

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01121-1 - An Elementary Latin Grammar
Henry John Roby
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY COLLECTION

Books of enduring scholarly value

Classics

From the Renaissance to the nineteenth century, Latin and Greek were compulsory subjects in almost all European universities, and most early modern scholars published their research and conducted international correspondence in Latin. Latin had continued in use in Western Europe long after the fall of the Roman empire as the lingua franca of the educated classes and of law, diplomacy, religion and university teaching. The flight of Greek scholars to the West after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 gave impetus to the study of ancient Greek literature and the Greek New Testament. Eventually, just as nineteenth-century reforms of university curricula were beginning to erode this ascendancy, developments in textual criticism and linguistic analysis, and new ways of studying ancient societies, especially archaeology, led to renewed enthusiasm for the Classics. This collection offers works of criticism, interpretation and synthesis by the outstanding scholars of the nineteenth century.

Elementary Latin Grammar

Henry John Roby (1830–1915) was a Cambridge-educated classicist whose influential career included periods as a schoolmaster, professor of Roman law, businessman, educational reformer and Member of Parliament. *An Elementary Latin Grammar* (1862) is a complete, concise introduction to the Latin language. Written for classroom use, it presents essential grammatical constructions in the clearest possible manner, using ample material from the classical authors as demonstrations of basic principles. The book guides the reader through noun and adjective declensions and the full array of verb conjugations before turning to prosody and syntax, where Roby's innovations in Latin instruction are most evident. Simple, direct, and based upon examples including texts by Livy and Cicero, the book shows students how to parse basic sentences while also introducing them to more subtle and complex constructions. It remains a useful resource for teachers of Latin, and a fascinating document in the history of education.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01121-1 - An Elementary Latin Grammar
Henry John Roby
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press has long been a pioneer in the reissuing of out-of-print titles from its own backlist, producing digital reprints of books that are still sought after by scholars and students but could not be reprinted economically using traditional technology. The Cambridge Library Collection extends this activity to a wider range of books which are still of importance to researchers and professionals, either for the source material they contain, or as landmarks in the history of their academic discipline.

Drawing from the world-renowned collections in the Cambridge University Library, and guided by the advice of experts in each subject area, Cambridge University Press is using state-of-the-art scanning machines in its own Printing House to capture the content of each book selected for inclusion. The files are processed to give a consistently clear, crisp image, and the books finished to the high quality standard for which the Press is recognised around the world. The latest print-on-demand technology ensures that the books will remain available indefinitely, and that orders for single or multiple copies can quickly be supplied.

The Cambridge Library Collection will bring back to life books of enduring scholarly value (including out-of-copyright works originally issued by other publishers) across a wide range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences and in science and technology.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-01121-1 - An Elementary Latin Grammar

Henry John Roby

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Elementary Latin Grammar

HENRY JOHN ROBY



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01121-1 - An Elementary Latin Grammar
Henry John Roby
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,
São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108011211

© in this compilation Cambridge University Press 2010

This edition first published 1862
This digitally printed version 2010

ISBN 978-1-108-01121-1 Paperback

This book reproduces the text of the original edition. The content and language reflect the beliefs, practices and terminology of their time, and have not been updated.

Cambridge University Press wishes to make clear that the book, unless originally published by Cambridge, is not being republished by, in association or collaboration with, or with the endorsement or approval of, the original publisher or its successors in title.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01121-1 - An Elementary Latin Grammar
Henry John Roby
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

ELEMENTARY
LATIN GRAMMAR.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01121-1 - An Elementary Latin Grammar
Henry John Roby
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

AN
ELEMENTARY
LATIN GRAMMAR

BY
HENRY JOHN ROBY, M.A.
UNDER MASTER OF DULWICH COLLEGE UPPER SCHOOL,
LATE FELLOW AND CLASSICAL LECTURER OF
ST JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

MACMILLAN AND CO.
Cambridge:
AND 23, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN
London.
1862.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01121-1 - An Elementary Latin Grammar
Henry John Roby
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

VIRO CLARISSIMO
IO. NICOLAO MADVIGIO
ARTIS GRAMMATICAE ET CRITICAE
OMNIUM QUOTQUOT NOVIT PERITISSIMO
POTISSIMUM DEBERI
SI QUID ACCURATIORIS DOCTRINAE
HVIC LIBELLO ACCESSERIT
GRATO ANIMO PROFITETUR EDITOR.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01121-1 - An Elementary Latin Grammar
Henry John Roby
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

PREFACE.

