessarily lack the perspective gained by following the changing meanings of the words through several centuries and by observing their relationships to each other and to synonymous expressions.

The selection of Latin texts from which the material for the present work was taken, is very full and representative, and covers every period of the development of the Latin language from Plautus to Isidore, as may be seen from the list of sources printed at the end of the volume.

In the statement of the deductions made from this collection of data, my object has been to adduce the evidence for the existence of each usage, to trace as far as possible its gradual development through all the periods in which it is found, and to illustrate its various aspects by typical examples. While attention has been directed mainly to the post-classical usages, some parts of the volume deal quite fully with usages of the pronouns that are distinctively classical; and it is hoped that the remaining chapters contain much that will prove of interest and value for the full understanding of the Ciceronian and Augustan Latinity. Throughout the entire work, the so called "regular" or "classical" meanings of the words have been treated, whenever some discussion of them was necessary to the understanding of the later meanings; and no pains have been spared to search out in the classical writers the beginnings of the later changes, or the conditions out of which they grew.

The following chapters, however, are by no means to be regarded as a complete history of the pronouns under discussion. The changes dealt with have been set forth in broad general lines; and, although the development of each meaning is traced from its first appearance as far downward as possible, a detailed analysis of the questions treated or of the passages cited has rarely been entered upon. The forms of the words have received attention, only when they have materially affected the meaning. The magnitude of the entire investigation has made it necessary to omit the discussion of such questions as the psychological nature of the changes involved, the special conditions

to which individual authors were subjected, and the influence of one author upon another. At almost every step in the progress of the work important problems have arisen and glimpses of interesting fields awaiting the student have often tempted me to turn aside for a moment. Yet rarely has a brief space of time been devoted to these minor questions. They are reserved for the future. The wide and varied reading both of the Latin texts and of the modern authorities has in itself been no small task. Nevertheless it seems unwise to defer publication any longer. It is hoped that the book, mere outline as it is, may justify its existence.

One who has himself conducted a line of research involving so many different problems and requiring so extensive a collection of data as the present one, will be the first to appreciate the difficulties of the work and to overlook any defects that it may contain. All friendly criticisms and suggestions will be gratefully received.

I take this opportunity to express my thanks to those who have aided me in my work. I can scarcely hope to be able ever to repay the debt of gratitude I owe Professor Wölfflin, who with unsparing generosity and by the sacrifice of much of his valuable time, aided me with continual encouragement and advice. By placing his excellent library and other resources at my service, he so facilitated my work, that I was enabled in less than three semesters to accomplish as much as would have required as many years under less favorable circumstances. Likewise to my former teachers, Professors Martin L. D'Ooge, Francis W.

Kelsey, John C. Rolfe, George Hempl and Joseph H. Drake, of the University of Michigan, I desire to express my gratitude both for my collegiate training in linguistics and for many valuable suggestions on this book. Professor Rolfe and Dr. Henry A. Sanders, of the University of Michigan, and Dr. George V. Edwards, of Olivet College, have been so kind as to read all the proofs, and have called my attention to numerous defects that would otherwise have escaped my notice.

Great as these obligations are, they can scarcely be greater than those I owe my wife, who by her sympathetic and intelligent appreciation of my work has afforded me much assistance, and has been to me an unfailing source of inspiration.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,

Dec. 24, 1900.



CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I. *IS.*

	PAGE.
Introductory,	3
A. <i>Is</i> in Poetry.	
1. Frequency of its Occurrence in the Scrip- tores Prisci and Lucretius, in Catullus, the Writers of Elegy and Idyls, in Epic Poetry, in Satire and kindred Branches, in Didactic Epos,	8
2. General Attitude of the Poets toward the Word,	13
3. Attitude of the Poets toward the special Forms of the Word: Preference for the forms <i>is</i> , <i>ea</i> and <i>id</i> and Avoidance of all other Forms.—Reasons for this Attitude, .	15
B. <i>Is</i> in Prose Literature.	
1. Legal and other Scientific Literature, .	28
2. History, <i>etc.</i> ,	30
3. Pompeius, <i>Commentum</i> in Donatum, .	32

CHAPTER II. HIC.

A. The Rivalry between Hic and Is.	
1. Eo = Ideo, Hoc = Ideo,	35
2. Eo with the Comparative and Hoc with the Comparative,	48
3. Id est and Hoc est,	53
4. Ad id and Ad hoc,	66
a. = Praeterea,	66
b. Expressing Purpose,	71
5. Ob id and Ob hoc,	73
B. The Correlations Hic—Ille, Hic—Hic, Ille— Ille, <i>etc.</i>	
1. Hic—Ille,	79
a. Relative Order of the two correlated Clauses,	80
b. The adjectival and substantive Forms,	82
c. The adverbial Forms,	89
2. Hic—Hic,	96
a. The adjectival and substantive Forms,	97
b. The adverbial Forms,	101
3. Ille—Ille,	105
Note on Ille, Hic and Is in legal Formulae,	107

CHAPTER III. ISTE.

Introductory.—The Etymology and the classical Meaning of Iste,	111
A. Iste = Hic.	
1. Evidence proving the Usage,	116
a. Iste tuus, <i>etc.</i> ,	116

b. The Employment of Iste outside of direct discourse,	117
c. The Collocations iste meus, iste nos-ter, <i>etc.</i> ,	120
d. Iste Referring to Objects connected with the Speaker,	121
e. Iste Employed in Connections usu-ally Reserved for Hic,	125
f. Iste and Hic refering to the same Antecedent,	131
g. Iste—Ille = Hic—Ille,	132
h. Iste = <i>ὁὗτος</i> in early Latin Transla-tions from the Greek,	137
i. The Evidence furnished by the Glos-ses,	142
j. The Evidence of the Romance Lan-guages,	143
k. The Testimony of the Roman Gram-marians,	144
l. The incorrect Orthography Isthic,	144
2. Geographical Extension of the Usage,	144
3. Chronological Limits of the Usage,	145
4. Relative Frequency of the Use of Iste and Hic,	149
5. Semasiological Nature of the Change,	152
B. Iste = Ille or Is,	159

CHAPTER IV. IPSE.

Introductory.—The classical Usage.

A. Ipse = Idem.

1. The Phrases ipse qui, is ipse, ille ipse, hoc ipse, iste ipse, and particularly id ipsum and hoc ipsum, expressing Identity, 163

2.	Ipse unsupported by another Pronoun,	171
a.	Ipse parallel with Idem or Unus,	175
b.	Ipse contrasted with Alius and Alter,	177
c.	Ipse = Idem in short adverbial For- mulae or Phrases,	177
d.	Ipse = Idem as proved by the gen- eral Context,	178
e.	Ipse = δ <i>αὐτός</i> ,	180
f.	The Evidence of the Glosses,	182
3.	Geographical Limits of the Usage,	182
4.	Chronological Limits of the Usage,	183
5.	Ipse = Item,	184
B.	Ipse = Ille or Is,	184

*CHAPTER V. THE DETERMINATIVE
AND THE DEFINITE ARTICLE.—SUMMARY.*

A.	The Determinative.	
1.	Ille = is,	193
2.	Hic = is,	195
3.	Idem = is,	196
4.	Ipse = is,	196
B.	The Definite Article,	197
1.	Ille = Definite Article,	198
2.	Is = Definite Article,	198
3.	Hic = Definite Article,	199
4.	Iste = (?) Definite Article,	205
5.	Idem = Definite Article,	206
6.	Ipse = Definite Article,	208
C.	Summary and Conclusion,	213
	Sources,	218
	Addenda and Corrigenda,	221

CHAPTER I. IS.



CHAPTER I. IS.

In the study of these pronouns we may profitably begin with the determinative *is*. It is the simplest in its elements (*cf.* **ol-so* > *ille*, **e-p-so* > *ipse*, **e-so-to* > *iste*, **ho-i-ce* > *hic*),¹ and in all the periods of the Latin language it is the weakest in meaning of the above mentioned pronouns (see Schmalz, *Lateinische Syntax* in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch der kl. Alt.* II.2, 3d ed. p. 444: "es schliff sich auch als kleines Wörtchen sehr bald so ab, dass es überhaupt fast ganz ausser Kurs kam"). Traces of an original stronger demonstrative force are not far to seek. We may mention the familiar use of *is qui* in the sense approaching that of *talis ut* (see Harpers' *Latin Lexicon s. v.* for citations from Cicero, and add *Sen. Contr.* 3,3; *Vell. Pat.* 2,82,2 *ea adiit pericula, a quibus seruari se posse desperauerat*; *Plin. Epist.* 3,12,4; *Gerber and Greef, Lex Tac.* p. 709 *d*) "i. q. *talis, eiusmodi*"). Still more clearly does this force of the pronoun appear when it serves to introduce an *ut*-clause, as in *Plaut. Capt.* 934f.

Pater, et petere a te ego potero et di eam potestatem dabunt, [res.
Ut beneficium bene merenti nostro merito mune-

¹These are the derivations accepted by Stolz (*Historische Grammatik*, 1894).

Such passages are rare in Plautus; a second instance is Poen. 1186 eo genere. Later examples are: Nepos, Them. 6,1 (*cf.* Lupus, Der Sprachgebrauch d. C. Nepos p. 110); Vell. Pat. 2,90,4; Plin. Epist. 6,6,8; 6, 14,1 ea conditione ne; Tac. Dial. 23,20 ita...ea... is...ea...ea...is...ea...sic...sic..., ut...; Ann. 1,6,20 (see G. and G., Lex. *l. c.*); Censorinus 1,6; Justin 37,1,7; Script. Histor. Augustae, Geta 7,4 *etc.*; Tertullian, Ad Nationes 1,7*p*; Lactantius, De Opificio Dei 4,3; 12; Ambrosius, Exameron 2,3,11 (27E); Augustine, Epist. 22,4*m bis*; Alcimus Avitus 7(6), p. 35,12(P); Boethius, De Consolatione Philosophiae 1,6*pr.*, 28. A stronger demonstrative force, approaching the normal meaning of ille, is also to be observed in such passages as Plaut. Trin. 746

...atque ea condicio uel primariast;

Amph. 781

Haec east profecto patera;

Caecil. Statius, 28 f. (p. 33R) (*apud* Cicero, De Sen. 25 and Nonius 1,20)

Tum equidem in senecta hoc deputo miserrimum,
Sentire ea aetate ipsum esse odiosum alteri.

Cf. Virg. Aen. 3,393. In other instances the stronger demonstrative force of the pronoun is evident from the fact that the word it modifies is contrasted with another (*cf.* Plaut. Stich. 239-241; Men. 574), or is itself repeated (*cf.* Asin. 179; Truc. 122; Trin. 238; Ovid, Met. 7,43 f). With the demonstrative hic such a repetition is very common in all periods both with poets and prose writers (Plaut. Men. 132; Horace often). Ille is not so often repeated in this way as

hic. The repetition of the determinative is uncommon. These and similar types of construction, in which the determinative bears traces of a stronger force, are met in all periods of the literature.

In dealing with the semasiological and syntactical changes of this pronoun, it will be necessary, as the sequel will show, to draw a sharp distinction both between the usage of the prose writers and of the poets, and between the various subdivisions of these two great branches, *e. g.*, between technical prose, history and oratory; between the epos (in the narrower sense), satire, lyric poetry, *etc.* Within these smaller groups again it will be advisable to distinguish the chronological relations of the authors. There is entire justification for thus classifying the Roman prose literature; for, while a classification of modern prose literature on the basis of the prominence of poetical or rhetorical characteristics would doubtless lead to great confusion and many inconsistencies, the case was entirely different with the Greeks and the Romans. This is apparent from the two passages Cic. De Leg. 1,5 opus (*sc. historiae*) unum hoc oratorium maxime; Quintilian 10, 1,31 historia est proxima poetis et quodam modo carmen solutum. For further details on the style of historical composition in antiquity see Norden, Die Antike Kunstprosa I,81-95. The poetical coloring of Livy, particularly of the first decade, will at once occur to the reader, although it must not be overlooked that the Augustan historian adopted a more sober style after he had completed the first decade, the subject matter of which was poeticis magis decora fabulis quam incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis.

It will also be recalled that the details of the complete history of Rome which Cicero and Atticus contemplated writing conjointly, were so arranged that Atticus was to establish the historical facts, while Cicero was to furnish the rhetorical embellishments (*cf.* the correspondence with Atticus for the year 45 and Plutarch's Cicero 41).

A. *IS* IN POETRY.

We take up first the use of *is* in the poetical literature of the Romans, because it is here that we find the most striking proofs of the weakening of its force and its gradual disuse. The French editor Dacier appears to have been the first to call attention to the fact that the expression *eius atque* in Horace, Ode 3, 11, 18 is unpoetical. The eminent Bentley in his note on this passage says: "sed poetae epici, magno sane cum iudicio, uocabulum hoc perpetuo mulctarunt exilio; ne heroici carminis maiestatem humi serpere cogere; utpote singulis fere periodis recursurum, ni stilo subintelligerentur extrinsecus, neque praesentia sua uersus inquinaret. inde est quod in toto Uirgilio ne semel quidem occurrit eius, bis duntaxat in Ouidio, ut Trist. 3, 4, 27." (a third, but doubtful passage is Met. 8, 16) "...eo tamen peius noster (*i. e.* Horace), et quod in carmine lyrico longe supra Ouidii elegos surgere debuerit, et quod..." Adolf Kiessling's note on *eius* in O. 4, 8, 18 in part confirms, in part contradicts and in part expands Bentley's affirmation: "der sonst der Sprache der Oden, wie überhaupt gehobenem Ausdruck fremde Gebrauch von *is* (doch scheut die Elegie das Pronomen nicht) mag hier durch den scherzhaften Zug, der durch das ganze Gedicht geht, sich entschuld-

igen lassen." Bentley does not comment on this passage. Kiessling brackets the stanza in which eius occurs, 3,11,18. As for the reason that led the poets to avoid this word, both Kiessling and Bentley hint vaguely that it is unpoetical. Bentley seems to be condemning only the form eius, while Kiessling's statement may be understood to include all the forms of the pronoun. I know Dacier's attitude only from Schütz, 3d ed. (1889), p. 402. Grosrau, Sprachlehre, §382, H, Anm. 2 makes a somewhat more definite and detailed statement: "Wie et id, idque auf den ganzen Satz bezogen, so steht isque am Anfang des Satzes scharf hinweisend bei Cicero, häufig bei Virgil, 1,215; 3,596; 4,203; 6,684 *et al.* Sonst haben die Dichter höheren Stiles das Wort vermieden, *da es nur formelle Beziehung, keine eigentliche Bedeutung hat*" (the italics are mine). Quite a different reason is assigned by Schmalz, *l.c.* "Is war den Dichtern unbequem, weil es sich nicht gut in den Vers fügt, und so meiden es Catull, Virgil, Horaz, Lucan, auch der Metriker Terentian, sichtlich." This statement seems to be a somewhat misleading abridgment of Obermeier, Der Sprachgebrauch des M. Annaeus Lucanus, p. 15: "Ohne Zweifel war dieses Pronomen . . . zu unbequem da sich seine obliquen Casus nur schlecht in den Hexameter fügten." The questions suggested by all these inadequate statements are numerous and render imperative a careful examination of the entire problem.

In the investigation of this question it will be necessary first, as suggested above, to determine the relative frequency of is in the poets as compared with that in the prose writers.

Proceeding chronologically let us begin with a review of the usage of the early poets. Taking a selection from their extant works and fragments large enough to be representative, we obtain the following table of percentages:¹

	hic	is	ille	ipse	iste	idem
Comicorum fragmenta ed. Ribbeck	42	25	20	4	7	2½
Tragicorum " " "	33	30	16	10	6	5
Plautus, Captivi	40	26½	16	3¾	13	1½
" Casina	34	29	22	2½	12	1
" Menaechmi	43	20	18½	4½	12	2½
" Trinummus	30¾	33	18¾	7¾	9	1½
" average of the above	37	27½	18½	4¾	11½	1¾
Ennii fragmenta	38	23	17½	10	3½	7

This table is based upon the following total number of occurrences of these pronouns: Comici 319, Tragicici 187, Captivi 422, Casina 254, Menaechmi 372, Trinummus 500, (excluding prologues); Ennius 153.

It will be seen from this table that the pronoun *is* occurs more frequently than any of the others with the exception of *hic*, and in one instance, that of the *Trinummus*, more frequently than *hic*. Ennius' use of *is* will be discussed more in detail below.

Lucretius in his usage of these pronouns holds a place very near the archaic poets, a circumstance which is of importance as furnishing further evidence of his sympathies with these writers, and showing his dependence upon them. In books 1, 2, 3, 6 of his poem the above pronouns occur in the following proportions:

hic 34, *is* 25, *ipse* 20, *ille* 14, *idem* 8, *iste* 0. In

¹ It has not been thought necessary to make the percentages in the tables exact to a small fraction of one per cent. Accordingly their sums sometimes slightly exceed or fall below a hundred.

Catullus, however, we find an important change. His complete works give us:

	hic	ille	ipse	is	idem	iste
	39	25¼	15½	12⅔	4⅓	2¾
with which <i>cf.</i> Cæsar	20	9½	14	50½	6	⅓

It will be observed that in Catullus *is* occupies the fourth rank, being less frequently used than either *hic*, *ille* or *ipse*. The Aratea, a translation made by Cicero in his earlier years, although antedating Catullus, shows a much stricter avoidance of the word. In the fairly extensive fragments of the Aratea (about 550 lines) that have come down to us, *is* is met with only three times: verse 250 (*is*), frag. XV (*eius*), verse 315 (*eum*); while in Catullus (about 2000 verses, many of them much shorter than Cicero's hexameters) it occurs 42 times. This apparent inconsistency in the usage of Cicero and Catullus disappears, however, when we distinguish between the latter's "Nugæ" and his longer poems in hexameters (No. 62 Uesper adest and No. 64 Epithalamium Pelei). These two poems, which make up about one-fourth of the Catullus-corpus show but a single instance of *is* (64,122), since the word *eius* is unquestionably corrupt in v. 109 of the Epithalamium.

Having thus determined the date at which *is* begins to be less frequently used in poetry, we may now proceed to distinguish the various branches of poetry and to set forth in tabular form the whole number of occurrences of the determinative pronoun in (a) satire, (b) didactic epos, (c) elegy, (d) historical and heroic epos, (e) ode.

SATIRE (with related branches).

Horace, ¹ Sat. and Epist.	31 instances	to ca. 4000 verses,	or 1 to 130 vv.
Persius	6	" " " 475	" " I " 80
Juvenal	4	" " " 3800	" " I " 950
Martial	5	" " " 8600	" " I " 1720

DIDACTIC EPOS.

Cicero, Aratea	3 instances	to ca. 550 verses,	or 1 inst. to 180vv
Virgil, Georgica	9	" " " 2200	" " I " " 245
Manilius	24	" " " 4200	" " I " " 170
Germanicus	1	" " " 950	" " I " " 950
Epos Aetna	1	" " " 654	" " I " " 654
Grattius, Cynegetica	2	" " " 540	" " I " " 270
Serenus Sammonicus	1	" " " 1100	" " I " " 1100
Nemesianus	2	" " " 672	" " I " " 336
Auianus, Fabulae	2	" " " 654	" " I " " 327

ELEGY and IDYL.

Virgil, Bucolica	2 inst.	to ca. 800 verses,	or 1 inst. to 400
Tibullus	5	" " " 1900	" " I " " 380
Lygd. and Panegyri.	2	" " " 400	" " I " " 200
Sulpicia	1	" " " 300	" " I " " 300
Propertius ²	13	" " " 4100	" " I " " 315
Ovid, Amores	2	" " " 2450	" " I " " 1225
" Tristia, Pont.	66	" " " 6250	" " I " " 95
Statius, Silvae	6	" " " 3900	" " I " " 650
Calpurnius	1	" " " 760	" " I " " 760

EPOS (historical and heroic).

Aeneid	1 instance	to ca. 125 verses
Ovid, Metamorphoses	1	" " " 165
Lucan, Pharsalia	1	" " " 1330
Valerius Flaccus	1	" " " 220
Statius, Thebais	1	" " " 320
Statius, Achilleis	1	" " " 1125
Silius, Punica, B'ks 1-10 and 17	1	" " " 190
Ilias Latina	1	" " " 500
Dracontius, Carm. Profana	1	" " " 600
Claudianus	1	" " " 5000

¹In the same lines hic occurs 350 times.

²Propertius 2,24,51 is now read Hi or Ni instead of Ii.

It might at first thought seem to the reader that the number of occurrences of *is* in Ovid's *Ex Ponto* and *Tristia* is too large to warrant the assertion that the poet avoided the pronoun. The relative smallness of this number, however, is apparent at a glance, when we note that on an equal number of pages of Caesar the pronoun occurs about 800 times.

The following are the precise references to the passages in which *is* occurs, only, however, for those authors who employ the word but a small number of times:

Persius 6,16 *ob id*. 3,95 *quidquid id est*. 6,65 *quidquid id est*. 2,71 *id*. 3,48 *id*. 5,97 *id quod*.

Juvenal 3,182 *id uitium*. 6,413 *id uitium*. 7,162 *quidquid id est*. 10,183 *id*.

Martial 2,30,5. 7,31,12. 14,145,1; in all three cases *is* or *id* at the beginning of a line. 3,1,1. 6,68,11; in both instances the formula *quidquid id est*. In addition to these passages it occurs twice in the prose introductions. Friedländer's index is misleading, since it cites only two examples.

Virgil, *Georgica* 1,432 *is*. 2,239 *eā*. 263 *id*. 3,252 *eos*. 289 *eā*. 510 *eā*. 4,89 *eum*. 334 *eam*. 430 *eum*.

Germanicus, *Phaenomena* 32 *eas*.

Aetna 253 *eā*.

Gratius 224 *eius*. 363 *id*.

Serenus Sammonicus 1095 *id*.

Nemesianus, *Cynegetica* 212 *quicquid id est*. 298 *id*.

Avianus 2,2 *eam*. 20,5 *is*. (*varia lectio* 40,4).

Virgil, *Bucolica* 3,35 *id quod*. 9,37 *id quidem*.

Tibullus 1,2,39 *f is bis*. 6,25 *eius*. 10,66 *is*. 2,3,33 (36) *quisquis is es*.

Lygdamus 3,4,94 *Isque*. 6,12 *eum*.

Sulpicia 4,7,8 *id*.

Ovid, *Amores* 3,4,3 *ea*. 15,5 *Si quid id est*.

Stattius, *Silvae* 1,4,53 *ea*. 6,49 *quisquis is est*. 5, 1,219 *Is*. 5,65 *Quisquis is est*. In verse 1,2,180 *ea* is a conjecture of Bährens for *et*, and, like *Uerum id*, at (for *uerum erat*) 5,5,49, is not accepted by Vollmer.

Calpurnius, *Ecl.* 4,12 *Quidquid id est*.

Lucan 1,171 *is*. 2,726 *Non ea*. 3,611 *eam*. 4,546 *eum*. 7,406 (*eo=propterea*). 10,265 *non id* (*uaria lectio ita*). The poorer MSS. show forms of *is* in 3,228. 6,733. 828. 9,538. 1062. The passages in the sixth, seventh and tenth books are overlooked by Obermeier, *l. c.*

Stattius, *Achilleis* 1,811 (=2,137) *Is*

Ilias Latina 22 *eius*. 640 *idque*.

Dracontius 5,271 *Id quod*. 6,57 *Uix ea fatus eram*.

Claudianus XXXIII (=Proserp. 1,117). XXVIII, 558.

To these tables might have been added the *Disticha Catonis* and the *Carmina De Figuris* and *De Ponderibus*. These show one instance of *is* to every thirty-five to seventy lines, a frequency easily accounted for by the prosaic character of the subject matter and the carelessness of metrical treatment. In *Corippus* it is rarely used (examples: *Ioan.* 2,326 *ea*; 6,255 *Uix ea*; 8,33; 127 *Uix ea*; *Laud. Iust.* 1,79). The same is true of *Cyprian's Heptatuch* (*Genesis* 1039 *Is qui*; 1347 *Id*; *Deuteronomy* 57(953) *id*). In view of the strictness with which *Cyprian* avoided this word one should hesitate long before accepting Mayor's conjecture of *is qui* for *ille qui* *Deuteronomy* 124. 5 (=1040f). In

the poetical portions of Boethius, *De Consolatione Phil.* it does not occur. On the avoidance of the word by the Satirists see Šorn, *Der Sprachgebrauch des Eutropius*, II,4. For *Commodian* see below.

The discrepancy between Ovid's *Amores* and his *Tristia* is perhaps to be explained by the circumstance that the former were written at Rome at the beginning of his career, at a time when he was strongly under the influence of his early rhetorical training, the latter in exile in his later years, at a time when his style was less careful. In putting forward this explanation, however, we must not fail to remember that the *Metamorphoses*, which is the last poem Ovid wrote before his exile, shows a comparatively frequent use of the determinative.

Before inquiring in detail what the above tables teach us concerning the use of this pronoun in the poets, it remains only for me to point out the striking contrast between the usage of the early poets discussed above (p. 8) and typical later poets. This contrast is clearly brought out by the following table:

	hic	is	ille	ipse	iste	idem
Tragicorum frag.	33	30	16	10	6	5
Comicorum frag.	42	25	20	4	7	2
Catullus	39	12	25	15	2	6
Virgil, <i>Aen.</i> III	49	5	23	14	3	5
Silius, Bks. VIII and IX	58	3	20 $\frac{1}{3}$	12	1	5 $\frac{2}{3}$
Lucan, Bks. II and III	60 $\frac{2}{3}$	1	19	13	3	2 $\frac{2}{3}$

Let us now see what the above tables teach with reference to the attitude of the poets toward this pronoun.

If the suggestions of Bentley and Grosrau cited above are true (*cf.* the words "epici carminis maiestatem—inquinaret"—"höheren Stiles"—"keine eigentliche Bedeutung"), we must in order to be consistent in detail, assume that the higher forms of poetry should be stricter in their avoidance of the word than those branches which do not rise so lofty above the *sermo pedestris*. Such a condition of affairs is precisely what we find reflected very clearly in the detailed table for Catullus above. We likewise find the determinative all but banished from Horace's Odes, while it is far less rigidly excluded from the Epistles and the Satires, as the two passages above mentioned are the only ones in the Odes in which it occurs. But, since the usage found in the works of Ennius (see below page 16) is slightly different, the evidence of such a distinction is limited to these two instances. Virgil employs it more rarely in his Georgics than in the Aeneid, though on the general theory we should expect the contrary. Juvenal in his Satires is much more sparing of it than the writers of the heroic epos, Statius and Valerius Flaccus, while Martial, the writer of epigrams, avoids the word more strictly than any other Roman poet except Claudian and Boethius. In fact each of the branches distinguished above shows great variety within itself. The average number of lines corresponding to each occurrence of it varies in the

Satire, <i>etc.</i>	from	80	to	1720
Didactic Epos	from	170	to	1100
Elegy and Idyl	from	95	to	1200
Heroic and Hist. Epos	from	125	to	1300 ¹

¹ If we include Claudian, 5000.

Any attempt to establish a general canon based on the distinction of genera is therefore seen to be futile. If we disregard the genera and undertake to determine some principle based on chronology, we shall likewise be unsuccessful in discovering a regularly operating principle. However, in general, it is perfectly clear that the post-Augustan poets and especially the later writers, are much more strict in the exclusion of the pronoun than the Augustan. Compare, *e. g.*, Martial (1 × 1720)¹ with Horace (1 × 130); Statius, *Silvae* (1 × 650) with Tibullus (1 × 380), with Propertius (1 × 320) or with Virgil's *Bucolics* (1 × 400); Lucan (1 × 1430) with Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1 × 165); and Dracontius (1 × 1200) with Virgil's *Aeneid* (1 × 125). In other words, the rule of composition, for such we must call it, was more strictly applied as time went on, and as originality played an increasingly less prominent part in Roman literature. We shall be impressed with the comparative rarity of *is* in poetry, when we consider that Cæsar alone has over two thousand instances of *is*, even omitting the forms *hi* and *his*, which in a large number of cases undoubtedly represent original *ii* and *iis* or *eis*, against Horace's 34 and Virgil's 75.

An examination of the usage of the poets with a view to determining whether they observed any distinction in the use of the special cases reveals some striking facts. Certain forms of *is* are rigidly avoided, while for others a strongly marked preference is shown. This preference for certain cases is seen in some writers long before any tendency to avoid the word as a whole is observable. Ennius for example, if we are

¹ *i. e.*, one instance in 1720 verses.

justified in making deductions from the somewhat limited number of extant fragments of his works, observes a careful distinction in the use of the forms of *is*, as employed in his Hexameters on the one hand and in his Dramas, the tone of which approaches that of the vernacular, on the other. In the fragments of the *Annals* (600 verses) only the forms *is*, *ea* and *eos* and the monosyllabic forms *sam*, *sas*, *sos*, *sum* occur, there being in all fifteen instances. In the *Satires* (86 verses) only *is* occurs (four times). In the *Fabulae* the word occurs about as often as in the *Annals*, but with this marked difference: the form *is* is used only once, *ea* only once, *id* four times, while the forms *ei*, *eum*, *eo*, *eis*, entirely excluded from the *Annals*, occur seven times, the forms with the initial sibilant being entirely rejected. The facts are most evident in tabulated form (based on L. Müller's edition, 1884):

	Ann. Sat.	Fab.
Monosyllabic forms and <i>ea</i>	18	7
Other forms	1 (<i>eos</i>)	7

In view of the somewhat scanty fragments of *Ennius* one might be tempted to regard the above mentioned conditions as a result of chance, did he not find them strikingly confirmed by the usage of the later poets. To make this clearer we here insert a tabulated statement of the relative frequency of the cases of *is* in the Augustan and post-Augustan poets mentioned in the above tables with the exception of the *Tibullus*-corpus, *Propertius*, *Horace* and *Manilius*, who are not so rigid in the exclusion of the oblique cases, and with the addition of *Ennius'* *Annals*, *Ca-*

tonis Disticha, the Carmina de Figuris, de Ponderibus and de VII Planetibus, Namatianus and Priscian's Periegesis. For the sake of comparison with a standard prose-writer we adjoin in a parallel series the figures giving the relative frequency in Caesar. Number of instances:

	is (sam, etc.)	ea	id	cum, eam	eo, ea	eos, eas	other forms	total
Caesar	50	90	175	245	360	185	940	2045
Poets	104	150	112	22	15	5	2	410

For Caesar the occurrences are stated in round numbers and include the Pseudo-Caesarian Bell. Alex., Bell. Afr., and Bell. Hisp. The two isolated cases in the poets are eius from Ovid, Ex Ponto 4, 15, 6 (omitted in Heinze's text) and Ilias Latina 2, 2. The above figures yield the following percentages:

Caesar	2½	4½	8½	12	17½	9	46	100
Plautus	15	5½	30	19½	7	3½	19½	100
Poets	25¼	36½	27½	5½	3½	1¼	½	100

In this table Plautus is represented only by the four plays tabulated above. The forms eius and ei (Dative) make up seventeen per cent. of the nineteen and one-half per cent. in the last column but one. If we now include in the poets the totals for the Tibullus-corpus, Propertius, Horace and Gratius, the proportions remain still not very materially altered:

	is	ea	id	eu(a)m	eo(a)	other forms	
Occurrences:	118	152	144	36	22	20	492
Percentages:	24	31	29¼	7¼	4½	4	100

We observed above that the determinative as a whole is avoided by the poets. The last two tables show

that in the handling of the special cases also careful discrimination was made.

Certain forms of *is* have entirely disappeared, others are rarely used, while still others have become decidedly less frequent than in prose. On the other hand a marked preference is shown for the monosyllabic forms *is* and *id* and for the pyrrhic *ea*. With these three forms the poets have in fact developed a number of formulae that find frequent employment. Among the more common of these may be mentioned:

1 2 *isque, idque.* Ennius, Lucretius, Tibullus,
Virgil, Ovid, Statius, Silius.

3 *atque is.* Statius, Silius.

4 *atque ea.* Lucretius, Virgil, Ovid, Statius,
Silius.

5 *uix ea* (often followed by *fatus erat*). Virgil,
Ovid, Statius, Dracontius.

6 *dumque ea.* Statius, Silius.

7 *quidquid id (is) est (es).* Lucretius, Tibullus,
Virgil, Statius, Nemesianus, Avianus, Cal-
purnius.

Of these nos. 1,2,5,6 are of quite frequent occurrence, there being nearly one hundred instances in all. None of them, however, are found in Lucan. The form *ea* shares with other pyrrhic words the peculiarity of often filling the last two short syllables of the fourth foot of the hexameter. Thus *is* formed the cadence $\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim$ so common in our epics. Examples are: Virgil, *Aen.* 2,17 *ea fama uagatur*; 3,505 *ea cura nepotes*; 660 *ea sola uoluptas*; 4,379 *ea cura quietos*; 2,123 *ea numina diuom*; 3,100 *ea moenia quaerunt*; 12,216 *ea pugna uideri*; Ovid, *Met.* 6,154 *ea cuncta placerent*;

8,123 ea fabula: uerus; 15,64 ea pectoris hausit, *etc.*, *etc.*; Statius, *Thebais* 2,73; 4,242; Valerius Flaccus 3,223; 455; 4,144; 6,18; 7,108; 8,43.

Compare with this peculiarity the observation made by Edwards, *The Ablative of Quality and the Genitive of Quality in Latin*, New York, 1900, p. 39, that the Ablative of quality corpore stands nearly always in the fifth foot of the hexameter, because of the impossibility in many instances of employing the Genitive in this position. Whatever may have been the reason or reasons that led the poets to distinguish between the Ablative and the Genitive construction,¹ the

¹ It is evident that the choice between these two constructions, if determined simply by the technique of prosody, must depend, in Virgil and the later writers at least, upon the character (vocalic or consonantal) of the initial vowel of the following word. As a matter of fact, in Lucretius 1,1-300 the dissyllabic words with initial consonant that follow a dactylic word in the fifth foot of the hexameter are about three times as frequent as the words with initial vowels in the same position (in Virgil 1, 1-300 the proportion is about two of the former to one of the latter). There would accordingly be more opportunity on an average to employ the Ablative, *if the choice were determined merely by the character of the following word*. Is it not more likely that the reverse would be the case, and that the character of the final dissyllable would be determined by the use of the Ablative or the Genitive in the fifth foot? Or, if Lucretius was forced to use a word like *posse* in the sixth foot, would he have found any difficulty in writing *1,488 solidi reperiri corpori posse*?

Since writing the above, I have laid this question before Dr. Edwards, who agrees with me that Lucretius was not constrained by the metre to write *corpore*, referring to 2,53 *rationi' potestas* and 2,623 *numini' diuae*. He urges, however, and rightly enough, that the influence of Lucretius, and particularly of Virgil, on subsequent usage must have been great.

appearance of the word corpore so often in the fifth foot is easy of explanation. In the Latin hexameters a dactylic word often forms the fifth foot (about 230 cases in Lucretius 1,1-300, Virgil 1,1-300 and Juvenal, Satire 1), less frequently in the first foot (about 80 cases in the same lines) seldom in the fourth (12 cases) and very rarely in the second and third (no cases). It is a question then of the diaeresis and the penthemimeral caesura. Applying these conditions to the pronoun *is*, we may readily conjecture that, if no elision takes place (elision occurs very rarely; so Ovid Met. 2,785 and Silius 7,160—In both cases it also precedes the diaeresis), the form *ea* will stand only in a foot that is followed by the diaeresis, *i. e.*, in the fifth, fourth and first often, in the third less frequently, in the second very rarely. What we actually find is that out of 86 instances of *ea* 48 fall in the first foot, 28 in the fourth foot, 8 in the third and 2 in the second. The excess of the occurrences in the first foot over those in the fourth (we might have expected the reverse) is accounted for by the frequent use of *is* as a correlative. Thus out of the 201 passages in which various forms of *is* occur in Ennius, the Tibullus-corpus, Propertius, Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, Statius and Silius, 118 fall to the first foot, 34 to the fourth, 25 to the second, 19 to the third, 5 to the fifth and none to the sixth. This also explains the absence of *is* from the sixth foot and its infrequent appearance in the fifth.

In addition to the cases of *is* counted in the comparison drawn between Caesar and the poets the following instances occur in metrical inscriptions:

id: Bücheler, *Carm. Epigraph.*, nos. 767; 995, 26; 1009 *Quicquid id est*; 1031; 1258 *Idque* (= C. I. L. XII, 2098; VI, 12652; XI, 1273 (ex schedis); VI, 6592; 23004); Hübner, *Inscriptiones Hispaniae Christianae ex Zamorae schedis*.

eius: B. 765 (= C. I. L. XII, 2143).

ei (dat.): B. 489 (monosyllabic); 492 (iambic) (= C. I. L. III, 10501; 754).

eo (for eum): B. 474 (= *Ephem. Epigraph.* IV, p. 346, no. 936).

ea: B. 774 (= C. I. L. VIII, 684).

Taking up the forms in detail, we may now observe that the forms *is* and *ea* are among those less frequently found in prose. This is also true of *id*, but the contrast between the prose usage and that of the poets is not so marked in the case of this form. Most striking of all is the almost entire absence of *eius* in the poets, which is used by the prose writers more frequently than any other form, occurring, for example, in *Cæsar* upwards of three hundred times. It is fairly common in *Lucretius* (55 times in books 1-3; 6) and *Manilius* (12 times), who often employ it to fill the last foot of the hexameter. The only other poets of those cited in the above tables, who use it are: *Catullus* 84,5; *Tibullus* 1,6,25; *Propertius* 4,2,35; 4,6,67; *Horace*, *Satires* 2,1,70; 6,76; *Ovid*, *Trist.* 3,4,27; *ex Ponto* 4,15,6 (some manuscripts have *huius*—In *Met.* 8,16 *eius* is a questionable reading); *Gratius* 224. From this count the ante-classical poets and *Commodian* are also omitted. The latter shows marked peculiarities in his use of the word, as in his metrics in general. He uses *is*, however, spar-

ingly, showing the forms: *is* 4 times, *ea* 6 times, *eius* 3 times, *eo* 12, *earum* 5, *eos* 6, *eis* 3. Entirely missing from the poets are *ii(ei)* Nom. pl., *iae* and *eis*. Omitting *Commodian* and the inscriptions mentioned, *earum* occurs only in *Catullus* 63,54; *Horace*, *Sat.* 2,8,92; *eorum* only in *Horace*, *Sat.* 1,4,80; *eos* only *Propertius* 2,21,7; *Horace*, *Epist.* 2,1,67; *Virgil*, *Georg.* 3,252; *Aen.* 1,413; *Carmen de POND.* 72; *eas* *Horace*, *Sat.* 1,10,14; *ei* (dat.) only *Catullus* 82,3; *Ovid*, *Hal.* 34. It is also worthy of comment that only the instance in the *Carmen de Ponderibus* and those in the inscriptions fall later than the Augustan age. This clearly shows not only that the later writers in metre avoided the word as a whole, but also that they were more rigid in the exclusion of the oblique cases just enumerated. As a matter of fact, in the entire post-Virgilian literature under discussion there are only five cases of *eum*, five of *eo*, one of *eius*, two of *ei*. Three of these fall to *Lucan*.

Considerable light is thrown upon the reasons for this attitude of the poets by the explanations of *Wölfflin-Meader* in the *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik* XI,373 ff:

1) 'The nominative forms *ii*, *ei*, *iae* were indistinguishable in pronunciation, and hence in metrical value, from the Dative and from the Nominatives *hi* and *hae*. The poets' ears could hardly have felt the combination of sounds *iae* as an objectionable cacophony, since they frequently admit such forms as *meae*, *deae*, *etc.* *Iis* was avoided for the same reasons as *ii*.'

This point suggests one of the most interesting as

well as most important problems of textual criticism. The questions involved are a) at what time was the phonetic identity of ii and hi, eae and hae, iis and his (hiis also occurs) an accomplished fact? b) how far has this confusion operated at a later date to cause corruption in the manuscripts of the earlier writers? Weissbrodt, *De usu pronominum is et hic quaestio*, Progr. Bromberg, 1878,79 has shown quite clearly that this confusion could scarcely have become general before the end of the second century A. D., although isolated cases of hi for ii and of his for iis are found much earlier. In the fourth and fifth centuries this confusion was very common, if not universal. The attempt of Hans Ziegel, *De is et hic pronomibus quatenus confusa sint apud antiquos*, Marburg, 1897, to bring order into the chaos must be regarded as a distinct advance. He endeavors to prove by the collation of certain manuscripts, that an unknown grammarian of the fourth or fifth century established some rules for the guidance of authors or scribes in the choice between the two sets of forms. Still his results cannot be accepted until they receive confirmation by the consultation of other manuscripts. If the question were one of orthography and phonetics only, it would be comparatively simple. It is, however, complicated by considerations of semasiology. The weakening of the force of hic, which will be treated in the following chapter, had in the classical period so far advanced as to render the interchange of the two words no uncommon occurrence. We may therefore not unreasonably inquire, whether the writers, though perfectly aware of the orthographical, phonetic and semasiological dis-

inctions (however slight) between the two words, nevertheless deliberately chose his and hi in preference to iis and ii. One circumstance, which, so far as I am aware, has never been noted, is of great weight: in sentences of the type of Quint. 9,2,1 *nam mihi de his sententiarum figuris dicere in animo est, quae ab illo simplici modo indicandi recedunt*, other forms than his and hi are of the rarest occurrence, while these two forms are quite frequently met with (Compare, *e. g.*, the readings in Cato, *De Agricultura* 1,4; 18,6; 52,1; 66,2; 149,2; 158,2). We feel called upon to lay considerable stress upon this fact in view of the surprising persistency with which modern writers on Latin grammar cite instances of hi and his to prove the weakening of the meaning of hic. Very few writers quote instances of any other form. This extraordinary preponderance of the two forms hi and his would be more naturally brought about by manuscript corruption than by semasiological conditions contemporary with the author, since such conditions would be likely to affect all forms alike and not simply the two just mentioned. As no instance of iis or is (for iis) occurs in the poets mentioned above except the dramatists, it is very difficult to say whether the confusion in manuscript tradition has affected their works as well as those of the prose writers.'

