

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



The Particle *Sic* as a Secondary Predicate

J. Stanley

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 07 / October 1897, pp 346 - 348

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00039299, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00039299

How to cite this article:

J. Stanley (1897). The Particle *Sic* as a Secondary Predicate. The Classical Review, 11, pp 346-348 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00039299

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

A STYLISTIC VALUE OF THE PARENTHETIC PURPOSE-CLAUSE.

Liv. vii. 1. 7. ne quando a metu ac periculis vacarent pestilentia ingens orta, etc.

Ib. 27. 1. ne nimis laetae res essent pestilentia civitatem adorta coegit etc.

Ib. x. 1. 4. tamen, ne prorsus inbellem agerent annum, parva expeditio in Umbria facta est, etc.

Ib. 6. 3. tamen, ne undique tranquillae res essent, certamen iniectum inter primores civitatis, etc.

Ib. vi. 34. 5. ne id nimis laetum parti alteri esset parva—causa intervenit, etc.

There is some difficulty about the *ne*-clauses here. Purpose-clauses they are, but they do not stand in a simple relation to the leading verbs. Weissenborn's note on the first passage is: die Absicht statt der Folge. The two first examples might be made

ordinary purpose-clauses by personifying *pestilentia*.

The word *nimis* occurs in two of these passages, and *quando*, *undique*, *prorsus* strike the same note in the other three. All the sentences alike sound the note of doom. It is fate, it is the Gods to whom '*nimietas*' is distasteful. In every case *ne* may be taken to mean *deis nolentibus ut*. We may compare the parenthetic purpose-clause for an analogous construction, but that is more detached from the sentence-structure in sequence. There was probably never a feeling of ellipsis here. It is perhaps explanation enough of the usage in question to describe it as an ironical use of the parenthetic purpose-clause.

EDWIN W. FAY.

THE PARTICLE *SIC* AS A SECONDARY PREDICATE.

THERE are many passages in Latin authors where commentators have found difficulty in explaining the meaning of the particle *sic*. They have rightly or wrongly assumed 'idiomatic' meanings which are very far removed from, and very hard to connect with, its proper signification of *hoc modo*. (Hand. Tursell. iii. 467). Moreover, if anyone will examine carefully the articles on *sic* in the dictionaries of Forcellini, Georges, Lewis and Short, White and Riddle, and the fragmentary work of Key, he must, I think, be struck by the inconsistent and unsatisfactory manner in which it has been treated.

I propose in this paper to show that in some cases at least these difficulties and inconsistencies are due to the fact that commentators and the compilers of dictionaries have failed to perceive that *sic* is sometimes used, not as a simple adverb or as a predicate with *esse*, but as a secondary predicate 'denoting the circumstances under which, or the character in which a person or thing acts or is acted upon.' (Roby, *Lat. Gram.* § 1017 c). The distinction between this use and its use predicatively with *esse* is well illustrated by Ter. Phorm. 210 seqq. *vultum contemplamini; en, | satin' sic est?* GE. *non. AN. quid si sic?* GE. *prope modum. AN. quid sic?* GE. *sat est. In satin' sic est* the word *sic*, 'being thus, like this,' denotes the cir-

cumstances under which his face is *satis*, 'will do,' while in *quid si sic* the word *sic* is directly predicated of *vultus* understood. With the words *quid sic* we must supply *est vultus*, and then it is seen that *sic* is again a secondary predicate 'denoting, etc.' Cf. Cic. Rosc. Am. 84 *sic est vita* with Verr. 1, 70 *sic iste . . . felicius fuit*. We must also distinguish that predicative use to which Madvig refers in his note on Cic. Fin. iv. 63, where the adverb *non tam modum ipsius actionis significat quam quid de actione iudicetur*, to which belong Propertius' *sic maestae cecinere tubae*, and expressions like *sic volo*, *sic iubeo*, *sic postulo*.

I shall now deal with some passages which illustrate the view I am advocating, but which have been differently explained by well known commentators. I shall endeavour to show that the apparent variations in the meaning of *sic* are due, not to any real change of meaning, but to a difference of relation to the other words in the various sentences. In some of these, *sic*, like other colourless terms in Latin, may require a stronger rendering in English, with a complexion derived from the context, but in all it will be seen that it literally means 'thus' or 'such,' preceded by 'being' or 'when,' as is usual with secondary predicates in English.

Plaut. Amph. 117 *huc processi sic cum servili schema*. Here *sic* clearly indicates the character in which he comes forth, and is further explained by *cum s. s.* following; it cannot possibly have any other relation to the rest of the sentence. The use of an explanatory phrase immediately following *sic* I have pointed out in my note on *sic temere*, which appeared in the *Class. Review*, April 1896, pp. 157–158.