THE following pages will be found to differ very considerably from the Eton Grammar and those formed more or less on its model—for instance, King Edward VIth's and Dr Kennedy's. On this account the Syntax at least may perhaps require one or two careful readings, before the mode in which it deals with grammatical difficulties be fully apprehended. My object has been in the Accidence to state, as accurately as I could within the limits of a book for learners, the inflexional forms in use among the Romans of the best period; and in the Syntax to explain briefly and precisely the use of them. The examples are chiefly from Cæsar, Cicero, or Livy, or such as they might have written; and have been so chosen and so translated as to give frequent subsidiary hints on Latin construction or English translation. Peculiarities, especially those of earlier or later writers and of the poets generally, have been usually left to be explained by the teacher on their occurrence. If the principles given be correct, such peculiarities will not cause much difficulty.

The leading principles and arrangement of the book, especially the Syntax, are chiefly my own, at least so far as direct

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-01121-1 - An Elementary Latin Grammar
 Henry John Roby
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

viii

Preface.

help goes; but for details throughout I have made the amplest use of Madvig's Grammar. The facts of the *Accidence* have been almost entirely either derived from it, or corrected by its aid. In the *Syntax* I may particularly mention the treatment of objective propositions (§ 295. 4), of the tenses, and of the *oratio obliqua*; besides numerous examples. Where my use of his book has amounted almost to an abridgment of some length, his name has been added. I have not often deliberately differed from him. The edition which I have used is the first of the English translation: one correction (§ 81. 3) and some slight additions are from the last edition of the German (1857), to which no attention appears to have been paid in the last edition of the translation (1859).

My acknowledgments are also due to Morell's English Grammar for parts of the analysis (on Becker's system) of sentences; to Key's larger Grammar, 2nd ed. (a book well worth knowing, as it exhibits the results of a very fresh study of Latin) for some examples and useful hints; and to Donaldson's larger Grammar for similar occasional help, but in a less degree. Kennedy's School-grammar (almost always neat and ingenious) has been of some service, chiefly as indicating the amount of information usually required, but also in other ways. Many points of agreement with each of these writers will be found, where I am not conscious of any direct debt. Indeed Dr Kennedy's book I did not become acquainted with till I had written the first draught of the *Syntax*. My other obligations to books of this class are too slight to deserve separate mention.

There are some novelties in the *Accidence* which had perhaps better be noticed here. I have followed Madvig in his arrangement of the cases, which commends itself both by its propriety and simplicity: in omitting *mei, tui*, &c. as the direct genitive of the personal pronouns (see § 56); in distinguishing the imperative forms into a present and a future tense; and in omitting *amaminor*, &c. as being a form due only to a corruption of an old singular *amamino*. I have followed Donaldson

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-01121-1 - An Elementary Latin Grammar
 Henry John Roby
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Preface.

ix

in referring the gerundive to the active voice, and have given short reasons in a note to § 254. Madvig's view (see his *Bemerkungen*) and Key's appear to me substantially the same.

I have also confined the vocative case to those Latin nouns, substantive and adjective, of the 2nd declension which end in *us*: for in these alone is it different from the nominative. In pp. 12—23 no notice is taken of some rare words, which school-boys are likely to have little or nothing to do with; and generally, but especially in the Prosody, Greek nouns have been banished to a note (p. 79) and Appendix A. No translation is given in the paradigms of the Subjunctive and Infinitive, but the matter is fully treated in the Syntax (especially §§ 238, 247). The usual translations correspond to but few of the uses of either, and, as I know by experience, constantly lead to blunders. *Prima facie* indeed they are wrong. *Amem* is not *I can love*, nor *I may love*: although the latter may serve in some sentences, the former is better avoided altogether. The term *potential* mood is, I think, product and cause of similar mistakes.