2) 'The Nominative *ei* was coincident in form with the Dative *ei*.'

3) 'The Dative *ei* varied between the monosyllabic pronunciation (Lucilius 4,40(*Ei coni. M.*); 7,27; Ennius, *Fab.* 204 (Müller); Catullus 82,3), the iambic (Ovid, *Hal.* 34—Lucan avoids the Dative 6,172 by

using viro [Obermeier, *l. c.*] and the spondaic (see Ritschl, *Opusc.* II, 419, where are quoted twenty-two examples from the comedians and seven from Lucretius).'

4) 'The forms eum, eam, eo, eā, eos, eas varied between the monosyllabic and the dissyllabic pronunciation, and eorum, earum were pronounced with and without synezesis.'

5) 'Eius is still more uncertain in its pronunciation. It is monosyllabic (Cicero, *Arat. apud De Nat. Deor.* 2,109) or pyrrhic under the republic (*cf.* Lachmann on *Lucr.* pp. 27; 161), while the normal Augustan pronunciation was trochaic.'

'To avoid such difficulties the poets excluded the forms in question entirely from their writings.' On the whole subject of the uncertainty and variety in pronunciation of the dissyllabic and trisyllabic forms of is see Bücheler, *Lateinische Declination*, index *s. vv.*

Positive evidence that the considerations just mentioned played a part in determining the poet to avoid the use of these metrically inconvenient forms of is, is found in the similar attitude of the poets toward idem. The evidence collected by Bücheler, *op. cit. s. vv. idem, eadem, etc.*, shows that we have no reason for supposing that the confusion in pronunciation of idem was any less than that of the determinative. On the contrary, the transference of the accent would tend still further to bring about the disappearance of the initial vowel of the oblique cases (compare the form of the *Nom. masc., sg.* and *pl. Dat.-Abl. pl. idem* and *isdem*—the normal forms employed in the hexameter—with the uncompounded *ii, eis, iis*, rarely or never

employed by the poets). The reduction of these two forms to dissyllables rendered their employment in metrical writings possible, or at least unobjectionable; and placed them, in fact, metrically on the same basis with *is* and *id*. Accordingly we frequently find them in poetry, while *ii* and *iis* are absolutely avoided. This is in itself sufficient proof that the difficulty of metrical treatment was the chief objection to the two simple forms. In Catullus, Tibullus-corporis, Propertius, Horace's Odes, Ovid's Ex Ponto, Martial and Juvenal the following forms of *idem* occur, if we may trust the indices: *idem* Nom. sg. and pl. 72 times; *eadem* Nom. sg. pl. and Acc. pl., 38; *isdem* Dat.-Abl. pl. 7 times; other forms, 13 (10 in Ovid and Juvenal.). Horace is less strict in the use of *idem*, precisely as he is less strict in the exclusion of *is* from his Satires and Epistles. I have no doubt that the examination of Virgil, Lucan, Silius, Statius and Valerius Flaccus would reveal still greater caution on the part of these writers in the use of *idem*.

While there can be no doubt that these considerations have played an important part in determining the exclusion of the determinative and the pronoun of identity from poetry, we must not overlook other considerations. It was a true feeling for the language that led Dacier to remark on the unpoetical character of *is*, and that led Bentley (if his opinion was not formed independently) to approve his judgment. The determinative does express in most cases only "formelle Beziehung," but it is going too far to add, as Grosrau does, that the word "keine eigentliche Bedeutung hat." To be sure, the word often adds so little

to the sentence that it may be dropped even in prose, yet the usage of the poets shows that here, as in prose, the word often has a more or less strong demonstrative force, "he and no other," sometimes approaching talis in meaning (*cf. supra*), while, *vice versa*, it is less frequently used as a simple correlative with qui. We occasionally find it where in classical prose we should expect ille or hic.

From correspondence with Professor Shorey, of the University of Chicago, I learn that the same feeling concerning the weakness of the meaning of certain words underlies his note on Horace O. 4,2,33 and the statement found on p. xix of the Introduction to his edition of Horace's Lyrics.

This discussion would be incomplete and perhaps misleading, if we should omit to state that even in prose the forms ei (ii) Nom. pl. and eae are extremely rare. In Caesar, for example, the two combined make up only $1\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. of the entire number of occurrences of the determinative, in the Rhetorica ad Herennium only $1\frac{2}{3}$ per cent., in Curtius $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent., in Florus $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent., in Apuleius $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent., while they are entirely absent from Fronto B'ks. 1-5. Is their scarcity due to their disappearance (absorption) into the forms hi and hae, or to disuse caused by a weakening of meaning? The answer must pend the solution of the problem stated on pages 22 sq. It may further be added that even the form hae would from the bare fact of its being Nom. pl. fem. find rather infrequent use as a substantive either in prose or verse (more often in the latter), while both hi and hae would often be understood from the per-

sonal ending of the verb or represented by the relative *qui, quae*. The form *id*, on the other hand, was largely used in prose as well as in poetry (compare the numerical prominence of the neuters *hoc* and *haec*), yielding in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* $25\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. of all instances of the determinative, in *Florus* 27, and in *Fronto* (and *M. Aurelius*), B'ks. 1-5, 29 per cent.

B. *IS* IN PROSE LITERATURE.

Although the prose literature of the Romans does not show peculiarities in the use of *is* so striking as those just discussed, yet some interesting and valuable facts may be learned from observing the attitude of the prose writers. An examination of the monuments shows that *is* is less and less frequently employed in proportion as the style passes from the cold and unimpassioned scientific exposition (legal literature, *Cato, De Agr., etc.*) through the more lively historical narrative into the impassioned tone of oratory and rhetorical (declamatory) prose (*Seneca*). In fact it is *par excellence* the pronoun of the curial style. In all our preserved laws, formulae, *etc.*, *hic* hardly appears at all. When it does, it refers with few exceptions to the subject matter of the document itself. *Ille* occurs previous to the year 48 A. D. only three times in *Brunns' Fontes*. The passages are: *lex Cornelia de XX quaestoribus* (81 B. C.) 1, 5 *ollis hominibus* in which case *ollis* seems to have the force peculiar to formulae, "so and so"; *lex a vicinis Furfensibus templo dicta* (58 B. C.) 1. 3 *comulateis olleis legibus illeis regionibus* (in which case it certainly bears the meaning just mentioned)—*cf. Hermes VII, p. 201,*

where the style of this provincial document is discussed. In view of the extreme rarity of the word, one is surprised to meet with it in the Laws of the Twelve Tables 10,8 *ast im cum illo* (*i. e.*, *auro quo iuncti sunt dentes*) *sepeliet*. Aside from the question as to how much the text of the laws has been modernized, there is of course a possibility of corruption in the manuscripts of Cicero, where the passage is preserved. If the text is sound, the demonstrative may be justified by the contrast between the gold particularly mentioned in the sentence just cited, and the general prohibition *neue aurum addito*. Even after the date above mentioned *ille* appears rarely in the laws. In the S. C. Claudianum (48 A. D.), which really has the form of an address and not of a legal document, *ille* occurs four times. In the carelessly written *decretum proconsulis Sardiniae* (79 A. D.) there is an example; likewise in the S. C. Macedonianum (69-79 A. D.), where *illi* stands simply for *ei*; in the *testamentum Galli* (first century); in the *testamentum Dasumii* (108 A. D.); in the *lex arae Iovis Salaritanae* (137 A. D.), in which occurs the above cited formula *ollis legibus ollis regionibus*; in the *epistula praefectorum praetorio* (168 A. D.), where *illo* = *eo*; in the *lis fullonum de pensione solvendo* where *illud quod* = *id quod*; in the *gesta de aperiendo testamento* (474 A. D.), *quod . . . illud* = *quod . . . id*. It should be noted that only few of these are *public* documents, which keep closer to the classical usage.

Turning now to the writers of scientific prose we find the relative frequency of the six pronouns to be as follows:

	is	hic	ille	ipse	idem	iste
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Cato	59½	23½	3	2	11	1
Vitruvius	64	22	⅓	5½	8	⅛
Gaius	64	15	4	8	8	1
<hr/>						
Dictys Cretensis	70½	13	2¼	8½	4¾	¼
Dares Phrygius	72	11	7¼	6⅞	2⅞	⅞

In the first three cases *hi* and *his* are counted with *hic* although there can be no doubt that many of them should fall into the *is*-column. Owing to the confusion between *ii* and *hi*, *iis* and *his*, 73 and 11 would probably be a more exact proportion for Dictys Cretensis. In the case of Dares those instances of *hi* and *his* which undoubtedly represent original *ii* and *iis* are included in the 72 per cent. The last two writers are added not as scientific writers, but because their percentages approach nearest to those of Cato, *etc.* They may easily have used the pronoun *is* so largely in order to give their writings a flavor of antiquity.

The historians in their employment of these pronouns show some marked differences:

	is	hic	ille	ipse	idem	iste
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Caesar	50½	20½	9½	14	6	⅛
Curtius	36	21	16½	18¾	7	⅞
Suetonius	55¾	18¼	6⅔	14	5⅓	⅛
Justin	35	22	14⅓	16⅓	12	⅓
Victor	50½	22	9	11	7	1

The pronouns *ille* and *ipse* are decidedly more fre-

quent,—it could not be otherwise in historical literature,—while is has decreased. The less frequent employment of is by Curtius and Justin could be easily accounted for. The African Latinity of Florus and his poetical coloring, for which see Archiv f. lat. Lex. u. Gram. VI, 1 ff. [Wölfflin], removes him widely from these. He shows:

17 24 26 27½ 5¼ ¼

With him, as with Catullus, is holds the fourth place instead of the first, its position being usurped by ille and ipse. He represents the extreme phase of a movement, which has left clear traces of its influence on the historical and particularly on the patristic literature. A medial position is occupied by the following writers:

	is	hic	ille	ipse	idem	iste
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Seneca Rhetor	13⅔	35⅓	35	6	3⅓	6⅔
Pliny, Epistulae	16	34	23	16	6½	4½
Macrobius, Som. Scip.	16	47	11½	15½	8¾	2
Boethius, De Consol.	23½	35½	20½	13	3½	1½

The facts told by these tables require no comment. The following chapters will be found to describe in detail the semasiological changes that explain, to a large extent at least, the shifting of the predominance in usage from one pronoun to another.

Concerning the weakening of is in particular, those interested may consult Praun, Bemerkungen zur Syntax des Vitruv p. 83; Šorn, Der Sprachgebrauch des Historikers Eutropius, part II, p. 3; and Hoppe, Program, p. 8.

I can cite no writer in whose works is has so far

been replaced by *hic*, *ille* and *ipse* as in those of the grammarian Pompeius. In his writings it is confined almost entirely to certain set formulae or phrases. As a free and independent word it is nearly extinct. The following table is based on the first 108 pages of Keil's edition of Pompeius.

	<i>is</i>	<i>hic</i>	<i>ille</i>	<i>ipse</i>	<i>idem</i>	<i>iste</i>	totals
Number of instances:							
Cæsar and							
continuator	2.73	2045	830	382	525	277	5
		749	304	140	189	101	2
Pompeius		24	425	430	235	35	335
Percentages:							
Cæsar, <i>etc.</i>		50½	20½	9½	14	6	⅛
Pompeius		1¾	27¾	28¾	17½	2¼	22

The conclusions which are to be drawn from this table are to be found in chapter III.

In reference to the disappearance of the individual forms of *is*, little is to be said beyond the remarks on the forms *ii*, *iis*, *eae* made above. It is well known that in later Latin the form *eum* (neuter) made on the analogy of *ipsum*, *bellum*, *etc.*, usurps the place of the form *id*, except in the phrase *id ipsum* (= Italian *desso*) and probably a few other formulae. Examples are cited by Geyer, *Kritische und sprachliche Erläuterungen zu Antonini Plac. Itin.*, p. 41.

CHAPTER II. HIC.

CHAPTER II. HIC.

A. THE RIVALRY BETWEEN HIC AND IS.

The encroachment of *hic* on the province of *is* is most clearly demonstrable in the case of certain short formulae or phrases, in which the neuter Nominative, Accusative or Ablative is used to refer not to some particular word, but to the general idea of the following or the preceding sentence or clause. Such phrases are *eo* (= *ideo*, *propterea*), *hoc* (= *ideo*, *propterea*), both either with or without a following *quia*, *quod*, *ut*, *ne*, *etc.*; *eo* with the comparative, *hoc* with the comparative; *id est*, *hoc est*, both explanatory; *ad id*, *ad hoc* with various meanings; *ob id*, *ob hoc*; *postea*, *postidea*, (*post id*, *post eă*), *posthac* (*post hoc*, *p. haec*—also *postillă* and *illă*); *eiusmodi*, *huiusmodi*; and lastly *eo consilio*, *hoc consilio*, the last two not being frequently employed. These are all special cases under the general principle stated by Kühner, *Lat. Gram.*, § 118, 2 Anm. 7 and 8 (= vol. II, p. 455). The first five pairs form the subject of the present section.

1. *Eo=ideo, hoc=ideo.*

The causal use of these two Ablatives is fully developed as early as Plautus, not to mention the doubtful passage in the *lex XII tabularum* 2,2 *morbis sonticus . . . aut dies status cum hoste . . . quid*

horum fuit uitium iudici reoue, eo dies || die || diffensus || diffissus, Th. Mommsen || esto. Examples of hoc = ideo are:

Pseud. 807¹ Illum (*sc.* coquum) conducunt (homines)
potius qui uilissimum.

Hoc ego fui hodie solus obsessor fori;

819 ff. Eï homines cenas

.condiuntstrigibus,

.conuiuis intestina quae exedunt.

Hoc hic quidem homines tam breuem uitam
colunt;

Miles 850

.ego promebam postea,

Hoc illi crebro capite sistebant cadi;

Hoc is here a probable and generally accepted conjecture of Brix 2d ed. for the MSS. hic. Cist. 319 ff.

Nam hasce aedis conductas habet meus gnatus,
haec ubi astat. [nominauit.

Hoc hanc eam esse opiniost: nam haec illum

I cite these passages in full since they are the only ones known to me in Plautus. Ussing *ad* Asin. 235 (= 248 U) says 'hoc = ideo' but I cannot regard the passage as an indisputable instance of the construction. Sentences of the type Stich. 127

Sed hoc est, quod ad uos uenio quodque esse
ambas conuentas uolo

(*cf.* Asin. 864; Merc. 711; Men. 1135) do not belong here, inasmuch as the passage Rud. 1258

Illuc est quod nos nequam seruis utimur

¹ All citations from Plautus follow the larger revision and completion of Ritschl's edition by Löwe, Götz and Schöll.

proves that this hoc is an Accusative. Slightly different is *Lucr.* 6,379, where Wakefield (*apud* Munro *ad loc.*) would take hoc in the causal sense. Munro is clearly right in rejecting this explanation of the word. In like manner the passage *Miles* 1321

Istuc crucior, a viro me tali abalienarier

shows that *Stichus* 9

.....sed hoc, soror, crucior:

Patrem tuom meumque....

(13,14)...nunc inprobi uiri officio uti

is to be excluded from this context. In *Stichus* 41

.....ego te hoc, soror, tametsi es maior,

Moneo ut tuom memineris officium

hoc is plainly Accusative. For *Miles* 297 see below p. 40.

There is to my knowledge no instance of this construction in Terence. Was the graceful imitator of the Greeks led by his love of sermonis elegantia to avoid the construction? The only passage that I can call into question is *Phor.* 804, and since the causal hoc does not occur in the comicorum fragmenta, Kiessling *ad Hor. Sat.* 1,2,53 "wie öfters in der Sprache der Komödie" should read "wie vereinzelt bei Plautus." A similar judgment must be passed upon Lorenz *ad Mil.* 850 "hoc = 'darum'; derselbe Abl. *Pseud.* 807; 822 und öfters." The only other examples which Hand, Tursellinus III,92 and 93 cites as certain are: *Lucr.* 4,555 (now 553); 660 (now 658); 624 (now 622); *Virg. Geo.* 2,425 (*Uss. ad Plaut. Aul.* 248 takes *Virg. Aen.* 9,492 in this way); *Plin. Epist.* 2,19,3 hoc quod; *Seruiana schol. ant. litt. ad Ecl.* 10,18 (*Duker pro-*

poses here *ob hoc* against the MSS). If to these we add Lucil. 6,29 (corrected by Müller to *hac*); Catullus 44,13 (where cod. Oxoniensis reads *h*=*hoc*); Lucr. 4, 360; 6,274; 864 (in all these instances, as in the cases cited by Hand, the word stands in the formula *hoc ubi*¹ at the beginning of a hexameter); 3,531 (where *hoc* is a conjecture of Munro for the MSS. reading *haec*.); Hor. Sat. 1,2,53f; 1,6,41; 1,7,10; we shall see that one may well question the correctness of Kiessling's procedure in making this construction characteristic of the language of comedy.

The construction was doubtless avoided on account of the phonetic identity of *hoc* Nom. and Acc. sg., *hoc* Abl. and *hoc* Adverb (= *huc*), which rendered the form ambiguous. Careful writers could therefore employ the form only where the context left no doubt as to its meaning. They could easily find substitutes for it in the causal expressions *ob hanc rem*, *ob hanc causam*, *de hac causa*, *hac causa* (later also *hinc*) and the like, or if necessary, *in qua causa*, *qua de causa*, *quam ob rem*, *etc.* It was no doubt in part this feeling that led to the juxtaposition of the Ablatives *ipso*, *solo*, *uno* and the superlative *maxime*, although, of course, no one would deny that these words at the same time intensify or otherwise modify the meaning of *hoc*. Another means of avoiding the locution was the phrase *ob hoc* discussed below, pp. 73ff. Ter. And. 268 offers *ex hoc*. The same purpose is imperfectly served by the addition of a *quod* clause (causal), although in

¹ Lucretius has similarly *hic ubi* at the beginning of a hexameter in 6,446; 524; 836; (*cf.* Hor. Epist. 2,2,136). In Lucretius 4,1093 *hoc* = "by this means."

some cases this clause is itself susceptible of a double interpretation, and more perfectly effected by the addition of a quia or a quom clause, which last form of correlation had a precursor in the Greek τούτω . . . διότι, as exemplified in Antiphon περὶ τ. Ηρω. Φον. 3 τούτω ἐσώθησαν, διότι <εἶ> ἐψεύσαντο.

The causal Ablative eo is slightly more common in its simplest form than is causal hoc. A typical example of this usage is Plaut. Trin. 363 f.

Nam sapiens quidem pol ipse fingit fortunam
sibi: [malust.

Eo non multa quae neuolt eueniunt, nisi factor

The remaining instances in Plautus are: Bacch. 298

Non me fefellit, sensi: eo exanimatus fui;

Bacch. 95; Capt. 837; 860; Cist. 7 (*bis*); Poen. 288; Pers. 276; Rud. 876; Truc. 85. Trin. 372 (not 371) may perhaps be placed here. Truculentus 180 is doubtless an interpolation.

Poen. 478 . . . uiscum legioni dedi

Fundasque: eo praesteruebant folia farferi

is beyond doubt the right reading, but eo is here an Ablative of means. I believe Ussing's interpretation of Asin. 435 (= 432U) eo = "than he" is correct, but the parallels he cites are not appropriate and do not prove the point. There are to my knowledge only these eleven certain instances in Plautus.

From Terence I can cite only the passage Hec. 238

Enim lassam oppido aibant tum esse: eo ad eam
non admissa sum.

The passage Adel. 620 offers an instance of eo denot-

ing purpose or end, not cause. After Terence we first meet this pronoun in the Ciceronian age. For even assuming the correctness of the reading in Cato, *De Agr.* 22,3 (see Keil's critical note *ad loc.*), we must interpret it with Gottfr. Grosse (translation of Cato, Halle, 1787) and Holtze, *Syntax. prisc. script.* I,221 in the sense "for this purpose," "to this end" (Grosse: "die kosten dazu betragen . . ."). In fact, notwithstanding the statement of Kühner, *op. cit.* II, p. 745 (*cf.* Hand, *Turs.* II, 410) to the contrary, the usage is well attested for Cicero himself and for Sallust. The instances are: Cic. *De Div.* 2,46 *frater es; eo uereor;* *De Nat. Deor.* 2,30 *quocirca sapientem esse mundum necesse est, naturamque perfectione rationis excellere, eoque deum esse mundum, omnemque uim mundi natura diuina continere;* *De Fin.* 3,16 *fieri autem non posset, ut appeterent aliquid, nisi sensum haberent sui eoque se diligerent;* Sallust, *Jug.* 42,1 *nobilitas noxia atque eo percussa;* *Orat. Phil.* 13 (= Maurenbrecher *Fr.* 1,77,13) *antea malum publicum occulte, auxilia palam instruebatur, eo boni malos facile anteibant.* It does not occur in these two writers without the connectives *et*, *que* or *atque*. From this time on *eo* occurs in its simple form in all periods of the development of the language, at least down to Boethius (*De Consol. Phil.* 3,3^{pr},4).

Here should also find mention the formula *eo fit ut*, as in Cic. *Acad.* 2,66; *De Leg.* 3,39; Sallust, *Cat.* 52,23; 53,4. The familiar type of construction Plaut. *Most.* 636

Quid eost argento factum?

along with *hinc fit*, *inde fit*, *etc.*, would perhaps lead

one to suppose that the *eo* here expresses an idea of separation or of source rather than one of cause. Yet on the other hand, when we meet with such instances as Plaut. Amph. 756

Eo fit quia mihi plurimum credo

(*cf.* Ter. Haut. 505, in which *eo* is correlated with a causal conjunction), and such as Plaut. Curc. 61 *id eo fit, quia || ideo BEJ ||*, in which the subject of *fit* is expressed, we are led to conclude that the probabilities are at least as strong, that the Romans felt the causal force of the *eo* in this formula.¹

Those who wish to study this locution more in detail may consult the following passages: Hor. Sat. 1, 6,89; 1,9,55; 2,8,65; Livy 2,48,4; 3,66,4; 71,6; 4,7, 11; 10,9; 5,16,4; 17,10; 20,9; 46,9; 6,5,5; 7,8,5; 19, 5; 8,8,8; 17,8; 9,11,11; 36,4; 40,9; 22,47,5; 29,1,20; 20,1; 25,12; 30,42,16; (Observe that in Livy this construction is confined for the most part to the first decade—*Cf.* Stacey, *Die Entwicklung des livian. Stiles*, in *Archiv für latein. Lexikographie und Grammatik X* (1898), p. 17–82); Velleius Pat. 2,67,4; Plin. Nat. Hist. 24,62; Quint. 2,16,4; 17,7; 4,2,80 (Bonnell reads *aut*); 119; 3,3; 11,3,29; for Tacitus (about fifty instances) see Gerber und Greef p. 351; Fronto 24*m*(N); Apuleius, *Apol.* pp. 500,17 (Paris edition of 1688); 509,2; 514,1; 525,8; *etc., etc.*; Gellius 11,9,1; Censorinus, *De Die Nat.* 18,8; 8,5; 14,2; Victor, *Historia Abbreviata* 15,3; 38,5; 39,20; 40,8.

As in the case of *hoc*, so in that of *eo*, ambiguity (since *eo* may mean “thither,” “to the end that”

¹ *Cf.* also *ita fit ut.*

—expressing purpose— or “hence,” with illative force) led to the infrequent use of the word, which was avoided by differentiation, giving rise to the forms *ideo* and *eo usque*. Still other expressions, such as *propterea*, *ob eam rem*, *ea causa*, *etc.*, and later *inde* and *ob id*, contributed to the disuse of *eo* causal.

From the foregoing, particularly from the infrequent occurrence of *hoc*, it is clear that we can speak of a rivalry between *hoc* and *eo* in the simple forms only in a limited sense. Both of these expressions are more frequently used in correlation with a causal or a conditional clause. In *Plaut. Mil.* 298

*Primumdum, si falso iusimulas Philocomasium,
hoc perieris.*

hoc gathers up the cause just stated in conditional form (*cf.* below p. 47). The only passage in *Plautus* that can possibly be considered to exemplify the usage is that quoted by *Hand, op. cit.* p. 93, *Rud.* 388

*Hoc sese excruciat animi,
Quia leno ademit cistulam ei.*

Munro also *ad Lucr.* 3,531 cites this passage as an instance of causal *hoc*. The question may, however, be raised whether *hoc* is here Ablative or Accusative. A very close parallel is afforded by *Trin.* 1170

Quom ille itast ut eum esse nolo, id crucior,
the only difference being that this instance has the passive (middle?) voice instead of the active. Another type of construction which strongly confirms the assumption that *hoc* is Accusative, is that found in *Stichus* 9 ff. cited above, in which an expegetical

Accusativus cum infinitivo stands in apposition with the *hoc*. This is evidently also the view of Kühner, *op. cit.* II, § 126,3,b, who cites Stich. 9 ff., Mil. 1321

Istuc crucior, a viro me tali abalienarier,
and Capt. 597 (should be 600)

Crucior lapidem non habere me,

under the rubric "Der Acc. cum Inf. steht . . . nach den verbis affectuum." The construction does not to my knowledge occur in Terence. In fact it is not until comparatively late in the period of the Silver Latinity that *hoc . . . quia, etc.*, becomes at all frequent. It is quite common in the Patristic literature from Cyprian on, usually in the correlation *hoc . . . quod*, in which case ambiguity is usually avoided by adding *ipso*. Cypr. Epist. 30,5*e* qui ruerunt, hoc ruerunt, quod caeca temeritate incauti fuerunt; 31,5*p* iam hoc ipso quod non cessimus, uicimus; 6*m* nec hoc animentur quia multi sunt, sed hoc ipso || ipsud T || magis reprimantur, quia non pauci sunt; Arnobius 2,2*p* uel hoc ipso . . . quod . . . , quod . . . ; Tertullian, Ad Nat. 1,5*p* cum tamen aliquos de nostris malos probatis, iam hoc ipso Christianos non probatis; Ambrosius Ex. 1,6,23(12 F) nam hoc ipso quod diuersae eadem sint naturae, simplicem . . . motum habere non possunt. Passages from pagan writers are Script. Hist. Augustae, Avid. Cas. 7,8; XXX Tyran. 26,7; Boeth. De Consol. 5,6*pr*,45.

Owing to the frequency of the correlative use of *is, eo* is far more common in this construction. It occurs in Plautus (*eo . . . quod* or *quia*): Asin. 620; 844; Bacch. 319; Capt. 70; 994; Cist. 237; 492;

Pers. 785; 834; Rud. 24; 1114; Stich. 177; Truc. 272; Vid. 70; in Terence (under the form *eo... quod* or *eo... quia*): Haut. 787; Eun. 415; Ad. 698; and in Cato, *De Agr.* 6,4 *eo quia*; 17,1 *eo quia* || *ea quae* *Jocundus* ||; 37,1 *quod...eo*. Here I would place also the passage from the *Origines* cited by Gellius 17,13,3 *non... eos... eo postremo scribo quin populi et boni et strenui sient*, "I mention them last not for this reason because they are not..." Gellius cites this passage in explanation of the *quin* in the sentence *non idcirco Isocrates causas non defendit, quin id utile esse et honestum existumaret*. "Isocrates' reason for refraining from the pleading of law suits was not that he thought it profitless and dishonorable." The usage is also found in Plautus¹ *Trin.* 341

*Non eo haec dico quin quae tu uis ego uelim et
faciam lubens:*

Sed...

The construction represents the more usual *non eo... quia non* (compare *Asin.* 844), and is paralleled by *Ter. Haut.* 554

Neque eo nunc dico, quo quicquam illum senserim;

Sed siquid, ne quid,

where an affirmative motive is stated, "I mention it now not that (because) I may have noticed anything

¹ On obtaining access, after much difficulty, to O. Kienitz, *De quin particulae apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu* (Carlsruhe, 1878), I notice that he brings (p. 21) the passage from Cato into connection with Plautus, *Trin.* 341.

in him, but....", and with reversed order of the clauses, by Ter. Eun. 96 f,

Non pol, quo . . . plus . . . diligam,
Eo feci: sed . . .

A sed would naturally follow the two passages from Gellius. The second one (which Gellius cites first) bears on its face indications of being "made to order" by some rhetorician and not quoted from a work of literature. This construction is not recognized in Harpers' Lexicon, *sub voc.* quin. The correlation *eo . . . quod, etc.*, further occurs in *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 3,4,7*p*; in Cicero's orations thirteen times, in Nepos, Eun. 11,5 (see addendum, p. 219 *infra*); in Celsus, B'ks 1-5, seven times. Its association with *quod* was so common (the two words being either separated by intervening words or in juxtaposition), that the words coalesced both in form and meaning (*cf.* Ital. *ciò che < ecce + hoc + quod*) so that *eo quod* (causal) comes to be equivalent to *quod* (causal). This coalescence is convincingly proved by the circumstance that, after *quod*, *quia*, *quoniam* take on the usage *dico quod* (*quia, etc.*) *es(se)t = dico esse*, *eo quod* is also (in late Latin) used in the same way—see S. Silviae Perigrinatio ad Loca Sancta 8,2 *dicent eo quod*, "they will say that"; 8,5 *retulit eo quod*. Particularly instructive is the New Testament passage Mark 9,26(25), where the following readings represent the original *ὥστε τοὺς πολλοὺς λέγειν ὅτι ἀπέθανεν*:

1 Vulgate: *ut multi dicerent quia mortuus est* (so cod. Brixianus f and the majority of the ante-Hieronymian translations, with either *est* or *esset*).

2 Cod. Veronensis b: dicerent eo quod mortuus esset.

In the S. Silviae Perigrin. the construction occurs pp. 48,27; 49,12; 58,9; 63,31; 64,13 and, with the infinitive, 66,6. In Justinian's Novellae eo quod is sometimes used to render *διότι*. In 679-680 A. D. in a judgment of Thierry III (printed in Lindsay, Handbook of Lat. Inscr. p. 127) occur the expressions dicerit eo quod porcione sua . . . retenirit and dedit in respnsis eo quod ipsa terra . . . tenuerant. This coalescence justifies what would otherwise appear to be redundancy in the excerpta ex libr. glossar. apud Götz, Corpus V,215,5 lampadas solstitium estibum (*sic!*) . . . ideo lampadas dicitur eo quod ex eo die lampas solis . . . (*cf.* Isidore. De Nat. Rerum 8,2 solstitium autem aestiuum ideo lampas dicitur eo quod . . .; Etymol. 1,17,7 note a). See also Bonnet, Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours, p. 326. A similar cumulation of causal particles occurs in Isidore, Origines 1,4,16 a . . . in omniibus gentibus ideo prior est litterarum pro eo quod ipsa prior nascentibus uocem aperiat.

The gradually weakening eo was replaced, as has been implied above, by ob id, ob hoc, ideo, idcirco, propterea, ob eam rem (causam), and other causal expressions.

It is a matter of great difficulty, even if it is not impossible, for us to know whether the Romans felt any difference between the eo in the type of sentences just mentioned and that exemplified by Plaut. Aul. 240

Eo dico, ne me thensauros reperisse censeas;

and Ter. Phor. 745

Eo perperam olim dixi, ne uos . . .

Effutiretis,

in which *eo* looks forward to a purpose clause instead of a causal clause. The same difficulty arises in the case of the two correlations *hoc* (Abl.) . . . *quod* and *hoc* (Abl.) . . . *ut*(*ne*). However the case may stand, it is desirable for the purposes of modern grammatical study to draw a sharp distinction between the two constructions, and not to cite the latter type as an example of causal *eo* or *hoc*, as is sometimes done by modern writers.

This same uncertainty arises, when we inquire whether the Romans were conscious of a difference in meaning between the use of the Ablative in the form *eo* (*hoc*) . . . *quia*, and *eo* (*hoc*) . . . *si* (*quia* . . . *eo* (*hoc*) and *si* . . . *eo*(*hoc*)). If Nepos in a well known passage Hann. 2,6 used *cum* and *si* (apparently merely *varietatis causa*) to express two similar sets of relationships, with how much greater ease might a speaker have passed (either consciously or unconsciously) from *eo* (*hoc*) . . . *quia* to *eo* (*hoc*) . . . *si*! The construction occurs as early as Plautus (see Trin. 371(372?) || *eo om. cod. F* ||; Poen. 1194).

The answer to the question whether in these constructions *hoc* retains a strong demonstrative force, while *eo* remains purely correlative, is one which must have a more or less subjective coloring. Yet it is certain that *hoc* could not have been used extensively (and we are justified in assuming that it was used more extensively in the colloquial language than in the literary language) without sacrificing some, if not

all, of its demonstrative force. This statement holds true *mutatis mutandis* of the other formulae discussed in this chapter. In the case of the others, however, the rivalry of the two pronouns was sharper than in the present case, and the tendency to confusion greater.

NOTE.—Id causal or expressing purpose and hoc (Acc.) bearing the same meanings are of such infrequent occurrence that they need not be discussed here. Hand, *op. cit.*, does not mention them (he treats hoc causal throughout as an Ablative). The only(?) cases of this id in Plautus and Terence are: Plaut. Amph. 909; Capt. 680; Epid. 192; Mil. 1158; Terence, And. 157; 376; 414; Eun. 150; 323 (scholia, ed. Schlee p. 101,5 “id] propter hoc”); 393 (scholia, p. 102,1 “id] propter hoc”); 829 (scholia p. 109: “id] propter id”); 1005 (scholia, p. 112: “id] ideo”); Hec. 368; Phor. 259; Adel. 791 (scholia, p. 160,15). See further Kühner, *op. cit.* II, p. 212, Anm. 3.

2. *Eo cum comparativo = hoc cum comparativo.*

The instrumental construction “by this (so much) the more, less,” *etc.*, and the Ablative proper (separation) construction are here to be distinguished. Hoc (Abl.) plus *ne facito* is cited by Cicero from the *lex XII tabularum* (see Schöll p. 153) in *De Leg.* 2,59. Both constructions occur with *hoc* and *eo* in Plautus and Terence. The following are the passages:

A. Instrumental *hoc*: Plaut. Amph. 166 f.

...dura hoc || hec *codd.* EF; haec Z;
corr. Angelius || < magis > (*add.* Camerarius) servitus est

Quod noctesque diesque adsiduo satis superquest

(254) Hoc adeo hoc commemini magis, quia illo die inpransus fui;

Ter. Eun. 220 f.

PHAED. Opus faciam, ut defetiger usque, ingratius ut dormiam.

PARM. Uigilabis lassus: hoc plus facies.

B. Ablative hoc: Plaut. Curc. 670 f.

. . . .Hoc prius uolo

Meam rem agere;

Pers. 764

. . . .Oh, nihil hoc magis dulcest;

cf. Rud. 279

Neque hoc ampliusquicquamst;

Ter. And. 30 f.

. . . .Quid est,

Quod tibi mea ars efficere hoc possit amplius?

C. Instrumental eo: Plaut. Aul. 376

Atque eo fuerunt cariora, aes non erat;

Cist. 298 f.

Uideo ego te Amoris ualde tactum toxico,
Adulescens; eo te magis uolo monitum.

Mil. 1080 Eo minus dixi, ne haec censeret me aduersum se mentire;

Most. 763 f.

Nam ille eo maiore hinc opere sibi exemplum
petit,

Quia isti umbram audivit esse aestate perbonam;

so Men. 151; Merc. 971; Most. 902 a; Poen. 883; Rud.

92; Trin. 274; 856; (*cf.* Cist. 380 eo sum tardiuscula).
Ter, Ad. 698

Quia tam misere hoc esse cupio uerum, eo
uereor magis.

D. Ablative eo: Plaut. Mil. 926

Eo potuit hercle lepidius nil fieri;

Ter. Haut. 62 f.

... Annos sexaginta natus es,

Aut plus eo, ut conicio....;

Hec. 421

Dies triginta aut plus eo in nauis fui.

Cato has only hoc, and always in the phrase hoc amplius (= praeterea), De Agr. 57; 94; 142; 157, 10. In the Rhetorica ad Herennium, on the contrary, the hoc does not occur, while eo is found eight times, always as an instrumental.

From the very first we notice a discrimination between these two pronouns; we find the instrumental use predominant with eo, and the usage that is developed from the true Ablative predominant with hoc. This is very conspicuous in the case of Plautus and the Rhetorica ad Herennium. In Plautus there are twelve cases of instrumental eo to one of the true Abl. construction and two of instrumental hoc to three of the Abl. construction.

The distinction is still more apparent in the writings of Cicero. We find the true Ablative eo only half a dozen times in the orations, philosophical writings and the letters Ad Familiares and Ad Quintum Fratrem (*cf.* Acad. 2, 35 quid eo leuius? De Fin. 1, 41 quid eo miserius dici aut fingi potest? De Nat. Deor. 3, 23 nihil est

eo (*sc. mundo*) melius: nihil est enim eo pulcrius). In contrast with this we find eo over one hundred and forty times as an instrumental. Similarly in Varro, *Res Rust.* eo = "than this" only once, 1,18,3 eo plus, but is used with the other meaning about fifteen times. Varro's use of the word is somewhat circumscribed. He joins it usually with magis, minus or facilius. Sallust likewise has in *Jug.* 80,6 eo amplius = plures denis, but with the other force eighteen times. Both Nepos and Livy (Books 41-45 are not included) use it only in this latter sense, nine times and one hundred times respectively. Celsus in books 1-3 follows Livy, using in all but one passage (1, *pr.* eo . . . magis quoniam) the relative quo instead of quia, quoniam, ne, *etc.*

With hoc we find the case entirely different. Cicero differs from Cato in that he uses hoc with the comparative supported by or introducing quia, quod, *etc.*, that is to say, in sharp rivalry with eo, in thirty-four passages in his orations (see Merguet, *Lex. sub voc.* II, p. 468, d, a), and in twenty-two passages in his philosophical writings (Merguet, II, p. 154,5, d, a). In the letters (only partially collated) it occurs in both senses (*Ad Fam.* 4,4,2 hoc ipso melior . . . quod; 11,29,3 hoc mihi gratius facere nihil potes;—the same words in 13,66,2; 74; 79; 16,22,2). Sallust avoided hoc entirely, always using ad hoc instead of hoc amplius and hoc plus. Varro, *Res Rust.* 3,10,3 has hoc minus and hoc plus Ablative. Nepos has it only three times: *Alc.* 11,2 hoc amplius; *Timoth.* 4,6 hoc plura . . . quod; *Dat.* 5,4 hoc maiore fore in discrimine, quod . . . Livy also only three times (books 41-45 are not in-

cluded) 1,23,8; 36,25,4; 38,26,7; being in each case translatable by "so much the." Celsus offers us 3,5 (= p. 83 D) hoc ipso peius...quod; 8,1 (= p. 326) quo latiora...sunt, hoc hebetiora. The lack of a stronger demonstrative force in the determinative makes its use as an instrumental Ablative impossible except in a few cases, while the weakening of the demonstrative force in hoc makes possible its use in the other sense.

The following passages will illustrate the close contact of the two constructions:

- | | |
|---|---|
| Valer. Max. 1, <i>pr.</i> mea par-
uitas eo iustius ad fauo-
rem tuum decucurrerit,
quo cetera diuinitas
opinionē colligitur. | 3,3 <i>Ext.</i> 1 rex, quo patien-
tia pueri magis delecta-
tus est, hoc et hoc A ²
certius perseuerantiae
experimentum sumere
uoluit. <i>cf.</i> 3,6,1; 4,7,2. |
| Plin. Nat. Hist. 8,1 quo
largiore aluntur lacte eo
tardiorē uisum accipi-
unt. | 10,175 omnia animalia quo
maiorē corpore, hoc mi-
nus fecunda. |
| 14,80 uinum omne dulce
minus odoratum, quo
tenuius eo odoratius. | 23,40 quo generosius ui-
num est, hoc magis ue-
tustate crassescit. |
| Sueton. Cal. 15 inferias..
instituit, et eo amplius
(=praeterea) matri Cir-
censes . . . | Jul. 38 nummos, quos pol-
licitus olim erat, uiritim
diuisit, et hoc amplius
centenos pro mora. |
| Florus 1,24(2,8),18 partem
. . . dari placuit eo li-
bentius, quod . . . | 1,18(2,2),14 hoc inlustrior
noster (<i>sc.</i> exercitus),
quod . . . |

Hoc amplius was a favorite and often employed phrase (beginning with Plaut. Rud. 279), and was used from Cicero (see Tull. 44; Phil. 13,50), and (?) Varro (*cf.* Res. Rust. 2,10,9) on, in the sense of praeterea or ad hoc. Instead of it, eo amplius appears unexpectedly in Suetonius (*vid. sup.*), Aggenus Urbicus, Terullian, De Pud. 5 (= p. 226,20), Lucifer Caralitanus, De Regibus Apostatis 11 (= p. 61,24 H) and Gaius 2,172; 3,212. Instead of the usual eo secius, we meet in Lucan 1,315 hoc secius, doubtless due to the poet's strict avoidance of the determinative. Of the poets, Lucretius alone, to my knowledge, uses eo with the comparative. See 1,69 eo magis, with which compare 2,125 hoc etiam magis; 2,826f. quanto.... | magis, hoc magis, and Virg. Aen. 5,94 hoc magis; Geor. 4,248 quo magis...., hoc acrius.

3. *Id est and hoc est.*

Id est is doubtless the older of these two formulae. Hoc est is met for the first time in Lucilius 9,32f.

...in praeposito per

Pelliciendo, hoc est inducendo geminato L.

Id est occurs for the first time in Cato, De Agr. 57 (three times). The real rivalry between them begins for us with the Rhet. ad Herennium and is, of course, confined to prose. Although id est stands nowhere in the work without a variant, yet the reading is scarcely to be rejected in 1,16,26*m* and should probably be retained in 1,6,10. Hoc est occurs seven times, serving always to define a general idea by 1) stating its component elements, as in 1,7,11*p* hae tres utilitates tametsi in tota oratione sunt comparandae, hoc est, ut

auditores sese perpetuo nobis attentos, dociles, benivolos praebeant, tamen...; *cf.* 2,14,21*p*; 2,30,48*p*; 3,8,15*e*; 3,9; 16*p*; or by 2) adding a result brought about by the idea defined, as 1,6,9*p* cum turpem causam habemus, hoc est, cum ipsa res animum auditoris a nobis alienat; 3,11,20 mollitudinem uocis, hoc est, ut eam torquere in dicendo nostro commodo possimus...faciet exercitatio; 4,1,1*e* does not here concern us (*cf.* Cic. De Nat. Deor. 1,98; Lael. 58; De Fin. 2,91; Tusc. Disp. 2,30). Id est is used in the same manner: 1) 1,16,26*m* inuenta ratione firmiter quaerendum est, id est, quod continet accusationem, quod adfertur contra rationem defensionis. 2) 1,6,10 si persuasus auditor < fuerit, id est, > si oratio aduersariorum fecerit fidem auditoribus... With hoc est 4,1,1*e* may be compared id est 4,11*p*; 2,26,40.