Plaut. Cas. 704 seqq. *gladium Casinam intus habere ait qui med atque ted evitet*. OL. *scio. sic sine habere. nugas agunt. novi ego illas malas merces*. It may be noticed that *intus* is a secondary predicate as well as *sic*, the latter being = *talem*. For *talis* as secondary predicate cf. Ter. Eun. 160 *istum nunc times ne illum talem praeripiat tibi*. Verg. Georg. 3, 92 *talis et ipse iubam cervice effudit equina* | *Saturnus*.

I explain *sic* similarly in Plaut. Ps. 389 *nolo bis iterari: sat sic longae fiunt fabulae*. Bacch. 1005 *sat sic suspectus sum, quom careo noxia*, where *quom c. n.* explains *sic*. Mil. 854 *ibi erat bilibris aula, sic propter cados*. Ter. Hec. 283 seqq. *hacine causa ego eram tanto opere cupidus redeundi domum! hui! | quanto fuerat praestibilius ubivis gentium agere aetatem | quam huc redire, etc.* PAR. *at sic citius qui te expedias his aerumnis reperias. | si non rediisses, etc.* Here *sic* = 'being thus,' i.e. 'being back,' i.e. 'having returned.'

Cic. Rosc. Am. 71 *noluerunt feris corpus obicere; ne bestiis quoque quae tantum scelus attigissent immanioribus uteremur; non sic nudos in flumen deicere*. Halm's note is: '*sic nudos, nackt wie sie sind, in unmittelbarer nacktheit*; Liv. ii. 10, 11 *sic armatus desiluit*.' The Clarendon Press editor translates 'naked as they were'; Lewis and Short explain similarly under the heading 'demonstrative temporal force.' I object to these explanations because (1) they make *sic* a mere redundancy with *nudos*; (2) 'naked as they were,' if it has any meaning at all, implies they were naked at the time, which does not appear from the context; (3) I have no doubt that *nudos* merely means 'uncovered' as opposed to *in culleum insutos*; (4) it seems to me that the only way in which a satisfactory meaning can be obtained is by taking *sic* as a secondary predicate pointing to *tantum scelus*, and so = 'being such,' i.e. 'so wicked.' For this use of *sic* equivalent to an adjective suggested by a preceding substantive cf. Mart. 2, 1, 11 seqq. *esse tibi tanta cantus brevitate videris? | hei mihi quam multis sic quoque longus eris!* where *sic* = *tam brevis*. Cf. also

the passages from Lucretius and Vergil cited below. The interpretation which I suggest will be found to give additional force to Cicero's words.

Lucretius v. 436 seqq. *sed nova tempestus quaedam molesque coorta | omne genus de principis discordia quorum | intervalla vias conexus pondera plagas | concursus motus turbabat proelia miscens | propter dissimilis formas variasque figuras | quod non omnia sic poterant coniuncta manere*.

Munro translated the last two lines thus: 'because by reason of their unlike forms and varied shapes they could not all remain thus joined together.' But if this be correct, what manner of joining is meant by 'thus'? Dr. Duff in the Pitt Press edition says: '*sic* 'straight off,' 'at once,' οὐροσ. Cf. 970.' Can it be shown that *sic* ever has this assumed 'idiomatic' meaning? In line 970 *sic* is a conjectural insertion made by Munro, who explains it as = *sicut erant* or *negligenter*, quoting for that meaning sundry passages, in none of which is either of those meanings certain, or necessary. To examine these passages here would involve a too lengthy digression, but I may point out that Munro's view of Persius *sic poeta prodire* has been abandoned by Conington and Nettleship, while I have shown in the *Classical Review*, April 1896, that Horace's *sic temere* admits of a better explanation.

Lewis and Short (p. 1691^a) quote Lucr. v. 441 above for *sic* as 'a local demonstrative accompanied by a corresponding gesture.' If so, what does it mean?

I suggest therefore that *sic* should be taken in its ordinary sense of 'thus' or 'such,' equivalent to *dissimilia formis figurisque* and standing to *omnia* in the relation of a secondary predicate 'denoting the character, etc.' Then the words *propter figuras* will go with *proelia miscens*, and the last line of the passage will be translated 'because being of this kind, so unlike, they could not all remain joined together.' Thus a satisfactory meaning is obtained.

Verg. Aen. 5, 618 seqq. *fit Beroe . . . ac sic Dardanidum mediam se matribus infert*. Here commentators like Sidgwick pass over the difficulty, or like Conington leave the meaning of *sic* unexplained. I suggest that it is exactly similar to *talis* in Georg. 3, 92 cited above, and is a secondary predicate = *Beroen simulans*.

Similarly Aen. 6, 680 seqq. *atque hic Aeneas; una namque ire videbat | egregium forma iuvenem et fulgentibus armis | sed frons laeta parum et delecto lumina voltu: quis pater ille virum qui sic comitatur euntem?*

Here *sic* refers to *egregium forma*, etc., *deiecto lumina voltu*, and denotes the character in which the younger Marcellus accompanies the elder. This was partially perceived by Forbiger, whereas Conington's 'thus as we see' misses or evades the exact meaning of the particle.