The treatment of much of the Accidence might be greatly improved, if it were the custom of schools to pay more attention to the principles of sounds and letter-changes. But it would not be easy to do this successfully for boys first learning Latin, and I have therefore acquiesced (e.g. in § 25) in an unscientific procedure.

The usual names for the cases, moods, tenses, &c. are retained and used without any reference to their etymological meaning. This appeared to me less objectionable than adding a new nomenclature or fresh selection of terms to those already existing. In the Syntax, the ordinary names of constructions, &c. will be often found appended even where I thought them very bad, e.g. Ablative *Absolute*. Such vague terms as a Genitive or Accusative of *respect* or *reference*, I have endeavoured to avoid. By Active or Passive *voice*, I have generally meant the form only, whether the meaning be transitive or intransitive.

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-01121-1 - An Elementary Latin Grammar
 Henry John Roby
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Preface.

The analysis of the sentence has been simplified from that given in Morell's Grammar; and the terms *secondary* and *oblique predicate* strictly defined (rather differently from Donaldson) and freely used. They will, I believe, be found valuable instruments in syntactical analysis. The logical *copula* is omitted altogether. Whatever may be said in logic, *Pastor est supinus* and *Pastor dormit supinus* are precisely the same grammatically, and *est* has as good a right to be considered the predicate as *dormit*. Moreover, it is very objectionable to treat an adverb as forming the predicate; and yet what is to be done with *bene est* if *est* be the copula?

In treating of the cases and moods, I have endeavoured to deduce from their use the proper meanings of each, considering their construction to be determined by this. Such a method is exactly the reverse of the Eton system, which treats the use of particular cases and moods as resulting from the arbitrary preferences of different classes of verbs and adjectives, or the several prepositions, or certain conjunctions. Upon this baseless theory rest the exhibition of the use of the genitive, dative, &c. after adjectives, as something quite separate from their use after verbs; the omission of any leading distinctions between the several cases (partially supplied in K. Edw. VIth's, and still more in Kennedy's Grammar); the separate treatment of their use to denote relations of space and time; perpetual dreams of an ellipse of this or that preposition (now, however, generally disclaimed); of *si*, of *ut*, of *o* with the vocative, of the '*participium existendi*' (a most gratuitous supposition when the language does not possess any participle of being, and *existere*, in good Latin, never denotes 'being'); and what is almost worst of all, rules to explain the moods based upon the frequency of their occurrence with particular conjunctions; in fact, a statistical statement, appealing, I presume, to some theory of probabilities, substituted for a rational explanation, even in so important a matter as the subjunctive mood.

But as such rules are often called safe practical guides, to be

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-01121-1 - An Elementary Latin Grammar
 Henry John Roby
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Preface.

xi

used like a rule of thumb, it may be as well to examine one or two of those most in use, to see how far this is the case. I give Dr Kennedy's words, that the rules may wear the best face possible.

1. "Cum duo substantiva diversarum rerum concurrunt, alterum in genitivo ponitur, *When two substantives of different things come together, one is put in the genitive case.*" Not to dwell upon *diversarum rerum* and *concurrunt*, both of which contain plenty of pitfalls, the rule actually does not state *which* substantive is to be put into the genitive, thus leaving the student to adopt either the Latin or the Hebrew idiom. Other grammars have *posterius* for *alterum*; and then we get a rule which has the singular infelicity of flying in the face of the only case-inflexion in English nouns. *Cæsar's friend*, *Cæsar's amicus*, are generally better English and better Latin than *The friend of Cæsar*, *Amicus Cæsar's* (i.e. *friendly to Cæsar*), and probably more common. But a boy does not really use these rules. In writing Latin he is guided by the English inflexion or the preposition *of*; and in translating from Latin he reverses the same process besides thinking of the sense. The rule is carried in his mind as a collateral piece of knowledge, and is recited as a mere incantation against the master's wrath with not so much meaning as Cato's *Ista pista sista*, muttered over a sprain. Dr Kennedy gives subsequently other rules respecting the genitive of a very different character; but what possible good can such a rule as the above do at any time?