In Cicero we find convincing evidence that the two phrases had fairly entered upon a course of rivalry that was to last over five hundred years. It is clear that Cicero carefully weighed the two formulae and adopted or rejected each at different periods in the development of his style. In his speeches down to the year 56 B. C. occurs only one unquestioned case of id est, Verr. 3,116, to which may possibly be added 3,67. Concerning the sentence id est...lex, in Frag. A, VII,29 (= B, 6,13 Orelli = pro Cornelio II, anno 65) Sigon. apud Orellium II (1883), p. 72,12 says "sustuli duas voces idest res, quae videntur in albo libri positae fuisse eis vocibus declarandis 'cum ea feratur' et locum hunc per se satis mendosum mendosiore reddunt." Hoc est, on the other hand, occurs Rosc. Amer. (anno 80) 87; 103; 117; Div. in Caecil. (anno

70) 11; Impeachment of Verres (*anno* 78) thirty-seven times; Tullio (*anno* 72) 50; Caecina (*anno* 69) eight times; Cluent. (*anno* 66) 148; De Leg. Agrar. (*anno* 63) 1,2; 2,31; Sulla (*anno* 62) 49; De Domo (*anno* 57) 78; Piso. (*anno* 55) (65)66; Milo. (*anno* 52) 24; Phil. (*anno* 44); 2,70. This last example "et consul et Antonius!" *hoc est dicere: et consul et impudicissimus, et consul et homo nequissimus* does not strictly speaking belong in the present category (*cf.* De Nat. Deor. 1,98 and the similar examples referred to on p. 54 *supra*), since *hoc est dicere* (*cf.* Ital. cioè dire) forms an independent sentence, in which *hoc* clearly retains its strong demonstrative force. In other words, fifty-three cases fall before and during the consulate, four after it. None are later than the year 52. To these fifty-seven we should add sixteen instances of *hoc est* in the De Inventione against one of *id est*. After the year 56 are found twenty-four instances of *id est* in the orations, eleven of them in the Philippics. If Cicero was consistent in abandoning *hoc est* in his later years, we should expect to find only *id est* in his philosophical writings, all of which fall in the fifties and the forties. As a matter of fact, *id est* occurs over a hundred times, *hoc est* only five times, four of these last being in his work De Fin. (2,16; 98; 4,56; 71) and one in the De Nat. Deor. (2,17). So also in his letters Ad Fam. *hoc est* occurs only twice 14,2,3 (*anno* 58); and 5,12,8 (*anno* 57). *Id est* stands 5,17,3 (*anno* 57) and in eleven other passages dating between the years 50 and 43¹.

¹Cicero's correspondents do not follow the orator in this particular. *Hoc est* was written by Asin. Pollio 10,32,2 (*anno* 43); Brutus, Ad Brutum 1,17,6 (*anno* 46); Caecina 6,7,4 (*anno* 46); Caelius 8,4,4; 8,9,3 (*anno* 51); Trebonius 12,16,1 (*anno* 44).

The same conditions are observable in the letters to Atticus and to Quintus. In the *De Oratore* (*anno* 55) *hoc est* occurs 1,180; 2,66. If in this formula *hoc* preserves to some extent its demonstrative force (and Cicero's consistent attitude would suggest that to him the two formulae were not strictly synonymous), the suggestion may with some hesitation be hazarded that *hoc est*, the stronger term, was found by Cicero more natural when in the height of his energy and power, while *id est* was a less forcible expression which he adopted after his spirits were crushed by his banishment. It may be objected to this explanation that it would be valid chiefly in explaining the usage in the orations and not so likely to hold true of the *De Inventione*. If we bring the use of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* into connection with that of Cicero, another explanation is suggested. The Auctor may have been under the influence of the Greek *τούτέστι* of his sources, and may thus have determined the usage of Cicero; or in view of the uncertainty of our knowledge of the relations of Cicero and the Auctor ad Herennium, it may be better to assume that the two writers were independently affected by Greek influence, to which Cicero's early training in rhetoric and philosophy exposed him. It may be unnecessary to assume the influence of any special book, since Cicero spoke Greek fluently. In this connection it is interesting to note that in the *Archiv für lat. Lexikogr. und Grammatik* X (1897), p. 478, Prof. J. C. Rolfe confirms (with additional evidence derived from the letters, philosophical and rhetorical works) the conclusions of H. Hellmuth (*Acta Sem. Erlangensis* 1, p. 120f.),

who, following up a suggestion of Wölfflin (Philologus XXXIV, 144), points out that between the years 62 and 54 B. C. Cicero gradually passed in his orations from the spelling *abs te* to *ab te*.⁴

The consistency with which Cicero's successors in Roman literature adopted his later practice speaks well for the soundness of his judgment, and suggests that *id est* was the normal and natural phrase. Varro shows *id est* sixty-eight times, not including the doubtful passages, two in the *Res Rust.* ([3, 2, 18; 3, 16, 3]) and four in the *De Ling. Lat.*, Livy four times (9, 19, 7—Müller here omits *id est*—; 10, 8, 10; 37, 15; 21, 10, 8) in books 1–40, Vitruvius twelve times (see Nohl's index), Velleius Paterculus 2, 23, 6; 48, 4; 63, 3; Valerius Maximus 2, 4, 1; 6, 6, 5; 8, 7 *Ext.* 2; 8, 9, 1; and Petronius offers seven instances (see Segebade u. Lommatzsch *s. v.*) while none of these writers use *hoc est*.

In Cæsar and Nepos both phrases are wanting. Sallust alone has an instance of *hoc est*: Jug. 31, 20 (in an oration) *uos autem, hoc est populus Romanus . . . satis habeatis*. In the same oration in § 26 *id est* occurs. The occurrence of *hoc est* in Catullus 83, 6 is not surprising in view of the results that we have reached in the first chapter.

A preference on the part of the writers of "Silver Latin" for *hic* over *is* makes itself felt from Seneca the Elder on, in the reappearance of *hoc est* (*cf.* Sen. Contr. 1, 1, 19). *Id est* occurs 9, 4, 11 an *hic pro patria fecerit, id est: an illo tempore . . .*; *cf.* 10, *pr.* 16; Exc. Contr. 7, 7. Ascon. Ped. in Pisonianam 52 has *hoc est*, and Seneca in *De Ben.*, *De Clem.*, *Ad Lucil.* returns to the later Ciceronian usage, showing 44 (+ ? 3) cases

of *id est*. In *De Ben.*, *De Clem.*, and *Ad Lucil.* 1-25 *hoc est* does not occur. Pliny, *N. H.* books 2, 3, 6-15, 23-30 has *hoc est* 39 times, *id est* 20 times. Frontinus[†] *De Aquis* 7 has *id est*; *De Contr. Agr.* p. 58, 14 (L) *hoc est*. Quintilian has *id est*: 3, 7, 15; 11, 28; 9, 4, 80; 1, 9, 1; 5, 49; 11, 12; 3, 5, 4; 5, 10, 86; *etc.*; *hoc est*: 3, 7, 1; 7, 1, 14; 8, 2, 20; 8, 3, 89 (a citation from Cassius). Pliny's Letters show *id est* nine times, *hoc est* five times; Panegy. *id est* twice, *hoc est* eight times.

The following conspectus shows the attitude of the later writers:

	ID EST	HOC EST
Balbus, <i>Ad. Cels.</i>	page 100, 10	None.
Hyginus Grom, <i>De Contr. Agr.</i>	9 times.	None.
“ “ <i>De Gen. Con.</i>	5 times.	None.
“ “ <i>De Lim. Const.</i>	None.	p, 170, 4; 171, 4.
Siculus Flaccus	Over five times.	
Fronto [M. Aureli uerba]	p. 213 N.	
Gellius, <i>Noct. Att.</i>	ca. 46 times.	9 times.
Florus	10 times.	
“ <i>De Virg. Or. an P.</i>	Once.	
Gains	At least 29 times.	
Suetonius	10 times.	3 times.
Acro ad Horat.	3, 5, 23.	3, 5, 24.
“ “ <i>Verr.</i>	3, 116.	
Decretum Commodi	Once.	
Censor. <i>De Die Nat.</i>	16 times.	5 times.
Porphy. in Horat.	355 + 31 doubtful or spurious.	1; 79 + 12 doubtful or spurious.
Volus. Maecianus	11; 14; 15; 29; 46; 65 <i>bis</i> ; 71 <i>bis</i> ; 72.	9; 10; 12; 13; 15; 65 <i>quinquies</i> ; 69; 72; 73.
Script. Hist. Aug.	None.	Hadr. 10, 2; Helius 2, 6; 5, 4;
	None.	Did. 8, 9; Pescen. 7, 6;
	None.	Ant. P. 2, 8; 7, 3; M. Aur. 5, 5.
	Macrin. 8, 4; Max. II 2, 4; 28, 8.	None.
	Gord. 2, 2; 3, 2; 5; 33, 1.	Gord. 3, 3.

	ID EST	HOC EST
Script. Hist. Aug.	Avid. Cas. [4,3.] Gall. 11,3; 21,5. XXX Tyr. 24,5; 32,5. Heliogab. 4,2; 3; 17,4. Alex. Sev. 15,3; 45,6; 61,2. Aurelian 22,1.	Avid Cas. [3,7.] Gall. 6,2; 19,4. None. Heliogab. 24,3. <i>do.</i> 6,2; 25,7; 39,6. Aurelian 32,4. p. [16,4.]
Frontinus		
Agennus Urbicus	p. 17,21; 25,9.	8,25; 23,24; 62,3; 63,12; 74,2; 77,7; 89,16.
Eutropius	One.	None.
Macrobius	At least 78 times.	Exc. Bob. V, p. 651 <i>bis</i> .
Boethius, De Consol.	2,7 ^b . 11.	
" De Arith.	Often.	Often.
" De Geom.	Passim.	Passim.
Justinian, Novellae (Authentica)	Passim.	Passim.
Cassiodorus	At least 15 times.	Once.
Jordanes	Passim.	None.
Schol. Gronov. in Cic.	30 times.	p. 392,41; 397,29 (Orelli).

Patristic Literature:

Min. Fel.	6.	None.
Tertullian	20.	None.
Cyprian	11.	6.
Arnobius	10.	Once.
Lactantius	11.	Once.
Firm. Matern.	8.	4.
Ambrosius	8.	4.
Paulin, Nolan, 1	12.	None.
Augustin. Epist.	Often.	Seldom.
Lucifer Car.	None.	7.
S. Silv. Peri.	"sescenties." 2	"raro." 2
Diaconi Lib.	116,5; 6; 13; 19; 118,6.	None.
Anton. Plac. It.	None.	184,3; 188,14; 19; 190,20; 15; (<i>om. C.</i>); 180,8; 163,7. 224,11; 228,1; 229, 5, <i>etc.</i>
Adamanus		Hoc est dicere 5.
Faustus	11.	
Planc. Fulg.	Often.	
Fulg. Episc.	Sup. Theb. p. 182,3; 5; 10; <i>etc.</i> , 28 times in all.	p. 183,9; 12.
Alcimus Avit.	14.	5.

The passages from the De Condic. Agr. are: pp. 114,8; 115,18 centuriae, id est plinthides, hoc est later-

1 Epistulae 1-46.

2 Geyer in *indice*.

culi; 116,13; 25; 117,3; 120,8; 18; 122,16; of the De Gen. Contr. pp. 125,14; 132,17; 133,1; [133,4]; 134,10. In the case of the De Lim. Const. the evidence confirms the view of a separate authorship for this work and for the De Contr. Agr. and the De Gen. Contr. The references to Siculus Flaccus are: pp. 146,8; 154,20; 155,22; 161,19; 163,25. Kalb, Roms Juristen p. 75 writes concerning Gaius "Wohl von keinem Juristen annährend so häufig wie bei G." Et hoc est quod uulgo dicitur occurs often, but hoc est as a parenthetical explanative seems to be foreign to him. In Suetonius id est occurs: Jul. 19; 56(*bis*); Oct. 26; 32; 88; Galb. 3; Domit. 17; frag. p. 293; 305; and hoc est: Tib. 24; Galb. 8; Vesp. 11. In Acro's commentary in Uerr. there are at least five further instances. For the Decretum Comm. see Bruns, Fontes p. 229,26. Hoc est is found in Censorinus, De Die Nat. 1,2; 8,6; 13,3; 14,10; 22,14. The figures for Porphyrio are based on Holder's index (1893). On Cassiodorius see Bayr. Gymn. = Blätt. 1898 (XXXIV),559. The figures for the Schol. Gronov. were privately communicated by H. Stangl of Munich.

This collection of examples shows that from Pliny the Elder on down to the seventh century both formulae were current. The only prominent writers to avoid hoc est are: Tacitus, Florus, Gaius, Macrobius and Jordanes. Id est always remained the normal form and with a few exceptions the one more frequently employed. One might at first glance be led to suppose that these conditions are reflected in or confirmed by the definition "id est · hoc est" in Götz, Corp. Glos. IV, p. 350,27, in which id est serves as

lemma, and might therefore be supposed to be the more frequent expression. Yet the examination of a number of glosses of the same collection shows that the writer (or compiler) did not necessarily make this distinction. Many definitions appear in double form. Thus "ob · propter" and "propter · ob" are found, each in its alphabetical order. The translator of Justinian's *Novellae* felt *id est* to be the normal form, since in translating *τοῦτέστι* he uses *hoc est*, but writes *id est* when not under such influence, *e. g.*, in translating *δὴ* (47, 2 *pr.*) and in interpolating an explanation of a Greek word (29, 5 *pr.* = p. 222, 30 Schöll) *biocolytas* (*id est uiolentiarum inhibitores*). (On the contrary Ignatius, *Epist. ad Phil.* 12 interpolates an explanation of *ἀντιθεοῦ* by means of *hoc est*. Here the codex Petavianus reads *id*).

The final triumph of *hoc est* is testified by the Italian *ciò* (< *ecce + hoc + est*).

To show how very close the words approach each other in meaning and usage, it is only necessary to cite a few parallel passages. For Cicero reference may be made to Klussmann, *Tulliana* (*Progr.*, Gera, 1887) p. 6 ff., who cites numerous instances without calling attention to any difference in meaning. The distinction with Cicero is, as we have seen above, in the main chronological and not semasiological.

Pliny the Elder.

2, 84 <i>quam diapason</i>	26, 103 <i>phycos tha-</i>
<i>harmoniam uocant, hoc</i>	<i>lassion, id est fucus</i>
<i>est uniuersitatem con-</i>	<i>marinus.</i>
<i>centus.</i>	

- | | |
|--|--|
| 11,266 . . . nisi quae pul-
monem et arterias ha-
beant, hoc est nisi quae
spirent. | 2,218 . . . pulsum uena-
rum, id est spiritus,
magis sentiunt. |
| 14,98 . . . labrusca, hoc
est uite siluestri. | 8,174 . . . ginnum, id est
paruum mulum. |

Numerous similar parallels might be adduced from Pliny.

Quintilian.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 8,2,20 ἀδιανόγητα, hoc est
quae uerbis aperta oc-
cultos sensus habent. | 3,5,4 . . . de iure . . . de
re; illud rationale, hoc
legale genus Herma-
goras atque eum secuti
uocant, id est νομικὸν et
λογικόν. |
| 3,7,1 . . . quod genus ui-
detur Aristoteles atque
eum secutus Theophra-
stus a parte negotiali,
hoc est πραγματικῆ, re-
mouisse. | |

Aulus Gellius.

- 19,1,18 τὰς τοιαύτας Φαντασίας, id est uisa istaec animi
sui terrifica, non adrobat, hoc est οὐ συγκατατίθεται . . . ;
5,12,5 'Marspater,' hoc enim est (cf. 17,8,2 *id* enim
est) 'Marspiter,' itemque Iouis 'Diespiter' appellatus,
id est diei et lucis pater.

Cyprian.

De Domenica Oratione 17 quomodo in caelo, id est in
nobis per fidem nostram uoluntas Dei facta est ut esse-
mus e caelo, ita et in terra, hoc est in illis credere
nolentibus fiat uoluntas Dei.

Ambrosius, Exameron.

1,1,1(B) artificem ad exemplar, hoc est ideam intendentem. 1,7,25(13F) materia, id est ὕλη, sicut philosophi dicunt.

Censorinus, De Die Nat.

1,2 τῶν μέσων, hoc est . . . media. 18,12 pentaeteridas . . . id est IV annorum circuitus.

Macrobius, Som. Scip. 1, 3,7 φάντασμα uero, hoc est uisum. Ennius, Sac. Hist. *apud* Lactant. Inst. 1,11,46 ΖΑΝ ΚΡΟΝΟΥ id est Latine Iuppiter Saturni.

Priscillian.

6,107 = p. 79,8 ex ignis et haedis, idest ex duobus in unum hominem nouum corporis et spiritus castificatione suscepta pascha domini et pascha nostrum, hoc est Christus in homine et homo inueniatur in Christo; p. 102,9 (*cf.* Psalm 59,11) circumuersa mundi || Greek, περιωχή; *varia lectio* circumstantia || idest perfidiae terra uincatur ut calciamento pedum domini, hoc est Euangelio pacis ostenso destruat Dagon.

Macrobius.

Sat. 1,23,7 siue ἀπὸ τοῦ δαιομένου, id est χαιομένου, seu ἀπὸ τοῦ δαιομένου, hoc est μεριζομένου.

Som. Scip. 1,5,17 in numeros pariter pares, hoc est in bis quaterna, ut . . . in numeros aequae pariter pares diuisio quoque ipsa soluat, id est bis bina bis.

Lex Romana Visigothorum.

(Gai Inst. Tit. 8,3), p. 332 (Haenel) agnati sunt per uirilem sexum . . . coniuncti, id est consanguinei fra-

tres, hoc est, de uno patre nati. item patruus, id est, frater patris, fratris sui filio agnatus est. ipso modo sunt fratres patruales, hoc est, qui *etc.*

Similar parallels are of frequent occurrence and it is apparent that in many instances the writer has aimed only to secure variety of expression.

The chief uses of *id* (*hoc*) *est* are the following:

1. To translate a foreign word. Examples above. Add Tac. Ger. 40.
2. To give the application of a metaphorical expression. Varro, Res Rust. 3,4,1.
3. To explain a Latin expression by
 - a) giving a more familiar synonym. Varro, Res. Rust. 2,4,17 *fringere...id est frangere.*
 - b) 1) stating all its component parts. Auct. ad Heren. ll. cc. Cic. De Re Pub. 3,6 *quare qui utrumque uoluit et potuit, id est ut cum maiorum institutis tum doctrina se instrueret...*
 - 2) *vice versa* stating a common characteristic of a number of particulars mentioned. Cic. Laelius 65 *simplicem praeterea et communem et consentientem, id est, qui rebus isdem moveatur, eligi par est.*
 - c) stating one or more of the component parts either 1) any chance one cited to illustrate the general expression: Varro, De Ling. Lat. 5,93 *artificibus maxima causa (sc. nominandi) ars, id est, ab arte medicina ut sit medicus dictus; so 10,40, where the formula approaches exempli gratia in meaning.*
 - or 2) that element which is

especially appropriate to the context, and to which the writer directs particular attention: Tac. Dial. 3,21; *9 extr*; 22,8...orationibus, quas iam senior et iuxta finem uitae composuit, id est, postquam magis profecerat, usuque et experimentis didicerat quod optimum dicendi genus esset.

3) This often takes the form of a correction of a general statement: Plin. Nat. Hist. 2,131; Cic. Ad Fam. 14,2,3 quod de domo scribis, hoc est de area....

d) combining with a synonymous expression a statement of the ground (Cic. De Leg. 2,27) or purpose (object to be attained) for an action: Varro, Res Rust. 3,9,2...ornithoboscioni instituire uolt, id est adhibita scientia ac cura ut capiant magnos fructus.

e) correcting a false application (intended to deceive) of a word by some other person. The implication is usually "A or B call it so and so, but if we should strip it of its fair appellation, we should find it in reality to be so and so" (*cf.* Klusmann, Tulliana): Cic. Verr. 3,67...cum apparitoribus, id est cum uī ac minis (Müller reads eo for id est); Milo. 24...ad praeturam gerendam, hoc est ad euertendam rem publicam, plenum annum et integrum. In the reverse order in Verr. 5,114.

It seems desirable at this point to call attention to the difference between *id est* and *idque*. They are not discriminated with sufficient care in Gudeman's note on Tac. Dial. 3,21 (in his larger edition p. 78). "In Germ. 40 *id est* = 'that is to say'. In other passages Tacitus uses '*idque*': Ann. IV, 11; 39; XIII, 45." The essential difference between Germ. 40 and the

passages Dial. 3,21; *gextr*; 22,8 is clear from the preceding analysis. *Idque* in the passages cited introduces (like *καὶ ταῦτα*) words which describe the circumstances under which an action takes place. These are usually quite surprising or contrary to expectation (hence not usually implied in the term preceding *idque*, while with *id est*, *etc.*, the definition is rarely, if ever, contrary to what would be expected), and to them especial importance is attached. They are in no wise to be regarded as a definition or a translation of the first term, such as are introduced by *id est*, *hoc est*, *quod est* (*ὃ ἐστίν*).

4. *Ad id and ad hoc.*

In each of these phrases two meanings are to be distinguished. They are used to express purpose and as an equivalent to *praeterea*. In the latter sense *ad hoc* is used to the almost entire exclusion of *ad id*. Sallust, in whose works it makes its first appearance, was especially fond of it (Constans, *De Serm. Sall.* p. 132 "Peculiari amore dilexit ac saepissime usurpavit, quam locutionem Lawsius parum recte contendit antiquorum imitationem redolere"). Certain peculiarities of Sallust's usage are possibly due to the development of his style. In his *Bellum Catulinae*, his earliest work, it is in five cases (A) correlated with other adverbial expressions: 37 *primum omnium—deinde—praeterea—praeterea—ad hoc—*; 14,3 *praeterea—ad hoc—postremo—*; 17,4 *praeterea—ad hoc—praeterea—*; 21,4 *praeterea—ad hoc—*; 30,6 *ad hoc—itemque—*. (B) Not thus correlated it stands four times: 26,4; 31,3; 44,6; 53,3. In the *Bellum Jugur-*

thinum the latter, more independent usage predominates (6,1; 67,1; 85,4; 89,5; 96,2; 102,6), there being only three instances of the former: 6,3; 75,5; 111,2 primo—praeterea—ad hoc—denique—; the first two having praeterea—ad hoc—, while ad hoc—ad hoc—is used in 31,28. In his maturest work, the *Historiae*, only (B) occurs. In group (A) it is used either to introduce a substantive or an entire sentence, the former invariably extended by an adjectival modifier, which is usually a relative clause. In group (B) it is not until the *Bellum Jugurthinum* that Sallust uses the phrase to introduce a substantive. So 2,2 igitur praecleara facies, magnae diuitiae, ad hoc uis corporis et alia omnia huiuscemodi breui dilabuntur, at...; cf. 17,6. This is the only usage which occurs in the *Historiae* (*Orat. Phil.* 21; *Fr. Hist.* 3,77,7 < ad hoc > a generally accepted conjecture of Kreyzig, entirely conforms to the Sallustian usage). A transitional type is *Jug.* 91,5.

Nepos does not use the phrase, but it again finds favor with Livy, and was extensively used by later writers, especially by the historians Velleius Paterculus, Curtius (at least eight cases), Tacitus (eight occurrences), Suetonius and Florus (twelve times), as also by Pliny the Younger. The phrase is especially appropriate to narration and description.

In books 1-10, 21-40 of Livy's *History* (thirty-eight instances in all) it is in no single instance (40,25, 4 is not to the point) correlated with praeterea or another adverbial expression. It occurs both as introducing entire sentences (2,23,4; 6,12,6; 20,8; 9,24,6; 21,54,8; 55,7; 23,32,9; 28,35,2; 44,2; 5; 29,26,8; 30,

17,14; 32,17,15; 33,4,4; 9,11; 35,12,11; 38,5,5; 39,53,4; 40,25,4) and substantives (2,59,11; 5,16,2; 8,12,4; 23,22,3; 28,14,17; 29,4,6; 31,40,10; 33,19,10; 34,52,6; 36,40,12; 37,23,2; 38,17,4; 39,5,16). Rather loosely connected with the preceding words and forming a kind of after-thought attached to the completed sentence are 7,12,2 and particularly 30,34,1, in which the added element may be regarded as a distinct sentence with its verb suppressed for rhetorical effect. Our Paduan historian somewhat extends the functions of the phrase. He uses it to introduce an adjective (21,52,10 *sparsos et incompositos, ad hoc grauis praeda plerosque...*) and a participle (21,31,11 *... amnis ... pluribus ... alueis fluens, ... ad hoc saxa glareosa uoluens nihil... tutum... praebet; 40,9... debilitati...; ad hoc praeusti artus...; cf. 6,11,6; 32,17,15.*) With him the substantive is rarely modified by a relative clause, and in one passage (an extremely rare case) the substantive stands entirely alone (28,14,17). In Sallust the grammatical form of the member introduced by *ad hoc* corresponds to that of the preceding member. Livy boldly varies the construction: 6,11,6... *inflato animo, ad hoc uitio quoque ingenii uehemens et inpotens...*; 5,16,2 *multis simul bellis, Uolsorum... Aequorum... ad hoc Ueientique et Falisco... bello occupatos; 33,19,10... cum classe ... ad hoc leuioribus nauigii...* In certain passages Livy seemed to feel that this formula was not sufficiently strong to meet his needs and has supported it by *etiam* (33,9,11) and *quoque* (*supra*). In 23,22,3 it seems to be scarcely stronger than simple *et*. The formula itself, however, serves as conjunction and is

not, like *praeterea* (in *Bell. Afr.* 19,1; 25,2; 50,2; *Afranius* 72), supported by *et* or *que* (as *Caes. Bell. Gall.* 3, 17,3; *Bell. Civ.* 2,35,5; 3,96,1) or used with the cor-relatives *cum . . . tum* (as in *Cicero*).

In the letters and *Panegyricus* of *Pliny* (fifteen cases) we find a return to the *Sallustian* usage *praeterea—ad hoc*. He has further 9,26,8f. *et rursus—et statim— . . . ex eadem nota—simile his—et ibidem—et—et deinceps—ad hoc—et mille talia . . .* New is the order: *ad hoc—praeterea* (2,11,10). He employs predominantly the substantive, and was particularly fond of the sentences like *Livy* 30,34,1. So: 2,14,1 *raro incidit (sc. causa) . . . insignis. ad hoc pauci (sc. nunc causas agunt) cum quibus iuuet dicere*; 2,11,10 *con-spectus augustissimus fuit. princeps praesidebat: erat enim consul. ad hoc Ianuarius mensis . . . celeberrimus*; *Pan.* 77*m* *ad hoc tam adsiduus . . . ut*; 1, 22,4 *ad hoc quam parcus (sc. fuit) . . .*; 6,33,4.

The *Tacitean* examples are with a single exception found in the *Annals*. The only peculiarity he shows in his usage of the phrase lies in the order of the words in *Hist.* 1,6,10 *multi ad hoc numeri e Germania ac Britannia et Illyrico, quos . . .*, which, with *Ann.* 12,20,5, offers the type of *Livy* 30,34,1. *Ad hoc* postpositive, of which I can cite only the two further examples *Florus* 1,24(2,8),16 *elephantis ad hoc immensae magnitudinis . . .*; *Suetonius, Nero* 46, 1 *terrebatur ad hoc eudentibus portentis . . .* is quite possibly due to the influence of the analogous use of *praeterea*. The main verb precedes it in *Cic. Sex. Rosc.* 100 *Audio praeterea . . .*; *De Leg. Agr.* 2,32 *dat praeterea . . .*; *Cluent.* 81 *accusatus est praeterea . . .*

Praeterea in Cicero and Cæsar is, in fact, as often postpositive as it is initial. The order Adjective—praeterea—Substantive (as above) was an especial favorite (so Cic. Verr. 2,170 *multarum praeterea ciuitatum* . . . Numerous examples in Merguet's *Lexica*): so also Verr. 5,34 *cuiusquam pr. dedecus*; Sex. Rosc. 133 *quid pr. caelati argenti* and even Verr. 2,120 *quod enim iste pr. genus*. In all other cases Tacitus uses *ad hoc* to introduce an entire sentence 12,34,1; 13,34,14; 14,24,3; 31,15; 15,4,5; 38,13.

Florus like Livy, is fond of breaking the monotony of the exact grammatical conformity of the expressions preceding and following *ad hoc*. Examples are: 1,45(3,10),25 *ciuitatem, uallo sudibus et fossa induc-
toque fossae flumine, ad hoc XVIII castellis . . . cir-
cumdatam . . . domuit*; 2,21(4,11),5 *quippe a senis in
uouenos remorum ordines, ad hoc turribus atque tabu-
latis adleuatae . . . ferebantur*.

The two following correlations are new: 2,13(4,2), 40 *nunc—nunc—ad hoc—iam uero*; 2,13(4,2),91 *ad hoc—nouissime—*, to which may be added from Paulinus of Nola, *Epist.* 5,4(p. 27,13-17) *praeterea—ad hoc—postea denique . . .* The other instances from Florus (he does not use *ad id* = *praeterea* nor *ad hoc* to express purpose) are 1,7(13),4; 24(2,8),3; (2,8),16 (postpositive); 34(2,18),10; (2,19),3; 38(3,3),13; 2,21(4,11),6.

Of the synonymous expressions, *hoc amplius* was the most extensively used. *Super haec* found favor with both Plinys (see *Nat. Hist.* 3,138; 7,98 and *Epist.* 8,4,2; 4,26,2). *Ad haec* occurs from Curtius to Boethius. *Ad huc* (with which *adde huc* could easily be

confused, especially when the following words were neuters) is very close to ad hoc in Sen. Nat. Quaest. 4,8 (other examples in Goelzer, Grammaticae in Sulp. Sev. Quaest. p. 92, Anm. 4), but ultimately became so weakened that Cyprian, Ad Dem. 12 could write adhuc insuper, and Alcimus Avitus, Contr. Eut. Her. I, p. 25, 15...habemus hic adhuc amplius, quod mirari oportet.

Ad hoc accedere (*cf.* Bell. Hisp. 41 tum praeterea accedebat) and the like do not, strictly speaking, belong here.

When ad id is used in this sense, it is followed, so far as I know, by the relative quod, so that ad id quod = praeter id quod.

To express purpose both phrases are extensively employed. The rivalry between them had not apparently begun in Cicero. In Verr. 3, 188; De Re Pub. 1, 58 hoc retains its full force as *πρωτότριτον*, while ad id is used by him normally with the relative quod. Neither Caesar nor Varro have ad hoc, although Caesar, Bell. Civ. 1, 81 has ad id expeditiores (corrected by Faern to ad iter), and Varro, Res Rust. 2 *pr*, 5 ad id (*i. e.*, ad agrum stercorandum) pecus adpositum. Nepos has neither. So the rivalry between the two phrases begins with Livy. Aside from 1, 8, 4 ad id hominum and 2, 3, 6; 4, 54, 5, in which cases it is followed by the relative quod, ad id occurs in Livy (books 1-10) about sixteen times. Ad id regularly completes the meaning of a past passive participle, *e. g.*, 1, 10, 5 fabricato ad id apte ferculo; 4, 37, 4 ad id

missi; 7,39,14 qui ad id missi erant; 5,24,4 triumphique ad id creati; 7,12,9 ad id accitus; 9,13,2 dato ad id signo; 9,26,16 ad id parum potentes. The intrusion of hoc in such contexts is seen by comparing any of the above passages with 1,47,9 alii iam ante ad hoc praeparati. Parallel are also 5,52,11 collegium ad id (*i. e.*, for celebrating newly introduced religious services) nouum condidimus and 4,34,6 nec lato satis ad hoc (*i. e.*, ut classi pugnari possit) amne. In 2,42,5 and 40,48,4 id and hoc respectively are strengthened by ipsum. Contrary to what might be expected, if hoc retained its full force, ad hoc does not in Livy look forward, as does ad id (see 6,42,1; 7,30,4 ad id ualere, ut . . .), to a following clause. This usage occurs, however, in Pliny the Elder, books 9,13,23-30, and it finds application not only as in Livy in conjunction with the participium passivum (9,122 ad hoc productus; 29,34 detonsam) or activum (9,77 ad hoc sufficientibus) and adjectiva (28,42 efficacior ad hoc), but also (with the indicative as well as the participle) prepares the way for a following ut or ne (9,182 ad hoc prodest, ne . . .; 27,146 ad hoc parens, ut . . .). In 10,1 ad hoc datis pinnis, ad hoc = praeterea. In these books ad id occurs but three times (12,63 porta ad id una patente; 15,26 optima laurus ad id latifolia siluestris; 28,193 efficacior ad id), always referring to what precedes (*cf.* 9,86 ad ea). Pliny's preference for ad hoc may be compared with his preference for hoc est noted above. Conversely he uses ob id more freely than ob hoc (see below).

Curtius appears not to have used ad id, but resembles Pliny in the use of ad hoc, *e. g.*, 4,8,4 ad hoc

(*sc.* ut claustra Nili fluminis tueatur Polemon) XXX triremes datae; 5,5,22 C ad hoc electi sunt; 8,1,12 spatiosas ad hoc (*i. e.*, ad feras uenandas) eligunt siluas. Tacitus shows a decided preference for ad id to express purpose. It occurs Ann. 1,81,7 suam ad id curam; Hist. 2,22,9 contra praetoriani dispositos ad id ipsum molares...prouoluunt. Agr. 38,15 datae ad id uires.

Florus has no instance of ad id expressing purpose (neither does he use ad id = praeterea). In 2,17 (4,7),13 he uses in id missus for ad id missus.

Later writers use both forms. In general ad hoc is more common in the patristic literature.

Ad hoc looking forward to a following clause (consecutive) takes on the meaning of tam (ita), as in Lucifer Caralitanus, De Reg. Apost. 7(= p. 51,22) ad hoc sis post tanta funera tua superbus, ut aut audiens nos Dei sacerdotes temet conuertas ad Deum.

5. Ob id and ob hoc.

According to Reissinger, Ueber Bedeutung und Verwendung der Präpositionen ob und propter in älteren Latein p. 42 these two expressions occur for the first time in Cicero; in the orations only ob hoc (Caecin. 73 o rem praeclarum uobisque ob hoc retinendum, recuperatores || hoc *omit.* Tegernseensis ||), in the philosophical writings only ob id (always strengthened by ipsum, and in De Fin. 3,63; Tusc. Disp. 1,11; 13; 5,95 looking forward to quia or quod). In De Leg. 2,12 *id* is a conjecture of Lambin. In Ad Fam. 1,9,16 ob id ipsum is taken up by in quo...superasset. Sallust has et ob id Fr. Hist. 1,77,18

(= Orat. Phil. 18) and in no other instance. No other prose writer earlier than Livy uses the phrases. Ovid, Met. 12,91 has *ob hoc*, and Horace, Ars Poet. 393 *ob hoc*.

As in the case of *ad id* and *ad hoc*, so with the present formulae, the frequent use begins with Livy. In books 1-10, 21-40 *ob id* occurs thirteen times (+ *ob ea* three times), *ob hoc* five times (+ *ob haec* eighteen times). Livy, however, distinguishes carefully in usage between these two words. In all but two instances (25,16,3, where *ob* rests on conjecture [*cf.* Fleckeisens Jahrb. 1881, 683], and 34,42,6 *et cum ob id se pro ciuibus Romanis ferrent*) *ob id* is used to modify an adjective (including participles): 5,29,3 *segni- ob id ipsum*; 21,47,1 *et ob id aptos*; 25,13,7 *castigatus*; 23,13 *ob id ipsum intentius*; 35,7 *quietis*; 26,13,6 *diminuto*; 28,2,2 *occulta*; 31,31,16 *plures ob id ipsum*; 34,55,1 *indictarum*; 37,24,5 *celerius*; 39,19,5 *fraudi esset*. *Ob ea* is similarly used 8,15,5; 40,1,5. *Ea*, however, in 40,45,7 has a definite antecedent, *prodigia*. *Ob hoc* on the contrary is used only with the non-adjectival forms of the verb: 25,37,17 *ob hoc cum omnia neglecta apud hostes essent*; 30,30,28 *non nihil etiam ob hoc, quia . . .*; 34,4,15 *ne ob hoc ipsum contemnantur*; 50,4 *acclamarunt gratias se inter cetera etiam ob hoc agere, quod*; 39,4,7 *donec consuli ob hoc (proleptic) ipsum moranti Romam redire libitum esset*. *Ob haec* stands almost invariably at the beginning of a sentence, and refers to the content of the preceding sentence: 1,40,5 after three reasons are stated they are summed up by *ob haec ipsi regi insidiae parantur*. 3,53,2 *ob haec iis aduenientibus gratiae actae*. 21,

53,11 cum ob haec taliaque speraret (*cf.* 8,23,3 ob haec cum); 9,45,8 ob haec uolgo in conciliis iactata; 37,48,4 ob haec Aetolos sustulisse animos et adnuisse imperata facere; 5,51,1 et ob eadem haec; 9,38,9; 10,21,13; 21,50,11; 63,5; 27,30,1; 28,39,13 gratias actumlegatos. . . .misit; 32,22,12; 35,13,10; 37,34,8. The only exception seems to be 28,39,15 non grates tantum ob haec agere iussi sumus, sed. . . , since in 10,31,8 libri ob haec aditi, the word haec refers to a definite antecedent.

Seneca the Rhetorician in his use of ob id has kept closer to the correlative use of id by employing it only (he reads elsewhere id ipsum) when followed by a causal or substantive quia- or quod-clause (twelve cases: *Contr.* 1,1,13; 14; 4,6; 8,7; 2,1,20; 2,3,11; 14*bis*; 9,1,9; 10,5,15; *Exc. Contr.* 1,1). Ob hoc (ob hoc ipsum four times) is always used with a verbal form, nine times with damnare, accusare and petere (*Contr.* 1,1 *pr.* 1,8,15 || ob hoc MSS. ab hoc *corr.* W. Müller || ; 2,1,34; 2,6,4; 5 *tris*; 7,6,13 *bis*; 9,5,8; 10,3,10 < ob > hoc || ob *suppl.* W. Müller || ; 11 ob < hoc >. *Exc. Contr.* 4,3 ob hoc quod; 4,5 ob hoc maxime quia; 1,7,14 ob hoc ipsum quod; 7,2,12 ob hoc ipsum quod; 10,2,17 ob hoc ipsum, without quod; 9,1,6 ob hoc uidelicet ipsum ut. . . .).

Valerius Maximus (4,1,7 ne ob id; 8,1,12 cum ob id; et ob id occurs: 2,10,7 (the codices Laur. and Bern. omit the et in this passage); 5,9,3; 6,1,7; 7,3 *Exter*, 10; 8,14 *Exter*, 1; 9,3 *Exter*, 3) and Vell. Paterc. 2,112,2 show only ob id. Curtius agrees with Livy in using ob id with Adjectives and Participles, and ob hoc with the non-adjectival forms of the verb: 4,16,7 maiore et

ob id tutiore circuitu; 8,14,19 humo lubrica et ob id impediēte; 4,16,23 auidum certaminis et ob id ipsum incautius; 4,10,22 nepos paruulus, ob id ipsum miserabilis, quod . . . ; 4,14,4 ob id ipsum, quod ignoti essent, ignobiles esse; 7,2,2 horum ob id ipsum melior est causa, quod ego . . . suspectus sum; 3,5,9 laxataque uis morbi ob hoc solum uidebatur, quia magnitudinem mali sentiebat; 6,3,13 . . . Dareum ob hoc uicimus, ut seruo eius traderemus imperium; 4,10,31 ob haec ipsa (*i. e.* conditions just described) amantis animus in sollicitudinem suspicionemque reuolutus est; 9,8,24 ob haec. In 10,5,5 id is adjectival. The single instance of ob ea is 6,8,3, a very unusual passage.

Pliny, Nat. Hist., books 2, 3, 6-15, 23-30, has ob id over fifty times, ob hoc fifteen times. Typical illustrations of his usage are: Ob id: 1) with Adjectives: 7,104 ob id . . . utilis; 11,41 ob id . . . simile; 11,249 ob id . . . pernicious; 9,9 Tiberio principi nuntiauit Olisiponensium legatio ob id (proleptic) missa uisum auditumque in quodam specu concha canentem Tritonem; 2) with Verbs: 2,43 captus . . . traditus; especially with verbs of naming: uocare (9,38; 109; 12,54), appellare (11,244), cognominare (7,68; 8,33 ob idque); 15,13. Ob hoc: 9,89 consecrantibus; 8,42 magna his libido (*sc. est*) . . . et ob hoc . . . ira; 11,99 appellatus; 2,146 quae ob hoc fingitur. Ob hoc occurs also 8,109; 122; 10,17; 212; 11,198; 13,28 *et al.*; et ob hoc: 12,45; ob hoc ipsum: 9,75. Both ob id and ob hoc are used by decided preference with the non-adjectival forms of the verb.

Frontinus has nothing new to tell us.

Pliny the Younger uses ob hoc exclusively, once

looking backward (5,19,6 sanguinem reiecit adque ob hoc in Aegyptum missus a me...), in all other instances pointing to a following quod (causal), ne or ut. The instances are 4,8,4 te quidem, ut scribis, ob hoc maxime delectat auguratus meus, quod....; 6,1,2 reuertar, uel ob hoc solum, ut experiar an....; 7,3,3 tempus est te reuisere molestias nostras, uel ob hoc solum, ne....; 7,7,2 te negotiis distingere ob hoc moleste fero, quod...non potes; Ad Traian. 29(38),2 ipse enim dubito ob hoc maxime, quod....; 75(79),2 quod in notitiam tuam perferendum existimaui ob hoc maxime, ut....; 49(53),1 est aedes uetustissima Matris Magnae aut reficienda aut transferenda; ob hoc praecipue, quod....