Hor. Sat. 1, 4, 135, *hoc faciens vivam melius; sic dulcis amicis occurram*. Here *sic* stands in the same relation to *occurram* as *hoc faciens* does to *vivam*.

Ovid Met. 1, 695 seqq. *ritu quo cincta Dianae | falleret, et credi posset Latonia si non | corneus huic arcus si non foret aureus illi. sic quoque fallebat*. Here *sic* = *corneo arcu* and stands in the same relation to *fallebat* as *cincta* does to *falleret*. Cf. 13, 896 *sed sic quoque erat tamen Acis*, where also *sic* = 'being thus,' i.e. 'in this form.'

Sallust, Cat. 7, *sed gloriae maximum certamen inter ipsos erat; sic quisque hostem ferire properaret*. Here *sic* = *maxime certans*. The failure to perceive its true meaning accounts for the variant *se* and Gründel's suggested *ac si*.

Propertius 2, 8, 15 seqq. *ecquandone tibi liber sum visus? an usque | in nostram iacies verba superba caput? | sic igitur prima moriere aetate, Properti?—sed morere; interitu gaudeat illa tuo*. Here *sic* = 'thus flouted,' *verbis superbis caput impulsus*, and thus fittingly connects vv. 17 seqq. with what has preceded (cf. Nägelsbach, *Lat. Styl.* p. 608), refuting the contention of Lachmann and Müller that a new elegy begins at v. 17.

Tacitus, Ann. 1, 34, *adistentem contionem in manipulos discedere iubet: sic melius audituros responsum*. Furneaux tr. *sic* 'as they were,' comparing Ann. 4, 40, 4 and 15, 17, 3 for this so-called idiomatic meaning. I sug-

gest that *sic* 'like this' is merely a secondary predicate, and = *adistentes*. In Ann. 4, 40, 4, (*simplicius acturum de inimicitiis primum Agrippinae, quas longe acrius arsuras, si matrimonium Liviae velut in partes domum Caesaris distraxisset. Sic quoque erumpere aemulationem feminarum*.) *sic* seems to mean simply 'in this manner,' viz. *distrahendo in partes domum Caesaris*. The other passage which Furneaux cites is Ann. 15, 17, 3, *quando in incerto habeantur Parthorum conatus, Suriam repetiturum; sic quoque optimam Fortunam orandam, ut pedes confectus itinerum spatiis . . . equitem adsequeretur*. Here *sic* either suggests *repetenti* and is a secondary predicate denoting the circumstance under which Fortune is to be addressed by Corbulo, or it may be taken as pointing to the following *ut* clause, which will then be explanatory. Cf. Cic. Or. iii. 46, *sic agam vobiscum . . . ut aliquid de vestris vitiis audiat*.

Before concluding, I must mention one more passage, Livy, 2, 10, 12, which is usually cited in support of the current explanation of Cic. Rosc. Am. 71. Livy's words are: *clamore sublato undique in unum hostem tela coniciunt, . . . iam impetu conabantur detrudere virum cum simul fragor rupti pontis simul clamor impetum sustinuit. tum Coeles 'Tiberine pater,' inquit, ' . . . hunc militem accipias.' Ita sic armatus in Tiberim desiluit*. Here I see no reason to doubt that *sic* points to what has gone before and = 'being thus circumstanced.' *Ita* of course means 'accordingly.' Hand. Tursell. iii. 485. Different is Quintilian 2, 21, 20 *ita sic quoque recte diximus*, where *sic* points to what follows, 'accordingly the following is also a correct statement.'

J. STANLEY.

'NUMNE.'

THIS form has had an interesting history. Its very existence has been both affirmed and denied. Ritschl, *Opusc.* ii. p. 248 and Hand Tursellinus iv. 79 have denied its Latinity. Neither Georges, *Lex. d. lat. Wort.-form* nor Lindsay, *Latin Lang.*, even mentions it, though the former in his *Lat. Deutsch Wörterb.* cites it for Cic. 'numne vis audire?' But where does this occur? Elmer, *Proc. Am. Phil. Assn.* 1892, p. xx. in a footnote says: 'Hand Tursellinus iv. 79 and Ritschl, *Opusc.* ii. p. 248 are probably right in

denying the Latinity of this form.' Stolz in *Handb. d. Klass. Alt. Wissenschaft* ii.² does not mention the form at all, but in the *Hist. Gram. d. lat. Spr.* p. 439, § 83 simply records it. Ribbeck, however, *Lat. Part.* p. 13 maintains that the form does occur.

The passages that have been cited for its use are three:

(1) Plautus, *Truc.* ii. 6, 65. Goetz and Schoell however have a different reading here (line 546): *tu num nevis*, etc.

(2) Cic. *N.D.* i. 31, 88.