2. "Dativum ferre regunt verba composita cum adverbis *bene satis male*, et cum præpositionibus præsertim his, *Ad ante ab, In inter de, Sub super ob, Con, post et præ.*" To which, however, is wisely subjoined "Multa ex his variant constructionem." But then what becomes of the rule of thumb?

The truth is, I believe, that verbs compounded with these prepositions have other cases and constructions quite as often as a dative. 2ndly, The rule (I do not speak of the examples

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-01121-1 - An Elementary Latin Grammar
 Henry John Roby
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

given) makes no distinction between the direct and indirect object, although many of these verbs are transitive, and therefore have both. 3rdly, The dative after such verbs, when it occurs, is only the ordinary dative of the indirect object.

3. "*Quum*, causali sensu, subjunctivum plerumque regit; sed interdum Indicativum:

"*Quod, quando, quia, quandoquidem, quoniam, siquidem* causali sensu Indicativo gaudent: nisi opus sit subjunctivo.

"*Quum, quando, quoties, simul ut, simul atque, ubi, postquam* temporales Indicativo gaudent: *quum* sæpe subjunctivo, post et ante tempus Præteritum.

"*Dum, donec, quoad, antequam, priusquam* pro sententia loci, nunc Indicativum, nunc Subjunctivum capiunt."

What then should a boy do? first decide on his conjunction, and then put Indicative and Subjunctive alternately? or two Subjunctives for one Indicative? or *vice versâ*? There is not the slightest clue given to the real meanings of the moods in such sentences: all hinges on their comparative frequency after certain conjunctions. *Pro sententia loci* nowhere gets any explanation: *nisi opus sit subjunctivo* may refer to the Oratio obliqua, or to what Dr Kennedy mentions as the Potential and Optative uses, which however he distinguishes from the subjunctive 'as subjoined to particles:' but how, or to which it refers, is not said.

If the meaning of the cases and moods be well grasped, it is very interesting then to notice the natural or accidental attraction of particular verbs, &c. to particular constructions; but it does not appear to me possible to do this adequately within the limits of a boy's grammar. Madvig's does it well, but with much reduction it would lose its value.

If any should object that the treatment of the subjunctive mood in these pages is more difficult than that of the ordinary system, I would venture to ask whether, if so, this may not be due to the fact that the points of difficulty are really ignored in the ordinary system: and let a boy know the rules ever so per-

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-01121-1 - An Elementary Latin Grammar

Henry John Roby

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Preface.*

xiii

fectly, he would not be able to explain Latin authors, or know when to use the subjunctive and when the indicative. But my own belief is that boys get their first notions of grammar, not so much from rules as from examples, and that in writing their exercises they do not obey a precept but follow a precedent. As they make progress, they will want the rule to fix their nascent conceptions; and when they want it, they will begin to understand it. Syntax is never interesting, except to an advanced or advancing scholar; the difficulty lies in the subject itself, and cannot be conjured out of it by meaningless mesmeric passes. If it could, Latin would lose its educational worth, and the question might be fairly urged whether French or German would not be more useful to English boys. A boy has no real mental training unless some abstract thought be evoked, and Latin syntax cannot be acquired without it. Of course a boy need not go into the matter fully at first, but had better not get into a wrong mode altogether.

The treatment of the Cases is more likely to be charged with want of minute details. It will be found however that many of the ordinary details are necessary only on the artificial system adopted: and that others are only poetic, or rare. For boys writing Latin prose, it is desirable to keep poetic usages in the background: there will be little trouble with them if boys grasp well the meaning of the cases. The Latin dative is, I fancy, the very simplest oblique case in either Latin or Greek, and seems to me adequately treated for school-boys in two or, at most, four rules.* Now in Edward Vith's Grammar, the 'Dative after the Adjective' contains 6 rules: and the 'Dative after the Verb' 22 more, all in large print; of these 5 do not belong to the dative, but are due to some of the rules having overshot the mark: but,