Tacitus has only ob id (since he writes ob haec instead of ob hoc) and this only in the Annals (*cf.* Wölfflin, Phil. XXV,XXVI,XXVII): 3,42,9 Iulius Indus...discors Floro et ob id nouandae operae audior; 3,75,9 sed Labeo incorrupta libertate, et ob id fama celebratior; 6,9,8 seu composerat quaedam in Gaium Cæsarem ut impudicum, siue ficto habita fides. atque ob id conuictu principis prohibitus cum....; 6,8,2 ausus est...M. Terentius, ob id reus, amplecti (*sc.* Seiani amicitiam); 6,25,12 actae ob id grates decretumque (*sc.* est); 14,60,7 actae ob id de ancillis quaestiones....; 2,35,4 Piso...ob id magis agendas (*sc.* res) censebat, ut....; 2,66,9 Cæsar...Pomponium Flaccum, ueterem stipendiis et arta cum rege amicitia eoque accommodatiorem ad fallendum, ob id maxime Moesiae praefecit. Ob ea occurs Ann. 2, 87,3; 11,25,17. Ob haec occurs 12,65,3; 13,41,18; 14,64,10.

Suetonius has both phrases. He felt *id* to be so weak a word that he reinforces it with *ipsum*. Otho 1 *quamuis ob id ipsum (quod praepositos suos occiderant) promotos (sc. milites) in ampliorem gradum . . . sciret*; Julius 8 *colonias Latinas ad audendum aliquid concitasset, nisi consules . . . legiones paulisper ob id ipsum retinuisset*; Tib. 65 *collegam sibi adsumpsit . . . quem longo interuallo absens ob id ipsum susceperat*; Galba 10 . . . *adstante nobili puero, quem . . . ob id ipsum acciuerat, deplorauit temporum statum*; Vitel. 14 *quosdam . . . ob id ipsum ("simply on the charge") quod . . . , interemit*. The only exception is Dom. 10 *impudicos probauerant et ob id (n)ullius momenti esse potuisse*. In the Lives of the Cæsars there are three instances of *ob hoc* (always *et ob hoc*): Aug. 94 *Augustum natum mense decimo, et ob hoc Apollinis filium existimatum*; Dom. 17 *professus . . . conspirationis indicium et ob hoc admissus*; Tib. 70 *imitatus (sc. Tiberius est) Euphorionem et Rhianum . . . et ob hoc plerique . . . multa de his ediderunt*; Frag. Gram. 3 *et ob hoc repudiatus*; 16 *suspectus . . . et ob hoc remotus*; Frag. Rhet. 5 *uel magis ob hoc*.

Of the later writers the following show only *ob hoc* (or *ob haec*):

Justin—in every case at the beginning of a sentence—(*ob hoc*: 12,3,7 *diebus uatis*; 16,1,5 *gesturus*; *ob haec*: 12,6,15; 13,4; 17,2,15; 20,2,5). Script. Hist. Aug. (*ob hoc*: Hadr. 3,3; 10; M. Ant. 7,3; 14,5; Verus 3,6; Hel. 3,8; Commod. 4,8; Pert. 7,2; Did. Jul. 3,7; Sev. 9,10; Pesc. 2,3; Car. 3,3; 4,5; 8,3; Geta 2,2; 4; Heliog. 9,2; Alex. Sev. 63,5; Maximini 11,8; Gord. 28,5; Gall. 2,2; XXX Tyran. 22,3; and

one further passage; *ob haec*: Alex. Sev. 50,2). In this work *atque ob hoc* and *et ob hoc* are favorite phrases, and *ob hoc* tends to gravitate toward the following *ut* or *quod*, *etc.*, in some instances standing at the very end of its clause just before these conjunctions. *De Viris Illustribus* (*ob hoc*: 11,2; 26,3; *ob haec*: 33,10; 48,5; 56,5). *Aur. Vict. Hist. Abbr.* (20, 17 *ob haec tanta*; 39,41 *ob ea*).

Thus we see that within a period of four generations from their first appearance in the literature, these two phrases, probably following the analogy of the older phrases *ob eam rem* (*eas res*), *ob eam causam*, and of *eo*, *ideo*, *propterea*, *etc.*, developed a great variety of usages. The present sketch is of course only an outline. Their history can be written only by viewing them in connection with the other causal adverbs and adverbial phrases. By the time of Pliny the Younger both phrases had come to be so freely used that the individual writers show great variety in their employment.

B. THE CORRELATIONS *HIC—ILLE*, *HIC—HIC*,
ILLE—ILLE, *etc.*

In these correlations we likewise find clear indications of a weakening of meaning of the pronoun *hic* (as also of *ille*). For *iste—ille* see below pp. 132-137. We begin with the correlation—

1. **Hic—ille**, since it was the normal form by which contrasts were expressed, and was doubtless developed as early as the other two phrases, since it is as old as the words themselves. Such natural con-

trasts occur not infrequently in Plautus and Terence and call for no special comment. A word may not be amiss, however, on the relative position of the elements introduced by these words. With the Auctor ad Herennium it had become a matter of indifference which of the two pronouns preceded, as is shown by 4, 19, 26 *membrum . . . articulus . . . inter huius generis et illius superioris uehementiam hoc interest: illud (the former, membrum) tardius . . . uenit, hoc . . . crebrius peruenit . . . itaque in illo genere . . . , in hoc autem . . .* While it is true that the three sets of contrasts *huius—illius*, *illud—hoc*, *illo—hoc* are not strictly coordinate, yet *illud—hoc* and *illo—hoc* stand in the same relation to *huius—illius*, as that in which this last correlation stands to *mem.—art.* The order *huius—illius* is readily accounted for by the widely extended Roman practice of employing *hic* at the beginning of a new thought to refer to an immediately preceding idea, a usage similar to the normal usage of *is*. Various reasons could be suggested that might have motivated the change to the order *illud—hoc*. Livy makes the same change 39, 53, 3 (*Demetrius*) . . . *Perseus . . . , hunc . . . illum . . . ; illum . . . hunc* (*cf.* 22, 39, 4 *Terentio . . . Hannibale . . . hic . . . ille . . . , illo . . . hoc . . .*). Cicero and Velleius Paterculus seemed to find nothing objectionable in a sustained series of these alternatives recurring in the same order: *Orat. in Cat. 2, 25 ex hac parte . . . illinc, hinc . . . illinc, hinc . . . illinc, hinc . . . illinc, hinc . . . illinc, hinc . . . illinc, hinc . . . illinc, hinc . . . denique . . . ; Vell. Pat. 2, 84, 1 in hac parte . . . in illa, hinc . . . illinc, haec . . . illa, hinc . . . illinc, . . . denique . . .* Velleius has

clearly modeled his sentence on Cicero's, but has improved upon it by introducing the agreeable change from Adverb to Adjective. Pliny the Younger 9,7,3 f. varies it still more: *duae (sc. uillae). altera . . . altera; illam . . . hanc, haec . . . illa: haec . . . illa; illic . . . hic: illa . . . haec: ex illa . . . ex hac . . .* The correlation is rare in Cicero, notwithstanding the general acceptance of Raschig's conclusion that it is common in the orators and rhetorical writers. The Ciceronian example is paralleled by Cyprian, *De Cath. Eccl. Unit.* 19 *hic (sc. in lapso) . . . illic, hic . . . illic, hic . . . illic, hic . . . illic, hic . . . illic, lapsus . . . ille, lapsus . . . ille . . .* The order *ille . . . hic* recurs in Sallust, *Cat.* 11,2; 54,2; *Jug.* 85,2 (*cf. Cat.* 12,4 f; 58,14; *Jug.* 85,22), who also has in *Jug.* 94,5 *Romanis hostibusque . . . his, illis . . .* Both orders occur in Curtius, *e. g.*, 3,1,17 *illa . . . haec* 3,11,24 *mater coniunxque Darei: illa . . . , haec . . . ;* 6,1,8 *illi . . . hi . . . ;* 4,17 *illos . . . hos . . . ;* 10,2,16 *illos . . . hos . . . ;* 4,1,40 *has aut illas partes secuti.* His natural order is thus seen to be *ille . . . hic*, since in the last passage he had no choice but to follow custom, which had already established the invariable order *hic . . . ille* in the brief phrases *hic—illic, hic et (atque, aut, uel) illic, et (aut, uel) hic et (aut, uel) illic* for the adverbial forms as well as for the substantive and adjectival forms of the pronouns. In Tacitus the instances of the correlation are about equally divided between the two orders. By the later writers both orders are freely used.

In our discussion of the meaning of this correlation we shall find it desirable to distinguish between the adverbial forms on the one hand and the substan-

tive and adjectival forms on the other. We take up first the latter class.

In the examples thus far cited each demonstrative retains its full and normal meaning. This is also true to a certain extent of the 'so-called rhetorical usage of this correlation, in accordance with which the two pronouns are employed to refer to two antecedents mentioned in the context immediately preceding, so that they take on the meaning "the former—the latter." The earliest extant example is, as is well known, that found in a fragment of Accius (frag. 4 p. 137 Ribb.).

Tu pertinaciam esse, Antiloche, hanc praedicas,
Ego peruicaciam aio et ea me uti uolo:

Haec (*sc.* peruicacia) fortis sequitur, illam indocti possident.

From the semasiological standpoint this usage scarcely differs from the normal usage of the pronouns, since *haec* refers to the quality that the speaker wishes to possess, while *illam* refers to that in which he would have no interest. We may the more confidently assume that, although for the most part, Accius gave in his tragedies a fairly close translation of the Greek original, he was not influenced in the present instance by the Greek οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος, or even by ὁ μὲν . . . ὁ δὲ to use *haec*—*illam* to express the contrast, since the above passage bears on its face clear indications of being an original contribution of the Roman poet.

If we now turn to Cicero's *De Nat. Deor.* 1,47 we shall find for the first time in a Roman prose writer a usage which implies an important change in the mean-

ing of the word: *nam Cotta meus modo hoc modo illud* (*sc. facit*). In this passage neither pronoun has a definite antecedent. The vague antecedent of *hoc* does not stand any closer to the speaker's sympathies, nor is it locally or temporally closer to him than that of *illud*. In other words all deictic force of the two pronouns is lost and they serve only to indicate that the objects referred to are of different characters, "one thing—another." They thus become synonymous with *alius—alius*, (not *alter—alter*, which refer to two, usually definite, antecedents), and like *alius—alius*, do not imply that only two alternatives are possible (as would *aut hoc aut illud*), but rather indicate that an indefinite number of possibilities exists. This is perhaps true likewise of Cicero's Laelius 13 *qui* (*i. e.*, Socrates) *non tum hoc tum illud* ("not now one view, now another"), *ut in plerisque, sed idem semper* (*sc. dicebat*); although it must be admitted that in view of Cato Maior 66, where speaking of the same question, "is the soul immortal?" Cicero says *atqui tertium certe nihil inueniri potest*, the choice seems rather to be limited to the affirmation and denial of immortality. No such limitation can be assumed in Sallust, *Hist. (Orat. Phil.) haec atque illa temptans*.

Yet the phrase does not necessarily imply a large number. Quite to the contrary in *Verr. 1,53 non dicam illinc hoc signum ablatum esse et illud, hoc dico, nullum te Aspendi signum, Verres, reliquisse*; and in *De Leg. Agr. 2,55 uectigalia locare nusquam licet, nisi in hac urbe hoc aut illo ex loco hac uestrum frequentia* it implies that although three or even more alternatives are possible, yet the possibilities are few

in number. In the former passage Cicero was not, of course, thinking of any particular statue; that is to say, the antecedents of *hoc* and *illud* are not definite. Still the implication is "I do not mention this particular statue or that particular statue, though able to refer to special instances." (Compare the use of *quidam* referring to an antecedent, which, though definite in the mind of the speaker—*e. g.*, *quendam nominare possum* "I might mention a certain individual"—remains, through the intention of the speaker, indefinite in the mind of the person addressed). In the latter instance the audience was familiar with the *locus ubi uectigalia locare licet*, but it still remains a matter of uncertainty and of unimportance to which *locus* each pronoun refers. The phrase thus approaches *unus atque alter* in meaning. De Inuent. 2,99 *si hoc aut illud fecisset aut ni sic fecisset* implies neither that the alternatives are few or many. A curious and rare usage is Virgil, *Ecl.* 7,21 in which *hos* (*sc. uersus*) and *illos* (*sc. uersus*) look forward to the remainder of the amoebian poem. From the patristic literature we may cite Cyprian, *Ad Don.* 3*e*; Arnobius 1,11*p*; 1,59,23^b*e*; 24*m*; 2,13*p*; Augustine, *Epist.* 11,3 *natura . . . in se habeat haec tria . . . : primo ut sit, deinde ut hoc uel illud sit (i. e., qualitatem habeat), tertio ut . . .*; then follow *hoc uel illud, aut hoc quidem aut illud, hoc uel illud, hoc uel illud*, used as a single word (like the Greek philosophical categories *πρὸς τὶ, etc.*).

Even when the number of alternatives is limited to two, it may occasionally remain uncertain to which antecedent each pronoun refers. For example, in Livy 2,51,9 *his atque illis* refer to two Roman armies. It

is impossible to determine from the context to which each pronoun refers, and indeed it does not matter, because neither army is nearer to the speaker in time, place or interest, and hence neither should be definitely specified by *hic* or *ille*. That is to say, we have now reached a stage at which these pronouns have lost all their demonstrative force and mean simply "one—the other" with no reference at all to a definite antecedent. The same interpretation must be put on Livy 5,40,3; *cf.* 10,14,2. The usage was not frequently employed by prose writers. Florus offers an example 2,13(4,2),77 *inter hos (sc. Caesarianos uel Pompeianos) atque illos duces*, if we are not to assume in the light of section 5 *hinc* "on Caesar's side" . . . *inde* "on Pompey's side", section 14 *ille* (Pompey) . . . *hic* (Caesar) and section 48 *illi* (Pompey's cavalry) . . . *hi* (Caesar's German infantry) that Florus' sympathies were more with Caesar, and that in consequence of this *hos* means *Caesarianos*. *Hinc uel illinc* (§ 44), like the passage in question, remains uncertain. Compare further Anon. Decl. in Catil. 121; Dictys Cretensis 2,2 *his aut illis*; Placitus 3,3 *aut hoc aut illo modo*; Arnobius, Ad Nationes 4,4*p.*

When the antecedent still remains indefinite, but the number of alternatives is unlimited, each pronoun serving simply to suggest one example out of any number that might indifferently be chosen, we have the weakest stage of meaning to which this correlation sank. Of the original elements of its meaning there remains only the implication of a contrast, but even here the contrast is often not between the two antecedents themselves, but between the activities they

exhibit or certain qualities they possess. Even this contrast has no emphasis laid upon it, but assumes the form "two different objects exist" rather than the form "the two objects are different." This usage is largely confined to poetry, particularly to the epic (in its widest sense), though not unknown to prose writers. A typical example is Virgil's *Aeneid* 7,637 f.

Classica iamque sonant; it bello tessera signum.
Hic gladium tectis trepidus rapit, ille frementis
Ad iuga cogit equos clipeumque . . . ;

cf. 4,157

Gaudet equo, iamque hos cursu, iam praeterit
illos;

5,44^I

Nunc hos nunc illos aditus, omnemque pererrat
Arte locum.

Further examples are: *Manil.* 1,191 *nunc his nunc illis regionibus*; *Sil. Ital.* 5,150 *nunc hos nunc illos*; *Stat. Thebais* 2,589 *hos . . . illos*; *Orestis Tragoedia* 852. *Lucan*, though a careful imitator of *Virgil*, offers no instances, unless we may so interpret 6,277, which perhaps falls under the preceding type. The usage is found in the lyrics of *Horace*, *e. g.*, 1,1,7-8; *et al.* From the prose literature we may cite *Florus* 1,18(2,2),35 *in hos uel illos ictus mobilia rostra specimen uiuentium praebabant*; *Plin. Epist.* 6,20,14 *hi . . . illi* with preceding *alii . . . alii . . . alii . . .* and following *multi*. The indifferent character of this antecedent is clearly made manifest in such a passage as the following: *Virgil, Aen.* 6,315

Nauita (*sc.* Charon) set tristis nunc hos nunc
accipit illos,
Ast alios longo submotos arcet harena;

Macrobius, Sat. 1,24,1 laudare hic memoriam, ille
doctrinam, cuncti religionem. It was this absolute
indifference of the antecedent that made it possible
for Horace to write in Sat. 1,1,112

neque se maiori pauperionum
Turbae comparat, hunc atque hunc superare
laboret

in precisely the same sense with Virgil, Aen. 4,157.
Finally a passage in which the words no longer stand
in parallel syntactical relation, Juv. 10,196 f.

...pulchrior ille
Hoc, atque ille alio, multum hic robustior illo.

As soon as it became possible thus to use these two
pronouns to refer to entirely vague and indefinite
antecedents, it became possible to extend the series
indefinitely by repeating either pronoun. Thus multi-
membral contrasts or series originated. Such a series
is found in Ennius (see below) and Lucretius 3,311
(the discussion is on the character of man as depend-
ing on the prominence in his nature of one or another
of the three elements)

...procliuius hic iras decurrit ad acris
Ille metu citius paulo temptetur, at ille
Tertius accipiat quaedam clementius aequo;

cf. Virg. Geor. 2,505-8 hic...hic...hunc...; Hor.
Sat. 1,2,41-45 hic...ille...hic...hic...hunc...
quin etiam illud accidit ut cuidam...; *cf.* 1,4,27 ff. hic

....hic....hunc....Albius....hic....; Ode 3,1,9-13 Est ut uiro uir....hic....hic....ille....; Lucan 7,774-776 ille....ille....hunc....in hoc....in Cæsare....; Stat. Sil. 2,1,213-17 hos....hos....his....his....hos....illos....hos....; 2,2,45-50 haec....illa....haec....haec....; 4,3,50 hi....hi....illi....hi....; Theb. 4,299 ff. hi....hi....his....his....his....ille....ille....hos....; Juv. 3,69 f.

Hic alta Sicyone, ast hic Amydone relictæ,
 Hic Andro, ille Samo, hic Trallibus aut Alabandis,
 Esquilias....petunt....

10,225 ille....hic....hic....ille....huius....; Claudian 5,410 ff. hi....alii....ille....ille....ille....hic....hic....hic....hic....

The use of the pronouns as indefinites in an extended series naturally admits *varietatis causa* other indefinite nouns or pronouns into the series. So cuiusdam and uiro uir above. Similarly used are alius (Lucan 2,183 f. hic....alius....ille....), alter (Calp. Ecl. 10,48 f. hic....alter....ille....; Statius, Sil. 5,3,185 ff. alter....alter....alter....hi....hi....hi....illi....), pars (Ovid. Met. 11,29 f. hae....illae....pars....; 11,486 pars....pars....hic....hic....; Lucan 10,128-131 hos....alios....haec (*sc.* pars)....pars altera....pars....; Stat. Sil. 3,1,118-125 his....illis....pars....pater ipse....). Theb. 2,551 offers hos....illos....nec paucos....

So also the prose writers: Plin. N. H. 13,40 aliis....aliis, his....aliis,quibusdam aliud....aliud.... (in pairs) ita fiunt IXL genera; Plin. Panegy.

25e aliquis . . . alius . . . hic . . . ille . . . ; Epist. 4,24,3 quidam . . . alii . . . huic . . . hic . . . alius . . . illum . . . ; Gellius, N. A. 1,9,9 alius . . . item alius . . . hic . . . ille . . . ; Apul. Met. 2,29 (p. 66). The possibilities of such a series are illustrated by Gellius, N. A. Praef. 6-7 alii . . . alii . . . ille . . . hic . . . alius . . . partim . . . quidam . . . alius . . . atque alius . . . et item alius . . . sunt etiam qui . . . sunt item qui . . . sunt adeo qui . . . et . . . et . . . et . . . (with nouns omitted) est qui . . . est qui . . . et . . . et . . . est item qui . . . est . . . est praeterea qui . . . est itidem qui . . . est qui . . . sunt item multi qui . . . neque item non sunt qui . . . aut . . . aut . . . aut . . . et quaedam alia . . . multasque . . . nos uero

Instances of the insertion of a proper name in such a series are very uncommon, the only ones known to me being those from Horace and Lucan cited above, while Plin. Epist. 4,24,3 concludes a series with *nos ipsos*. In Horace, Epist. 2,2,59f. we read *tu . . . hic . . . ille*; 91 *ego* (understood) is contrasted with *hic*. Statius, Sil. 5,3,185 concludes a series with *tu*; 3,1,118 with *pater ipse*.

The attentive reader has doubtless already observed that in this category no passage from a prose writer has been cited in which *hic* and *ille* are unaccompanied by some other indefinite word, as well as that the larger part of the indefinite bimembral alternatives is made up of the brief expressions *nunc h. nunc il.*, *iam h. iam il.*

The corresponding adverbial correlations are of much more frequent occurrence than the substantive and adjectival. In Hand, *Turs. s. vv. hac, huc, etc.*,

is found a good collection of instances of these correlations. They were used from Plautus on down to the latest period. We distinguish: 1) *hic—illic*, 2) *hinc—illinc*, 3) *huc—illuc*, 4) *hac—illac*. These phrases, like those discussed above, show both the stronger and the weaker meaning. *Huc—illuc* and *hinc—illinc* are by far the more frequent forms; *hac—illac* rarely occurs, *hic—illic* only occasionally.

Hic—illic is first found in Plautus, *Most* 605, where the slave in reply to the usurer's repeated demands for his interest exclaims *faenus illic, faenus hic* (that is, "faenus everywhere"). The phrase is already used of entirely indefinite antecedents. *Catullus* 6,9

Puluinusque peraeque et heic et illeic || sic Baehr. ||
Attritus . . .

testifies to the substantive usage exemplified by *Livy* 2,51,9 (cited above), which is found in the adverbial form in *Livy* 8,37,6 *nec hic nec illic*. So *Catullus* 10, 21 *neque hic neque illic*. *Ovid. Met.* 7,581

Hic, illic, ubi mors deprenderat, exhalantes is like *Most.* 605 (see also *Virgil, Geor.* 1,54; 69 f.) In *Varro, Res Rustica* 3,5,6 *aut hic aut illic* is definite.

2) *Hinc—illinc* is also first met in Plautus, *Amph.* 229, in the form *hinc et illinc*, a superfluous epexegetis on *uterque*. Both adverbs here retain their normal force, *hinc* meaning "on our side," *illinc* "on the enemy's side," whereas in *Most.* 565 *et hinc et illinc* means "on both sides" (indefinite).

a) *Hinc . . . illinc* with *asyndeton* and not *juxtaposed*: *Lucr.* 2,521 *hinc flammis, illinc . . . pruinis*; *Virgil, Geor.* 1,509; *Petron.* 83; 108; *Curtius* 6,11,16

hinc ignis illinc uerbera . . . ingerebantur (*sc.* Philotae); *cf.* 8, 14, 32 and Juvenal 10, 44 *illinc cornicines, hinc . . . agminis officia* (observe the order).

b) With asyndeton and juxtaposed: Catullus 68a, 133 (= 68b, 93) *hinc illinc* (circumcursans); Lucretius (of an indefinite antecedent); Ovid, *Met.* 1, 619 f. *illinc | Hinc* (chiastic sentence); Seneca, *Medea* 108 h. i. *mittite carmina*.

c) With copula:

Hinc rex et illinc Sen. *Medea* 516.

Hinc illincque || illinc cod. A || Cic. *Tim.* 49.

Hinc atque illinc: Liv. 3, 5, 1 (*impetus facti*); 26, 39, 19 (*transferentes uela*); 32, 10, 12 (*uulneribus acceptis*); Petron. 48 (*secuit*); 32 (*fimbriis h. a. i. pendentibus*).

Hinc uel illinc: Tac. *Annal.* 2, 6, 7 (*adpellerent naues*); *Hist.* 3, 47, 19 (*adpellere naues*); Germ. 44, 11 (*mutabile h. u. i. remigio*).

Hinc aut illinc: Liv. 7, 8, 1 (*aufert*); 9, 32, 6 (*telum h. a. i. emissum*).

d) With correlating adverbs or conjunctions:

Nunc hinc nunc illinc: Lucr. 2, 214 f. (*nubibus ignes | concursant*); 6, 199 (*fremitus—"thunder"—per nubila mittunt*); Virg. *Aen.* 4, 442 (*n. h. n. flatibus illinc | . . . certant*) with the interlocked order.

Atque hinc atque illinc *umeros ad uolnera durat* Virg. *Geor.* 3, 257.

3 *Huc—illuc*. The two adverbs bear their full original demonstrative force in Plaut. *Capt.* 370

Ad te atque ad illum: pro rota me uti licet.

Uel ego huc uel illuc uortar quo imperabitis.

With the weakened force it occurs Aul. 607

Hinc ego et huc et illuc potero quid agant arbitrarier.

The formulae in which it occurs are of about the same range with those of the two adverbial correlations just discussed, and may be grouped under the same general heads:

a) Asyndeton—not juxtaposed:

b) Asyndeton—juxtaposed: Cic. Ad Att. 9,9,2e cursem huc illuc uia teterrima; Sall. Jug. 60,4 (agitare corpora); Ovid, Met. 2 (feror); Virg. Geor. 2,297 (aesculus sustinet umbram); Aen. 4,363 (uoluens oculos); 5,408 (uersat); Manil. 1,199 (reflectat); Petron. 114 (uentus conuertebat ratem); Ilias Lat. 393 (coruscat); Lucan 8,699 (truncus iactatur aquis); Stat. Achil. 200 (uolutat); Siluae 1,3,72 (prosternat); Theb. 2,602 (clipeum obiectans); 4,366 (uersans lumina); 733 (impellat); 9,172 (frustra ruit auis); Sil. Ital. 17,137 (iactans—*sc.* equus membra); Plin. Epist. 2,17,9 (digeret); Quint. 10,7,6 (salientes).

c) With copula:

Huc *et* illuc: Ad Herenn. 4,11p (fluctuat); Cic. Cael. 13 (torquere et flectere suum ingenium); De Nat. Deor. 2,115 (casu et temere cursantibus); 101 (aer effluens uentos efficit); De Off. 1,101 (rapit); Acad. 2,116 (trahuuntur rationes); De Div. 2,80 (uolucris passim uagantes); De Nat. Deor. 3,68 (uersat); De Fin. 2,99 (uersetis); Hor. 4,11,9 (cursitant); Celsus 2,15,8 (lectus manu impellendus); 8,1,35 (se inclinans); Sen. De Ben. 5,5m (hoc et illo—*sic!*—diducit); Med. 862 (h. fert pedes et illuc); Stat. Theb. 4,380 (h. tristis et

illuc . . . pinum deiectat); 9,849 (h. fessus et i. | Mutabat turmas); 10,168 (acies h. errat et i.).

Huc *atque* illuc. Cic. Quint. Rosc. 37 (tergiversantem); De Oratore 1,40 (intuens); 184 (uagare); De Fin. 5,86 (uerses); Bell. Afr. 73 (rapsaret); Sall. Hist. 3,48,26 (M) (huc ire a. i.—order!); Livy 7,34,16 (signa moueri); 5,8,8 (signa transferrent); Valer. Max. 6,8,7 (errantia); Petron. 37 (discurreret); 101 (uectatur); Celsus 4,1,29 (ab utraque parte h. a. i. uolutum intestinum colon); Stat. Theb. 2,545 (h. ferus a. i. animum . . . ferens); Gellius 2,6,5 (distrahitur—of the human mind); Dictys 3,3 (oberrans); Script. Hist. Aug. Maximini 5,1 (discurrens, “the whole world over”); Jordanes, Get. 182.

Huc *illucque*: Celsus 5,26,14 (oculi mouentur). In Plin. N. H. 37,83 the phrase is not well authenticated.

Huc *uel* illuc: Ter. And. 266

Dum in dubiost animus, paulo momento h. u. i. impellitur;

Huc *illucue*: Celsus 6,6,36 (moueatur); 7,3,8 (discernit); 7,18,14 (conuersum—*sc.* fuit); 8,16,8 (se dederunt).

d) With correlating words:

Et huc *et* illuc: Petron. 39 (quadrat).

Uel huc *uel* illuc impelluntur Celsus 7,7,3.

Nunc huc *nunc* illuc: Lucr. 2,131 (reuertri

| N. h. n. i. in cunctas undique partis);

Virgil, Aen. 4,285 (n. h. celerem n. diuidit illuc); 5,701

(N. h. ingentis n. i. pectore curas

Mutabat uersans);

Manil. 2,904 (N. h. n. i. mutantis); 3,167 (mota); Sen. Med. 938

(N. h. ira n. i. amor | Diducit);

Sil. Ital. 4,323

N. h. alterno, n. i., flamine gestant (*sc.* uenti).

Tum huc tum illuc: Cic. De Div. 1,120 (uolant alites); *cf.* Lael. 13 *supra cit.*

Iam huc iam illuc: Florus 1,33(2,17)8 (missi duces).

Dum huc dum illuc: Plaut. Truc. 38 (rete or impedit) in its present condition is corrupt, if not interpolated.

Modo huc modo illuc: Catullus 3,9 (circum-siliens); 15,7 (praetereunt,—*sc.* in platea homines); Cic. De Div. 2,145 (ducentium); Par. 14 (transferuntur); Tim. 48 (verb lost—lacuna in text).

4) *Hac—illac*: Plaut. Rud. 213 hac an illac eam incerta (definite?); Ter. Haut. 512 Hac illac circum-cursa (indefinite); Eun. 105

Plenus rimarum sum, hac atque illac perfluo; Petron. 57e (pedem opponerent); Tac. Agr. 28 hac atque illa rapti.

Multimembral adverbial series are very rare yet not entirely wanting. Stat. Silu. 1,6,67-74 hic.... hic....illic....illic....hic....; Sil. Ital. 10,312 f. hic.... hic.... illic || illuc *codd.* LFOV || hic.... passim....; 403 f. hic....hic....illic || *v. l.* ibi ||....

It will be recalled that the earliest bimembral series cited above in which the pronouns are used indefinitely is found in Cicero, while the earliest passage in which the words mean "the former, the latter" is in Accius, Joseph Bach (*op. cit.* p. 309) being fully

justified in regarding with Brachmann Plaut. Bacch. 395 as spurious. However, a trimembral series considerably antedating Accius occurs in Ennius, *Fabulae* 330 (M)

His erat in ore Bromius, his Bacchus pater, illis
Lyaeus ("some—some—others").

Since the semasiological change undergone by *hic* and *ille* in passing from a definite to an indefinite antecedent is the same in the multimembral as in the bimembral series, there is no reason for assuming that the process was accomplished sooner in the one case than in the other, unless it be that the repetition of the same pronoun (made necessary in the multimembral sentence) referring to different antecedents in the same sentence (so *hic*—*hic* above) facilitated the change in meaning. As a matter of fact, we find that in the bimembral correlations *hic*—*hic* and *ille*—*ille*, the first step toward this change is apparent in Plautus and Terence (see below). On the other hand in the case of the *hic*—*ille* type it is only in the short adverbial expressions *hic*—*illic*, *hinc*—*illinc*, *huc*—*illuc*, *etc.*, that we find in these two comedians the process of the weakening of the meaning under discussion an accomplished fact. That neither series (non-adverbial) appears in Plautus or Terence is due simply to the fact that these correlations are appropriate only to description and narration, which are rarely found in comedy. In view of this we shall probably not be much in error, if we assume that the indefinite use of the bimembral series was also possible to Ennius, and only the scantiness of the extant remains of his works deprives us of examples.

As has already been suggested, the adverbial forms appeared earlier in the literature and obtained much greater currency than did the others. They may actually have developed earlier. Unlike the adjectival and substantive forms, which stand for a material antecedent the individuality of which is likely to be clearly felt, they represent only more or less vague local or temporal conceptions. In the great majority of instances the locutions *hinc—illiuc, etc.*, serve to point out that certain acts take place in two different places, it being unimportant whether one is near and one far away. The important thought is that the two points where the action takes place are separate and distant from each other. The distinctive meaning of each word is thus easily lost, and the meaning of the locution *as a whole* becomes the important thing. Furthermore those adjectival and substantive locutions that give indication of having been modeled on the adverbial forms, *e. g.*, *modo hoc modo illud, tum hoc tum illud, hoc aut illo, hic atque illis, hoc uel illud, hoc aut illud*, make up by far the larger number of instances in which the correlation bears the indefinite sense.

2. Hic—hic. The weakening of *hic* to an indefinite pronoun is seen with equal clearness in this correlation. There is, however, one important difference between the two locutions. In the case of *hic—ille* the contrast is largely expressed by the difference in the meaning of the words. In the present case the contrast is not expressed by the words themselves, they being identical in meaning, but either by gesture, *etc.*, or by the predicates affirmed of their antecedents.

Cicero's citation from Servius (Ad Fam. 9, 16, 4) hic uersus Plauti non est, hic est has been made a locus classicus by Wölfflin's discussion of it in his "Gemination im Lateinischen" (Münchener Sitzungsber. 1882). He characterises it as an imitation of the Conversationsstil comparing Horace, Ars Poet. 439

"Corrige, sodes,
Hoc," aiebat, "et hoc."

(on which Lucian Müller, *ad loc.*, misunderstanding the classical usage, says "für et illud"), and Sat. 1, 1, 112 hunc atque hunc (Müller, "für atque illum"). The usage is further exemplified by Ars Poet. 45 hoc amet, hoc spernat, and two such pairs Ars Poet. 363 and 365

Haec amat obscurum; uolet haec sub luce
uideri;

Haec placuit semel, haec decies repetita placebit.

In Ad Fam. *l. c.* and similar passages there is really no weakening in the force of the pronoun, since one object after another is laid before the critic, and each one, as it is examined, becomes "this verse" (*cf.* Plaut. Capt. 1011 Pater hic est, hic seruos—see also 1018 Pater hic est. Hic fur est). Closely connected with this last type is Virg. Ecl. 4, 55–57

Non me carminibus uincat nec Thracius Or-
pheus,

Nec Linus, huic mater quamuis atque huic pater
adsit,

Orphei Caliopea, Lino formonsus Apollo;

and Aen. 8, 357

Hanc Ianus pater, hanc Saturnus condidit
arcem:

Ianiculum huic, illi fuerat Saturnia nomen.

This passage exemplifies the close contact in meaning between hic—hic and hic—ille. Compare Tacitus, Hist. 4,55,7 Tutor....Sabinus...., hic Treuir, hic Lingonus, Tutor....Sab..... The usage is rare in late Latin, but is found in Script. Hist. Aug. Avid. Cass. 2,8; Min. Fel. 40,4; Alcimus Avitus 5 (p. 33,2) quidquid hic || illic Mommsen || nocuit, hic profecit; quidquid tunc fleuimus, nunc amamus.

Very instructive for the interpretation of Ad Fam. l. c. are Ter. Ad. 417 f.

Hoc facito....Hoc fugito.

Hoc laudist....Hoc uitio datur,

where, as in Ars Poet. 363 and 365, two pairs of alternatives are found, and Ter. Ad. 425 f.

Hoc salsumst, hoc adustumst, hoc lautumst
parum;

Illud recte.

where we likewise have two alternatives. The second is il. recte; the first is trimembral, the three alternatives as a whole being contrasted with illud recte, and being logically equivalent to haec praue. This passage testifies to the existence of the usage at a time long antedating Servius. It is paralleled by the familiar passage Hor. Sat. 1,4,134-7 rectius hoc est....hoc....sic....hoc...., where sic is introduced *varietatis causa*.

In the last two passages, in which the number of

alternatives exceeds two, the antecedents have already lost their individuality, and, as in the case of *hic—ille* discussed on p. 85, the stress lies entirely on the contrast between the predicates that are assigned to them. The pronouns pass still further into the realm of indefiniteness, when brought in such rapid succession before the mind that no time is allowed for the mind to dwell upon each one. In many passages even the contrast between the predicates, which is often very slight, is left unstated, and the reader or listener is left to infer from the mere presence of a copula (*et, aut, etc.*) or from the general context, that two distinct antecedents are referred to. Thus to be interpreted are: *Ad Heren.* 2,40 *hoc aut hoc fecissem*, and *Cic. De Invent.* 1,99 *hoc et hoc sit demonstratum*; 100 *uobis hoc et hoc plane factum est* (cited by Krebs-Schmalz, *Antibarbarus* I^o, 593); *Quint.* 6,1,4 *cum sciret haec et haec; id.* 3 *responsurus sit aduersarius his et his*. [*Hac et hac*] in 9,4,129 is a gloss on *fluit*. *Cf.* 4,4,8 *ego hoc dico, aduersarius hoc*, in which the contrast is expressed by the two grammatical subjects. In these passages, except possibly the last, it seems unnecessary to assume that the speaker is thinking of a definite object when he utters each “*hoc*”, nor is he on the other hand using them exactly as indefinites. They seem rather to approach in meaning the familiar legal formula *illud—illud* “such and such”. Furthermore there is no implication, except in 4,4,8 that only two alternatives are referred to, so that we might translate “for example, this or that.”

Of the same type with *Livy* 2,51,9 cited p. 84, is *Virgil, Aen.* 10,9 f

Quis metus aut hos

Aut hos arma sequi ferrumque lacesere suasit,
in which it is a matter of indifference which *hos* refers to Rutuli and which to Troiani; Persius 5,155 *Huncine an hunc sequeris?* (*cf.* Sil. Ital. 4,353 f).

Lastly we may refer to the cases in which the choice is not limited to two objects, the words coming to mean "one—another", plural "some—others". This usage is found chiefly in the hexameter poetry. See Virgil, Aen. 6,773 f.

Hi tibi Nomentum et Gabios urbemque Fidenam,

Hi Collatinas imponent montibus arces;

cf. 7,506 ff.

Olli . . . adsunt, hic torre armatus obusto,
Stipitis hic grauidi nodis: quod cuique repertum
Rimanti, telum ira facit;

and 1,106 *Hi . . . his . . .*; Geor. 4,84 f. *aut hos aut hos*; Hor. Epist. 1,17,39 ff. *hic . . . | . . . | Hic . . .*; Lucan 2,30 *hae . . . hae . . .*; 252 f. *Hos . . . | Hos . . .*; 3,687 | *Hic . . . | Hi . . .*; 6,198–200 | *Hunc . . . | Hunc . . .*; 7,375 f. *haec . . . | Haec . . .*; 8,196 | *Hos . . . hos . . .*; 10,489 *hos . . . hos . . .*; Sil. Ital. is not less fond of the correlation. For Statius see Thebais 2,246; 710 f.

The usage admits naturally of extension to three or more members, as in Virgil, Geor. 2,505–8 *hic . . . hic . . . hunc . . .*; Aen. 7,473 f. *hunc . . . hunc . . . hunc . . .*; Hor. Epist. 2,2,67 *hic . . . hic . . . hic . . . hic . . .*; Lucan 2,154–7 *hic . . . hic . . . hic . . .*; Stat. Sil. 4,4,15 f. *hos . . . hos . . . hi . . .*

From the prose writers: Florus 2,33(4,12),52 hoshoshos In New Test. Matth. 13,22 ποιῆσαι ὁ μὲν ὁ δὲ ὁ δὲ is rendered in the codex Bobbianus (now Taurinensis k) hoc hoc autem hoc autem, in all other existing MSS. (the Palatinus e, an African translation, has a lacuna at this point) aliud quidem aliud autem aliud autem (or uero) In the parallel passage 13,8 even k and e read aliut aliut aliut In Matth. 8,9 the Vulgate huic alio represents τούτῳ ἄλλῳ

Like *hic—hic—ille—etc.*, this series also admits indefinite nouns and pronouns. Curtius 9,9, 12 hi hi quidam; Stat. Theb. 3,129–31 hae hae pars pars; Lucan 10,128 ff. hos alios pars pars inuentus fortior aetas. Tacitus has a variety of such expressions, especially in the Annals, *e. g.*, 14,8,2 hi hi alii quidam; 1,18,1 hi hi plurimi; 2, 13,4 hic alius plurimi; 4,50,2 his aliis et erant qui; 13,39,14 hos alios multos; Hist. 3,55,9 his alios (*cf.* Ann. 6,1,9); Sat. 1,4,27 ff. hic hic hunc Albius hic; Sil. Ital. 17,482–5 hic hic hos horum ipse Rhoeteius; Juvenal 1,46–49 hic hic Marius

The corresponding adverbial forms *hic—hic, etc.*, in the sense of *alibi—alibi, ἔνθα μὲν—ἔνθα δὲ*, like the adverbial forms *hic—illic*, have a much wider range of usage than the adjectival and substantive forms, but are far less frequently employed than the *hic—illic*

type, and seem to be a later development. At least they appear considerably later in the extant literature.

1) *Hic—hic*, etc., is rarely met, *hinc—hinc* being used in its stead. Examples are Sil. Ital. 8,395 f; 3,547 f.

2) *Hinc—hic*. See Hor. O. 1,34,14-16.

3) *Hinc—hinc*. Type a), *hinc hinc* juxtaposed and used asyndetically, seems never to occur, except as referring to one and the same antecedent.

b) Asyndetic and not juxtaposed: The two adverbs may both modify the same verb or may be used with separate verbs. The correlation appears earlier in the former construction. The first examples in prose literature, as is well known, are found in Livy. Earlier than the first decade of Livy is Horace, Sat. 1,1,18 *hinc uos uos hinc discedite*, which, so far as I am aware, has always been interpreted in the general sense: "Go ye each his own different way." I am not inclined, however, to follow the traditional rendering, which takes *hinc . . . hinc* in the sense of *hinc . . . illinc*, or more exactly either *hac—illac* or *illuc . . . illuc*, but would for several reasons make *hinc* in both instances refer to the speaker, Jupiter, and retain its normal meaning "hence, hence, both of you." Livy is therefore antedated in this usage not even by a poet. Livy uses the words in most cases to balance a pair of nouns that stand in the same construction. The passage 1,13,2 *hinc patres hinc uiros orantes*, is the earliest instance of the usage in Latin literature. This same passage stands in Aurel. Vict. 1,2,9 *hinc patres inde coniuges deprecatae*. Either

Victor or the maker of the *Epitome Liuiana*¹ felt *hinc—hinc* as an unusual expression and altered it to the more familiar and more prosaic *hinc—inde*. The same type of construction is found 3,23,7 *h. Uolscos h. Aequos*. 6,15,3; 8,35,8; 21,8,8; 22,47,2; 25,15,14; 25,29,3; 26,48,12; 28,9,13; 29,33,5; 30,19,8. In two cases we have instead of single substantives a phrase of two or more words correlated by *hinc—hinc*: 26,37,2 *hinc in Hispania aduersae res, hinc prospera in Sicilia*; 10,39,16 *hinc foederum cum Romanis ictorum testes deos, hinc iurisiurandi aduersus foedera suscepti execrationes horrens*. Later examples of such an extended phrase are: *Stat. Theb.* 1,383 f; *Sil. Ital.* 10,530-2; 2,273-5. The brief expressions in which two substantives are correlated reappear in *Curt.* 9,4,10 *bis*; 5,10,9; 5,4,28; 8,13,11 (in the second and third instances the substantive stands in the Ablative); *Lucan* 7,533; 9,861; *Sen. Dial.* 2,2,1 (two proper names); *Stat. Sil.* 1,2,235; *Theb.* 1,193 (two proper names, each with an adjectival modifier); 3,564 f; *Sil. Ital.* 1,522; 4,380 f; 550; 562; 5,44; 7,526; *Juvenal* 1,119 *hinc toga, calceus hinc est*. Slightly varied are *Sil. Ital.* 1,561.

Hinc puer inualdique senes, hinc femina;
and 4,414

Hinc laeua frenos, hinc dextra corripit arma.

The phrase is very seldom employed to correlate

¹ Dr. Henry A. Sanders, whose special study of the *Epitome* enables him to speak with authority on the subject, has been unable to find any evidence either to prove or to disprove the assumption that the writer of the *Epitome* made the change. The balance of probability would perhaps assign it to Victor.

two verbs: Manil. 2,419 f; Lucan 10,537 f.; Stat. Sil. 2,2,116 f.; Sil. Ital. 1,222 f.; 2,273-275.

c) With copula:

Hinc *et* hinc, widely separated: Lucr. 6,88 f. hinc...et hinc; in juxtaposition: Hor. Epod. 2,31 (trudit); 5,97 (saxis petens); Petron. 79v; Stat. Sil. 4,3,47 (coactis).

Hinc *atque* hinc stands almost invariably at the beginning of a verse: Virg. Aen. 1,162 (rupes minantur); 4,447 (heros tunditur); 12,431 (suras incluserat); Germanicus, Arat. Phaen. 49 (torquet); Stat. Sil. 2,2,14 (perrumpunt); Theb. 7,479 (natae); 12,759 (natauit); Sil. Ital. 4,274 (dederunt); 1,375 (instent).

Hinc...*at* hinc (widely separated): Stat. Sil. 3,5,74 f.

Hinc...*atque* hinc (widely separated); Sil. Ital. 17,251.

It is easy to see how hinc—hinc took on its indefinite meaning. In the passage from Horace's Satires cited above, both groups of persons are bidden to depart from the speaker. Perhaps there is no notion in the speaker's mind of the direction which each person addressed is about to take. On the other hand it may be an essential part of the speaker's thought that they depart in different directions. In proportion as this second thought is more or less prominent, in just so marked a degree does the phrase take on the meaning "to one place—to an (the) other." As a rule, however, in the examples cited above, the word hinc has entirely lost its special implication of movement in a direction away from the speaker, and is already synonymous with an indefinite hic.

3) *Huc—huc*. The two words imply, of course, motion toward the speaker. This meaning offers a serious bar to the process of development just outlined, that takes place in the case of *hinc—hinc*. Nevertheless the phrase did take on an indefinite force, and although our earliest example (Catullus 61,34

Ut tenax edera huc et huc
Arborem implicat errans)

considerably antedates Livy's *hinc—hinc*, it is paralleled by Lucretius *hinc et hinc* (6,88 f.), which phrase may have exercised no weak influence toward hastening its development. Examples of the usage are very rare. I know of only six: Hor. Epod. 4,9

. . . ora uertat h. et h. euntium;

Sen. Med. 385 (recursat); Stat. Sil. 1,3,38 (*huc oculis, huc mente trahor*); Sil. Ital. 9,360 (*it seges nutans*); 614 (*iactas*).

4) *Hac—hac*, like *huc—huc* is a poetical usage, and very rarely met. Naevius, *Astiologa*; Propert. 1,3,14; Horace, Epist. 2,2,75; Virgil, Aen. 1,467 f.; Stat. Theb. 9,762. I know of only one instance in prose literature, Pompeius, Comment. in Donat. p. 105,31 (K).

Adverbial series of three members are found: Luc. 1,176-181 *hinc . . . hinc . . . hinc . . .*; Sil. Ital. 1,185-187 *do*; 5,198 *do*.

3. Ille—ille. As our discussion of the two correlations just dismissed has been rather full, we may treat the present one very briefly, the more so because it shows about the same range of meaning with the others and is of quite infrequent occurrence.

Parallel to the construction *hic uersus Plauti non est, hic est* is Terence, *Phor.* 332

Quia enim in illis fructus est, in illis opera luditur.

The same usage is found in Cicero, *Rosc. Amer.* 59 (cited in Mühlmann's *Thesaurus*) *quaesisse, num ille aut ille defensurus esset*; *De Inuent.* 1,98 [*illud docuimus, illud plane fecimus*]. Suetonius (*Jul.* 41) quotes from Julius Cæsar, *commendo uobis illum et illum*. Martial 7,10,1 f. offers *ille uel ille*; while Manilius 2,185

Ille senescentis ueris, subeuntis et ille,

in which a definite antecedent is referred to, is paralleled by Quint. 2,8,11 *in illo...in illo...*; 3,6,93 *ille...ille...*; 11,3,168; Lucan 4,636 f.; *ille* (*Antæus*)... | *Ille* (*Heracles*); *cf.* 612; Plin. *Epist.* 1,23, 3 *uel ille cui adessem uel ille quem contra*; *cf.* 6,29,15 *Miseni illud ruisse...illud ardere*; Juv. 10,91 *illi...* | *Illum...*

The type represented by Virg. *Aen.* 10,9 (*hic...hic*) is closely paralleled by Sil. Ital. 4,317 ff. *Itali...Tyrias...alas.* | *Aut illi...* | *Aut illi.*

With entirely indefinite series it occurs in Manil. 2,517-19

*Audire ut cupiant alios, aliosque uidere,
Horum odio, nunc horum idem ducantur amore,
Illis insidias tendant, captentur ab illis,*

an important passage, as showing *ille—ille* entirely synonymous with *hic—hic* and *alius—alius*. Further examples are: Sen. *Sent.* 9,2,16 *nemo paene sine uitio est: ille iracundus est, ille libidinosus*; Petron.

123,226. In the light of these passages Wölfflin's proposal to read in Tac. Ger. 14,11 f. *ille...ille* instead of *illam...illum* can meet with no objections on the score of the meaning of the phrase *ille...ille*. Pompeius, *Commentum in Donat.* has on p. 204,7(K) *et illa brevis est et illa*; p. 205,16 *et illud et illud*.

Trimembral series occur in Petron. 115 and Juv. 2,93; 95-99.

NOTE TO CHAPTER II.—The rivalry between *hic*, *is* and *ille* is also apparent in the usage of these words in legal formulae of the types:

a. *Illa die, illa hora ab urbe sum exiturus* (in imitation of the style of imperial edicts), *Script. Hist. Aug. Alex. Sev.* 45,2; *cf. Arnob.* 4,19*p* *cum legitis ex illo patre atque ex illa matre deus ille est proditus*.

b. *Eam alitem, ea regione caeli et eius dei nuntiam uenisse*, *Livy* 1,34,9.

c. *Ex hac familia in hanc familiam*.

The writer finds it necessary to postpone the discussion of these usages to a later date, when he shall have a fuller collection of data at his disposal. They are, of course, intimately connected with the formulae *hic—hic* and *ille—ille* just discussed.

Another correlation *hinc—inde* should not be overlooked in this connection. The writer hopes in the near future to publish a history of this phrase and throw new light upon the development of the other correlations discussed in this section, both by comparing them with *hinc—inde* and by continuing the study of their development down to the seventh century.

CHAPTER III. ISTE.

CHAPTER III. ISTE.

The weakening in the meaning of *hic*, necessarily brought about by its frequent use as a substitute for *is*, resulted in an effort, unconscious of course, on the part of the users of the language, to find another word to take its place. *Ille*, with its strong demonstrative force, was too remote in meaning from *hic* to serve this purpose. So recourse was had to *iste*. Since this last pronoun was very extensively used as a substitute for *hic* (which it eventually almost entirely displaced), it may very properly be discussed immediately after *hic*. The usage *iste* = *hic* forms the main subject of the remarks of the present chapter, at the conclusion of which, however, it will be necessary to call attention to two other peculiarities in the usage of the word.

While no general agreement has been reached as to the etymology of this pronoun, there can be no doubt that there is much fuller consensus of opinion on the point than existed a few years ago. In 1870 Johann Kvičala in his *Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der Pronomina*, (= *Sitzungsber. d. Wien. Akad.* 1870, p. 137), induced by the extensive use of the word as a *δευτερόριτον*, urged the identity of the *-te* in *iste* with the ablative of the personal pronoun *tu*. He seems to have found no supporters to his view, although Netušil in *Archiv f. lat. Lexikogr.* u.

Gramm. VII, 579 ff. argues for *ti*, dative. It is not necessary, as von Planta following Danielsson has pointed out (*Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialecte* II, 423), to assume this etymology, in order to explain the peculiar character of *iste*. Spanish *esso* (from *ipse*) is used as a *δευτερόπριτον* implying contempt. (*Cf.* also pp. 156 ff. below.) No more satisfactory is the proposal cited in the third edition of Neue's *Formenlehre*, II, 396, from Stolz, *Lateinische Grammatik*, p. 216, that the second element of *iste* is the suffix *-pte*. In the second and third editions of his grammar Stolz returns to the view concerning the last element of the pronoun advanced by Corssen, who (*Ueber Aussprache, Vocalismus und Betonung der lateinischen Sprache* II, 843, 2d edition) writes: "Das dem. Pron. *-tu-s*, *-ta-*, *-tu-d*, von dem selbständig die Accusative-formen *tum*, *tam* mit adverbialer Bedeutung erhalten sind, ist enklitisch an die Nominative Form *i-s* des Pronominal-stammes *i-* gefügt in *i-s-tu-s*, *iste*." This element, according to Danielsson, Pauli's *Altitalische Studien*, III, 158 ff., represents in the Nom. sg., masc. and fem. an original *-so-*, *-sa-* (*cf.* Brugmann's *Grundriss*, I, 426, Anm. 2—this note does not appear in the second edition). The first two letters of *iste* are resolved by Schweizer-Sidler, *Gram. der lat. Sprache* I, 122, 2d ed., into *i-*, pronominal root and *so-*, *sa-*, pronominal stem, and the final syllable, is explained as representing original *-se*, *-so* "nach dem Neutrum und den übrigen Casus ins Masc. und Fem. des Nom. sg. eingedrungen." This last derivation, which connotes a later origin for *iste*, is the most satisfactory from a semasiological standpoint; and best accounts for the

strong demonstrative force of *iste*, that has enabled it to maintain until today (*cf.* Spanish *este*) its distinct deictic character.

It may now be regarded as beyond dispute that one of the most important elements of the meaning of *iste*, in the ante-Augustan periods at least, is its distinct reference to the second person, *i. e.*, to something having a direct connection with the person addressed, or (which for our present purposes is practically the same thing) conceived by the subject to have such a relation. Joseph Bach, whose examination of the usage of the demonstrative pronouns in the archaic period is very thorough, maintains that the word occurs in no passage in this period without bearing a distinct reference to the second person. It is further claimed that in Cicero the word always has this force. On this point see Landgraf's note 366c on Reisig's *Vorlesungen über die Lateinische Sprachwissenschaft* III,97f., where Kvičala, *op. cit.*—particularly p. 133—is cited with approval.

One of the most palpable bits of evidence that seems to prove the correctness of this view, is the attitude of the Roman historians toward the pronoun. In Cæsar, for example, the word occurs only once (B. G. 7,77), and then in an oration inserted in his narrative. Similarly it occurs only in direct address in Sallust, since in *Frag. Hist.* 1,49 (Maurenbr.) the words *uacuam istam urbem* seem to be a portion of the address of a Samnite to his fellows. The same is true of Nepos, Curtius and Livy (at least in books 1-40). In the *Bellum Hisp.* 9,1, *ista* is a conjecture for the traditional *ita*, and has been changed to *illa* in

the best modern editions. In contrast with the historians, we find that Cicero in his orations, letters and dialogues and Varro in his dialogue on Agriculture make very extensive use of *iste*. This goes to show that the writers of historical narrative had little occasion to employ the word. That the same is true of ordinary exposition, is clearly proved by the use of *iste* in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. In this anonymous treatise *iste* occurs upward of ninety times. Of these instances only four fall to the first three books, while the other eighty odd are found in the fourth book. The explanation is simple. The fourth book, which treats of *elocutio*, is largely made up of illustrations of various figures of rhetoric, and these examples, with few exceptions, are drawn from orations or are imitations of the oratorical style. We must not forget that at the beginning of the fourth book the Auctor ad Herennium lays great stress on the fact that he employs his own illustrations and not those cited by others, counting, apparently, as his own those which he translated from the Greek (*cf.* 4, 7, 10, where he especially takes credit for translating the Greek technical expressions used in rhetoric). In this connection I cannot refrain from making the suggestion, that the Roman teachers of rhetoric are to some extent, and perhaps largely, responsible for the very extensive use made of this word by the orators. Any one who reads attentively the large number of made-up examples of figures of rhetoric in the Auctor, can scarcely fail to be convinced of this. *Iste* becomes inseparable from them and recurs with a mechanical monotony. Compare also the frequent repetition of

iste in the first ten chapters of book 4 of this work, where it refers in each instance with disparaging force, to those whose views are combatted by the Auctor.

In view of these facts, and of the pedagogical convenience of the ordinary rule of grammar which makes hic, iste and ille correspond to the first, second and third persons respectively of the verb, it is not surprising to find the statement repeated in all our school grammars. It remains on the whole true, but I shall propose below, page 158, an important modification of the rule, and shall call attention to the necessity of discriminating between the use of the word in direct address on the one hand, and its use as a δευτερόπριτον on the other. Still, notwithstanding the truth of the general statement in so far as it refers to the "Golden," or, at least, to the Ciceronian Latinity, but it is misleading, and in fact censurable to imply by one's silence that the usage of the so-called Silver Latin is identical with that of the Ciceronian period. Schmalz forms the only exception to the general practice and his modifications of the rule,—depending as he was obliged to do on second-hand information,—are far from exact. The only and the earliest example of iste=hic cited by the erudite Kühner in his *Grammatik der Latein. Sprache* II², 454, is from St. Augustine!—a striking commentary on the state of the historical grammar of the Latin language in 1878. An examination of the whole subject is therefore necessary, the more so, since an appreciation of the later meanings of this word is essential to a proper understanding of the works of several of the "Silver" writers, especially Celsus, Seneca the Younger and

the poets. In the following discussion of the subject, the evidence for the meanings of *iste* is adduced in several distinct groups, within which the citations are arranged so far as possible in chronological order.

A. *ISTE* = *HIC*.

The earliest evidence of a weakening of the force of *iste* as a *δευτερόριτον* is found in the collocation *iste tuus, ista tua* (*cf.* Koziol, *Stil des Apuleius* p. 78), *iste uester, etc.*, which occurs as early as Plautus. In *Amphitruo* 285 Mercury says to Sosia

Ego pol te istis tuis pro dictis et male factis,
furfifer,
Accipiam.

Thirty-one similar instances are mentioned by Bach, *op. cit.* pp. 216 ff. The usage once established, we find it in Accius' *Telephus* 8; in Varro, *Res Rust.* 3,2,5; in Cicero (in the orations *iste tuus* twenty-seven times, *iste uester* seven times; in the philosophical writings *iste tuus* nine times, *iste uester* nine times; see Merguet's *Lexicon*), in Catullus 71,3; 81,3; 116,7; in Livy 4,4,7 *nobilitatem istam uestram*; in M. Aurel. (*apud* Fronto, *Epist.* 1,3) *Frontonem istum tuum* and in the Christian writers Firmicus Maternus 21,2 *deus iste uester*; Cyprian, *Epist.* 31,1*m* *ista tua caritate*; Arnobius 2,51*e*; Planciades Fulgentius, *Mitol.* 1, pr. 22(M) (= p. 12,14 H) *ne tu istam tuam satyram . . . credas*; Gord. Fulgentius 8 (= p. 156,14 H) *quae sunt ista tua, Deus, secreta misteria*.

At a later period the Romans found it necessary to juxtapose the form *tibi* to the word *iste*, in some instances at least, in order to secure a more distinct reference to the second person. Such, at least, is the

explanation of the Italian *codesto* (= *ecc[um] + tibi > ti + istu[m]*).

As long as *iste* was used for emphatic reference to the second person, its usual usage would naturally be confined to cases of direct address, to conversation, for example, to orations and letters, or in general to passages written when the interest of the author was fixed upon the person addressed, or at least when the latter occupied a position in the author's consciousness. The appearance of the word in other connections than these must be taken as an indication that there is absent from the consciousness of the user any such element in the idea group that is associated with the phonetic symbol *iste*; in other words, that *iste* is no longer a *δευτερόπριτον*.

There is possibly such an instance in Catullus 41,3

Ameana puella . . .

Tota milia me decem poposcit,

Ista turpiculo puella naso.

There seems to be no reference to the second person in this passage, for, although in line five the poet addresses the friends of the young lady, he turns abruptly to them and apparently has no thought of them in the first four lines. If there is no reference to the friends, we should then have to assume that it is the reader to whom he appeals. If this is the case, the usage would illustrate the argument set forth on p. 156 below. Horace in *Sat.* 1,4,130ff. uses *istinc* in the sense of a *meis utiis*. The passage runs

. . .mediocribus et quis

Ignoscas utiis teneor; fortassis et istinc

Largiter abstulerit longa aetas, liber amicus.

We may not, however, in this passage regard the word as used with the absence of all reference to the second person, since the phrase *quis ignoscas* containing the indefinite second person may be taken as an indication that Horace feels himself in close touch with his reader. There is in Virgil only one passage in which the word occurs outside of direct address, namely, 10, 504.

Turno tempus erit, magno cum optauerit emp-
tum
Intactum Pallanta et cum spolia ista diemque
Oderit.

The passage is a comment of the poet himself on the ruthless slaughter of Pallas (*cf.* verse 502 *nescia mens hominum . . . seruare modum*). The dark prophecy gives coloring to the entire sentence, and while the main cause for it is the death of Pallas, yet the taking of the *balteus*, referred to by the words *spolia ista*, is inseparable from the whole, and in my opinion *ista* decidedly heightens the effect that the poet, rising to a lofty dignity of tone characteristic of the orator, is desirous of producing. This may be regarded as an almost certain case of the use of the word outside of direct address, since little weight can be attached to the reading ^T*IPSA* of the Mediceus. There is likewise but a single passage in Manilius in which *iste* is used in this way, namely, 1,492-4.

Quis credat tantas operum sine numine moles
Ex minimis caecoque creatum foedere mundum?
Si fors ista dedit nobis, fors ipsa gubernet.

As the indefinite second person excuses the use of the word in Horace, so may the rhetorical question and

the subjunctive *gubernet* justify its use here. These are the only passages of this kind that I have found in the poets up to the time of Tiberius (I have omitted to examine some of Ovid's writings, *e. g.*, *Ars Amatoria*, *Medicamina Faciei*, *Haliëtica*).

Velleius Paterculus 2,7,3 cannot be made use of, since *istius* is here a conjecture of Cludius for Amerbach's *ipsius*. *Illius* would be more in accordance with the classical usage. As *iste* occurs no where else in Velleius, I prefer not to accept the reading. This being the case, the earliest prose writer to employ the word outside of direct address is Valerius Maximus, who offers no less than ten instances: 4,3*pr.* (in a passage expressing contempt); 4,3,6 (contempt); 2,8,7 (regret); 7,1,2 (censure); 7,8,6 (falsehood); 8,1,3 (undesirability); 9,14*pr.* (disapproval); 5,1,11 (praise); 6,4*Ext.* 1 (praise); 2,2,8 (high praise). There are in addition four passages in Velleius in which the use of *iste* may be regarded as justified by its occurrence in rhetorical questions. They are 5,3,2*b*; 5,6*pr.*; 5,6*Ext.* 4; 9,1,5. Celsus has followed in the foot-prints of Velleius, but has gone farther. Particularly striking is 8,12 (= p. 354,16 Dar.) *reposito osse, si cum dolore oculorum et ceruicis iste casus incidit, ex brachio sanguis mittendus est.* Cf. also 1,pr. (pp. 2,1; 3,1; 5,23; 6,6; 12; 9,29; 11,16; 17; 20 *isti... ipsi*). Instances of this usage from Seneca the Younger are cited by Hoppe, *Program*, Lauban, p. 8, with the words: "Her- vorzuheben ist bei Seneca der häufige Gebrauch von *iste*, ohne dass dessen besondere Bedeutung bewahrt wird." Pliny the Elder does not differ essentially from his predecessor in polyhistory, as may be seen by

reference to the following passages: *Praef.* 28; 2,85; 139; 141; 7,132; 9,129; 10,137; 13,23; 125; 14,9; 91; 115 || ita *cod* d ||; 27,8; 28,6; 8; 229; 29,11; 24; 30, 10; 13; and is followed by Martial (1,84,3), Quintilian (see: 9,4,32; 2,40; 10,3,24), Tacitus (*Agr.* 40,10; *Ann.* 16,16,7—the only instances in Tacitus) and Florus (2,13(4,2),13).

We may now proceed to establish its usage as a *πρωτότριτον*, *i. e.*, as a synonym of *hic*, and then discuss the chronological and geographical limits of the usage and consider the semasiological character of the changes in meaning involved.

There are at least ten further lines of evidence, that make the existence of an *iste* *πρωτότριτον* certain.

In the first place we find as early as Catullus (see Schmalz on Reisig's *Vorlesungen* III, Anm. 366 bb) some pronoun of the first person (usually a possessive) modifying the same word with *iste*. Examples are: Catullus 17,21

Talis iste meus stupor nil uidet, nihil audit,
Ipse, qui sit . . . , nescit;

Virg. *Aen.* 11,165

Nec uos arguerim, Teucri, nec foedera nec quas
Iunximus hospitio dextras: sors ista (*i. e.*, the
death of Pallas) senectae
Debita erat nostrae.

Euander is here speaking, and addresses the Trojans. This practice is quite common in the correspondence of Fronto and in Apuleius. From the former may be cited: 1,2 *ista mea fortuna . . . istam necessitatem meam . . . ista mea uerecundia* (the words of Marcus

Aurelius); 1,7 orationem istam meam (in a letter of Fronto himself). Apuleius offers us: Met. 1,11 sermones istos nostros; 2,3 meis istis manibus; 6,22 (cited by Goelzer, Gramm. in Sulp. Sev. Quaest. p. 90, Anm. 1) istud pectus meum. In a letter of the emperor Aurelian to Probus, *apud* Script. Hist. August. Prob. 6,6, the soldiery spoken of as *decimani mei* are shortly afterwards referred to by *isti*. Further examples are: Cyprian, De Oper. et Eleem. 20*e* in *istis* muneribus meis; and Sulp. Sev. D. 176,3 *regio ista nostrorum*. This usage is rare during the pre-Augustan period and is there confined to the poets.

There are other cases in which the reference of this pronoun to the first person is equally clear, although no possessive pronoun is added to it. It often refers to something in the vicinity or even in the possession of the writer or the speaker, or to something in which the speaker has a special interest. This application of the word is found in Seneca the Younger, Lucan, Pliny the Elder and his nephew, Juvenal and Fronto, not to mention the later writers. The elder Pliny in his dedication to Vespasian (sec. 18) refers to his work by the neuter plural substantive *ista*. His nephew in a letter to Caninius from the author's country home (2,8,1) writes, *studia altissimus iste successus adfatim suggerunt*, where *iste successus* means "this, my retired villa." Rauschnig, De Latinitate L. Ann. Sen. Phil. p. 70, cites instances of this usage from Seneca. Juvenal 4,67 writes *iste dies* "today" for *hic dies* or *hodie*, and 6,295 (perhaps in order to avoid confusion with *hinc* immediately preceding and following) *istos colles = the seven hills of Rome, i. e., "our seven hills"*,

in 9,131 called his *collibus*. In 14,179, where we read

“Uiuite contentis casulis et *collibus* istis,
O pueri!” Marsus dicebat . . . senex,

istis is of course capable of being interpreted in its normal sense. In the correspondence between Marcus Aurelius and Fronto this usage becomes quite common. Fronto writes p. 183 (N) *dum istius doloris expers uitam degerem*, meaning the pain which he himself suffers in his sickness. In the letter *De Nepote Amisso* (p. 236 *e*) he writes *casibus miserrimis afflictus sum . . . Plura scribere non possem isto in tempore*. Probably no writer of the second century went so far in this particular as did Apuleius. Especially clear are *Met.* 1,18 *iugulum istum dolui*, “my neck ached”; 2,14 *frater meus sub istis oculis miser iugulatus est*, “before my eyes”. An interesting parallel is afforded by *Met.* 2,5 *omnem istam lucem mundi* and Plautus’ *lucescit iam hoc*.

It is here desirable to cite a passage from Obermeier, *op. cit.* p. 15, since it stands in need of some little correction. “Iste hat bei Lucan die übrigen Demonstrativa geradezu verdrängt. Denn es steht sogar regelmässig statt *hic* bei Verhältnissen, welche die redende Person betreffen; z. B., 3,126 . . . mit *ista potestas* bezeichnet der Volkstribun Metellus die eigene Würde, 5,287

Nil actum est bellis, si nondum comperit istas
Omnia posse manus

die Aufrührer meinen die eigenen Hände, 5,588

. . . proderit undis | *Ista ratis*,

der Kahn, auf dem sich der also sprechende Cæsar befindet, 6,242 . . . gladio . . . isto der Cæsarierer weist auf sein eigenes Schwert, 8,122 . . . 6,158 . . . 328 bello . . . in isto, d. i. in dem gegenwärtigen Kriege, und so findet sich eine Menge Beispiele. Da noch Vergil iste nur in Beziehung auf die 2te Person gebraucht (Reisig, Vorlesungen, S. 361),” (Should read ‘Haase zu Reisig’. Landgraf also seems not to know of the passage Aen. X, 504 cited above), “in der Prose aber dieser Gebrauch von iste statt hic nicht vor dem Philosophen Seneca erscheint” (See on the contrary the passages quoted below from Celsus, Valerius Maximus and C. I. L., I, 1st ed. No. 818), “so muss Lucan einer der ersten gewesen sein, welche iste statt hic anwendeten.” Further, p. 18 “Mit iste—ille bedient er sich des Ausdruckes einer viel späteren Zeit.” To this last statement Weymann in Archiv III, 575 enters no objection. The expression is as old as Valerius Maximus (see below). Touching the first two sentences of Obermeier’s statement it may be remarked that iste is not so common in Lucan as it is in Virgil, and is far less frequent than hic. Concerning the fact that iste stands only four times in Lucan outside of direct address see below.

The later pagan writers do not make such extensive use of iste as do Apuleius, Fronto and Gellius, who is discussed below. Instances, however, of the use of iste as *πρωτότερον* are not uncommon. We may cite as illustrations the anonymous Declamatio in Catinianam 86, where *cursum istum uolentae orationis* means “the rushing course of my eloquence”; Balbus Gromaticus p. 91,10 *iste liber*, “my book”; p. 94,5

mensura ista . . . de qua loquimur. In a letter of Probus *apud* Script. Hist. Aug. Probus 16,5 ab istis locis means "from Isauria, where I am"—this passage could in Cicero mean nothing but "from the place where you are"—; Script. Hist. Aug. Firmus 1,2 istam descriptionem, "a narration like mine"; Tacitus 13,4 (isto = Tacito); Macrobius, Sat. 1,7,19 regionem istam—"this land", *i. e.*, where we live—*quae nunc uocatur Italia, regno Faunus obtinuit.* Similarly in Sat. 5,13,3 and 6 iste refers to the Roman poet Virgil, Macrobius' countryman, and may be translated "our poet", while in the second paragraph preceding, Homer is referred to by *ille*, and a few pages before, the two are contrasted by the words *hunc—illum*. The so-called Gronovian scholiast on Cicero's oration for Roscius Amer. 17 uses *usque ad istam narrationis partem* in the sense "up to the present point in my address."

The patristic literature, like Fronto and Apuleius, makes rather more extensive use of the word in this meaning:

Min. Felix 18,11 *iste sermo*, "this expression";
 19,15 *ista quae nostra sunt*, "our persuasion";
 40,1 *dum istaec igitur apud me tacitus euoluo*;

Cyprian, De Hab. Virg. 15 *p* *isto in loco*, "at this point in my address";

Tertullian, De Idol. 19 *p* *in isto capitulo*, "in this chapter";

Commodian 1,25,19 *isto libello*, "my book";

Ambrose 1,8,32 *F* *nobis excursus iste processit, ut probaremus . . .*;

Sulpicius Severus, Chron. 1,2,1 *uoluminis istius*, "my volumen";

M. 25,3 ista (= mea) laudatio;
27,6 opusculum istud (= meum);

D. 1,18,2; 2(3),16; E. 2,8 *et saep. al.* In this connection consult Lönnergren, *De Syntaxi S. S.* p. 10: "pronomen quod est iste celeberrime adhibet, ut ad agentem personam referatur, quod genus loquendi apud infimae aetatis scriptores uiguisse constat."

S. Silv. Peregrinatio p. 87,27 hic omnes conuenire in isto loco; 85,29 hodie nocte ista;

Cassian. Inst. 5,1 quintus nobis iste liber produci-
tur;

Hilarian in his *Tractatus in Psalmos* often refers to the particular psalm under discussion by the pronoun iste, *e. g.*, 2,2*m.* On the other hand in *Int. Psalm.* 10 he writes hic psalmus.

To these citations we may add those having the adverbial forms istic and istinc. The earliest instance, to omit Horace, *l. c.*, is Juvenal 3,29, where istic means "here in Rome". He is followed by Marcus Aurelius, *Ad Frontonem* p. 34*m*(N) istic noctibus studeo; Fronto p. 212(N) in orationibus...sedulo curamus...sed contra istic (*i. e.*, in the branch of literature with which I am now occupied); Apuleius, *Met.* 2,20 Immo uero istic ("in this city") nec uirtutibus ullis parcitur. Instances from Cyprian may be found by consulting Hartel's index. From the conservative juristic Latin, Heumann, in his *Handlexicon s. v. iste* cites istic from *Dig.* 29,2,71,9 (a quotation from Ulpian).

Aside from this group of instances, there exists a large number of passages, in which iste appears in connections normally reserved for hic. Valerius Maxi-

mus, for example, in passing from one group of anecdotes to another regularly refers to those just related by the plural *haec*, and to those which follow by the form *illa*. This usage occurs, for example, in books five and six, and is exactly paralleled by Cic. *Ad Fam.* 12,2,2. In two instances, however, he departs from his usual custom and writes *ista* instead of *haec*. In 3,8,2 we read *ista* (*i. e.*, the anecdotes just related) *quidem seueritatis*, *illa* (the following) *uero pietatis constantia admirabilis*; in 5,4,3 *auribus ista tam praeclara exempla Romana ciuitas accepit, illa uidit oculis*. Lucifer Caralitanus writes interchangeably in *De Reg. Apost.* 2,3-5 *hunc Hieroboam* (p. 43,26), *istius* . . . Hieroboae (p. 44,3), . . . *istum H.* (44,18), . . . *isti H.* (45,25). In the B class of the *Scholia Terentiana* published by Schlee we find frequently recurring *ista secum loquitur* and *haec secum loquitur*. Jordanes, in *Romana* 23 reads *sub istius regni tempore*, although more often he writes *huius regis tempore* (so 18). Compare also 26 *hoc regnante* with 46 *sub isto rege*.

The frequently recurring phrase *ὁὗτος ὁ κόσμος* has its counterpart (chiefly, of course, in the patristic literature) in *iste mundus*. Although *hic mundus* was the classical and usual form, yet even in Manilius (cited above) we find the neuter plural *ista* used as a synonym of it. *Iste mundus* occurs first in Cyprian, *Ad Dem.* 19*c* in *isto adhuc mundo et hac carne constituti*, with which we may compare, 25 in *isto adhuc mundo*. Other examples are:

Ambrosius, *Ex.* 1,4,14 F. *Pharao principem istius mundi* . . . (A) *omnium nationum primum est Amaleck* . . . *Uide ne principem huius mundi accipere debeat*

mus; *cf.* 1,8,31E in iudicio istius mundi || istis (mundi *om.* N) ||;

Paulinus Nolan. Epist. 5,7(p. 29,29) istum mundum;

Filastrius, Heres. Liber 31,(3)2, *etc.*;

Hilarius Pictav. Tractatus in Psalm. 118, *Lamed*, 8 mundi istius;

Cassianus, Institutes 4,14 istius mundi. "saepissime hic mundus", Petschenig in indice.

Further examples may easily be found by consulting the indices to the various volumes of the Vienna Corpus Script. Eccl. Roman. From the pagan literature we may cite Censorinus, De Die Natali 4,4 sempiterno isto mundo. Similar to this phrase are:

Min. Fel. 11,1 moles ista, "this heaven we behold";
34,5 ista moles = hic mundus;

Commodian 1,3,1 f.

Cum Deus omnipotens exornasset mundi uaturam

Uisitare uoluit terram ab angelis istam;

Min. Fel. 21,11 ista generatio;

Commodian 1,26,25 istius saeculi;

Augustine, Epist. 25,3 *e* uitae istius;

Cyprian, De Mortal. 8 mortalitas ista communis;

8 istic in hoc mundo;

19 istinc de hoc mundo;

In these passages no distinction between *iste* and *hic* based on the presence of any idea of depreciation or contempt in the former can be established. Indeed *iste* is not infrequently found referring to the Savior himself. See the ancient Latin version of the inter-

polated epistle of Ignatius to the Philippians 5. No objection can therefore be raised on this ground to Plasberg's interpretation of *me isto nomine ditans* in Anth. Lat. 664 (Riese), "the name of Christian" (*cf.* Rhein. Mus. 54, 149); nor to Thomas' "nomen Christi" or "discipuli tui" (*op. cit.* p. 316).

Sentences of the type of *Nepos, Them. 1,1 Themistocles, Neocli filius, Atheniensis. huius...* (*cf.* Alcib. 1,1; Chab. 1,1 Chabrias Atheniensis. *hic quoque in* . . . ; Sallust, Bell. Cat. 5,1 Catulina, nobili genere natus, fuit magna vi et animi et corporis, sed ingenio malo prauoque. huic ab adulescentia . . . ; *Nepos, Epam. 4,1; Eum. 12,3; 4*) occur as early as the epitaphs of the Scipios (see C. I. L. Vol. I, Nos. 31 f.

L · CORNELIO · L · F · SCIPIO

AIDILES · COSOL · CESOR

HONC OINO · PLOIRVME · COSENTIONT R(*omae*) . . . ;

cf. C. I. L., I, 1011. 1012. Wilm. 573) and continued to be a favorite of the writers of history and biography (see Sallust, *op. cit.* 6,1; 18,4; 23,1-2; 25,1; 2; Bell. Jug. 35,2; and 65,1-3; Vell. Pat. 2,41,1; *cf.* 1,2,2 and Fritsch, *Der Sprachgebrauch des Velleius*, Arnstadt, 1876, p. 18; Valer. Max. 1,8 Ext., 8, etc.; Florus 1,1(3),1; (5),2; (7),2; 1,4(10),2; 1,25(2,9),2; 28(2,12),3; 2,2(14),2; 10(22),6(hi); Sueton. Rhet. 2; Gram. 18; Trebellius Pollio, *saepe*; De Uiris Illustr. 32,3; Victor, Hist. Abbr. 15,1; 18,1; 31,1). For our present purposes it is a matter of comparative indifference whether, as has been suggested by an eminent German Latinist, this usage developed under the influence of the style of the *Laudationes Funebres*, in which *hic* would natur-

ally and normally be used to refer to the person of the deceased over whom the discourse was pronounced, or whether it is to be regarded simply as the use, in a special type of context, of this pronoun to refer to an antecedent not actually present, but present only in the thought or imagination (*cf.* Priscian III, pp. 142 f. (K) hic. . . etiam de absente possumus dicere, ad intellectum referentes demonstrationem). *ὁδτος* was used in precisely the same way by the Greeks, in the shorter biographical notices of prominent writers (it seems not to occur in Plutarch's *Βίοι Παράλληλοι*), *e. g.*, in the *Βίος Σοφοκλέους* printed with Dindorf's Scholia, and in Suidas' Lexicon, *s. vv.* *Θοδλις* and *Θωρουζίων et al.* The thorough establishment of the usage in Latin literature is testified to by its occurrence as late as Isidore, *De Ortu et Obitu Patrum* §§ 5; 9; 10; 12; 18; 19(*tris*); 22; 35; 36; 40 *et alias*. In spite of its extensive use, however, it was obliged to share its position with *iste*, which Isidore wrote instead of *hic* not infrequently, *e. g.*, §§ 8; 11; 52. Isidore also writes indifferently § 15 *Distat autem hic locus* and § 5 *Distat autem locus iste*. Possibly the influence of his sources here plays some part, as he quotes them extensively *ad litteram*.

Instead of the usual *hoc modo* and *huius modi* St. Augustine, *Epist.* 7,2,3*p* writes *isto modo*, "as follows", and Hilar. *Tractat.* in Psalm. 2,2*e* *istius modi*. Aulus Gellius employs *istius modi* more than twenty times and in connections implying praise as often as in those which indicate contempt. In many cases one might write for it *huius modi* apparently without marring the sense.

Claudius Mamertus writes for "de ea re hic am-

plius non dicam'' now (*e. g.*, p. 123, 19*e*) hinc alias and now (see p. 31, 6) istinc alias (*cf.* Vogel's index *s. v.* istinc). Precisely so also Ennodius: istinc alias p. 5, 23; hinc alias pp. 52, 7; 128, 13; 140, 14; 224, 16; 297, 29; 317, 7.

Further compare Plautus, Men. 799 hinc stas, illim causam dicis with Claud. Mamert. p. 134, 15 *E* illinc stare et istinc dicere.

In Valerius Maximus 3, 2, 3 we read hactenus istud instead of the usual hactenus hoc. Lastly we may call attention to the appearance in Celsus 1, *pr.* (p. 9, 29 D) of the phrase post ista instead of post haec, which occurs as early as Cicero, Fr. A, III, 22 (Bait. and K.), and later in Cyprian, De Domin. Oratione 27 *p*; Arnobius 4, 36; Commodian 1, 29, 3.

The falling of all essential lines of demarcation between the two words is attested by the passage in Pompeius, Comment. in Donatum p. 122, 34 ff. de duabus syllabis quattuor hi sunt: pyrrhicius, spondaeus, trochaeus, et iambus, de tribus VII isti sunt: tribrachus, molossus, *etc.*... de quattuor XVI isti sunt: proceleumaticus.... There are similar passages in Filastrius, Heres. Lib. 33, 3 dicunt et dogma ponentes ista, "the following", and Jordanes, Get. (33) 170 quorum ordo iste ac successus fuit: primum Gyzericus,sequens.... In Macrob. Sat. 6, 7, 1 ista = "the preceding." It is of interest to note that estu is used in this way in the Iguvian Tablets II b, 23 estu iuku habetu, "hanc inuocationem habeto", Bréal, Les Tables Eugébines p. 274; "istam orationem habeto", Bücheler, Umbrica p. 148. Filastrius in transitions repeatedly interchanges the two, thus, 30 post hunc;

31 post istum; 32 post istos; 35 post istum; 36 Cerinthus successit huius errori; 38 post istum; 40 post hunc; 41 post hunc; 42 post istum; 44 post hos, *etc.*

Of not less interest are those passages in which *iste* and *hic* stand in one and the same sentence referring to the same antecedent. Examples are not infrequent. The earliest are in Celsus 2,2*e* ille sollicitari debet, cui haec noua sunt; aut qui ista numquam sine custodia tuta habuit; 5,28(p. 215,12 f. D) sed ut haec maximi effectus sunt, si cui ista non adsunt. . . .; 3,6 should not have been cited by Matthias, Index *s. v.*, since the *his* may here represent an original *iis* or *eis*. So also Valer. Max. 9,11 *Ext.*4. The same correlation occurs in Pliny's Nat. Hist. 2,85 incomperta haec et inextricabilia. . . . si cui libet ista altius persequi (though we should not fail to observe that *ista* is here used of a depreciated antecedent and seems almost to be equivalent to *talis*). The order of *iste* and *hic* is reversed in Lactantius, De Ira Dei 5,8 speciose ista populariterque dicta et multos illiciunt ad credendum, si qui haec sentiunt (it may here be questioned whether *haec* does not stand for *ea*); and Hilarius, Tractat. in Psalm. 2,13 *p* iste irae sermo et. . . . haec indignationis perturbatio. A return to the other order is found in Calpurnius, Ecl. 1,9 f.

Hoc. . . ., Corydon, nemus, antra petamus
Ista patris Fauni;

and the anonymous Declam. in L. Serg. Catilinam 85 excitentur hi populi (*sc.* Carthaginienses, Numantiui, Graeci) rursus diuinitus, atque istae urbes redeant in statum uetustissimae dignitatis; *cf.* Aug. Epist. 108,11.