* The list on pp. 88 and 89 might be rendered unnecessary by a boy's learning from the first to connect an intransitive verb in English with each of the words named. Appendix D has been added to obviate objections to the method adopted.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-01121-1 - An Elementary Latin Grammar

Henry John Roby

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

if they are deducted, their place is more than supplied by 7 other rules in other parts of the Syntax. A boy must have a good head to understand the use of a case which requires 30 rules to explain it, and 5 others to explain the rules. The Revised Eton Grammar reduces them to 14: Dr Kennedy's to 9 in the *Syntaxis Minor*. But all these grammars, by laying down arbitrary rules about verbs of *commanding* and *delighting*, make such a perfectly regular use as the accusative after the transitive verbs *lædo, delecto, juvo, rego, jubeo, guberno*, appear as an act of delinquency and violation of a general rule, or, as Dr Kennedy expresses it, 'they are joined to the accusative *contra regulam*.'

It must not be supposed that I regard the analysis of the cases, &c. as carried to its farthest point: I have stopped where I thought practical usage required it. Doubtless (in Latin) all genitives ultimately imply possession (or partition?): all datives, the person (or thing) *for whom*. The ablative has an obscure birth and is somewhat intractable: the accusative Madvig *may* be right in asserting to be the word used without any further grammatical definition than that it is not the subject, and that the notion of *place* is merely subordinate. But whether or not we can talk in such matters of actual historical priority, it seems to me more probable that in this case as in others, Space furnished the primary intuition and gave form and outness to the mental conception: and to this it is no objection that the general conception of *object* is far wider and includes in a sort that of *place towards which*. The genitive is hardly sufficiently appreciated in school-grammars, and its broad distinction from the other cases, as doing for substantives and partly for adjectives, what the nominative, accusative, and dative (and sometimes the ablative), do for verbs, is therefore frequently not caught. The genitive after verbs (§ 200. *b*) scarcely deviates from the proper conception (*accuso = causam facio: indigeo = indigus sum, &c.*): certainly even so it is very different from any of the other cases.

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-01121-1 - An Elementary Latin Grammar
 Henry John Roby
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Preface.

XV

The ultimate identity of many of the usages of each case is clearly indicated by their being equally referable to more than one head.

The Completed future is not free from difficulty. That the Latins treat it as a tense of the indicative mood is unquestionable: but could they have told whether *videris* (§ 235. 8) is an indicative or subjunctive? There is, it appears to me, much plausibility in Donaldson's identification of this tense with the perf. subj., as there is also in Madvig's deduction (see his *Opuscula*) of the perf. subj. from the compl. future: if the ground for such distinct subordination of the one to the other is not rather cut away from both by the common origin of *ero* and *sim*, of *amav-ero* and *amav-erim* (= *amav-esim*), which I believe is Curtius' view. Madvig goes the length of supposing a compl. future of the subjunctive as a different tense though the same in form with the perf. subj. This appears to me unnecessary, though his instances, in this case, as always, are very good. But when it is remembered how much more distinctly a completed future fixes events and circumstances which do not yet exist, than a simple future does, it may be doubted whether sufficient consideration has been given to the fact that the 1st pers. sing. which alone differs from the perf. subj., and differs by assuming an indicative termination, is the only one in which any positiveness of assertion respecting the future is natural. A man may speak positively of his own intentions, or may prophesy from knowledge of his own circumstances, but to do so of another must partake much more of the nature of a supposition, or a wish, or a command. *Sed hæc viderint doctiores: non equidem repugnavero.*

If any scholars should honour my little book with criticism either public or private, I shall be very grateful, as it will give me the best chance of improving it; and if objections be but specific, it will matter but little in this respect whether they be kindly or severely urged.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01121-1 - An Elementary Latin Grammar
Henry John Roby
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

xvi

Preface.

I have now only to thank warmly my kind friends, the Rev. J. E. B. Mayor, M.A., Rev. C. B. Hutchinson, M.A., and J. R. Seeley, Esq., M.A., for many valuable corrections and suggestions given amidst numerous engagements.

H. J. R.

DULWICH COLLEGE,
October, 1862.