Of the various formulae used by the Romans to

express contrasts, perhaps none were better suited to their purposes or obtained more general currency, than the familiar *hic—ille* (*cf. supra*, pp. 79–96). We should therefore expect it to resist strongly the encroachment of a rival on its sphere. Nevertheless, as early as Valerius Maximus, we find that *iste—ille* is beginning to make headway against it, as was seen above.

We must, however, be on our guard against taking the mere presence of *iste* in contrast with *ille* as in itself sufficient evidence of its coincidence in meaning with *hic*. This error has not infrequently been committed; yet a contrast between *ille* and *iste* in its classical sense is, of course, quite as possible as one between *tu* and *ille* or *iste* and *hic*; and such contrasts are occasionally found. *Iste—ille* occurs, for example, in Livy 3,47,7; 22,60,27, and *iste—hic* in Plautus, Rud. 808 *alter istinc, alter hinc*; Cic. Ad Fam. 2,11,1 *ista uestra . . . haec . . . nostratia* (*cf.* 3,10,3; 6,18,5 and De Re Pub. 1,31). Again it is equally conceivable that a contrast be drawn between these two words, in which *iste* has neither its normal classical meaning nor its later meaning “this.” Such an instance we believe to be afforded by Seneca, Epist. 47,4(= 5,6,4), although at the same time conceding that there is room here for considerable diversity of opinion as to the exact meaning of *iste* (*cf.* *istos qui* in § 2 of this same letter). For the period of the “Silver Latin,” at least, we should not interpret *iste* in the correlation *iste—ille* as *πρω-τότερον*, if there is not collateral evidence sufficient to prove that *iste* approaches the meaning of *hic*. In the passages cited above from Valerius Maximus, there

is colateral evidence enough to establish this usage. The earliest example after this known to me is from Lucan 9,417 ff.

... Nam cum communiter istae
Effundant zephyrum, boreae latus illa sinistrum
Contingens dextrumque noti, discedit in ortus,
Eurum sola tenens.

Here *istae* approaches *hic* in meaning, since it refers to Africa and Europe, the continents nearer to Rome, whereas *illa* refers to Asia, the more remote. Similarly Martial 4,49,10 says of his reading public, *laudant illa* (Greek literature) *sed ista*, "my epigrams", *legunt*, and Quintilian 8,5,24 in drawing a contrast between the earlier, ruder attempts of the Romans at oratory and the elaborate speeches of his own time refers to the former by *illum horrorem dicendi* and the latter by *istam nouam licentiam*. I can cite no example from any prose writer between Valerius Maximus and Quintilian, though some cases may exist in Celsus or in Pliny's Natural History, books 4,5,16-22,31-37. Later writers are not so chary:

Gellius 20,1,4 *non enim minus cupide tabulas istas XII legi quam illos XII libros Platonis de legibus*.

Macrobius. From the Saturnalia, compare 5,2,15 *illic* (in the Iliad)...*hic* (in the Aeneid); 17 *ille* (*i. e.*, Homer) *hic* (Virgil) with 5,13,3 *Homerus*...*signavit*...*at iste* (*i. e.*, Virgil); 21 *ille cum marino motu et littoreos fluctus*...*describit, hoc iste praeteruolat*.

Script. Hist. Aug. Balb. 7,7 (a comparison between Balbus and Maximus) *alterum seuerum, clementem alterum, bonum illum, istum constantem, illum nihil largientem, hunc affluentem copiis omnibus; an espe-*

cially interesting passage as showing iste...ille in correlation with alterum...alterum, although both refer to definite antecedents.

Itin. Antonini Plac. p. 174,1 in ista uel illa ripa.

Ammianus Marcellinus 16,12,47 Alamanni robusti et celsiores milites...dociles: illi feri...hi quieti...; animis isti fidentes, grandissimis illi corporibus freti. Observe the chiasitic order.

Codex Parisinus of Placidus Glosses (*apud* Götz, Corpus Gloss. V, p. 113,26) longe distat · ab illo sapiente · iste indoctus.

Jordanes, Get. 10(66).

This correlation is especially frequent in the patristic literature. It occurs as follows:

A. Parallel with hic...ille:

Orosius, Adv. Pag. 2,2,10 Babylon...Roma... illa (the former—the more remote in space)...ista, illa...haec...; 7,2,2 illud (*sc.* Assyriorum—the more remote in space) primum, hoc (*sc.* Romanum) ultimum imperium; illud...istud...; illi..., isti...; illam..., istam...

Alcimus Avitus, Contr. Eutyech. Haeres. 1 (p. 19, 33 Peiper) illic..., hic...; illic..., istas...

Fulgentius, De Aetat. Mundi 2, p. 136f. illic (more remote in time and interest)..., hic (nearer in time and interest)...: illic..., hic...: illic, hic...: illic..., hic... Ille legem accipit, ne comedat carnem in sanguine, iste legem suscipit, quo...carne saturetur et sanguine (*cf.* p. 137 below). Illum..., istum...

Ambrosius, Ex. 6,1,1 E neque enim eadem dicendi condicio, quae canendi et luctandi; cum in illis (the

latter) ludus offensionis, in isto lapsus mortis sit. illic si pecces, spectantum fastidium est, hic damnum est audientum. In this type of sentence there is no connection of importance between the writer and the antecedent of iste, so that the correlation under discussion approaches in meaning alterum . . . alterum Other examples of it are: Optatus 6,6 (p. 154, 21 ff.); Faustus, De Gratia 2,3 (p. 63, 11 ff.) illa ("the former") . . . haec . . . illa . . . ista . . . illa . . . haec; Alc. Avit. p. 26, 28 illi (the latter—Bonosiaci) . . . isti (the former—Entychiani) . . . Photinus . . . hic . . . cf. Fulgentius, De Aetat. Mundi 8, p. 156, 18. These passages show that ille . . . iste . . . and iste . . . ille . . . underwent the same course of development as hic . . . ille discussed above (see pp. 79-96). A particularly clear example of iste referring to an indefinite antecedent is found in the description of St. Martin exorcising evil spirits, inserted in Sulp. Sev. Dial. 2(3), 6, 4 tum uero cerneris miseros diuerso exitu perurgueri: hos . . . quasi de nube pendere . . . : at in parte alia uideres . . . uexatos et sua crimina confitentes. nomina etiam . . . prodebant: ille se Iouem, iste Mercurium fatebantur. postremo cunctos . . . cerneris . . . cruciari.

It will be further observed that in the passages here cited it seems not to be a matter of importance whether the correlation ille—iste or ille—hic precedes. In Oros. 2 the former precedes, in 7 the latter. In Alc. Avit. p. 19 the order illic—hic illic—istos is employed, on page 26 the reverse order; while in Faustus *loc. supra cit.* illa—haec illa—ista illa—haec occurs.

When the correlation ille—iste occurs unaccom-

panied by a coordinated ille—hic, the order ille—iste is about twice as frequent as iste—ille, if the examples cited in this paper (twenty-six of the former, thirteen of the latter) may be taken as a fair representation of his average usage.

B. In the following there is no such correlation with hic—ille:

Alc. Avit. Epist. XXIX(27), p. 59,21 (letter of King Sigismund to Pope Symmachus) istic (here in Gaul)...illic (there in Italy). The classical usage would have been hic...istic.... So p. 94,12 illam plebem refecistis gaudio, istam ditate rescripto.

Ennodius p. 55,31 ille praesto fuit indicibus (locally more remote) iste.... ille.... iste.... Note the order ille—iste.

Sulp. Sev. Dial. 1(2),6,7 illa (the Queen of Sheba—the more remote in time)...ista (the wife of the Emperor Maximus, who served St. Martin).

Filastrius § 67,18 non isti (the present nation of Jews) sed ueteres et periti illi.

Alc. Avit. Contr. Eut. Haer. 1(p. 21,12) in illo (the former—the Old Testament)...., in isto (the New Test.).... The two words are used in the same sense but in the chiasmic order in *op. cit.* p. 25,27 obeuntem (*sc.* Christum) ille (the crucified thief) contremuit, regnantem iste (Eutyches) fastidit. iste....ille....

Alc. Avit. ex Hom. Lib. p. 115,8 iste (Christus)...., ille (diabolus)—the nearer and the more remote in interest.

In Sulp. Sev. Dial. 1,24,2 illi refers to the saints lauded by Postumianus—the more remote in the interest and sympathies of the writer, while iste refers to

St. Martin, whose cause Sulpicius is advocating. Cicero would certainly have written here *isti . . . hic*.

Ennodius I, I (= Epist. 2, 14, p. 68, 14) ad illa (the latter—temporal honors) . . . ista (the latter—confessionis praemia) . . .

In the following cases ille and iste bear the same meaning as in Ambrosius, Ex. 6, 1, 1 E, etc.:

a) Order iste—ille:

Lactantius I, 11, 26 sed finxerint ista quae fabulosa creduntur: num etiam illa quae de diis feminis deorumque conubiis dicta sunt? In this passage there is less disparagement of the antecedent of iste than of the antecedent of illa. Cf. Hilar. Tractat. in Psalm. 2, 9 e; Alc. Avit. ex Hom. Lib. p. 114, 3 iste (the latter) . . . ille (the former). The closer external resemblance of isti to illi may have led Fulgentius Placidus to prefer it to hi in a passage (Mitol. 2, 70), in which he strives to attain the greatest possible phonetic correspondence between the two clauses: Epicurei . . . , Stoici . . . ; isti libidinem colunt, illi libidinem nolunt. Cf. De Aetat. Mundi 2, cited on p. 134 above.

b) Order ille—iste:

Firm. Mat. 2, 3 Osiris iustus (*sc fuit*) Tyfon furiosus, . . . ; ideo ille (the former) colitur, iste uitatur.

Ambrosius, *op. cit.* 1, 8, 30 F illae (the former) . . . , istae (the latter) . . . So Augustine, Epist. 4, 2 m and Alc. Avit. ex. Hom. Lib. p. 145, 14. In Ennod. CCCXCVII (= Epist. 8, 20), p. 282, 30 iste refers to the last mentioned antecedent, ille to the former.

Still more tangible evidence of the usage iste = hic is found in the old Latin translations of Greek

writings. Of chief importance are the Epistles of Ignatius, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Novellae of Justinian and the Bible. Of these the second and the last are doubly valuable, because of the existence of at least two distinct Latin translations of portions of of each of them.

In the Greek text of the Pastor Hermae forms of *ὅστος* occur about three hundred times. In about three-fourths of these instances both of our Latin translations render the Greek pronoun by some form of *hic*. In forty-five instances one translation has *iste* and the other *hic*. In five instances both have *iste*. Only three of these last cases, however, have come down to us without *variae lectiones* in the manuscripts: Visiones 3,3,2, where both translations read *isti* and *istae*, and Mandata 10,1,3, where the Palatine has *similitudines istas* and the Vulgata *quaestiones istas*. In the three other instances the editio princeps of the Vulgate has forms of *hic*. Aside from these passages *iste* occurs in the Vulgate only six times as a translation of *ὅστος*.

(*cf. the following page.*)

Palatina.

nequaquam super seruum domini hoc negotium.

et cum pausassem interrogans eam de omnibus his.

sufficiat tibi commonitio haec.

miseriordiam suam creaturae suae indulsit et hanc poenitentiae occasionem dedit, cui me prae fecit.

et ait mihi: arbor haec salix est.

To these should be added the doubtful passage Mand. 8,6 haec sunt, inquit, quae carente debeas.

Greek.

Vis. 1,2,4 Μηδαμῶς ἐπὶ τὸν δούλον τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτο.

Vis. 3,8,1 ὅτε ὄν ἐπασιδμήν ἐρωτῶν αὐτὴν περὶ πάντων τούτων.

Vis. 3,8,9 ἀραρετή σοι ἡ ἐπίμνησις αὐτῆ.

Mand. 4,3,5 Ὁ Κύριος ἐπέλαγγύσθη ἐπὶ τὴν ποιήσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔθηκεν τὴν μετάνοιαν ταύτην, καὶ ἐμοὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τῆς μετανοίας ταύτης ἐδόθη.

Sim. 8,2,7 ἀποκριθεὶς μοι λέγει τὸ ἐνὸρθρον τοῦτο λέγα ἔστιν.

To these should be added the doubtful passage Mand. 8,6

a quibus ergo debeas abstinere, haec sunt || ista *ed. princ.* illa Cott. Dress. ||

Iste = Hic.

Vulgate.

absit a seruo dei res ista.

cum ergo desini interrogando illam de omnibus istis.

sufficiet tibi commemoratio ista.

miserus est figmento suo et posuit poenitentiam istam et potestatem poenitentiae huius || huiusmodi *cod.* Dresd. || mihi dedit.

ait mihi: arbor ista salix est.

To these should be added the doubtful passage Mand. 8,6

a quibus ergo debeas abstinere, haec sunt || ista *ed. princ.* illa Cott. Dress. ||

In the Palatina *iste* occurs more frequently (forty-two times + Sim. 9,22,3, where Gebhardt and Harnack print *suam* instead of *istam*).

Next in chronological order follow the examples from the New Testament. *Iste* is frequently used in the four Gospels and almost exclusively to represent *ὁῦτος*. In Matthew all the manuscripts of the ante-Hieronymian translations, so far as they are preserved to us, agree in eleven instances with the Vulgate in rendering *ὁῦτος* by *iste*. In other instances one renders by *iste* the other by *hic*. In many cases both show *hic*. The following illustrations will give an idea of the relations of the manuscripts to each other :

Matth. 7,28 *τοὺς λόγους τοῦτους*.

uerba haec Vulg.

sermones istos k. The symbols here used are those regularly employed to designate the MSS of the ante-Hieronymian translations of the New Testament: a = Vercellensis (*sacc.* IV-V), a² frag. Curiensia (*sacc.* V), c Colbertinus (*sacc.* XI), d Bezae Cant. (*sacc.* VI), e Palatinus-Vindobonensis 1185 and Dublinensis (*sacc.* IV-V), f Brixianus (*sacc.* VI), f¹ Corbiensis I (*sacc.* VIII), f² Corbiensis II (*sacc.* V-VI), h Vaticanus Claromontanus (*sacc.* IV-V), i Vindobonensis 1235 (*sacc.* VII), k Taurinensis, *olim* Bobiensis (*sacc.* IV-V), l Reh(not Rhe)digerianus (*sacc.* VII), q. Monacensis (*sacc.* VII), r Dublinensis Usserianus I. See N. T. Graece ed. Tischendorf, 8th edition, Vol. III, prolegomena, by Caspar Gregory and N. T. rec. Wordsworth and White I, p. xxxi.

Matth. 18,10 ἐνὸς τῶν μικρῶν τοῦτων. Unum ex his pusillis Vulg. *plerique*. istis E, Q, f, e, q.

19,20 πάντα ταῦτα. omnia haec or haec omnia Vulg. omnia ista e, q, l.

25,45 ἐνὶ τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων. unum de minoribus his Vulg. istis f¹, f².

25,46 ἐπελεύσονται οὗτοι. ibunt hi Vulg. isti h.

To these must be added six other passages in which only d reads hic (10,23; 12,41; 42; 13,56; 18,14; 19,1), the hic being due probably to a corrector's hand.

Luc. 13,16 τούτου isto Vulg. *caet.* c, e, f, f², i, l, q, r. hoc a, a², d.

In Ignatius' letters the following cases occur:

Epist. ad Magn. (interpolata) 3 οὐ γὰρ τουτοὶ τὸν βλέπομενον πλανᾷ τις, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀόρατον παραλογίζεται, τὸν μὴ δυνόμενον . . . non enim istum uisibilem quis spernit, sed illum inuisibilem in eo contemnit, qui non potest . . .

ad Trall. (interpol.) 7 *e* τούτων. istis (= diaconi).

ad Phil. (interpol.) 5 πῶς δὲ καὶ μάγος οὗτος, ὁ . . . quomodo igitur magus est iste (*sc.* Christus) || Usser and his predecessors ille ||, qui.

cf. ad Phil. (interpol.) 6 πῶς . . . οὗτος θεὸς ὁ . . . ; quomodo . . . deus iste || Usser and his predecessors ille || qui.

In Justinian's Novellae iste is occasionally, but not frequently, used to translate οὗτος.

We may also compare the Vocative *o isti* (= *o uos*) in Arnobius 4,8*p* (p. 147, 10) (*cf.* also 1,41*p*; 2,13; 36; 4,17*p*) with Aristophanes, *Nubes* 1502 *οἷτος, τί ποιεῖς;*

Finally Planciades Fulgentius, *Mitol.* 1,7(= p. 21,2) translates *tuton phone* by *istarum uox*. As his purpose is only to give a Latin equivalent of the Greek words *per se*, without reference to any special context, the citation gains greatly in value.

Similarly the grammarian Dositheus, *apud* Keil VII,376-436, in his parallel paradigms of Greek and Latin pronouns, gives both *hic* and *iste* as equivalents for *οἷτος*. See especially p. 402, 21 ff.

I am not aware of any semasiological changes undergone by *οἷτος* in the course of the post-classical period, that could seriously detract from the value of the citations here made to establish the prototritonic character of *iste*.

Side by side with these translations stand the glosses, which for the most part are now conveniently accessible in Götz's *Corpus*. The following definitions are taken from them:

- Vol. II, p. 390,32 (*cod.* Laudensis) *οἷτος hic iste is*
 p. 390,33 " " *οἷτοι hi isti ei*
 p. 457,49 " " *τοἷτο id · hoc istud*
 p. 452,6 " " *ταῦτη hac istac*
 p. 92,57 (*cod.* Parisin. 7651, pp. 1-212) *iste is οἷτος*
- Vol. IV, p. 87,13 (*cod.* Vat. 3321 *saec.* VII) *histic hic*
 p. 87,26 " " " *hicste (for hic ste = hic iste) hicine istum*
 p. 88,17 (*cod.* Vat. 3321 *saec.* VII) *huiusce-modi huius modi istius modi*

- p. 88,18 (*cod. Vat. 3321 saec. VII*) huncine (for
huncine?) istum uero
- Vol. V, p. 109,23 (*cod. Par. 1298 saec. XI*) his · istis
- p. 108,7 “ “ “ hec · ste
- p. 110,12 “ “ “ huncine · istum uero
- p. 110,13 “ “ “ huius modi · istius
modi
- p. 300,23 (*Glos. Amplonianum II saec. IX*)
hic iste
- p. 305,21 (*Glos. Amplonianum II saec. IX*)
istic hic

The variant readings *h̄* istud and hoc istud of C and F in Livy 3,52,6 doubtless owe their origin to glosses.

The last certain line of evidence which we have to cite is afforded by the Romance languages, several of which have preserved modified forms of *iste* with the meaning “here” and kindred meanings (*cf.* Körting, Wörterbuch, Nos. 2770,2771,4438).

este Spanish, Catalanian, Portuguese.

ist Rumanian, Old French (only in oaths).

est Provençal.

ecce + iste = acest Rumanian.

cist Provençal.

icist Old French.

cet, ce Mod. French.

ecc[um] + istu[m] = questo Italian.

= kešt Rhetian.

= aquest Provençal.

= aqueste Spanish, Portuguese.

Italian: costui, costei, costoro, cotesti (from eccu

[m] + ti < tibi + isti), cotestui, -ei. The last three are applied only to the second person (see p. 117 *supra*), stamattina, stasera, stanotte.

To one who reflects that the Romans of the later empire were thoroughly familiar with this usage of iste, the well known definition of Priscian (Keil III, 142 f.) can offer no difficulties: demonstratiua uero ut 'hic', 'iste' uel 'ille.' sed interest, quod 'ille' spatio longiore intellegitur, 'iste' uero propinquiore, 'hic' autem non solum de praesente, uerum etiam de absente possumus dicere, ad intellectum referentes demonstrationem. This shows that the native grammarians felt that hic and iste had a very close resemblance in meaning. In fact they so far confused them, as actually to use in paradigms the forms of iste instead of hic as a substitute for the Greek definite article. See below p. 205, and *cf.* Servius, Commentum in Donatum p. 410, 16(K).

Possibly some inferences affecting the present discussion might be drawn from the incorrect orthography isthic. Was this introduced by the ancient Romans themselves under the erroneous supposition that isthic was a compound of iste and hic? Such a supposition might easily be founded on the close resemblance that they felt to exist between the two pronouns.

As for the geographical extension of the usage iste = hic, we find it in Rome and in other parts of Italy (in the works of Palinus in Milan, Cassiodorius, Ennodius and Jordanes), in Sardinia (in those of Lucifer Caralitanus), Sicily (in Firmicus Maternus), Africa (in Cyprian, Tertullian, Arnobius, Lactantius, Ambrosius, Augustine, Fulgentius), Mauretania? (in Pompe-

ius [Maurus]), Spain (in Prudentius, Orosius, Isidore), Aquitania (in Ausonius?, S. Silv. Peregr., Prudentius, Sulpicius Severus, *Itinerarium Burdigalense*), Southern France (in Cassianus, Hilarius, Salvianus?, Alcimius Avitus), Dalmatia (in the inscriptions: C. I. L. III, 1, No. 2628; Suppl. No. 9259—Saloni) and Pannonia (inscriptions C. I. L. III, 1, 3351—Alba Regia—; 4185—Savaria?). This general survey reveals the inexactness of the current notion that the usage *iste = hic* is peculiarly African Latinity. The frequency of its use in Africa (*cf.* Schmalz, *Lateinische Syntax* 3d ed. p. 444) is in my opinion to be accounted for simply by the close approach of the style of the African writers to the conversational tone. We know that their literature was mainly addressed to the less highly educated.

Chronological limits of the usage. Since the Romance words quoted above stand as living testimony of the usage *iste = hic* in the latest period of the Latin language, it remains only for us to determine the date of its first appearance. Valerius Maximus is the earliest author cited in this chapter as having the usage *iste = hic*, to whose writings we can assign a definite date *post quem non*. Five of the ten instances he offers us occur in books 2-5, and as the proemium of book 6 was written before the death of Julia, they fall before the year 29 A. D. There is no reason for doubting that the dates of the composition and publications of the different books followed each other in the present numerical order of the books. The passage 9, 11 was written immediately after the fall of Sejanus. The instances in books 7 and 8 would

therefore probably fall between the dates 29 and 31 A. D. The date of Celsus is not definitely known. If he was born about 2 A. D., he could have written the *De Medicina* before 29 A. D., in which case he would be a slightly earlier witness to the usage than is Valerius Maximus.

As the extant works of these two authors were written some eighty years after Caesar, and as their rhetorical training was entirely different from his, it is somewhat surprising to note that several editors of Caesar, among them Dinter (p. 127) and Kübler (p. 142), print as an *ad literam* citation from Caesar's *De Analogia* the words found in Pompeius, *Commentum in Donatum* p. 144,20: *duae sunt Albae, alia ista quam nouimus in Aricia, et alia hic in Italia. uolentes Romani discretionem facere, istos Albanos dixerunt, illos Albenses.* The words *discretionem* and *dixerunt* (for *nominauerunt*), as well as the position of the participle arouse suspicion as to the genuineness of the fragment, but the introductory words of Pompeius, *ait sic Caesar*, would lead one to assume, as Dinter does, a word for word citation. Yet an examination of Pompeius' manner of introducing his citations shows us that we must not take his formal statement too exactly. To illustrate, on p. 188,38 he cites with the words *sic ait Probus'* words that do not at all agree with the corresponding passage of Probus (p. 82, 16 K), and similarly p. 102,9 and 165,18 he assigns words to Terentianus and Donatus which differ greatly from the extant passages of these authors. The editors are therefore certainly wrong in assigning the words to Cæsar, and the lexicographers Menge-Preuss,

Meusel and Merguet are equally in error for including the word in their respective lexica.

Unfortunately we are not able to reach so definite a conclusion as the foregoing in the case of a fragment of Accius' Annals preserved in Macrob. Sat. 1,7,37

Eumque diem (*sc.* Saturni) celebrant: per agros
urbesque fere omnes
Exercent epulis laeti famulosque procurant
Quisque suos; nostris itidemst mos traditus
illinc
Iste, ut cum dominis famuli epulentur ibidem.

There are no clear indications that this passage is indirect discourse. The general tone is entirely consistent with a descriptive passage forming a part of Accius' own narrative. Furthermore, *iste* refers to a Roman custom which is contrasted with a Greek one (*illinc*), and to which the pronoun *hic* would naturally be applied. I would gladly prove here, were it possible, that Accius used *iste* in the present passage as a substitute for *hic*, that his readers might not be confused by instinctively feeling *hic*, so close after *illinc*, as an adverb and perhaps think it an error for *huc*.

Two passages antedating that in Caesar remain to be discussed. Both are inscriptions. The first is found in the C. I. L., Vol. I, 1st. ed. p. 208, No. 818. It is said to date from the last years of the republic or the first years of the empire. It is a curse pronounced upon a person named Rhodine, and engraved upon a lead tablet, which was thrown upon a grave. The expressions that bear on our discussion are: *quomodo*

mortuus qui istic sepultus est, nec loqui nec sermonare potest, seic Rhodine apud M. Licinium Faustum mortua sit, nec loqui nec sermonare possit. . . . seic R. accepta sit et tantum ualeat, quantum ille mortuus qui istic sepultus est. All are familiar with the usual forms, hic sepultus est, hic iacet, hic situs est, *etc.* We might then be inclined to assume that iste here stands for hic, an assumption that would be confirmed by the occurrence of hoc in a similar *dira* (C. I. L. No. 819) and by the fact that in a corresponding Greek inscription ΤΟΥΤΟΣ (= τοῦτους) is used (see Rhein. Museum IX, 367, — Lenormant). In addition to this, iste also occurs in a number of epitaphs of the imperial period in the expressions iste lapis (C. I. L. III, 3351; 2628), titulus iste (VI, 17505) and the like. We may further observe, that the formula hoc monumentum heredem non sequitur, so often inscribed on tombs, has a close parallel in Martial I, 116, 3–6

Hoc tegitur cito rapta suis Antulla sepulcro,
Si cupit hunc aliquis, moneo, ne speret agellum:
Perpetuo dominis seruiet iste suis.

Yet it must not be overlooked that the document under discussion, while a curse, is yet in form a prayer to some divinity, who stands to the speaker in the relation of second person. From this point of view the istic of our inscription might be regarded as normal. Be the case as it may with the present inscription, iste never succeeded in wholly displacing hic in this formula. This may be inferred, not only from the presence of the latter adverb in the Romance languages, but also from the fact that iste occurs almost exclusively

in metrical inscriptions, where its use may have been occasioned by the exigencies of the verse.

The other inscription referred to is found in C. I. L., 1, No. 820. It contains the phrase IN ITVSM ANNUM, which Gamurrini, the finder of the inscription, explains as an error of the stone-cutter for ISTVM. The phrase would therefore represent in hunc annum. If iste = hic occurs in carefully written literature in or about the year 30 A. D., there is nothing unreasonable in the assumption that it occurred in conversation, and hence might occur in non-public inscriptions, fifty or sixty years earlier. We cannot accordingly approve of Mommsen's condemnation "aus sprachlichen Gründen" of Gamurrini's correction. See *Hermes* IV, 282.

The length to which this usage has been dwelt upon in the present chapter might leave on the reader an impression that iste in the later periods of Roman literature had quite usurped the place of hic. Here, however, as is often the case in language development, the birth of the new does not imply the death of the old. Although weakened in meaning, hic maintained its position; and even down to the eighth century, we find it numerically stronger than iste. That the reverse was true of the *sermo cotidianus* may be inferred with some degree of certainty from the very frequent use of iste in documents, the tone of which approaches that of conversation. One striking instance strongly confirms this inference. Pompeius, the grammarian, probably a native of Mauretania, wrote in the latter half of the fifth(?) century his commentary on Donatus, a book which contains numerous reminders of the

conversation in the school room, and the style of which undoubtedly stands very near to that of the spoken language. He alone of Latin writers reverses the relative standing of *hic* and *iste*. On one hundred and eight pages (Keil, pp. 95-203) the nominative *hic* is not found at all. This and the other peculiarities in the use of these two pronouns can be best exhibited by means of a comparative table:

	<i>hic</i>	<i>iste</i>
Masc. sg. Nom. (<i>hic—iste</i>)	0	24
Fem. sg. Nom. (<i>haec—ista</i>)	ca. 7	39
Neut. sg. Nom and Acc. (<i>hoc—istud</i>)	235	1
Neut. pl. Nom. and Acc. (<i>haec—ista</i>)	33	80
All other cases	28	192
Adverb (<i>hic—istic</i>)	15	0

In this table there are of course included only those cases of *iste* and *hic* in which the words are used as free elements, *i. e.*, not in stereotyped formulae, in which words often continue a formal existence, although really obsolete.

What has taken place appears to be entirely normal. Differentiation has led to the rejection of *hic* substantive and adjective, and the retention of its phonetic equivalent exclusively in the adverbial function, while *iste* has come into use for the former noun functions of *hic*. In the fem. sing. also *ista* has notably encroached upon *haec*, (possibly following the analogy of the masc. sg.), and in the other cases, with the exception of the Nom. and Acc. neut, sg. and pl., the encroachment is still greater. The plural *haec*, which in all periods was used very largely, has made a much stronger resistance, while *hoc* (Nom. and Acc.) has

kept the field to itself. The only instance of the neuter (it is not spelled *istum*, but *istud*, after the analogy of *illud*) is found on page 185, line 28. This last result is just what we should have expected, for even in Cicero the forms *hoc* and *haec* as substantives exceed in number all other cases combined. That the phenomena exhibited in the above table are no passing phase nor a peculiarity of a particular writer, is shown by the evidence of the Romance languages, in which the forms *hoc* and *hic* (Adverb) always remained in use, as the Italian words *qui*, "here", and *ciò*, "it", from *ecum+hic* and *ecce+hoc* respectively, amply testify. It is true that modern Italian also possesses *questo*, which, although grammatically masculine, is applied to neuter objects. It must have come into use after *hoc* and *ecce+hoc* lost the character of a *πρωτόριτον*. The same rejection of *istud[c]* in favor of *hoc*, attended by a decided preference for Nom. *iste* over Nom. *hic* is found in the A and B classes of Scholia Terentiana published by Schlee, particularly in the "explanationes praeambulas" to each scene. *Istud*, p. 102,23, is perhaps due to the source from which the compiler drew his scholia, just as *istuc*, p. 160,22, is due to the influence of Terence. The form *ista* for *haec* frequently occurs, just as in Pompeius.

In the preceding discussion there have been cited in the main only passages in which *iste* occurs outside of direct discourse, yet from those authors who wrote later than Suetonius occasional passages have been cited of the opposite character. In justification of this it may be said, that, although the occurrence of *iste*

outside of direct address is evidence that it does not serve as *ἄνευ τερρότριτον*, the converse is not true. Indisputable instances of *iste* = *hic* in direct discourse are cited from Lucan on p. 123 above. There are two cases of *iste* in Cicero's dialogue *De Senectute* which seem to me to bear no reference to the second person. In section 29 *etsi ipsa ista defectio uirium* (the words of Cato) the words *defectio uirium* contain a sentiment which is in no sense to be connected with Scipio or Laelius, to whom Cato directs his remarks, since in sect. 15 the idea is distinctly attributed to some third parties, vaguely suggested by the subjunctive *uideatur*. These same indefinite persons are likewise conceived as the authors of the *cibi et potionis auditas* implied in *ista* in section 46. It is true, that they are the advocates of ideas and arguments combated by Cato, and hence they are, in a certain sense, in the position of opponents to him. Nevertheless it is only Scipio and Laelius who, strictly speaking, can be regarded as standing to Cato in the relation of persons addressed; for, although the Aristotelian dialogue gives the two collocutors but little opportunity to speak, Cicero never for a moment allows his reader to lose sight of the conversational character of the composition (*cf.* *De Amicitia* 4 *ipse mea legens sic afficior interdum, ut Catonem, non me, loqui existimem*). It would not be difficult to find other instances of this class in Cicero's dialogues. We can see no reference to the second person in Terence *And.* 215

Ad haec mala hoc mihi accidit etiam: haec
Andria,

Si ista uxor siue amicast, grauida e Pamphilost;
 Haut. 530 Istunc seruolum
 Dico adulescentis;
 Eun. 823,4 Iste Chaerea.

Qui Chaerea? Iste ephebus frater Phaedriae;
 nor in Plaut. Curculio 465, where there is no good reason for associating the sychophant with the audience, whom the choragus is addressing. This is also true of iste in Truc. 340; 349; Aul. 702; Pseud. 1053; Mil. 128 and other passages. In these cases, there is usually some degree of contempt implied either in iste or in the context. We should hesitate, nevertheless, to affirm, that in all the cases cited iste approaches hic in meaning. Some of these passages, with over fifty others, are mentioned or discussed by Bach, *op. cit.* pp. 257-226. It must be admitted that Bach's explanations are often ingenious, but he deduces little positive evidence to prove his points. He shows how iste *may* in each case be interpreted as a δευτερόρριτον, but not that it *must* be interpreted as such. In the absence of more conclusive proofs the matter must remain uncertain.

As iste is a very strong demonstrative, it usually refers to or modifies words upon which for some reason especial stress is laid. It is therefore not surprising to find it normally refering, particularly in the "Silver" Latinity, to the main object under discussion. By no writer is it more frequently so used than by Aulus Gellius, who is especially important to us for the light he throws upon the meaning of the word (*cf.* also Gaius 1,50).

We now approach the most interesting and most

important, though at the same time the most difficult, and in a sense the most unsatisfactory section in the discussion of this pronoun, namely, that which treats of the semasiological nature of the change *iste* > *hic*.

The difficulties that face us here arise partly from the non-existence in the present case of several lines of evidence which are usually of the greatest assistance in tracing changes of meaning. First and foremost, we do not know the etymology of the word with sufficient certainty to base an argument upon it. Secondly, we possess no exact definitions of the word by the earlier Romans. Furthermore, we can receive but little light from the analogous pronouns in other languages. The suggestion that *οἷτος* contains in its second syllable the same element that forms the second syllable of *iste*, is debatable; and even if *iste* is identical with Umbrian *estu*,—which is highly probable, if not certain,—the scanty remains of the Umbrian dialect do not supply us with enough data to determine the exact meaning of the Umbrian word. We cannot therefore be certain whether the classical meaning of *iste* is a primary or a secondary meaning; and if secondary, we cannot know how far it stands removed from the primary. Under these circumstances we can scarcely attempt more than to suggest what seems to be a plausible explanation of the nature of the change from the classical meaning to the later one. Even this may seem overbold.

Since the classical writers use the word almost exclusively as a *δευτερότριτον*, we will suppose that its use as a demonstrative of the first person is developed out of its classical usage, and is not concentric with it.

The relation of the antecedent of *iste* to the second person may vary greatly in character and degree of intimacy. It may be either very close or very loose. It may, for example, be one of ownership or of possession or of mere proximity. It may be simply one of interestedness, more or less keen, or of mere attention. Furthermore this relation may have no existence outside of the mind of the speaker. Such an object has in almost every instance a more or less intimate local relation with the first person also. This springs from the circumstance that, *iste* being confined for the most part to conversational use, the persons communicating are usually in each other's presence. Since moreover the object is the mutual object of conversation, it occupies also a large place in the speaker's interest; and this interest is the more likely to be very keen, because, as stated above, the strong demonstrative force of *iste* leads, for the most part, to its use in referring to antecedents upon which particular stress is laid, (see p. 153). Hor. Epist. 1,6,67 and Sat. 1,4,13 cited above seem to me to exemplify this usage, and to them we may perhaps add Cic. Ad Fam. 2,7,4 *cum te tribunum plebis isto anno fore non putarem*.

By a very slight change (unconscious, of course) in the attitude of the speaker, *iste* may be employed not to refer to something actually related to the second person, but to bring some object into relation to the second person. This use of *iste* awakens in the person addressed an interest in the object. This change could arise from a slight anticipation on the part of the speaker. He has before his mind an object, in which he desires to interest another, and conceives as

already accomplished the effect which in reality will immediately follow his mention of that object. Nothing is more common than such an attribution of our own feelings and sentiments to others. In this case the interest of the speaker in the object is at least as great as that of the person addressed, and iste in this way gradually loses its character as δευτερόρριτον, and comes to mean approximately "ecce hic." If this explanation is true, we may also add that the frequency with which secondary subordinate ideas were associated with iste facilitated this change.

But there is another point of view, from which we may regard this change, and by which an explanation of the meaning of iste is offered that often appeals to me more strongly than the foregoing. Let us assume for iste the etymology of Schweizer-Sidler (see above, p. 112), which involves the further assumption of a very strong meaning for iste. Let us also bring the meaning of iste into connection with that of οἶτος and οἶτοσί, with which it will probably also contain common etymological elements. In this way we shall be led to posit for iste, in the classical period, a very strong deictic force. Its function will then be, to direct sharply and pointedly the attention of the person addressed to some object, upon which the speaker's mind dwells with keen interest, and either to communicate to the second person the knowledge of the existence of this interest or to awaken in him a similar interest. If we were to seek for a parallel in a modern language, we should find the German locutions dies da and das da to correspond roughly to iste, although with considerably weaker deictic force.

On the assumption of this etymology and meaning for iste, it is not difficult to explain the classical and post classical usages.

In the first place we shall not be constrained to assume a necessary association of iste with the person addressed; nor shall we be forced, in consequence of this, to distort and misinterpret such passages as those from Cicero's *De Senectute* cited above (p. 152). Delicate "Nuancen" of meaning no longer need to be called in to eliminate such examples of iste as seem to disprove its universal character as *δευτερόριτον*.

Furthermore a keen interest of the subject¹ in the object (the antecedent of iste) implies that the subject has determined, or is in the process of determining, the relation of that object to itself, *i. e.*, to its life process. It follows as a corollary to this, that iste with its context asserts (directly or by connotation) a predicate of the object. This predicate varies with the varying relation of object to subject. It may be disparagement or commendation, contempt or praise, *etc., etc.*, or wonder, arising from an undetermined attitude. The great numerical excess in classical prose of instances in which iste implies contempt, is easily accounted for. The only forms of literature extant in this period, in which it is frequently used, are orations and philosophical dialogues, in which iste, referring usually to something connected with the person addressed, is, of course, used of an antecedent held in contempt, scorn, disparagement, *etc.*

Again, on this hypothesis we can easily account

¹The word "subject" here means the person from whom the thought proceeds.

for the extensive use of *iste* as *δευτερόριτον*. *Iste* as a strong deictic pronoun can be used only in cases of direct address, when the speaker and the listener stand face to face. *Hic* is still a strong demonstrative, and sometimes is itself used with deictic force (*cf.* Cic. De Sen. 4 *saepe . . . admirari soleo cum hoc C. Laelio*). The same is true of *ille*. But *ille* is a remote demonstrative and *hic* a near demonstrative, while *iste* (as deictic pronoun) is neither.¹ Accordingly *hic* and *ille*, so long as they retained their respective forces unweakened, sufficed to designate objects either near to or remote from the speaker, while *iste* tended to associate itself with objects that fell under neither of these two categories; and, chiefly in the language of the orators and of the disputants in sharply conducted dialogues of an argumentative character, it proved itself highly valuable as an instrument for expressing the contempt of the speaker for all that was associated with his opponent. I am not inclined to think that in conversation *iste* was applied as exclusively to the second person as it is in our extant literature of the "Golden" age. In fact, I have no doubt, that could we enjoy the boon of listening for a day to the conversation of an ancient Roman family in their everyday life, our notions respecting the restriction of the application of this word to contexts in which it connotes contempt or refers to the second person, would undergo remarkable changes.

Lastly, on this hypothesis the development of *iste* into a *πρωτόριτον* is simply explained. When *hic* lost

¹ See, however, the limitation of this statement toward the end of the following paragraph.

it protritonic force, just as in English the word "this" is losing its reference to the first person, the Romans unconsciously began to employ new means for pointing out the nearness of objects to the speaker, just as I felt it desirable to write on page v above the words "the present work" instead of "this work", which would mean *id opus* or *is liber*, not *hoc opus* or *hic liber*. Two of these new means maintained themselves many centuries side by side; namely, *ecce hic*, *ecce haec*, *etc.*, and *iste* (later *ecce iste* or *ecce istum*; see below p. 214 f. For the relation between them see below p. 205. The pronoun *iste* with its strong deictic force, being used in cases of direct address, was applied to objects which, like those referred to by the German *da*, were in plain sight or in the presence of the speaker. It was therefore used for the most part of objects that would have been referred to by *hic*, had this last still retained its stronger demonstrative force; and so naturally fell into the place of *hic*, just as *ille* naturally succeeded to *is* (see below, p. 194).

B. ISTE AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ILLE AND IS AND FOR THE DEFINITE ARTICLE.

During the period of the "Silver" Latinity, the pronoun *iste* is occasionally found referring to objects remote from the speaker and from the person addressed. As has been suggested above, the strict usage of *iste* as a *ὑπερθετικόν* by no means precludes its use to designate such objects, and this usage must have increased in range when *iste* began to lose its deictic character, or when it connoted a strongly characterised predicate, such as the idea of contempt.

When the word began to lose the character of a pronoun of the second person, the use referred to became still more natural. Many difficulties in the way of explaining the usage are done away with, when we assume that the classical meaning of *iste* is not its original one. Down to at least as late as the second century of our era, the word retained a strong demonstrative force and was used, as suggested above, in calling attention to objects in which for some reason much interest centered. As it came in this way to connote a predicate, the particular character of which depended upon the context and varied with the attitude of the subject toward the antecedent of *iste*, it was not infrequently used in the sense of *talis*. So closely did it approach this word in meaning, that we find it preparing the way for a following result clause (like *is*—see p. 3 *supra*—and *hic*); while Aulus Gellius (19, 1, 18) goes so far as actually to translate τὰς τοιαύτας φαντασίας by *uisa istaec* (observe the deitic *-ce* appended). While this implication of a predicate greatly facilitated the application of *iste* to objects remote from the subject and the person addressed, it at the same time sharply distinguishes *iste* from *ille*, which only exceptionally connotes such a predicate. It is therefore inaccurate to identify *iste* in meaning with *ille*.

The first century A. D. marks the most radical and rapid changes in the meaning of *iste*, and it is to the literature of this period, especially to Seneca the Younger and the poets, as also to Aulus Gellius, that we must primarily look for the evidence on the subject. Pending my further study of the subject I may refer to the scattered remarks to be found in the fol-

lowing books: Goelzer, *op. cit.* p. 89; Ebert in the *Acta Sem. Erlangensis* II,327; Obermeier, *op. cit.* p. 16; Rauschnig, *De Latinitate L. Ann. Sen. Phil.* p. 70.

As a consequence of the frequent use of *iste* as a substitute for *hic*, it followed the same path of deterioration in meaning with that pronoun, and sank to the mere function of a determinative (this does not imply, of course, that it did not retain also in some connections a strong demonstrative force until late in the history of the language—*cf.* the strong demonstrative force retained by *is*; see *supra* pp. 3 f). A close approach to such a usage is found in Celsus 8,12 (= p. 354,16), cited *supra*, p. 119. Such passages are frequent from Celsus on. In fact the word so far deteriorated that in the later periods, as will be pointed out in the last chapter, it was used as a substitute for the definite article. See p. 205 for further remarks on the subject.

CHAPTER IV. IPSE.

CHAPTER IV. IPSE.

For the classical usage of the intensive pronoun, I may refer to the excellent discussion of Nägelsbach-Müller, *Lateinische Stilistic* § 91. The main features of the classical meaning and construction are preserved at least as late as the seventh century of our era. At the same time there were developed certain usages quite distinct from these. The later meanings of the pronoun may be roughly indicated by the equations: ipse = idem, ipse = ille or is, ipse = Definite Article.

A. IPSE = IDEM.

The narrow limit which defines the spheres of the ideas represented by these two adjectives, is exemplified in the following early English citations:

Till she was slayn right in the selve place.

—Chaucer, *Frankl. Tale* 16170 (= 11706 T).

Than hit semet, for-sothe, that the selve woman
Wold haue faryn hym fro.

—*Destruction of Troy* 13828 (E. E. T. S.)

To shoot another arrow that self way
Which you did shoot the first.

—Shakespeare, *Merch. of Venice*, I, i, 148.

In English we say, "the same object," "the very object," "the self-same object," "the very self-same object." In the Latin language also these two words

approach each other very closely in certain constructions, even in the classical period. A remarkably instructive parallel may be drawn between the two passages:

Enn. Ann. 8 (M) terra- que corpus quae dedit ipsa capit.	Cic. De Sen. 72 sic hominem eadem optime, quae conglutinavit, natura dissoluit.
--	--

In the immediately preceding lines Cicero had said, *opus ipsa suum eadem, quae coagmentavit, natura dissoluit*. Ennius means, "that very (same) terra"; there is here no contrast between *terra* and something else; we have rather the statement, that two acts proceed from one and the same agent. "It is the earth that both builds up and destroys the human body." Compare the conditions presented in this sentence with Kühner, *Ausführl. Gramm.* II,457 "Das Demonstrativ idem...wird oft gebraucht, wenn einem und demselben Gegenstande, von dem schon eine Bestimmung ausgesagt ist, eine andere neue Bestimmung erteilt wird." It is true that the relative clause contributes here in no small degree to the expression of the conception of identity; yet it is equally true that the relative clause receives no slight support from *ipse*. The difference between the function of the relative clause here and in such a sentence as *legionarii per nonnullas horas uim hostium soli sustinuerunt; tandem aduenit ipse imperator, qui sese adhuc in tabernaculo continerat*, is that in the latter instance, it adds a new predicate to a grammatical subject already clearly characterised or described; in the former case, the clause adds a predicate that is essential to the under-

standing of the antecedent. Sentences of this type are not common in classical Latin. One example is found in the Lex Quinctia de Aqueductibus quoted by Frontinus (printed in Bruns' *Fontes Iuris Romani Antiqui*, 6th edition, p. 114,47) *ipsorum qui permisissent curatorum nomina* (*cf.* the passage above from Ennius) means "the very ones," *i. e.*, "the same ones who had granted permission". This law dates from 9 B. C. During the second century, however, the usage is more frequent and from Tertullian on occur numerous instances of the construction *ipse qui = idem qui*. The relative clause sometimes precedes, but it more often follows *ipse*. In addition to the passages cited under sect. 1, we may quote *De Pudicit.* 13 (p. 246,1) *ipsam substantiam damnans, per quam exciderat; cf. De Resurr. Carn.* 1 *ipsos... exurit, quos... nutrit iisdem ignibus et promerens; Serv. ad Geor.* 1,39 *Proserpina ipsa est quae et Luna; S. Silviae Peregrinatio* 4,5 (p. 42,7) *montes ipsos, quos ingressi fueramur pridie sera; sed non ipsa parte exire habebamus, qua intraueramus, et al.; Cassian. Conl.* 18,16, 8 *ipsa... lues est, de qua... dicitur per prophetam; Salvianus, De Gub. Dei* 4,11 *ipsi in nobis mores sunt, qui in seruolis nostris; so also* 5,6; *Epist.* 9,18; 19; all of which passages are to be found cited in Pauli's index. In Salvian. *Ad Eccl.* 2,8 with *licet ipsum accipiat* the words *quod alius accipit* must be supplied. In the index to Petschenig's edition of the *Passio VII Monachorum* is cited sect. 12 (*uerba infantuli cuiusdam*) *cum ipsis sum in timore Dei conuersatus, cum ipsis desidero passionem suscipere, cum quibus credo me et futuram gloriam inuenire; and Helm in his*

index to Plauc. Fulg. cites Mitol. 2,pr,65(M) ipsum (*sc.* Deum) proferat qui ista contribuit. In this instance the use of ipse may, however, be justified by the character of its antecedent. From the last half of the sixth century (570) we read in Antonin. Plac. 15 (p. 170,1) stat in ipso statu in quo fuit.

At least four passages may be cited in which the relative clause precedes ipse. They are, besides Tert. De Spectac. 21, Commodian, Apol. 322.

Per quod prius hominem prostrauerat morti
malignus,
Ex ipso deuictus;

Schol. Gronov. ad Cic. Rosc. Amer. 117 apud quem . . . praemium . . . ipsum potuisse occidere Roscium (cited by Landgraf *ad loc.*) *cf.* Greek *παρ' ὧ . . . αὐτόν*; Augustine, De Civ. Dei 5,21 qui Mario (*sc.* regnum dedit), ipse Gaio Caesari . . .

Lastly under this head we may refer to Symmachus, Epist. (p. 267,12), although this passage is susceptible of a different interpretation (ipsorum = ? eorum).

Among the pagans Macrobius also shows the usage (*cf.* Somn. Scip. 1,10,9 ipsa corpora, quibus).

Of more frequent occurrence than either of these constructions are the collocations *ipse, hic ipse, ille ipse, iste ipse*, expressing identity, all of which are known to Plautus and Terence, and are found in all periods of the Latin language. (See Niemöller, De pron. ipse et idem apud Plaut. et Ter., Halle, 1887, p. 31 f.) Clear examples are: Cic. Lael. 16 id ipsum cum tecum agere conarer, Fannius anteuertit. Phil.

2,74 quin his || “iis malim”—Orelli || ipsis temporibus domi Caesaris percussor ab isto missus || inmissus Wölfflin || deprehensus dicebatur, “at the same time”; Lucr. 1,433

Nam quodcumque erit, esse aliquid debebit id ipsum;

Caesar, Bell. Gall. 6,37,1 hoc ipso tempore et casu; Bell. Alex. 52 eoque ipso die; Vell. Pat. 2,125,4 in id ipsum...incendium; for Tacitus see Ger. und Gr. p. 693, col. 1; Florus 1,8(13),19 illam ipsam; Hilarius Pict. Tract. in Psalm. 118 Iod,6 eo ipso in tempore. Of these phrases the neuter singular id ipsum gained the greatest currency. At a later period it was often used as a translation of τὸ αὐτό, e. g., 1 Cor. 1,10 παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς... ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες obsecro...uos...ut...id ipsum dicatis omnes (new version “that ye all speak the same thing”). In Matth. 5,47 τὸ αὐτό = id ipsum, whereas in 46 τὸ αὐτό is rendered sic. The above Latin translations are taken from the ante-Hieronymian texts. The Vulgate reads hoc in both the passages from Matthew. Other New Testament examples are to be found in Rönisch, Itala und Vulgata pp. 424 f. This mode of translation is not confined to the New Testament, being found also in Ignatius, Epist. ad Philad. (interpol.) 10 in id ipsum (ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό); so also Sec. 6; Ad Philip. 1; Ad Magn. 7 (interpol.). It found a rival in hoc ipsum, which occurs in Ignatius, Epist. Ad Smyrn. (interpol.) 5; Ad Trallianos (interpol.) 9, where ταὐτόν is rendered by hoc ipsum. In Ad Philip. 1 in hoc ipso canone represents ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κανόνι. In the Authenticum of Justinian, Novel. 22,11; 22,29 *pr.* τοῦ αὐτοῦ and

ταὐτό are represented by hoc ipso and hoc ipsum. The usage was doubtless encouraged by the Greek collocation αὐτὸ τοῦτο (*cf.* Novell. 22,14 hoc ipsum; 38*pr.*, 2 de hoc ipso; *et al.*) and ταὐτὸ τοῦτο (*op. cit.* 22, 47,2; in 22,30, however, ταὐτοῦ τοῦτου is correctly rendered by hoc idem). The Greek phrase τὸ ἐν was frequently used as synonymous with τὸ αὐτό in such passages as Ignatius, Epist. ad Philip. 2,2, where τὸ ἐν φρονοῦντες is rendered by unum sentientes (with τὸ ἐν expressing identity compare the Latin expressions unum atque idem, unum idemque, in use from Cicero *on*—*cf.* Lael. 92—and especially common after Suetonius and Apuleius). Even as early as the time of Aulus Gellius id ipsum had come to be so completely identified in meaning with idem, that it was able to take the place of idem in a phrase so widely used and hence so stereotyped as unum atque idem. (See Aul. Gell. 6(7),21,2 unum atque id ipsum tamen in utroque uerbo ostenditur.) This usage is paralleled by the Greek ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτό, which occurs at least as early as Aristotle (see Bonitz, Index Aristot.) It would be equally justifiable to assume, that the Greek ὁ αὐτός was the main influence that led to the *origin* of the usage. The thoroughgoing adoption of this word by nearly all, if not by all the Latin writers, precludes us from assuming that ὁ αὐτός had any greater influence than that of encouraging the usage. That ὁ αὐτός did exercise a strong influence in this latter direction, particularly on the Patristic literature, cannot be doubted. We have noted the phrase in Arnobius, Lactantius, Ambrosius, Augustine, Cassianus, Hilarius of Poitiers, Alcimus Avitus and others.

Parallels to these phrases in other languages will readily suggest themselves, as the German *derselbe*.

In all of these collocations the demonstrative pronouns, like the definite article in *ὁ αὐτός*, *derselbe* and "the same," aid materially in the expression of the idea of identity, which is frequently still more definitely set forth by the addition of a relative clause. Good examples of this form of construction are Bell. Alex. 73 *eum ipsum locum cepit, in quo Mithridates secundum proelium aduersus Triarium fecerat*; 70 *id ipsum commemorarent officium*; in which both the relative clause and the correlative pronoun contribute to the expression of identity (*cf.* Vell. Pat. 1, 14, 3 *eo ipso anno quo*; 2, 125, 4 *his ipsis . . . gladiis, quibus*; Val. Max. 4, 5, 6 *inter ipsum illud tempus, quo*; Celsus 7, 4, 4 (p. 268 D); Sen. Contr. 1, 2, 12 (*Gallionis uerba*); Quint. 10, 2, 3).

On the use of *ipse* alone in the sense of *idem*, there is but scanty information to be found in the standard text books. Neither Kühner nor Dräger mention it. Schmalz in Reisig's *Vorlesungen*, III, Anm. 369 (p. 102) makes only one brief statement: "Manchmal muss es" in der späteren Latinität "die Stelle von *idem* vertreten, *cf.* Koffmane, *Geschichte des Kirchenlateins* p. 137, wo dieser Gebrauch für *Commodian* festgestellt wird." In his *Histor. Stilistik* (in Müller's *Handbuch* II, 1³, 1900), which was published twelve years later, he cites no earlier example than *Fredegar* 1, 125 *ipso anno = eodem anno*. According to Sittl and Wölfflin the usage is African.

The earliest instance I know of a passage in which an unsupported *ipse* approaches *idem* in meaning is

Varro, De Ling. Lat. 9,84f. sic as...et unum est et multitudinis habet *sensum* infinitum ("the plural *asses* does not indicate a definite number, as does duo, decem, etc."); dicimus enim asses (indef. pl.), quos cum finimus, dicimus dupondius et tressis et sic porro. sic uidetur mihi, quoniam finitum et infinitum habeat dissimilitudinem, non debere utrumque item (=eodem modo) dici, eo magis quod in ipsis uocabulis ("in the same words"), ubi additur certus numerus in miliariis || *militaris Florentinus* || aliter atque in reliquis dicitur; nam sic loquuntur: hoc mille denarium, non hoc mille denariorum || *sic L. Spengel*; denarii F. || et haec duo milia denarium || *sic uolg.*; denaria F || , non haec d. m. denariorum || *sic Christ et L. Spengel*; denarii F || . We may thus paraphrase this passage: 'The word *as* is singular and has an indefinite plural'—*i. e.*, the plural *asses* in and of itself gives no indication of the number of *asses* meant. 'Now when we make the number of *asses* definite, we use the words dupondius, tressis, etc. Accordingly, since there is a difference between the definite and the indefinite plural in this word, the two should not be expressed by the same form. A justification for making such a distinction is found in the usage which dictates that, when in *the same* words a numeral is added to the word milia, making the number of the thousands definite, a special form of the Genitive plural, not analogous to the regular forms, should be employed. That is to say, usage demands hoc mille denarium, not denariorum; haec duo m. denarium, not denariorum.' If the emendations of Christ and Spengel are correct, Varro implies that we should say multa milia denariorum, but decem

milia denarium. This same distinction should apply on the principle of analogy to sestertium and sestertiorum, nummum and nummorum, talentum and talentorum, medimnum and medimnorum, *etc.*; and, as Varro himself points out, the distinction was normally made in the words treuirum, duumuirum, *etc.*, in which expressions the shorter form of the Genitive plural was employed, although the longer form was elsewhere employed. We may not translate, "even in these words", a force often carried by ipse, for Varro is not comparing the compounds of *as*, with any other words. His only point is either "It is precisely in these words I am discussing, that a distinction is observed," or "in one and the same word the distinction is observed." In either case Varro is asserting that two facts are true of the same thing, that is, according to the first alternative we are dealing with two distinctions of the plural forms of compounds of *as*, which distinctions may be set forth in the proportion:

asses : dupondius, tressis, *etc.* :: denariorum multa
milia : denarium haec duo milia

In this case in *ipsis uerbis* "in the same words" means "in compounds of *as*." According to the second assumption, we are dealing with a discrimination in the Genitive plural that is met with in one and the same word, *i. e.*, denarium; or in the same words respectively, *i. e.*, denarius, sestertius, *etc.* In both these cases the word *uocabulis* causes some difficulties, perhaps only apparent, which are not removed even by the interpretation suggested above "even in these words". If in this passage the word *his* stood before *ipsis*, no scholar would find anything abnormal in

the passage. However there is no documentary evidence that a word has been lost. The passage is important as being the earliest instance in Latin literature of the encroachment of *ipse* on the sphere of *idem*.

A close parallel to the second interpretation proposed above is found in Pompeius, *Comm.* p. 118,7(K) *nec dicas mihi, positione fit longa* (*sc.* the last syllable of *cano* before *Troiae* in *Virg. Aen.* 1,1). *non : nam liquida non iuuat nisi in ipsa parte orationis* ("in the same *pars orationis*," *i. e.*, with the lengthened syllable). Compare p. 126,25(K) *in eadem parte orationis*.

In a passage in Manilius (1,698), mentioned by Sittl, *Locale Verschiedenheiten der latein. Sprache* p. 115,

Orbemque ex illa coeptum concludit in ipsa.

Ipsa in this passage rests on the authority of the best MSS., while *illa* (adopted by Scaliger—Paris 1579, Heidelberg 1590, Leyden 1609—from the older editions) is found only in the poorer MSS., among them *Leidensis* 3 (= Voss. 2).

I am unable to cite instances of this usage from writers between Manilius and Suetonius. A clear instance is found in the latter, *Oct.* 94 *Augusto uiso . . . affirmauit ipsum esse cuius imago secundum quietem sibi obseruata sit.* Possibly the use of *ipse* is here justified by its reference to Augustus, the *αὐτός*. Compare *Nero* 24 *aurigauit . . . etiam decemiugem, quamuis id ipsum in rege Mithridate reprehendisset.* From Minucius Felix Sittl, *l. c.*, cites 11,4?; 7 and Landgraf on Cicero's *Roscius Amer.* 132 cites 4,4 *ipsius sectae homo*, where Halm proposes superfluously

to read *istius*. We may add in this connection the instructive passage 30,4 *Romanis (sc. ritus fuit) Graecum et Graecam, Gallum et Gallam... uiuentes obruere, hodieque ab ipsis... Iuppiter homicidio colitur.*

At least six distinct lines of evidence may be distinguished, in which the character of *ipse* as a pronoun of identity is clearly demonstrated by the context.

1. *Ipsē* appears parallel with *idem* and *unus* either
 - a) in one and the same sentence, or
 - b) In the same type of context, but in distinct sentences.

For type

1 a) Tertullian opens the series with the passage, *De Spectac.* 21 *sic ergo euenit, ut qui in publico uix necessitate uesicae tunicam leuet, idem in circo... exuet; ut et qui... ipse...; et qui... idem... , in which ipse is parallel with idem. He is followed by the versio vulgata of the Pastor Hermae, praef. pastoris uisionum numero quinque, mandata eiusdem numero XII, similitudines ipsius numero X; Arnob. 4,22^p *eodem... eodem... eodem... , ipso... ipso... ; and Pomp. Comm.* 127,32(K) *ergo eadem erit ratio in illis pluribus, quae in tribus syllabis, ipsa in VI syllabis, ipsa etiam in VIII.**

Ipsē stands parallel with *unus* in Optatus 2,15(p. 50,8) *etenim cum Africanos populos et orientales et ceteros... pax una coniungeret et ipsa unitas... ; cf.* 5,1(p. 121,17) *denique et apud uos et apud nos una est ecclesiastica conversatio, communes lectiones, eadem fides, ipsa fidei instrumenta, eadem mysteria, in which sentence it is apparent, that no more serious influence than the desire for variety, has led the writer*

to employ four different words to express the idea of identity. Nor are the resources of the Romans exhausted with these four words *idem*, *ipse*, *unus*, *communis*, as Optat. 5,4 (p. 126,23) shows: permanent (*sc.* *Trinitas et fides credentis*) *semper immutabiles et immotae*; *trinitas enim semper ipsa¹ est, fides in singulis una est.* This passage has also an especial value as illustrating another point of contact in the general meanings of *ipse* and *idem*. We might here translate the last phrase: 'The trinity is always precisely itself', in the same way in which we may speak of a man being himself under all circumstances. We mean, of course, not that the trinity is itself in contradistinction from some other thing, but that it, under all circumstances, displays the same fundamental characteristics, as is shown by the words that immediately follow: *uim suam semper retinent ambae.*

1 b) For the use of *ipse* parallel to *idem* but in different sentences we may note the following types of construction:

in quoting a second or third citation from the same writer the usual form of expression employed was *idem dicit* (Varro, *De Ling. Lat.* 7,98 *apud Plautum* . . . (99) *apud eundem.* So Gellius, Macrobius, Augustine, *Speculum passim.* Instead of this we find *ipse* in Optatus 3,3 (p. 80,21); 3,5 (p. 85,23)—although these two passages admit of a different interpretation—in Filastrius, *Heres. Lib.* 121 (= 149), 8 *ideo et David de Iudaeis dicit: "deleantur . . ."* et

¹ *Cf.* Ant. Plac. Itiner. 42 (p. 188,10) *ipsam uirtutem semper operaretur*, cited by Geyer in his index under the rubric *ipse = idem.*

ipse iterum: "et in" Compare with these the titles of the poems of Ennodius (ed. Vogel) 190 a ALITER DE EODEM; 190 b ALITER DE IPSO; 190 c ALITER DE IPSO.

In the above citations the words *idem*, *unus*, etc., almost without exception precede *ipse*. It seems hardly probable that this is pure accident. I should rather be inclined to regard it as a justification for the use of *ipse* in a sense which it does not usually bear. In this way the reader is prepared in advance for the unusual meaning of the word.

2. In other cases the identification of *ipse* with *idem* is made clear by a contrast in varying forms with *alius*. This group of passages is opened by Minucius Felix 11,7 (words of Caecilius) *uellem tamen sciscitare* (the discussion is about the resurrection), *utrumue cum corporibus || an sine corporibus add. Halm || , et corporibus quibus, ipsisue an renouatis resurgatur? sine corpore? hoc, quod sciam, neque mens neque anima nec uita est. ipso corpore? sed iam ante dilapsus est. alio corpore? ergo homo nouus nascitur, non prior ille reparatur.* Similarly Ambrosius, Exam. 2,2,5(24d) (section 4) *et dixit deus: fiat firmamentum . . . prius consideremus quid sit firmamentum, utrum ipsum sit quod in superioribus caelum appellauit an aliud.* *Ipsē* is contrasted with *alter* in Ennodius 212, 6(= carm. 2,94)

Alter te dominus, sed manet ipse labor.

Alius must be read between the lines in Serv. ad Virg. Geor. 1,458 *hoc ad futurae serenitatis pertinet signum: nam si de ipso die dicas, stultissimum est.*

3. So completely did *ipse* take on the meaning of

idem, that it has even crept into certain local, temporal and other adverbial phrases and formulae, although such combinations are usually the last to allow any encroachment on their spheres. We may mention from S. Silv. Peregrin. in ipso loco (2,2), in ipso itinere (7,6), in ipsa ecclesia (25,11). Commodian, Apol. 823 gives us

Exurgit interea sub ipso tempore Cyrus;

Alc. Avit. Poem. 4,86 tempore sub ipso; Jordanes, Get. (60)307 in ipso tempore; while ipso tempore without a preposition appears in Optatus 2,2 (p. 39, 6); Vict. Vitensis, Hist. Persecut. Afr. Prov. 1,43 (= 1,14) ipso enim Geisericus praeceperat tempore (observe the separation of ipso from its substantive, also noticeable in sect. 19(= 1,6) ipso gestum est tempore); and in Jordanes, Rom. 38.

Ipsa autem die occurs in S. Silv. Peregrin. 25,11 (p. 76,29) and in ipsis diebus, in Cassianus, Inst. 3, 12 and Conl. 21,20,3.

Instead of the normal eiusdem modi or eodem modo we find in Filastrius, Heres. Lib. 122,1 (= p. 87,24) ipso modo.

4. There are numerous other passages in which the general context shows that ipse is used as a pronoun of identity, although there is no clear parallelism with special words such as idem and alius. Such are Commodian 2,16,9

In ipsis uersaris iterum;

Apol. 829

Ipsa redit iterum sub ipso saeculi fine,
and, with an accompanying similiter, in Ps-Hyginus,

De Limit. Constit. p. 207,10 primo lapide inscribimus DM KM. ab hoc deinde singulis actuariis limitibus similiter per ipsos inscribemus DM limes II, KM limes II. Other examples are Commodian 1,6,1

Iouis tonat, fulminat ipse,

(here ipse may be justified by its reference to Jupiter); Script. Hist. Aug. Firmus 3,3 f. idem (*sc.* Firmus) et cum Blemmyis societatem . . . tenuit . . . naues quoque ad Indos . . . misit. ipse quoque dicitur habuisse duos dentes elephantis. Yet in this last case there may possibly be implied in ipse a contrast between the general traffic carried on by Firmus' boats and some of his private acquirements through commerce. Ipse is found twice in succession in Pompeius, Comment. in Donat. p. 199,24(K) Uirgilius scripsit bucolica, ipse scripsit georgica, ipse scripsit Aeneida. It is not unlikely that Pompeius found this citation (for the words are probably not Pompeius' own) in Donatus. Similarly in Commodian we read 2,29,17

Cum ipsis et epulas capitis et pascitis ipsos.

In the following four instances the context proves the usage ipse = idem with especial clearness: Optatus 1,27(p. 29,3) in ipsa causa . . . duorum laborare; Augustine, De Civ. Dei 2,—(p. 103,19 D) III · IV et IV · III ipsum faciunt (cited by Landgraf, *ad* Schol. Gronov. ad Cic. Rosc. Amer. 132, p. 76); Luc. Car. De Reg. Ap. 1,9(p. 18,9) Sabellius . . . fuerit ausus dicere ipsum sibi et Patrem esse et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum (For various reasons I would here assume a direct Greek influence); Pompeius, *op. cit.* p. 205,1(K) ipse est casus in istis: et cuius nominatiuus

est et cuiatis nominatiuus est; Placidus, Lib. Glos-sarum ed. Götz V, p. 133,17 pinus ipse plurari (*sic!*) singulari que numero; Placitus, De Medicinis ex Animalibus, 24,5 uolturis iecur totum cum sanguine ipsius tritum. . . . caducos emendat might be taken to mean "of the same vulture", (exactly the same usage 30,4), did not the phrase strongly remind us of the frequency with which Pliny the Elder employs ipse to mark an entirely superfluous contrast between an animal or a plant itself and some part of the same animal or plant or with some thing connected with them.

Further citations are: Optatus 3,5(p. 85,23); 6,4 (p. 151,4); in both of which passages ipse should perhaps be interpreted as an equivalent of is, although Ziwwa in his index cites them as ipse = idem; Filastrius 6,1; 60,2; Cassianus, Inst. 5,40,1; Contr. Nest. 3,7,4; 4,6,7; 13,3; Jordanes, Getica (35) 182; Rom. 32.

The conservative style of the jurisconsulti did not, as it seems, admit the usage. Kalb, Roms Juristen p. 140 knows only 'one instance from the Digest, a citation from Marcian (D. 49,1,5,4), and we cannot be certain that even this is not the result of the liberties which the compilers of the Digest took with their sources.

5. The old Latin translations of Greek writings are as useful to us in writing the history of ipse as they were in discussing iste. Idem appears in them as the regular translation of δ αὐτὸς, yet the confusion between ipse and idem led frequently to the employment of the former as a translation of δ αὐτός; and in the process the correspondence in meaning between δ αὐτός and ipse may have been an important factor of

influence. The painstaking literal character of the old translations may still further have encouraged the tendency. The rendering of τὸ αὐτό by id ipsum has already been mentioned. To the instances cited on p. 119, we may add Pastor Hermae, Mand. 10,3,3 *μεμιγμένα ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* Versio Palatina: commixtum in id ipsum (notice that id has lost *all* reference to any particular antecedent). Versio Vulgata: writes simply mixtum. The usage is also found in the Vetus Interpretatio Latina of the Epistle of Barnabas (5th century A. D.). Ignatius, Epist. ad Magnes. (interpolata) 6 renders *ὁ αὐτός διαμένει* by ipse permanet, and Ad Trall. (interpol.) 6 translates *ταῦτόν . . . εἶναι (sc. λέγουσιν) πατέρα καὶ υἱόν καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιόν* by ipsum dicunt esse Patrem, ipsum Filium, ipsumque Spiritum Sanctum. The words cited above from Lucifer Car. 1,9 are a literal translation of this passage. From the Pastor Hermae, Vis. 3,1,2 is gleaned also *αὐτῇ τῇ νυκτὶ* (observe the order of the words), Versio Palatina: ipsa nocte. Vers. Vulgata: eadem nocte (*cf.* 3,10,7). A single example from the New Testament will suffice, Luke 10,21 *ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ* in ipsa hora, Vulgate, *caet.* b, c, d, e, f, f², i, l, q, r; eadem a, a²; illa E, P^{ms}, R. The Authentica of Justinian do not stand on the same high level of purism with the Digest. In the former ipsa appears:

Novella 22,18(p. 158,30 Sch.) *ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν αἰτίων*

= ex ipsis causis;

40(p.175,25) *ταῖς αὐταῖς ποίαις . . . ὀποιᾶς*

= ipsis poenis . . . quas;

(*cf.* p. 175,33) *τὴν αὐτὴν ἡνπερ*

= eandem quam and p. 176,7 *iisdem poenis*);

- 25 pr. (p. 196,4) ἐκ τῶν ἀτῶν . . . προφάσεων
 = ex ipsis occasionibus;
 29,1 (p. 219,34) ἐπὶ τῆς ἀτῆς τὰξέως
 = in ipso ordine.

On the contrary, apparently under no special conditions that do not hold as well in the cases just cited, *ὁ αὐτός* is rendered by *idem* 24,1 (p. 190,38) in *idem*; 25,1 (p. 197,17) in *idem*; 26,1 (p. 203,29) in *idem*; 30,11, *pr.* (p. 234,16) *idem*; 28,4,2 (p. 216,6) *sub eodem*; 29,5, *pr.* (p. 222,35) *eandem*; 49, *pr.* (p. 288,15) in *idem*. A more careful examination of the usage of the *Authentica* would doubtless reveal some interesting facts.

Along with these translations should be mentioned the two passages cited by Kalb, *op. cit.* p. 140 from the *Lex Romana Visigothorum*. These passages are translated from Gaius into Spanish Latin: Gaius, *Inst.* 3,151 *donec in eodem consensu perseverant* = *Lex Rom. Uis. 2,9,17 ipso*; Gaius 3,10 = *Lex Rom. Uis. 2,8,3*; Gaius 3,90 = *L. R. U. 2,9,1*.

6. Lastly comes the definition of the glossary *Cod. Vat. 3321 (saec. VII) apud Götz, C. G. L. IV, p. 89,1: idem · ipse.*

On the geographical extension of the usage the range of authors cited above throws some interesting and valuable light. We note first that the usage occurs in the works of the following African writers: Minucius Felix, Tertullian, Arnobius, Lactantius (?), Ps-Cyprian, Commodian, Optatus, Augustine, *Passio VII Monachorum*, Victor Vitensis, Cerealis, Fulgentius Planciades, and in Mauritania(?) (Pompeius [Maurus]). It is surprising that Apuleius is missing from this list. Koziol does not find the usage in his works.

Florus, the historian, was also doubtless an African. Although he uses *ipse* more extensively than any other Latin writer, he does not know it in the sense of *idem*. So great is the frequency of this usage in Africa that some scholars have been led to regard it as of African origin and as particularly characteristic of the African Latinity.

Next after Africa stands southern Gaul. To the extreme west belong the *Peregrinatio ad Loca Sancta* assigned to Saint Silvia, (also perhaps Antonini *Placentini Itinerarium*) and the *Lex Romana Uisigothorum*, 506 A. D. Still farther to the north is Hilary of Poitiers, and eastwards are Cassianus, Salvianus and Alcimus Avitus. From Sardinia comes Lucifer Caralitanius with one single instance. In northern Italy we have Ambrosius, Filastrius, Ennodius and Jordanes; in central Italy Varro the *Lex Quinct. de Aqueduct.*, Marcian (?), Ps-Hyginus, *De Limit. Constituendis*, Servius, Placitus (perhaps influenced by a Greek source, perhaps by Pliny), and Macrobius. To these should be added the *Scholia Gronoviana ad Cic.* and the glossary *Cod. Parisinus 3321*.

In other words the usage is thoroughly established in the western Mediterranean basin. A careful study of Prudentius, Orosius, Merobaudes, Idacius, Eugenius, Braulius and Isidore would perhaps establish it for Spain.

As for the chronology, the earliest indications have been discussed above. It appears in Africa certainly between 217 and 222 (*Tertullian, De Pud.*), possibly shortly after 203 (*De Resurrectione Carn.*) or even twenty to forty years earlier, if those scholars are

right who assign to Minucius Felix a date prior to Tertullian's *Apologeticus* (published in the year 197 or shortly after.) In Aquitania, south eastern Gaul and Sardinia, the fourth century marks the beginning. An anonymous manuscript in Einsiedeln, dating from the end of the eighth or the first half of the ninth century and containing a collection of inscriptions, may be cited as a late instance of this usage (C. I. L., VI, 1, No. 1199 a. b.)

In the compound *istum* + *ipsum* the usage has yielded the regular Italian pronoun of identity *stesso*.

We would naturally expect *ipse*, after it became so fully identified with *idem*, to show the same weakening that *idem* shows in its adverbial use in classical Latin. Such a passage is *Minutius Felix* 1,4 *sic solus in amoribus conscius, ipse socius in erroribus* (*ipse = item*).

B. IPSE = ILLE OR IS.

The essential character of *ipse* in classical Latin is found in the fact that it almost invariably connotes a contrast (*cf.* Nägelsbach-Müller, *l. c.*) In the classical Latinity this contrast is usually strong and the antecedent of *ipse* is consequently brought very prominently before the reader, while the object with which it is contrasted sinks into the background. Dräger, *Histor. Syntax* I², 81, however, remarks: "erst seit Curtius, der das Pronomen mit besonderer Vorliebe anwendet, finden sich Stellen, wo dasselbe das Subject ohne besondere Hervorhebung bezeichnet, zum Beispiel, 3,1,8 *nisi intra eos (sc. dies) auxilium Dareus ipsis misisset.*" Similar in purport is a statement of Lönnergren, *De syntaxi Sulp. Sev.* (Upsala, 1882, p.

10). Krebs, *Antibarbarus* (*s. v.* ipse) defines the time limit of this usage by the extremely vague word "schliesslich."

At the very outset we must realise the danger of confusing this usage with that discussed in the previous section. There are many passages in which it is very difficult, or even impossible, to decide whether ipse stands nearer to idem, to ille or to is. For example Frontinus, *De Limit.* 2 (p. 33,20) *si fuerit . . . uallis quae conspectum agentis exuperet, per ipsam metis ad ferramentum adpositis erit descendendum*, one would be rather inclined to assume, that ipse bears the meaning of is. Possibly some of the passages cited on pp. 167, 168 should be transferred to this section. A most perplexing case is *Acta Apost.* 16,33. Rönsch, *Collectanea Philol.* p. 186 cites this passage from the *Gigas Bibliorum Holmiensis sumens eos ipsa hora noctis* with the explanation "ipse für is und ille." On p. 101, however (= *Vollmöllers Roman. Forsch.* II, 287) he explains this ipse as equal to idem and compares 22,13, where the above mentioned text and the *Cantabrigensis* offer *ipsa hora*, the *Vulgate*, however, *eadem hora*. Since the Greek text here reads *αὐτῆ τῆ ὥρα*, while in 16,33 the Greek text has *ἐκείνη τῆ ὥρα*, and the *Cod. Cantabrigensis* correspondingly reads *illa*, and *Laudianus* has *ea* and *Lucifer Caralitanus, De non Parcendis in Deum Delictis* p. 268 has *eadem*, one certainly cannot fail to be bewildered. The passage illustrates with remarkable clearness the freedom that prevailed in the usage of the pronouns in the third and fourth centuries of our era.

Even earlier than *Curtius* there are passages in

which ipse implies no strong contrast, as in Catullus 64,66 f.

Omnia quae toto dilapsa e corpore passim
Ipsius ante pedes fluctus salis adludebant.

Moreover there is no sufficient reason for interpreting ipse in the sense of "the mistress," the Pythagorean *αἰτώρις*. The epic poets in general, who could not make free use of is, showed a decided preference for ipse, and by their frequent employment of the word, doubtless paved the way to its depreciation in meaning.

There is a second passage in Varro, Res. Rust. 3, 10,7 quotienscumque sumpserunt (*sc.* anseres ad saginandum), locus solet purgari, quod ipsae || ipsi Jucundus || amant locum purum, neque ipsae ullum, ubi fuerunt, relinunt purum. The context does not admit of the translation 'not even these,' for there is no contrast here. The only possibilities are either to take ipse as an equivalent of idem, or as a somewhat strong personal pronoun.

To the above mentioned passage from Curtius should be added 4,3,12 where the much discussed MSS. reading ipsas may be defended as a strong personal pronoun: tris (naues) ante ipsa moenia opposuerunt (*sc.* Tyrii), quibus rex inuectus ipsas demersit.

Pliny's Nat. Hist. offers several peculiarities. Very weak indeed is the contrast between dies earum (*sc.* halcyonum) partus and auis in 10,89: dies earum partus maria qui nauigant nouere. ipsa auis paulo amplior passere. Very similar are the passages 28, 48; 25,74 (ipsius duo genera); 29,101 fimum galinacium . . . inpositum et muris aranei caudae cinis

ita, ut ipse, cui abscissa sit, uivus dimittatur. In Pliny's Epist. 8,20,4 mihi ostenditur subiacens lacus nomine Uadimonis: simul quaedam incredibilia narrantur. perueni ad ipsum, the contrast between incredibilia and lacus is weak and unnecessary. Gerber and Greef cite eight passages from Tacitus under the rubric "ui quadam imminuta": Hist. 4,11,11; 84,25; Ann. 1,1,12; 3,46,5; 68,6; 4,16,17; 68,10; 12,47,11. Six are from the Annals, which show Tacitus' freest style.

In view of the extensive use of ipse = idem in Africa, it is not surprising that we should find ipse = is in Apuleius, Met. 2,11 (p. 47,18) quod dictum ipsius ('of his wife') Milo risu secutus, "grandem", inquit . . . ; and Florus 1,22(2,6),58 ille Italiae, hic Hispaniae uictor. . . . sed et colloquium fuit inter ipsos de legibus pacis. Possibly ipse in this passage is justified by its reference to the leaders of the two armies.

The usage is found in the earliest of the patristic writers. Minucius Felix 3,1 minorem ad te quam ad ipsum infamiam redundare. There is, to be sure, a contrast here, but not between two objects that are closely associated. We should, however, usually hesitate to interpret the word in this way when its antecedent is Christ or deus.

From this point on examples may be easily found by reference to the excellent indices in the volumes of Vienna Corpus of Ecclesiastical Writers and the Monumenta Hist. Germaniae. See also Rönsch, Collectanea Philol. p. 186.

There can be no doubt that *ὁὐτός* in the sense which its oblique cases often bear, contributed not a little to the development of this usage of ipse, not only in the

Latin translations of Greek writings, but also in the entire Patristic literature, which was subjected to a very strong influence of the Greek. From the numerous instances of ipse = $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ that these writings offer, we select the following:

Pastor Hermae:

Palatina.

et tu desideras sedere cum
ipsis.

si non ascenderit in corde
eorum.

nullum apud eum menda-
cium est.

agnosce illum a factis ip-
sius.

sensus illorum in actibus
ipsorum est.

aliqui ex ipsis.

Greek text.

Vis. 3,2,2 σὺ δὲ κατεπιθυμεῖς
καθίσαι . . . μετ' αὐτῶν.

Vis. 3,7,6 ἐὰν μὴ ἀναβῆῃ ἐπὶ
τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν.

Mand. 3,1 οὐδὲν παρ' αὐτῶ
ψευδός.

Mand. 6,2,4 γυνῶθι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ
τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ.

Mand. 10,1,5 (*Gr. supplied
by Hilgenf.*) ἡ δάνοια
αὐτῶν ἐν ταῖς πραγματείαις
αὐτῶν.

Sim. 8,9,4 ἕτεροι δὲ ἐξ
αὐτῶν.

Vulgata.

tu autem cupidus es sedere
. . . cum eis.

si non ascenderit in cor
ipsorum.

non est mendacium in ipso
(*i. e., Deo*).

intellige eum ab operibus
eius.

sensus eorum in negotiis.
ipsorum est || eorum est
V ||.

alii ex his (orthographical
variant for iis).

New Testament:			
	Greek text.	Vulgate, <i>etc.</i>	Ante-Hier. versions.
Matth. 23, 21	ἐν τῷ κατοικοῦντι αὐτόν.	in eo qui habitat in ipso. Also a, c, f ² , g ¹ , h, l.	qui in eo habitat <i>cod.</i> Pa- latina.
Matth. 23, 22	ἐν τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ.	in eo qui sedet super eum ipsum E (Cod. Cott.) Also b, c, e, g ¹ , l.	in eo qui sedet super ipsum h, f ² , <i>Dubl.</i> 4.15.
Matth. 17, 22	αὐτῶν συστρεφο- μένων.	conversantibus eis illis Q, R . Also g ¹ , g ² , f.	ipsis a, b, c, e, f ² , g.
Matth. 17, 2	ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν.	ante eos. Also a, q. in conspectu eorum <i>alii.</i> .	coram ipsis e.
Joh. 6, 50	ἐξ αὐτοῦ.	ex ipso eo E, f. . Also c.	ex eo q, b. illo a.

CHAPTER V.

CHAPTER V.

HIC, ISTE, ILLE, IS, IDEM, IPSE, IN THE FUNCTION OF THE DETERMINATIVE AND OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE.—SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

In this chapter I shall discuss briefly from another point of view the subjects treated in the preceding chapters, showing how the Romans made the pronouns serve the functions of the definite article and the determinative, and in conclusion shall add a few general statements necessary to the proper appreciation of the arguments set forth in this book.

The six pronouns *is*, *ille*, *idem*, *ipse*, *hic* and *iste* are so closely inter-related in meaning and usage, that a full understanding of the development of each of them must be based upon a due consideration of all the rest. In order to present each pronoun in its proper perspective and to set forth, at least in broad outline, its relationship to the others, I shall be obliged in the following paragraphs to state some of the results obtained in my study of the pronouns *ille* and *idem*. The details, however, of the arguments on which these results are based, must necessarily be omitted (see Preface, p. vii).

Probably none of the six pronouns mentioned approach each other so closely in meaning as do the determinative and the remote demonstrative. They

are both used mainly to refer to definite antecedents, both are *τριτότριτα*, and both may be used, and are frequently used, in referring to an object remote from the speaker, in space, time or interest. Accordingly it is not surprising that, as the pronoun is gradually lost its force and sank to a syntactical element which carried but little independent meaning, and as the need was felt for some other means of expressing the meaning formerly carried by *is*, recourse was first had to *ille*. It needs no arguments to prove that in Plautus' time *ille* had in general a much stronger force than the pronoun *is*. The legal literature, the language of which is always conservative, and Cato's *De Agricultura* (*cf. supra* p. 28f.) supplies us with an approximate standard for estimating the average prose usage of a period considerably antedating the years in which they were actually written, *e. g.*, of the time of Plautus.¹ Nevertheless, conspicuous indications in Plautus' language point to the beginnings of later and weakened meanings of *ille*. On this point see Bach, *op. cit.* p. 296. The deterioration of *ille* was in large part a consequence of its use as a substitute for *is*, but was doubtless materially hastened by the extensive use which the orators made of it, and by the tide of rhetorical influences that set in from Greece with the end of the third century B. C. and rose to so strong a flood in the "silver" age. In the period last mentioned the proportionate increase in the use of *ille* over

¹ Provided, of course, a later recension has not materially affected the usage of *ille* and *is*. Since such a recension must have been made before Pliny the Elder wrote, I hold it for improbable that the pronouns were much changed.

is is very conspicuous, as may be seen from the tables on pp. 30 and 31 above; and this numerical predominance of *ille* implies a corresponding weakening in its meaning.

In the form *ille qui* particularly it made headway against *is*; but there are other phrases, in which *ille* would have been impossible or at least inappropriate as a substitute for *is*. Hence recourse was not had exclusively to it. Next after *ille* the pronoun earliest called into requisition was *hic* (see chap. II). Not that the two demonstratives were synonymous. It was their very difference in meaning that made possible the use of both of them as substitutes for *is* at the same time, while *vice versa*, the actual use of the two in contexts formerly reserved for *is* tended to reduce to a minimum this difference in their meaning. For example, as soon as *hic* came to be used of objects that had no closer relation to the subject than that of occupying a place in his sympathies or interest, it could be used of objects remote in space and time, to which at an earlier stage in the development of the pronoun, only *ille* could have been applied.

The above statements apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to *idem*, which was used as early as Nepos (see Lupus, *op. cit.* p. 110) in connections in which the idea of identity is clearly implied in the context and where the use of a special word to point it out is superfluous. Such a sentence is well illustrated by the German (especially Swiss) usage: *Er näherte sich dem Hause und ging an demselben vorbei*; and the English: 'We examined the system, and found the same to be . . .,' or the Latin of Nepos, Epam. 10,4 *Thebas et ante*

Epaminondam natum et post eiusdem interitum, cited by Lupus; *cf.* Dion 2,3. The types of context in which *idem* could replace *is* are, of course, less numerous than in the case of *ille*. *Idem qui* for *is qui* was common. *Idem* as a substitute for *is*, found especial favor with the historians, chiefly during the period of the "silver" Latin, and to some extent even later. *Idem*, like *is*, became entirely obsolete in time, and *ille* and *ipse* took its place.

The use of *ipse* as a determinative has been touched upon above (see pp. 185f.). The nature of the change in meaning is analogous in all the foregoing cases. The meaning becomes less specific, and consequently the range of the application of the word continually widens. Just as *ille* gradually lost the character of a remote demonstrative, and came to be used, not to call attention to the remoteness of an object, but to refer to the given object simply because it was remote; and just as *hic* and *idem* similarly lost the character of a near demonstrative and pronoun of identity respectively; so the implication of a contrast gradually passed out of the complex of ideas represented by *ipse*. This change begins to make itself apparent in our extant literature about the same time as the corresponding changes in *hic* and *idem*, but the substitution of *ipse* for *is* does not become common until comparatively late. For *iste* = *is* see pp. 158f.

Of these five competitors for the position of *is*, *idem* seems entirely to have disappeared from use (unless it exists in the Ital. *de*), *hic* has succeeded in maintaining itself only in the neuter reinforced form *ecce-hoc* (French *ce*, Ital. *ciò*). *Ipse* succeeded in

establishing itself over a large territory, yet, even ipse either shares its domain with ille, as in ancient times, or takes on the special meaning of the Spanish *eso*¹, Ille therefore, which was the first pronoun to claim the place of the determinative, maintained its predominance from first to last.

In the cases just discussed the substantive use of the pronouns prevailed. The peculiarities they show in their development as adjectives are not less interesting. They all, with the possible exception of *iste*, tend to deteriorate to mere definite articles. The following paragraphs are nothing more than a few notes on the various aspects of the problem. A full discussion would necessitate an extensive study of the history of the definite article in other branches of the Indo-European languages; and I have not time at present to undertake such a study.

¹Since writing this, I have received the *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* XV,3, on pp. 303-316 of which Ascoli discusses the relation of the modern derivatives from *ipse* to their classical prototype. On p. 306 he affirms that the expression 'kku-epso (he thus writes it to avoid committing himself either to original *ecum-ipsium* or *atque-ipsium*), not only in the Spanish *eso*, but in all parts of the Romance territory in which it occurs, is used as a pronoun of the second person ('ha sempre quella funzione che dicono di dimostrativo 'di secondo persona', cioè di *codesto*'). I am not ready to accept this affirmation, which is of far reaching importance, without more specific proof than Ascoli brings forward. The character of the literature that makes up our sources of information on these popular idioms, is such that one is in great danger of being misled in forming conclusions on such a point as this.

I also note with much interest his statement on p. 314: *La scarsa funzione aggettivale di esso è pure nel senso, benchè attenuato, del pronome d'identità.*

The use of *ille* as a definite article has long been recognized and attention has frequently been called to such constructions as *Medea illa* (= ἡ *Μηδεια*), which is also extended to appellatives (*cf.* *Nepos*, *Arist.* 1,2 *testula illa* and the accepted reading of *Tac. Germ.* 14,11 f. cited above, p. 107), *ille alter* (as old as *Plautus*), *ille octauus*, *etc.*, *ille* + a substantivized participle (*cf.* *Hor. Sat.* 1,1,115 — a passage that offers a clearer instance of *ille* = article than *illis quaesitis* in *Hor. Sat.* 1,1,37 f.), and citations by the score, beginning with the *locus classicus* *Cic. Aratea*, *apud De Nat. Deor.* 2,114, might be adduced in which *ille*, in Latin translations of Greek writings, stands as an equivalent of the Greek article.

As was stated in chapter I, it was the weakest in meaning of the six pronouns under discussion, and in fact differed in many instances but very slightly from the use of the definite article in the modern English and German languages. This is true in particular of such sentences as *Cic. Lael.* 2 *memini* *in eum sermonem illum* (*sc.* *Scaeuolam*) *incidere, qui tum fere multis erat in ore*, 'I remember that Scaevola mentioned the subject that was . . . on the lips of everyone.' The demonstrative force here retained by *eum* can be no stronger than would be expressed by an attenuated English "that," should we substitute it for "the" in the above translation. It particularizes the substantive and points it out as one that is to be further defined immediately. By doing so it serves the function of a definite article. The construction is not so common as one might at first be inclined to suppose. There are only about half a dozen instances in

Cicero's Laelius. The examples in Tacitus are mostly found in the Dialogue on Oratory¹.

It naturally follows from the above, that when *ille* began to take the place of *is*, it also took on the function of the article in such sentences as the above. The change was going on in the first century of the empire, as the works of Seneca the Younger testify.

Hic seems not to have been very extensively used in this weakened sense. Expressions like *Lupercal hoc . . . ludicrum* Liv. 1, 5, 1, and *nuptialem hanc uocem* Liv. 1, 9, 12 correspond to the type *Medea illa*, but are of comparatively infrequent occurrence. In the two examples just cited, there is no particular contrast implied in *hoc*, and I should be disinclined to assume a strong demonstrative force for the word, although it unquestionably retains clear traces of its normal meaning.

Two further questions concerning the use of *hic* as an article must be mentioned here. They both have their origin in the use of *hic* as a substitute for δ , η , $\tau\delta$, etc. In the one case *hic* is found in Latin translations of Greek writings, where the Greek text shows the article; in the other case *hic* is used by Roman grammarians in paradigms, where in the Greek paradigms the definite article is employed.

Ever since the publication of Kaulen's *Handbuch der Vulgata*, Mainz, 1870 (*cf.* § 72), the attention of scholars has occasionally been called to the use of forms of *hic*, representing the Greek article, in various

¹ For *is* = definite article see also Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata: das Sprachidiom der Urchristlichen Itala und der katholischen Vulgata*, 2d edition, Marburg, 1875, p. 423.

early Latin translations of the Scriptures. Hermann Rönsch has shown himself more industrious than others in the collection of such examples. In his *Itala und Vulgata*, pp. 420-422, under the rubric "Artikelgebrauch von *hic*," he has printed a long list; and in his *Semasiologische Beiträge zum lateinischen Wörterbuch*, zweites Heft, Leipzig, 1888, p. 17, under the lemma "*hic* = Artikel," he supplements the earlier list by twelve further examples. The form of the rubric he employs certainly implies that he supposes *hic* not to be simply a Latin substitute for the Greek article, but its equivalent in meaning. Kaulen *l. c.* plainly says, *hic* und *is* haben in manchen Stellen schon ihren deiktischen Charakter verloren und sind zu blossen Artikelbezeichnungen geworden. . . . Furthermore, since Rönsch in his later book uses the sign of equality in the sense of "means" (*cf.* p. 16 "*habentia* = *ea quae habentur*" and "*gracilis* = fein, dünn"), we must conclude that he had not changed his views on the subject in the interim between the publication of the two books. I must confess, however, to grave doubts of the correctness of his judgment on this point, for the following reasons:

Rönsch has himself so arranged his citations that a moment's examination of them reveals the fact that sixty-eight out of his ninety-three examples, *i. e.*, about three-fourths of the entire number, present, under one form or another, the locution *hic mundus* (corresponding to the Greek *ὁ κόσμος*). Now no one who has read the Latin Patristic literature extensively can have failed to note the very frequent occurrence of this expression. The contrast between the present

world and the future life had become a part and parcel of the religious experience of the early Christian. The Church Fathers continually dwell upon this contrast, and *hic mundus*, or still stronger *iste mundus* (*cf. supra*, p. 125), which clearly expresses this contrast, was as familiar to their ears as is "this world" to those of the modern divine. In fact, *hic* had become a standing epithet of *mundus*, and while not so inseparably bound up with its substantive as *hoc* was in the word *hodie*, and as *haec* afterward came to be in the expression *ad hanc horam*, from which the Italian *ancora* is derived, *hic* was nevertheless intimately associated with it. We shall accordingly be justified in assuming that in translating $\delta \ \acute{\alpha}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ the ancients were influenced rather by a natural tendency to reduce every mention of the word *mundus* to the traditional form *hic mundus*, rather than by any desire to give an exact semasiological equivalent of the Greek article. In short, the mere existence of *hic* in this expression, in which it implies a contrast, removes it in meaning from the sphere of the article.

Let us now examine the remaining twenty-five instances cited by Rönsch.

The citations 2 Cor. 7,10 *huius saeculi* (*cod. h*), 2 Cor. 5,1 *huius habitationis* (*codd. h*, Boern. Amiatinus, Toletanus) and 2 Macc. 7,9 *apud*. Cyprian, *Ad Fortunatum* 11 *hac praesenti uita*, fall into the same category with *hic mundus*, although it must frankly be admitted that the addition of *praesenti* in the last case is indicative of some weakening in the force of *hic* as a near demonstrative. Yet it has not become simply a definite article, because, if it had, we should

expect now and then to meet *οἷτος ὁ κόσμος* in the unheard of Latin garb *iste hic mundus*.¹

In Luc. 17,17 *hi decem* (*cod.* e, according to Rönisch;—he should have added: a, b, c, d, f², i, q, s; *cod.* D reads *ουτοι*, for *οἷτοι*). The occurrence of *hi* in so many different versions forces the conclusion that it is due to the existence of a *οἷτοι* in the Greek text, although only *cod.* D *cum* *man. sec.* and *codd.* *All* show it now, and although it may have arisen from a misunderstanding of *ουχ οι* in the original text.

In the citation from Apoc. 20,6, *apud* Primasius, *Commentum in Apoc.*, in *hac* *prima* *resurrectione*, it is clear that the Greek phrase *αὕτη ἡ ἀνάστασις ἡ πρώτη* in § 5 immediately preceding the Latin phrase cited, led to the insertion of the pronoun *hac*. Whether it was intentional on the part of the translator, or was due to a confusion of the two phrases either in his mind or that of a later copyist, is a matter of indifference.

It was likewise no desire to give an exact rendering of the Greek article, that influenced the makers of the translations of Phil. 3,16 contained in *codd.* Boern. and h and the translator of Barnabas, *Epist.* 4,5 to use forms of *hic* in translating forms of *τὸ αὐτό* by *hoc ipsum*. This phrase, running side by side with *id ipsum*, and bearing the meaning of *idem*, was a stereotyped expression like *hic mundus* (*cf. supra* p. 167). Certainly the *uetus interpretator* of the letter of Barnabas did not intend *hoc* to stand as an equivalent for *τὸ* in the passage cited, as is shown by the circum-

¹This statement may be venturesome, since our manuscripts would in such cases probably show *istic* or *isthic* (*cf. supra* p. 143).

stance that no where else in his translation does hic represent \acute{o} , $\acute{\eta}$, $\tau\acute{o}$, etc. To be sure the phrase hi qui occurs twice in chap. 8, where it must be regarded, however, as an orthographical variant for ii qui¹, and in a few cases, *e. g.*, 1,5; 2,1; 2,4; 5,5; 9,5 (hoc est); 10,4; 10,7 (hoc est); 10,11 (hoc est); 12,3; 13,2; 15,6; it is inserted in the Latin translation², where the Latin idiom requires it, although there is no corresponding expression in the Greek text. Yet it normally³ translates $\acute{o}\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ⁴ or $\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon$ ⁵. Hic certainly retains in this work some traces of its classical force. Otherwise we should not find huius temporis⁶, instead of huius nunc temporis, representing $\tau\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\ \nu\tilde{\upsilon}\nu\ \chi\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}$ in 4,1; nor would haec sabbata in 15,8 represent $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \nu\tilde{\upsilon}\nu\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\beta\text{-}\beta\alpha\tau\alpha$ ⁷. In view of all this it is extremely improbable, that, while scores of opportunities for translating the article by hic occur in the letter, the translator should have availed himself of only one of these.

Four further passages mentioned by Rönisch (Mich. 1,13; 7,20 huic Iacob; Hos. 2,8; Psalm 96,1) show hic before an indeclinable proper name, where it serves to indicate the grammatical case and gender of the substantive; while in 7,20 huic Abrahae follows the analogy of huic Iacob that immediately precedes.

Ex hoc nunc (Greek, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\tilde{\omicron}\ \tau\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\ \nu\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$) occurs four times

¹ Numerous parallels might be cited (*cf. supra* pp. 23-25).

² Usually the forms hoc or haec.

³ There are forty-five instances.

⁴ $\acute{o}\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is translated by iste in only one passage, 10,4.

⁵ Only in citations from the Scriptures.

⁶ *cf.* Livy 1,56,2 noua haec magnificentia.

⁷ In chap. 9 et hi corresponds oddly enough to $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\iota$ (*i. e.*, *Ιουδαῖοι*).

in the Verona Psalter.¹ The hoc is here the result of an attempt to get around the difficulty that the Romans found in using an adverb as the object of a preposition.

The phrase *principes huius populi* (for ἀρχοντες τοῦ λαοῦ) in Act. 4,8 seems to be a Biblical reminiscence (cf. Isaiah 1,10 *apud* Barnabas, Epist. 9,3 *principes p. h. = ἀρχ. τ. λ. τ.*; Deut. 4,1 *in op. cit.* 10,2; Jer. 2,12 *in op. cit.* 11,2 p. hic = ὁ λ. οὗτος).

Of the remaining nine out of the ninety-three cases, four show some form of hic applied to an actually existing, material object, which is in the presence of the speaker and to which he directs the attention of his listeners. All four passages are direct discourse; and in all, the context permits the interpretation of hic in its classical sense, or even with deictic force.

The remaining five passages are Mich. 1,13 *huic filiae(?) (cod. Fuldensis)*, in which the text is doubtful; 3 Esdr. 8,15 (should be 33?); Act. 4,37, in which there seems to be most justification for taking hic as an article; 11,22, where hic may be interpreted as a resumptive "this," and is closely paralleled by Livy 1,21,4 *ad id sacrarium*, for *ad eius* or *huius sacrarium*; and Act. 19,23.

So Rönisch's ninety-three examples of "hic = Artikel" reduce themselves to at most five, and even these are not beyond question.

I have gone into this detailed discussion of the subject, in order to point out, first that we must not

¹The references are 113,18; 120,8; 124,2; 130,3. In the Vulgate also it represents the same Greek phrase in Psalm. 112, 2, a passage overlooked by Rönisch.

only be very careful in our use of the evidence afforded by these early translations, but that we must accurately distinguish between the use of a Latin word as a substitute for a Greek word and as a semasiological equivalent of it; and secondly that in the present case the evidence that the translations offer for the use of *hic* as an article is very scanty.

As to the second question mentioned above, we cannot regard the technical use of *hic* in paradigms, as in any sense indicative of a weakening in the force of *hic*, much less as proving it to be synonymous with the definite article. If any arguments were necessary to establish so patent a truth, we might refer to the fact that its occurrence in Varro, *De Ling. Lat.* 8,22 and 9,52 implies its use at an earlier date, when *hic* certainly retained its full force as a near demonstrative. It is in no sense a definite article, but merely a convenient device for indicating the gender and case of a word.

If *hic* was seldom used as a definite article, it naturally follows that *iste* was even more rarely so used; because, as we have seen above (see chap. III), *iste* had a much stronger demonstrative force than did *hic*, and naturally came to take the place of the latter. Consequently the use of *iste* as an article, if it was ever so used, must have occurred long after *hic* sank to that stage. We find this view fully confirmed by the evidence of the texts. I have found only three instances of the use of *iste* in Latin translations representing the Greek δ , η , $\tau\acute{o}$, etc. The first is found in the *Versio Palatina* of the *Pastor Hermae*, *Sim.* 9,14,2 (cited by Haussleitner in Luthardt's *Zeitschr. f. kirch.*

Wiss. 1885, p. 98) where the Greek reads *ἐὰν τούτων τῶν γυναικῶν ἀποβάλλωσι τὰ ἔργα, τῶν δὲ παρθένων ἀναλάβωσι τὴν δύναμιν*; the Versio Palatina reads *si abiecerint omnia opera mulierum illarum, et istarum uirginum resumpserint potentiam*; the Versio Vulgata, however, reads just the same, except that it substitutes *potestatem* for *potentiam*, and *harum* for *istarum*. Plainly both these translators were led to use the near demonstratives *harum* and *istarum*¹ by a desire to contrast *mulierum*, the women who personify pleasure and sin, with *uirginum*, who personify the potestates filii Dei. He refers to the former by *illarum*, since they are remote from his sympathies. The second passage is Pastor Hermae, Vis. 3,3,1 *τί ἐστὶν τὰ πράγματα*; Palatina, *quae sint res istae?*; Vulgata, *quae sunt hae res?* *Hae* and *istae* were written here under the influence of the preceding *haec*, and refer to objects near the speaker. But they were certainly very weak, even though they retain traces of a stronger meaning. In Ignatius, Epist. ad Tarsenses ex Philippis 1 *iniquorum istorum* = *τῶν δεινῶν*; but *istorum* implies contempt.

These three passages cannot justify us in assuming that *iste* was very largely used as an article. Its use in modern Spanish with the meaning "this," also makes this view improbable.

We now turn to the consideration of *idem* as a definite article. It was pointed out above (pp. 196, 193) that *is* served sometimes as a definite article and that *idem* was weakened in meaning until it became practically synonymous with *is*. The use of both *is* and *idem* as an article is shown by the nineteen cases

¹ *Istarum* is, of course, used here in the sense of *harum*.

in which they represent the Greek article in the Latin translations of the Pastor Hermae. All but four of these passages are found in the ninth Parable; two are in the eighth and two in the fifth. Both the Palatine and the Vulgate translation of the Pastor show the usage, eleven cases falling to the former. The instance in Sim. 5,6,5 is especially noteworthy. The Greek text reads *αὐτὴ ἡ σάρξ, ἐν ἣ κατώκησε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἐδοῦλευσε τῷ πνεύματι. . . ., μηδὲν ὄλωσ μίανασα τὸ πνεῦμα. 6. πολιτευσαιμένην οὖν οὖν αὐτὴν καλῶς καὶ ἀγνῶς καὶ συ[γχο]οπιόσασαν τῷ πνεύματι.* The Versio Palatina translates: *hoc ergo corpus, in quo deductus est spiritus sanctus, paruit eidem spiritui. . . ., nec omnino eundem spiritum maculavit. 6. unde cum idem corpus recte atque caste eidem spiritui paruisset. . . .* The Versio Vulgata has: *hoc ergo corpus, in quo deductus est spiritus sanctus, seruiuit ei || sic cod. V; illi ed. pr. Cott. Dress. || spiritui. . . ., neque omnino maculavit spiritum illum. cum igitur corpus hoc paruisset omni tempore recte atque caste. . . .* Note the alternation of forms of *is* and *ille* with *eundem*. In this way *idem* in the Palatina corresponds to *is* or *ille* of the Vulgata in 8,1,2; 9,6,3; 9,9,4; while this relation of Palatina and Vulgata is reversed in 9,7,7 and 9,11,6 (in this section, *illa* was printed in ed. pr. of the Vulgata). In only one passage (9,9,4 in *eodem campo*) besides that quoted above do both translations show *idem*. In six passages, 8,2,8; 9,1,6; 9,2,3; 9,4,3; 9,10,2; 9,10,3; the Palatina has *idem*, while the Vulgata makes no attempt to render the article; in four other cases, 9,4,4; 9,7,4; 9,8,5; 9,11,6; the relation of the two translations is reversed in this

particular. In most of these passages it is clear that *idem* not merely stands as a substitute for the definite article, but is synonymous with it.

It is a well known fact that *ipse* developed into a definite article in some parts of the territory of the Romance languages (*cf.* Meyer-Lübke, *Gramm. der roman. Sprachen* II, 129 f).

The earliest positive evidence of the usage is found in the translations of the Pastor Hermae:

(See following page.)

Ipse in both versions:

Palatina.

- Sim. 8, 1, 18 et nuntius ipse.
 Sim. 9, 2, 1 de ipso campo.
 Sim. 9, 6, 1 ipsam turrem.

In the versio Palatina:

- Uis. 3, 2, 5 ipsa turris.
 Sim. 5, 5, 3 ipsius p. familiae.
 Sim. 1, 8, 18 ipse . . . pastor.

Sim. 9, 2, 2 porta autem ipsa.

Sim. 9, 2, 3 portam autem ipsam.

Sim. 9, 1, 4 montis ipsius.

Greek.

- ὁ ἀγγελίος.
 ἐκ τοῦ πεδίου.
 τὴν πύργον.

- ὁ πύργος.
 τοῦ δεσπότου.
 καὶ ὁ ποιμήν.

ἡ δὲ πόλις.

τῆς πόλιος.

τοῦ ὄρους.

Vulgate.

- et nuntius ipse.
 de ipso campo.
 ipsam turrem.

turris.

illius p.

nec minus pastor ille.

et porta illa.

eam portam.

eius (without montis).

(omittit.)

καὶ ἐπάνω τῆς πόλεως.

Sim. 9, 3, 1 et super portam ipsam.

In the versio Vulgata:

ab ipsis uiris.

ὀπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν.

Sim. 9, 4, 6 a multitudine uirorum.

Sim. 8, 1, 18 well illustrates the great freedom prevailing under the empire in the use of the pronouns:

ipsi enim ualde hilares erant, et nuntius ipse magnam laetitiam de ipsis habebat; ipse quoque pastor ex illis hilaris fuit.

eorum uirorum ualde hilares erant uultus, sed et nuntius ipse quidem ex eis magnam laetitiam percipiebat, nec minus pastor ille ex eadem causa hilaritatem capiebat.

καὶ λίαν ἡλαροὶ ἦσαν οἱ ἀνθρωποι ἐκεῖνοι. . . καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος ἐπὶ τούτοις ἠγαλλιάτο καὶ ὁ ποιμὴν λίαν ἡλαρὸς ἦν ἐπὶ τούτοις.

Hieronymus seems to have kept his translation free from this remarkable construction. It is found, however, in the earlier translations both of the Septuagint and of the New Testament. There are citations in Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata* p. 423 from 3 Esdras 8, 15; 45; 50; 71; 92. In the *Collectanea Philol.*, p. 186 (= *Z. f. d. Gymn.* 1877), the same scholar cites a passage from the *Acta S. Timothei* p. 12, 57 (ed. Usener, 1887) *ipsis quae diximus superportis (τοῖς ἐπιφερομένοις) palis et lapidibus*. I am convinced that in passages of this kind, in which the Greek definite article followed by a participle is rendered into Latin, the Romans must have felt the *ipse* as rather nearer in meaning to *is* than to the article. It was their almost invariable practice to render δ + participle by *is* . . . *qui* . . . or by *ille* . . . *qui* . . . In Ignatius, *Epist. ad Phil.* (interpolata) 4 *ipse omnia euocans et mouens*, representing δ πάντα καλῶν κινῶν, the use of *ipse* is justified by its antecedent. In the *interpretatio uetus* of the Epistle of Barnabas there is no example.

Commodian, *Apol.* 657 reads

In nuptiis fuerat inuitatus matre cum ipsa.

Here Dombart (*vid.* *Index, s. v.*) takes *ipse* "pro articulo." Yet we may well doubt whether *ipsa* is not here justified by the frequency with which it is used by children to designate their parents. In like manner, Arnobius, *Ad Nat.* 1, 2, f. 1b *rerum ipsa quae dicitur appellaturque natura*, seems to be an equivalent to η καλομένη φύσις, and may perhaps be explained like the passage from the *Acta S. Timothei*.

In Lactantius' *De Opificio Dei* *ipse* is repeatedly used in describing the structure of the human body

with an extremely weak force, and seems closely to approximate the definite article in meaning.

Pompeius, the Grammarian, who shows so many peculiarities in the use of the pronouns, offers us a curious passage p. 133,27(K) *si dicas, "Tityre maxime," T. m. duo sunt dactyli, ecce nihil superest. sed ipsi pedes finiunt ipsam elocutionem.* Similarly Planiciades Fulgentius, *Mitol.* 3,9 (p. 76,8) *uox uero habet gradus symphoniarum innumeros, quantum natura donauerit ipsam uocem ut habeat arsis et thesis quas nos Latine.* Further see Placitus, *De Medicinis ex Animal.* 2,5; 17,14.

Meyer-Lübke finds traces of the use of *ipse* as an article not only in Sardinia (*cf.* Beger, *Latein. und Roman.* Berlin, 1863, pp. 51. 54), but also in the Balearic Islands (Mallorca) and on both sides of the Pyrenees (Ampurdan and Gasconne). We may conclude, by viewing Meyer-Lübke's statement in connection with the occurrence of the usage in the west-Aquitainian *Itinerarium Burdigalense* and the *Peregrinatio Sanctae Siluiae* from southern Gaul, that *ipse* = *δ* obtained a fairly firm footing in southern Gaul, quite a little further to the eastward. Furthermore two documents in the *Bibliothèque Nationale* (one from the year 679-80 and the other a document of Pepin's time from Aubin, district of Telle, dated 750) bear witness to the existence of the usage farther north. Hilary of Poitiers, although having *ipse* = *idem*, does not seem to know the usage, perhaps because he made efforts to keep his style closer to the classical usage, which his early training in Rhetoric would naturally lead him to do.

If now we put together all the changes here treated, and such others as I myself or others have noted, but which are for various reasons not discussed fully in this book, we obtain the following general view:

is (demonstrative) > talis
 > is (determinative)
 > definite article
 > obsolete¹

Is was replaced by ille, hic and ipse; also, but less extensively, by idem, and occasionally by iste.

ille > talis
 > is (determinative)
 > definite article

As a demonstrative ille was replaced by the compounds *ecum-illum* (= Italian *quello*), *ecce-ille* (= French *cel*), which were themselves further reinforced by [il]la[c]; *cf.* Engl. "that there."

idem > item
 > is (determinative)
 > obsolete

Idem was reinforced or replaced by the expressions *hic idem* (which for phonetic reasons could not long have maintained itself in the nom. pl. masc and fem.), *iste idem*, *ille idem*; *is ipse* (especially in the form *id ipsum*), *hic ipse*, *iste ipse* (and later *istum ipsum*, which yielded the Italian *stesso*), *idem ipse* (which, according to Dietz yielded Italian *desso*, also explained

¹ This means that as a free and independent word it passed out of use.

as id ipsum), ille ipse; ipsissimus, met-ipsismus (= French même).

- hic > talis
- > is (determinative)
- > definite article
- > obsolete

Hic in its pronominal use was replaced mainly by iste, which still remains in Spanish; ecce-hoc (= French ce, which has itself so far depreciated in meaning that it is reinforced by both ci < ecce-hic and la < illac) and eccum istum, from which is derived Italian questo, which is itself sometimes reinforced by qui < ecce hic.

- iste > talis
- > ille
- > hic (demonstrative) > hic (determinative)
- = is (determinative)
- > (?) definite article

Iste as δευτερόριτον was replaced by eccum-ti(for tibi)-istum, Italian codesto; and, if the statement of Ascoli cited above, is correct, by ipsa, ipso (for ipsum). As πρωτόριτον it was replaced by ecce-iste (French cette) and eccum-istum (Italian questo).

- ipse > idem (expressing identity)
- > ille or is (determinative)
- > definite article
- > obsolete (in some localities)

Ipsa was replaced by the compounds id ipsum, *etc.*, met-ipsimus.

The changes discussed in this book are frequently, if not usually, designated in scientific works by such expressions as "confusions of meaning," "barbar-

isms" and "Verwilderung," terms which are misleading, inexact and obscure. Such terms imply, moreover, that the person who uses them has either consciously or unconsciously assumed that there is a fixed standard of usage in language. It may seem to some scholars that a protest against this careless use of words, is a work of supererogation. Not at all so; because the very use of such expressions implies that the classical consciousness is not yet entirely emancipated from false notions respecting the superiority of Ciceronian Latin and the "corruptions" of later Latin, notions that have been rife since the days of Laurentius Valla's *De Linguae Latinae Elegantiis*, and even earlier. Many are still seeking for a "standard of usage" suited, for example, to students of Latin prose composition.

I must protest against the use of the phrases "confusion of meaning," "Verwilderung," *etc.*, to designate such changes as *ille* > *is*, *iste* > *hic* > *is*, and others; and I may make my position clear by one or two illustrations. Take the sentence from Tertullian, *De Spectac.* 21 *sic ergo euenit, ut qui in publico uix . . . tunicam leuet, idem in circo . . . exuet; ut et qui . . . , ipse . . . , et qui . . . , idem . . .* No reasonable person would suppose that, when Tertullian composed these lines, there existed in his mind any confusion as to the respective meanings of *ipse* and *idem*, any more than would arise in the mind of an English speaking person on reading the paraphrase: 'The man who on the street would scarcely remove his coat, would do so without hesitation in the circus; and the very person who, *etc.* . . . , while he who . . .'

Tertullian had occasion to express the idea of identity in three successive coordinate and symmetrical sentences, and he chose to employ two different words to express that idea. Their very difference, as he appreciated their meanings, was doubtless the factor that determined his choice. The other parallel sentences cited on p. 173 *supra* should be explained in the same way. On the contrary, cases in which a foreigner, with only an imperfect acquaintance with the Latin tongue, employs a word à la Mrs. Partington, must, of course, be viewed in an entirely different light. Yet even such instances have usually a very great scientific value.

Accordingly it is to be understood, that when the expressions "synonymous," "of the same meaning," *etc.*, are employed, in this volume, they are used in the sense of the preceding paragraph; and that due allowance must always be made for chronological, local and individual peculiarities. In addition to these, possible influences of a writer's sources must be weighed. In the fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh centuries in particular, when originality of thought was so rare in the Roman empire, the writers of books were much given to making *ad litteram* excerpts from earlier works, and have frequently incorporated into their own productions idioms of extraneous origin. Where such an influence has not been operative, that is to say, where an author uses two words as does Tertullian in the passage cited, there invariably exist differences in the elements composing the groups of ideas to which the words respectively correspond, although, at the same time they have important elements in common.

In conclusion I must make one further point clear. The shifting in meaning that we observe words to have undergone is, as we know, in every case the result of a cumulative series of unconscious and imperceptible deviations from a former meaning; or to speak more exactly, each time a word is employed it becomes really a new word, the old disappearing in the new. Accordingly it becomes a matter of prime importance in studying the nature of changes in meaning, that we should direct our attention especially to the minutest perceptible gradations of meaning, citing such passages as illustrate them most clearly. Such stages form, so to speak, "connecting links" between the earlier and the later meanings.¹ From this point of view, it is more important that we should study these minute gradations attentively than that we should emphasize unduly the differences that exist between two widely separated stages. Yet, since it has been my purpose, throughout this book to prove the existence of distinctly marked new meanings of the pronouns, rather than to show how such meanings have come into existence, my method of presentation has often more closely resembled the lexicographical, which aims to show that certain distinctly differing meanings exist, rather than the semasiological, which aims to show how such meanings arise.

¹*Cf.* Stöcklein, *Bedeutungswandel der Wörter*, München, 1898.

SOURCES.

The following Greek and Latin texts have been used in the preparation of this work. The editions followed in making citations are for the most part those used in the preparation of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, a complete list of which is printed in Vol. I,1 of that work (Leipzig, 1900). The exceptions are indicated in the following list by the addition of the editor's name. If the author's name is followed by no mention of his works, it is to be understood that his entire extant works are represented. Thoroughly reliable complete indices and lexica have been largely depended upon for those authors (indicated by an asterisk¹) where such exist; but even in such cases larger or smaller parts of the given author's writings have been read in addition.

Plautus (*cf. supra* p. 36). Terence, ed. Fleckeisen, 1897. *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta. *Ennius. *Ueterum Historicorum Romanorum Fragmenta, 1870 and 1883. *Cato, *De Agricultura*, ed. Keil, 1882. *Rhetorica ad Herennium. Cicero, *orations, ed. Müller, 1894, 1896, 1898; *philosophical works, ed. Müller, 1889, 1898, 1898; Brutus and *De Oratore* I, ed. Friedrich, 1893; and the letters, ed. Müller-Wesenburg, 1896, 1895. *Caesar. *Pseudo-Caesar. Nepos, ed. Halm, 1871. Sallust, ed. Jordan, 1887. Varro, *Res Rusticae*, ed. Keil, 1884. Catullus. Lucretius, B'ks. 1,2,3,6, ed. Munro, 1893. Livy, ed. Weissenborn-Müller, 1888-1892. *Vitruvius. Seneca. Valerius Maximus, Velleius Paterculus, ed. Ellis, 1898. Celsus, 1-2,1. *Tibullus. Propertius, ed. Rothstein, 1898. *Horace, ed. Keller and Holder. Virgil, ed. Ribbeck, 1894, 1895. Ovid, *Ibis*, ed. Ellis, 1881; other works ed. Merkel-Ehwald, 2d edition. Manilius, ed. Iacob, 1846. Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

¹All other indices. *e. g.*, Friedländer to Juvenal and Martial, and Korn to Ex. Ponto, *etc.*, have been found incomplete.

B'ks. 1 and 3. Frontinus Gromaticus. Curtius, ed. Damsté, 1897. Persius, ed. Conington-Nettleship, 3d ed., 1893. Seneca, Dial. 1-10. Pliny, Nat. Hist. 2,3,6-15, 23-30. Pliny the Younger, ed. Keil, 1886. Tacitus, ed. Müller, 1890. Fronto, ed. Naber, 1867. Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, 1-10; *Apologia*, in part, ed. Van der Vliet. Florus. Suetonius. Aulus Gellius. Justin. Lucan, ed. Francken, 1897. Statius, *Silvae*, ed. Vollmer, 1898; *Theb. and Achil.* as in *Thesaurus L. L.* Silius, 1-10,17. Martial, 1-7 read, ed. Friedländer, 1886. Juvenal, *Satires* 2,6,9 ed. Bücheler, 1893; *Sat.* 1,3-5,7,8,10-16, ed. Mayor, 1883,1893. Censorinus, *De Die Natali*. *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. Eutropius. *Auctor De Uiris Illustribus*, Tauchnitz. Aurelius Victor, *Origo*, ed. Sepp. *Declamatio in Catilinam*. Aggenus Urbicus. Balbus. Hyginus. Siculus Flaccus. Dares. Dictys, 1-3. Pompeius Grammaticus, 108 pages. Ammianus Marcellinus, 1-6. Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1-5; *Somnium Scipionis* pp. 476-526. Boethius, *De Consolatione Philosophiae*. *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*. *Scholia Terentiana*, ed. Schlee, 1893. *Poetae Latini Minores* Vols. III,IV.

Of the Patristic writers the following, (all¹ in the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Romanorum Vindobonense*): Mincius Felix. Tertullian. Cyprian, 1,2,4-13; *Epistulae* 1-43. Pseudo-Cyprian pp. 283-325. Commodian. Arnobius 1-4. Lucius Caecilius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*. Firmicus Maternus. Augustine, *Epistulae* 1-31. Sulpicius Severus. Priscillian. Fulgentii tres, ed. Helm. Alcimus Avitus, ed. Peiper, 1883 (= *Mon. Germ. Histor., Auct. Aut. VI, 2*) opera 2-32, and fr. VI, ex *Homil. Libris*. *Itinera Hierosolymitana* Vol. I. Eugippus, *Uita Severini*. Translations of Greek writings: Barnabas and Ignatius, ed. Gebhardt-Harnack-Zahn, 1875, 1876. Clemens Romanus, ed. Morin, 1894. Pastor Hermæ (*Vulgata* ed. Hilgenfeld, 1873, and *Palatina* ed. Gebhardt-Harnack, 1877). Irenaeus. *New Testament ex Uers. S. Hieronymi* (all of Matthew and parts of the other Gospels have been carefully compared with the Greek original and the texts of the Ante-Hieronymian translations: Veronensis (b), Colbertinus (c), Sangallenses 1394, 172 and bib. Vadiana 70 (n, o, p), Ambrosianus (s), Bernensis (t),

¹ Except as otherwise noted.

Vindobonensis 502 (v). This list of versions is concluded on p. 139. I have used the following versions only in so far as they are incompletely accessible in Sabbatier's citations: Corbeiensis (f¹, f²), Sangermanenses (g¹, g²), Augustine's *Speculum* has also been made use of to some extent. The Uersio Authentica of Justinian's *Novellae Constitutiones* I-XX has also been compared with the Greek original.

The following writers have been read in larger or smaller selections: Varro, *De Lingua Latina*. Petronius. Valerius Flaccus, ed. Langen, 1896. Gaius, ed. Huschke, 1886. Porphyrio in Horatium. Boethius, *De Musica*; [*De Arithmetica*]. The following Patristic writers in the C. S. E. R.¹: Lactantius, *Institutiones*. Novation. Ambrosius. Hieronymus (Migne). Rufinus. Prudentius. Paulinus of Nola. Optatus. Filastrus. Ruricus. Faustus. Corippus, ed. Patsch, 1879 (= *Mon. Ger. Hist.*, Auc. Ant. III). Augustine, *uaria*. Hilarian, *Tractatus in Psalmos*. Pelagius. Orosius. Vicentius. Prosper. Merobaudes (Migne). Salvianus. Claudian, ed. Birt., 1892 (= *Mon. Ger. Hist.*, Auc. Ant. X). Victor Vitensis. Fortunatus. Idacius (Migne). Ennodius, ed. Vogel, 1885 (= *Mon. Ger. Hist.*, Auc. Ant. VII). Isidore (Migne).

I trust that I have overlooked no modern authority of importance. I have been greatly helped in the collection of my material by the citations illustrating the use of the pronouns to be found in the appropriate sections of various monographs on the Latinity of particular writers. No list of these is here given, since they may be found in Schmalz's *Lateinische Syntax*, especially pp. 202-213. The more important receive particular mention in their appropriate connection in the body of this work.

¹ Except as otherwise noted.

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA.

p. 24, l. 30. Cicero, *Tusc. Dis.* 3,28, quotes *Enn. Fab.* 204 *ei rei sustuli*; but Seneca, *De Consol.* 9,30, following the natural tendencies of his period, alters it to *huic rei sustuli*.

p. 38, l. 6. The position of *hoc* in *Lucr.* 3,531 does not favor Munro's conjecture.

p. 41, l. 26. In *Gellius* 11,9,1 *cod.* B omits the explanatory sentence in which *eo* stands.

p. 44, l. 17. *Read:* *Non eo* || *ego cod.* C || *haec.*

p. 45, l. 12. *Read:* 3,4,7*p* || *nos eo cod.* E; *non eo modo codd.* H P || C; *non in eo modo cod.* B || ; in

p. 45, l. 13. In *Nepos*, *Chab.* 1,2 *Fleckeisen*, keeping the MSS. reading *ducem*, supplies *eo frustratus est quod* after *cateruis*.

p. 57, l. 16. *Read:* instances besides 101 and 102, where *Bücheler* does not adopt it, (see

p. 65, l. 3. *Read:* 9 *extr.* (This passage is by some regarded as spurious); 22,8;

p. 68, l. 2. *Read:* 5,16,2 *ad hoc Veientique* || *veienti quoque codd. rec. et edd. pleraeque* ||. So also in l. 25.

p. 71, l. 21. *Read:* *expeditiores* (*Faern's* correction to *ad iter expeditiores* is accepted by *Kübler*), and

pp. 74*f.* To the instances of *obid* in *Livy* add: 42,5,4; 45,16,6; 23,19; 24,3; to those of *ob haec* add: 21,53,11; to *ob ea* add: 35,14,4; 42,10,15. *Hyginus*,

Fab., has ob id 21 times, ob hoc 4 times. To the instances of ob hoc from Pliny, Epist. add 1,10,11 and 8,22,3. See Reissinger, *op. cit.*, part II.

p. 81, l. 5. *Read:* hanc; illam....hanc: haec,

92, l. 10. *Read:* teterrima; Livy 7,34,9 (signa uertunt); Sall.

p. 122, l. 28. *Read:* istas || ista *coni.* Guyetus ||

p. 128, l. 20. *Read:* 23,1-2 huic homini; 25,1 huius uiri; 2;

p. 183, l. 8. *Read:* stands Spain (Isidore) and

p. 188, l. 6. *Read:* ἐπάνω





AA 000 531 352 3

LIBRARY
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

